

OLD ENGLISH NEWSLETTER

VOLUME 44 • NUMBER 1 & 2 • 2013 • ISSN 0030-1973

Published for The Old English Division
of the Modern Language Association of America
by the Department of English, University of Massachusetts, Amherst

OLD ENGLISH NEWSLETTER

Volume 44 Number 1 & 2

2013

EDITOR

Stephen J. Harris, University of Massachusetts, Amherst

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

EDITORIAL BOARD

Mary Dockray-Miller, Lesley University

Stacy Klein, Rutgers University

Andrew Rabin, University of Louisville

Andrew Scheil, University of Minnesota

Mary Jane Toswell, University of Western Ontario

Renée Trilling, University of Illinois

ADVISORY BOARD

Antonette diPaolo Healey, *Dictionary of Old English*

Catherine Karkov, University of Leeds

Ursula Lenker, University of Munich

Roy Liuzza, University of Tennessee

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 Massachusetts, Bartlett Hall, Amherst, MA, 01003; email editor@oenewsletter.org. The generous support of the Department of English and the College of Humanities and Fine Arts at The University of Massachusetts 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. Payment can be made online.

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 offprints 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 © 2013 Old English Newsletter.

www.oenewsletter.org

NOTICE

Subscribers are reminded that with volume 42, the *Old English Newsletter* 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.oenewsletter.org.

THE YEAR'S WORK IN OLD ENGLISH STUDIES

2009

CONTRIBUTORS

Anthony Adams	Colby College
Rachel Anderson	Grand Valley State University
Christopher Cain	Towson University
Bryan Carella	Assumption College
John David Cormican	Utica College
Craig Davis	Smith College
Glenn Davis	St. Cloud State University
Nicole Guenther Discenza	University of South Florida
Mary Dockray-Miller	Lesley University
Eugene Green	Boston University
John Harkness	Augsburg College
Richard F. Johnson	William Rainey Harper College
Stefan Jurasinski	State U of New York—Brockport
Matti Kilpiö	University of Helsinki
Aaron Kleist	Biola University
Kevin Leahy	Portable Antiquities Scheme
Theodore Leinbaugh	University of North Carolina
Karmen Lenz	Macon State College
Joseph P. McGowan	University of San Diego
Andrew Rabin	University of Louisville
Mary Rambaran-Olm	University of Glasgow
Elizabeth A. Rowe	Cambridge University
Andrew Scheil	University of Minnesota
Douglas Simms	Southern Illinois U—Edwardsville
Larry Swain	Bemidji State University
Jane Toswell	University of Western Ontario
Brita Wårvik	Åbo Akademi
Benjamin C. Withers	University of Kentucky
David Woodman	Cambridge University

EDITOR

Daniel Donoghue Harvard University

Contents

Foreword	5
1. General and Miscellaneous Subjects	7
2. Memorials, Tributes, History of the Discipline	11
a. History of the Discipline	11
b. Bibliographies and Reports	16
c. Memorials and Tributes	17
3. Language	19
a. Lexicon	19
b. Syntax, Phonology, Other Aspects.	25
4. Literature	52
a. General and Miscellaneous	52
b. Individual Poems.	71
c. <i>Beowulf</i>	85
d. Prose.	99
5. Anglo-Latin and Ecclesiastical Works	134
6. Manuscripts, Illuminations, Charters	147
7. History and Culture.	163
a. General Sources and Reference Works	163
b. Religion and the Church	163
c. Society and the Family.	169
d. Gender and Identity	170
e. The Economy, Settlement and Landscape.	171
f. Magic, Medicine and Science	173
g. Law, Politics and Warfare	173
h. Vikings	178
i. The Norman Conquest and Settlement	179
8. Names	185
9. Archaeology, Sculpture, Inscriptions, Numismatics	188
a. Excavations	188
b. Cemeteries, Bioarchæology, Funerary Archæology and Practices.	189
c. Sculpture, Monuments, and Architecture	192
d. Artifacts and Iconography	196
e. Regional Studies and Economic Studies	201
f. Interdisciplinary Studies	203
g. The Anglo-Saxon Church	204
h. Numismatics	205
Abbreviations	210

Foreword

It will come as no surprise to readers of *YWOES* that to be an Anglo-Saxonist means to work across disciplines. Historians draw from new directions in archaeology; literary studies pay attention to manuscript context; language studies move among Old English, Latin, and Celtic languages; and there are other combinations in every part of the larger field. As bibliographers and editors we must place each article or book in a category, although increasingly the categories we work with seem inadequate to the task. In fact, this year's Archaeology section, for example, adds a new subcategory called "Interdisciplinarity," which one can interpret either as a sign of desperation or a celebration of diversity—or better, as a simple acknowledgement of the direction of productive scholarship these days.

Other trends in this year's reviews: while *Beowulf* continues to attract a great deal of attention from many directions, prose is a prominent growth area, in part because of landmark publications in 2009, such as *The Old English Boethius*, edited by Malcolm Godden and Susan Irvine, and important collections of articles on The Vercelli Book and on Ælfric. If the number of pages in this issue is any indication (and I think it is), Old English prose is where the action is these days.

For this issue we bid a grateful farewell to reviewers Jun Terasawa (Syntax) and to Kathryn Powell and Zoya Metlitskaya (History). And we welcome newcomers Brita Wårvik (Syntax) and Bryan Carella and Ted Leinbaugh (Prose). I thank Joey McMullen and Erica Weaver for their editorial help in preparing the text.

The contributors to *YWOES* 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.

As with previous issues, some items have been reviewed separately by two reviewers. These are indicated by the symbol ‡‡ and placed near one another.

Comments and suggestions, as well as review copies of articles and books, may be sent to Daniel Donoghue, Department of English, Barker Center, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA, 02138.

DD

1. General and Miscellaneous Subjects

Film

Anke Bernau examines the use of the medieval past in D.W. Griffith's 1915 film in "Poison to the infant, but tonic to the man: Timing *The Birth of a Nation*" in *Medieval Film*, ed. Anke Bernau and Bettina Bildhauer (Manchester: Manchester UP), 86–109. Bernau argues that Griffith's film reflected "contemporary ideas concerning nation, history, race, all of which . . . participated in popular and academic constructions of the medieval" (86). Based on two novels by Thomas Dixon, *The Birth of a Nation* gratified the contemporary belief that the Anglo-Saxon past provided a foundation for American identity. According to the prevailing theory, "America was not only the inheritor of the Anglo-Saxon past but the truest fulfillment of its historical destiny" (88). Bernau demonstrates that the film's conflation of past, present, and future through its use of innovative cinematic techniques underpins these ideological premises of national destiny. She concludes that "national narrative, racialism and cinematic form all participate in powerful and mutable tropes of medievalism" (105).

Kathleen Forni tackles the vexing question of what Anglo-Saxonists should make of the 2007 blockbuster film version of the Old English epic in "Popularizing High Culture: Zemeckis's *Beowulf*," *Studies in Popular Culture* 31.2: 45–59. Following film theorists Robert Stam and Thomas Leitch, Forni argues that Zemeckis's film and perhaps more importantly Roger Avery and Neil Gaiman's screenplay represent "an interpretation of the poem" that can be examined as "a case study in how literary classics are reinvented for popular consumption" (45). Forni discusses the challenges, which the filmmakers faced in making the story of the epic into a commercially viable product, pointing out that the often disconcerting departures from the original are more than efforts "to provide the unity and continuity between the two halves of the poem that has bedeviled Hollywood adapters" (46). In her discussion of the departures, she demonstrates that Avery and Gaiman's version of the epic is influenced by "the popular reception history of *Beowulf*, other popular film genres with which audiences might be familiar, and an effort to appeal to an adolescent male demographic" (49). In the end, Forni argues that—regardless of one's individual

opinion of it—Zemeckis's film deserves to join the shelves of countless other "translations" of the epic.

Dissertations

Michael R. Kightley explores the influence of Old English scholarship in the discourses of race and English national identity in his U. of Western Ontario doctoral dissertation, "Racial Anglo-Saxonisms: From Scholarship to Fiction in England, 1850–1960." Kightley focuses on the work of three writers: Charles Kingsley, William Morris, and J. R. R. Tolkien. According to Kightley, each of these literary figures produced both scholarly work on Old English literature and language and popular fiction consisting of representations of "Englishness." Using the work of these three writers as case studies, Kightley demonstrates that they "actively [mold] their medieval sources into intricate (and often problematic) theorizations of the Anglo-Saxon and English races, which they then adopt into their popular fiction for broader consumption" (3).

In her 2008 Catholic U. of America doctoral dissertation, "*Grendel*: John Gardner's Reinvention of the *Beowulf* Saga," Sandra M. Hiortdahl argues that Gardner's novel is both an ironic reinvention and celebration of the original epic. Through the lens of Gardner's views on artistic morality—especially as expressed in his *On Moral Fiction*, Hiortdahl charts Grendel's progression from innocence to depravity, positing a "moral" rationale for his behavior. Hiortdahl's dissertation locates Gardner's *Grendel* within the larger literary and critical traditions.

Fiction

2009 was an exceptionally charmed year for fictional accounts of life, love, labor, and looting in Anglo-Saxon times. No fewer than eleven novels are included in the YWOES bibliography for this year. In case anyone intends to indulge in the fantasy world of these tales, only the scantest (matching the apparel of many of the characters) of plot summaries will be given here. The novels themselves fall into three categories: young adult, historical fiction, and romance.

Written for a high-school audience, Katy Moran's *Bloodline Rising* (London: Walker) is a gripping tale of intrigue and deception set in seventh-century Constantinople and Britain. The protagonist, Cai, is the teenage son of the main character in Moran's earlier novel, *Bloodline*. Sold into slavery in Britain, Cai becomes a master spy in the novel's ever-shifting political landscape.

For students just venturing into chapter books, Joan Lennon has written *Witch Bell* (Tulsa, OK: Kane/Miller), the fourth book in the Wickit Chronicles, a fictional fantasy series set in the fenlands of medieval England, illustrated by David Wyatt. An orphan, Pip, and his companion Perfect, a stone gargoyle come-to-life, live at Wicket Abbey, where they engage in all manners of adventure. In *Witch Bell*, they meet a mysterious stranger known simply as the Traveler and bring him back to the Abbey for shelter. An envoy of the church, the Holy Hunter, is hot on the trail of the Traveler and has cast a suspicious eye on young Pip. Each book in the series includes a section at the end that explains various aspects of medieval monastic life.

In the historical fiction category, Stephen Baxter's *Conqueror* (New York: Ace Books) is the second novel in his "alternate-history" series of novels. In this volume, Baxter tells the stories of a variety of different characters, each of whom are fulfilling an ancient prophecy tied to appearances of Halley's Comet. Baxter is a compelling storyteller and many of the scenes provide a front-row seat at such historical events as the sacking of Lindisfarne and the Battle of Hastings (even the funeral of the Viking chieftain chronicled by Ibn Fadlan!).

With *King Arthur, Dragon's Child* (London: Headline Review), M.K. Hume has launched a new Arthurian trilogy. In this first volume, Arthur emerges from a rather lackluster adolescence to become a formidable warrior whom other warriors respect and trust. The novel ends with the death of Uther Pendragon and the desperate search for the legitimizing sword and crown which will unite Britain under a single High King.

In Giles Kristian's first novel, *Blood Eye* (London: Bantam), a young slave, Osric, is captured by a band of raiding Vikings. When the Norsemen set sail to return to their homeland with Osric in tow, they are forced to return to port due to foul weather. Their party is ambushed by local villagers, and—as part of a ransom agreement—they are sent on an adventure to steal a precious religious book. On their journey, Osric is taught how to fight in the Viking manner and joins them in their search for the mysterious book. Of the novels published this year, *Blood Eye* is perhaps the

most entertaining. Kristian's descriptions of battle are especially vivid.

Hazel M. Peel has written numerous novels, short stories, and newspaper features—mostly on the subject of her beloved Gloucestershire. Her latest novel, *Battle Royal* (Bath: Chivers), written under the pseudonym Wallis Peel, is a tale of family intrigue and political infighting. Set in the sixth century against the backdrop of the struggles for supremacy among the Celto-British, Romano-British, and Saxon tribes, *Battle Royal* tells the story of the attempt by Ceawlin, king of the Saxons, to unify these groups and achieve political hegemony over the island.

Perhaps the most robust category of fiction this year is devoted to themes of romance. Amanda McIntyre's *Tortured* (Don Mills, Ont.: Spice) pulls out all of the stops of this genre: torture, betrayal, brutality, murder, and sex. In the year 500 AD, a druid priestess, Sierra, is forced to work for the executioner of the brutal Saxon lord Aeglech. When a Roman prisoner, Dryston, fails to divulge vital information about a rebellion, the executioner, Balrogan, forces Sierra to use sex to extract the warrior's secrets. In a predictable turn of events, the two prisoners, Sierra and Dryston, form a bond. Sierra provides Dryston relief from the relentless torture at the hands of the executioner, and with Dryston, Sierra sexually reawakens and finds peace.

Set in ninth-century Northumbria, Joanna Fulford's first novel, *The Viking's Defiant Bride* (Toronto: Harlequin), is another steamy tale of unwilling passion. After the defeat and death of her father and brother, Lady Elgiva Ravenswood is given as a prize to the Viking conqueror Earl Wulfrum. In this forced marriage between vanquisher and captive, the sultry Saxon beauty Elgiva proves the fiercest challenge that the legendary warrior Wulfrum has yet faced. In true Harlequin fashion, their passionate battle ends in the marriage bed.

Lynsay Sands's novel, *The Perfect Wife* (New York: Leisure Books), is a vapid variation on the Cinderella theme. Tormented her entire life by her mean-spirited cousins, Avelyn is an anxious and self-conscious wreck, who, after a series of humiliating mishaps, finds true love with a war-weary and lonely knight. Ostensibly set in eleventh-century England, the tale might as well have been set in a suburb of Cleveland for all of the historical irrelevance of the setting.

S. Fowler Wright's novel, *Elfwin: A Novel of Anglo-Saxon Times* (San Bernardino, CA: Borgo P), was originally published in 1930 as *Elfwin: A Romance of History*. This historical romance is set against that backdrop of the Danish invasions of the ninth century.

Elfwyn, niece of King Alfred of Wessex, is betrothed to her cousin, Athelstan, but she actually loves Sithric, a Danish chieftain, whom she met while he was a hostage in her mother's court. Elfwyn renounces her family and flees to join Sithric. Separated from each other during a fierce battle, Elfwyn and Sithric seem destined never to be united, until Bear Thorkeld, a Viking lord, contrives to help them.

Set in the years after the Battle of Ethandun and the establishment of the boundaries between Anglo-Saxon and Viking lands, Susan Squires's novel, *Danelaw* (New York: Leisure), tells the story of a gifted young druid priestess named Epona. Living in the vale of the Uffington White Horse, Epona possess the gift of understanding and communicating with horses. She is losing this power, however, and must bear a daughter in whom the gift will be reborn. She comes in contact with two very different men. A young King Alfred seeks to gain her assistance in uniting his countrymen against the Vikings, while Valgar the Beast hears about a priestess who can provide him with horses. Epona's destiny and the future of her caste lies with one of these two men. Will it be the youthful king or the ferocious Viking?

■ *Varia*

The first volume of a projected two-volume collection of essays, *Tolkien's View: Windows into His World* (Zürich: Walking Tree), reprints twenty essays by Professor J. S. Ryan, one of the few living students of J.R.R. Tolkien who can provide some insight into Tolkien's "academic environment, both regarding the atmosphere in which he worked and prospered as well as the teachers and students surrounding him" (iv). The collection is divided into two parts: The essays in Part A are primarily biographic pieces on Tolkien and others in his circle, while those in Part B are drawn largely from Ryan's early career and reflect his emerging interest in philology. Anyone interested in Tolkien and his life and work will find in these essays an intriguing and personal glimpse into the mental milieu and academic aura of the esteemed Professor of Anglo-Saxon.

Don C. Skemer discusses a previously unknown version from the mid-fourteenth century of the story of two mythological Britons in "The Story of Engle and Cardyng: Fragment of an Anglo-Norman Chronicle Roll," *Viator* 40: 255–75. Discovered as flyleaves in Princeton University Library, Garrett MS 119, the fragment of an Anglo-Norman prose chronicle includes the story of Engle, a legendary king of England, and Scardyng, a giant, who—according to legend—became

the founder of Scarborough. Skemer discusses the significance of the chronicle roll as a form of popular literature incorporating both oral and written traditions. He also traces the provenance of Garrett MS 119 to the Lincolnshire abbey of Croyland and the library of William Cecil, Lord Burghley, who was Secretary and Lord Treasurer to Queen Elizabeth I. The essay closes with a diplomatic transcription of the story of Engle and Scardyng in the Garrett MS 119.

With Edward L. Ridsen's *Beowulf for Business: The Modern Warrior's Guide to Career Building* (Eastbourne: Gardners Books, 2007), *Beowulf* has joined the canon of classic literary works—such as Sun-Tzu's *The Art of War*—that would appear to convey timeless lessons for the modern executive. Ridsen asserts that "*Beowulf* can help you live a better, more successful life" (2). It is, after all, a "heroic, instructive, [and] moral poem" (6), which contains valuable lessons in "courage, duty, honor, composure, commitment and responsibility, knowing oneself and one's enemy, understanding customs and history, public speaking, power, and generosity" (9). Each chapter of Ridsen's book follows a set pattern. Chapters include clever titles such as "Make peace-making peaceful," "On stealing and hoarding," "The power of digressions," and "Foreign waters, or really foreign turf." Each chapter opens with the presentation of "The Idea" and a discussion of "The Passage" from the epic that relates to the main concept of the chapter. The chapter is rounded out by a section that demonstrates "The Application" of the precept to modern business, followed by "Manager's Spotlight," a discussion of the relevance of the point from the manager's point of view. Chapters close with a list of discussion questions entitled "Points to Ponder." The final chapter of the book, "Beowulf and Your Career," comprises a summary of all the concepts covered in the book with a discussion of the poem's significance and application to contemporary professional life. Ridsen offers a hands-on guide to the timeless wisdom of the poem as it relates to business practices, bringing the world of *comitatus* to bear on the world of corporate privilege.

Alaric Albertsson's *Travels through Middle Earth: The Path of a Saxon Pagan* (Woodbury, MN: Llewellyn) is a pagan guidebook-of-sorts that offers the reader a glimpse into the life and practices of a modern "Saxon Pagan." Albertsson is a founding member of Earendel Hearth, a group dedicated to living according to an idiosyncratic synthesis of Anglo-Saxon tradition, rural American folklore, herbal studies, and rune lore. *Travels through Middle Earth* includes chapters on Anglo-Saxon cosmology, deities, spirits, elves, dwarves, and

rituals, in addition to practical information about how to incorporate Saxon religious principles and practices into one's own spiritual life. Thankfully, Albertsson does not suggest that what he is describing is how the Anglo-Saxons practiced their religion; instead, he presents a spiritual pathway for anyone interested in pursuing an authentic spirituality based on Saxon pagan principles. In doing so, he also manages to avoid the pitfalls of many neo-pagans and New Agers who uncritically cobble together all manner of bizarre practices and ideas. Albertsson grounds his assumptions about and reconstructions of Anglo-Saxon religious practices in the context—albeit an idiosyncratic context—of history, linguistics, archaeology, and theology. In the end, this glimpse into the Saxon Pagan way of life is instructive and informative, if not necessarily applicable to the classroom.

Originally published in 1985, Peter Glassgold's *Hwaet! A Little Old English Anthology of Modernist Poetry* (Los Angeles: Green Integer Books) has been revised and expanded. This "bilingual" edition includes eccentric "translations" of poems by major modern and contemporary poets, such as Ezra Pound's "In a Station of the Metro" (where the faces in the crowd are like "Blostmabladu on watum, blacum boge"), William Carlos Williams's "This is Just to Say" (in which the plums in the icebox taste "swa swete and swa cealde") and "The Red Wheelbarrow," Gary Snyder's "By Frazier Creek Falls," Marianne Moore's "O To Be a Dragon," Wallace Stevens's "Anecdote of the Jar," Robert Lowell's "Water," and David Antin's "meditation 4." Although Glassgold tells the reader that his translations began as "part joke, part mad-game," they are oddly compelling and might prove useful—perhaps in Introductory Old English classes.

RFJ

■ Works not seen

Alexander, Lance. "Life in the Age of Beowulf." (2009), 1 videodisc.

Artamanova, Maria. "Construing Old English in the Thirteenth Century: The Syntax of the Winteney Adaptation of the Benedictine Rule." *Leeds Studies in English* 40 (2009), 27-46.

"Beowulf." *U*X*L Encyclopedia of World Mythology*. Ed. anon. Detroit: U*X*L/Gale, 2009. [online].

Parker, Joanne. "The Dragon and the Raven: Saxons, Danes and the Problem of Defining National Character in Victorian England." *European Jnl of English Studies* 13 (2009), 257-73.

2. Memorials, Tributes, History of the Discipline

2A. HISTORY OF THE DISCIPLINE

The history of Anglo-Saxon studies in all its periods and locales continues to be a rich field for scholarly inquiry. Throughout this year's work on the history of the discipline, analysis continues to focus on the ways that Anglo-Saxon texts and culture were used by readers, editors, and translators for their own contemporary purposes.

Henry Bainton's "Translating the 'English' Past: Cultural Identity in the *Estoire des Engleis*," *Language and Culture in Medieval Britain: The French of England, c. 1100–c. 1500*, ed. Jocelyn Wogan-Browne, *et al.*, (Rochester: York Medieval) 179–87, brings the history of the discipline all the way back to the Anglo-Norman period in its analysis of the political and cultural motivations behind the *Estoire* (an Anglo-Norman translation/adaptation of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle). Bainton argues against the conventional reading of the *Estoire des Engleis* as "actively involved in the promotion of a new Anglo-Norman identity that rested on an adoption by the Anglo-Norman settlers of the English past as somehow their own" (180); he postulates instead that "the translation from the standardized literary language of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle (late West Saxon) to a non-standardized French vernacular opened a textual space in which heterogeneous and competing narratives of belonging could be inscribed, where allegiances could be multiple and identities could slide" (181).

Jumping forward a few hundred years, Timothy Graham explores the ways that Matthew Parker (1504–1575) and his staff (especially his secretary John Joscelyn) collected and used medieval manuscripts in "Matthew Parker's Manuscripts: An Elizabethan Library and its Use," *Cambridge History of Libraries in Britain and Ireland: Vol. 1 To 1640*, ed. Elisabeth Leedham-Green and Teresa Webber (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2006), 322–44. Parker became Archbishop of Canterbury in 1559, and as part of his duties he set about collecting manuscripts and books into a collection that "was truly representative of the written culture of medieval England" (322). Parker's collection "offers a unique picture of how medieval books were explored and exploited for the contribution they could make

to major issues that confronted the archbishop and his contemporaries," especially religious issues of the protestant reformation (323). Graham provides detailed data about the provenance of much of the collection, which came in a large part from the southeast (especially from the remains of the two Canterbury houses). The collection had progressively fewer items from regions further from Canterbury, so that there are very few manuscripts in the Parker library from Northumbria (328).

Graham as well provides details about how Parker maintained, organized, and supplemented the collection; many of his practices seem nonsensical in the light of twenty-first century archiving and preservation practices. For instance, Parker tended to bind together texts that were of the same size, no matter their date or content (329). He also supplied/inserted missing parts of texts from other copies, he erased incomplete texts that he could not fill in, and he added copies of texts to manuscripts if he thought they were thematically appropriate (for example, he put a corrupted sixteenth-century copy of King Edgar's law codes into a manuscript of Anglo-Saxon legal texts (331). Parker also provided identifications of the manuscripts' previous owners, some of which were correct and some of which were wishful thinking (like his ascription of a variety of books to Theodore of Tarsus).

Most crucially, Graham focuses on the way that Parker used the medieval texts as evidence in his theological work on the Reformation. Graham examines notes and marginalia made by Parker and Joscelyn to make his point that "the manuscripts that were studied most closely [by Parker and his associates] included historical chronicles and books attesting to the doctrine and practices of the early English church," especially texts about papal abuses, superstition, clerical marriage, and the doctrine of transubstantiation (334). Parker was also very interested in the Old English translations of biblical texts, since they indicated the existence of an "ancient" tradition of biblical translation into English (336).

Corpus Christi College and the Cambridge University library got the bulk of Parker's collection, and Graham details the sometimes eccentric list of Parker's stipulations about upkeep and maintenance of

the books. In addition, Parker decreed a set of rules about access to his books that severely limited the collection's availability until the library staff began to ease the restrictions in the seventeenth century.

Jennifer Summit's new book, *Memory's Library: Medieval Books in Early Modern England* (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2008), also provides description and analysis of Parker's library, although she contextualizes her points within a larger history of the ways that early modern libraries preserved the medieval past. Her introduction narrates and discusses the change from the monastic library of the English Middle Ages to the antiquarian collections of the early modern period (her dates are 1431–1631). Like Graham's, much of her analysis is driven by the impact of the Reformation; Summit's broader focus is the history of libraries as a whole. She argues that "the libraries' very project of redirecting medieval manuscripts from monks to antiquarians necessarily desacralized those manuscripts, thus allowing their transformation from objects of belief into sources for a history of belief" (8). While her discussion briefly alludes to some Anglo-Saxon texts, she does not use any of Parker's or Cotton's pre-Conquest holdings as prime examples in her analyses of those collections. Her points are relevant to the Anglo-Saxon texts as well, however; for instance, she argues that Parker and the other sixteenth-century "antiquarians" reconstituted medieval texts as "monuments of antiquity" worthy of historical study rather than seeing them as religious texts that needed to be banned or refuted. Parker's collection is the prime example of her argument that "in the politically contentious post-Reformation period, the library was conceived, not as a passive vessel for the preservation of the past but as a place where the past was actively remade" (106).

Summit develops that line of thinking further in her discussion of Robert Cotton's library; like Parker, Cotton was driven by "Protestant nation building" (138). Summit argues that "Cotton invents the modern documentary source by transforming the medieval texts in his collection from objects of belief into objects of historical knowledge" (13); he was much more amenable than Parker to lending items and to having visitors to his collection. As such, Summit claims that "Cotton dominates the history of the Renaissance English library. He likewise dominates the history of the English Middle Ages, since much of what we know about the period's history and literary culture is thanks to the original sources that he amassed" (136).

Both Cotton and Parker not only collected manuscripts but determined and developed the ways that those manuscripts would be used right up to

our contemporary present, including the note that in the seventeenth century "being able to cite a Cotton manuscript became a marker of scholarly legitimacy" (137).

Raphael Holinshed and his assistants would not have had access to the Parker library, thanks to Parker's access restrictions, but Henry Summerson has proven that they did have access to a now-lost manuscript of the *Vita Edwardi regis* that contained a version of the text different from the sole extant manuscript (BL Harley 526, fols. 38–57). In "Tudor Antiquaries and the *Vita Edwardi regis*," ASE 38: 157–84, Summerson assigns the now-lost version of the *Vita* to the collection of John Stow, one of Holinshed's collaborators. Through analysis of the papers of William Camden, Francis Thynne, and Stow, Summerson reconstructs seven sections of text from the lost version, some in Latin (which Summerson translates) and some in Early Modern English. Most notable of these reconstructed texts is Text 1, which is presented as the full Latin poem describing the ship Earl Godwin of Wessex gave to Edward the Confessor in 1042 (the first part is in the Harley 526 version; Summerson adds the second part). Text 2 provides sections of an Early Modern English translation of the lost Latin original, narrating events of the 1060s, including the rebellion of the northerners against Tostig and the building of Westminster Abbey. Text 3, also in EME, narrates events from the early 1050s, with a focus on Godwin's exile in 1051 and his death in 1053. Text 4 is an EME translation of very brief account of Harold's undated trip to Rome. An extended narrative of the founding and building of Westminster comprises the Latin text 5, while the EME text 6 recounts a brief miracle of healing a blind man and the Latin text 7 describes Edward on his deathbed, entrusting the kingdom and the queen to Harold. Text 8 is a version of an episode that occurs as well (with significantly different details) in Aelred of Rievaulx's twelfth-century *Vita*; in it, Edward demonstrates his generosity and compassion to a thief.

Summerson notes in his conclusion that Stow, Camden, and Thynne performed substantial and careful editorial and translation work: "the attention that they gave to the *Vita* underlines the constructive way in which the historical scholarship of the Elizabethan age was capable of responding to the writings of a much earlier period" (169).

Somewhere between the Tudor antiquaries and the eighteenth century, Anglo-Saxon studies became an international pursuit, and Matti Kilpiö provides a brief history of the earliest Finnish Anglo-Saxonist in his introduction to *Anglo-Saxons and the North*:

Essays Reflecting the Theme of the 10th Meeting of the International Society of Anglo-Saxonists in Helsinki, August 2001, ed. Matti Kilpiö, et al. (Tempe: ACMRS), 1–9. The volume is something of a proceedings volume for the 2001 ISAS meeting held in Finland; Kilpiö is thus following in the footsteps of Henrik Gabriel Porthan (1739–1804), who studied the *Ohthere* and *Wulfstan* interpolation in Alfred's *Orosius* throughout his career and published his work (in Finnish) in 1800 (2–5). One of Kilpiö's notes makes the interesting point that for the majority of Porthan's students, "Porthan himself was responsible for the substance of the thesis; the role of the respondent was mainly restricted to showing that he was able to use Latin for scholarly argumentation" (2, n.5). To conduct his investigation, then, Kilpiö had to read Porthan's students' late-eighteenth-century Latin dissertations as well as Porthan's own published work.

Robert Rix's recent work is based in the eighteenth century as well; he analyzes the study and perception of Scandinavian and Germanic languages and literature in England in both "Thomas Percy's Antiquarian Alternative to Ossian," *Journal of Folklore Research* 46: 197–229 and "Romancing Scandinavia: Relocating Chivalry and Romance in Eighteenth-Century Britain," *European Romantic Review* 20: 3–20. The former is the more specifically focused of the two; in it, Rix examines Percy's *Five Pieces of Runic Poetry Translated from the Islandic Language* (1763) and *Reliques of Ancient English Poetry* (1765) as part of a "national project" that asserted English dominance and importance in the world of European letters. Rix sees the *Five Pieces* as a specifically English response to James Macpherson's 1760 *Fragments of Ancient Poetry*, which purported to anthologize translations of "ancient" Scottish poems by Ossian that Macpherson had supposedly collected through a living oral tradition. While Macpherson's work was later exposed as a fraud, Percy's book attempted at the time to provide an English literary and linguistic tradition even older and grander than Ossian's Scottish works. In particular, Percy emphasized the authenticity and textual history of the translations he presented, even including editions of the originals in appendices of later editions. Percy as well picked poems for his anthology that he thought would appeal to eighteenth century "sensibility" (rather than long poems focused on dynastic issues, for example, which he certainly knew) (207). Percy's translation anthologies, then, consciously provided an originary literary tradition for "a dominant nation and language yearning for cultural capital" (222). Rix's *European Romantic Review* essay, in contrast, contextualizes much more broadly the ways that the eighteenth-century antiquarians like Percy claimed

Scandinavian (and thus English, as opposed to French/continental) origins for the medieval romance tradition. In arguing that "metrical tales of chivalry originated with the Scandinavian court poets, the scalds," and that "the scalds had formed an integral part of Anglo-Saxon culture," the antiquarians thought they were able to show that English literature was a central rather than peripheral part of the European literary tradition (3). What Rix terms an "imaginative rewriting of poetic history" allowed Percy and others to dismiss the inconvenient point that many English romances were translations of extant French texts (3). Part of this imaginative rewriting was the development of "Runic" theory (Rix capitalizes to differentiate the eighteenth-century version from real runes), a rationalization for locating the origin of romance in northern rather than continental culture. The three components of Runic theory were "1) that the virtues of chivalry originated in Scandinavia before they became institutionalized throughout Europe; 2) that a Norse 'poetic empire' dominated the production and transmission of chivalric romances; and 3) that Norse texts came to function as evidence that romantic tales of chivalry were indigenous to Anglo-Saxon heritage." (4). Percy also emphasized the connections between the Normans and the Vikings, relying extensively in his presentation on Rollo, the Viking who became Count of Rouen in 911 (9), and *King Horn*, which he claimed to be Scandinavian in origin and "almost Saxon" in its language (11). As such, Rix sees Percy and his colleagues as part of a larger cultural project to put English literature as a whole (not just medieval English literature) at the center of European cultural history.

That connection between literature and national identity also forms the basis of Barbara Yorke's essay "The 'Old North' from the Saxon South in Nineteenth-Century Britain," *Anglo-Saxons and the North*, ed. Kilpiö, et al. [see above]. Yorke adeptly sketches out the seemingly contradictory Victorian admirations for both King Alfred and his enemies, the Vikings. Drawing on recent work by Andrew Wawn and others, Yorke describes how the Victorians esteemed the Vikings as practitioners of "muscular Christianity" who had "commendable qualities worthy of imitation" like ambition, military skill, and a thirst for adventure (131). Simultaneously, however, the Vikings figured as the villains in the extensive Victorian celebration of Alfred as founder of the English navy, father of English literature, protector of the church, and precursor to Victoria as ruler of the British Empire. Yorke draws on a wide variety of nineteenth-century letters, history books, speeches, play scripts, political essays, and children's books as

evidence in her discussion; she provides a number of entertaining descriptions of dramas and musicals featuring Alfred as well as analysis of the unveiling of the millennial statue of Alfred in the midst of the second Boer War in 1901.

Yorke points out that the Victorian celebration of the Vikings and of Alfred were both “indulging in the cult of medievalism by projecting their own ideals onto the past” (138). The seemingly contradictory impulses toward either the “Old North” (Vikings) or “Saxon South” (Alfred) was somewhat driven by geography: “Those who were interested in Vikings tended to live in areas that had been settled by Scandinavians” (139), while Alfred’s devotees came largely from Wessex. Part of the question’s urgency came from a Darwinian-inflected belief that “national characteristics” were biological, so the discussion turned on whether the nineteenth-century English were like the Vikings or like Alfred (141). Yorke concludes by noting that this Victorian debate has largely become moot in our contemporary culture, as the Vikings are “instantly recognizable today and known to every British schoolchild, while the Anglo-Saxons have to many become dim and distant figures, and even Alfred’s burnt cakes have been reduced to ashes” (149).

Emily Walker Heady provides a very specific analysis of one of those Victorian celebrations of Alfred in “A Steam-Whistle Modernist?: Representations of King Alfred in Dickens’s *A Child’s History of England* and *The Battle of Life*,” *Defining Medievalism(s)*, ed. Karl Fugelso (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer), 92–111. Heady describes Dickens’s use of the Alfred legends in two of his works, neither of which is very well-known. In the *Child’s History*, Dickens uses Alfred as a somewhat standard pedagogical tool to teach good citizenship as well as the importance of the arts in life. In *The Battle of Life*, Dickens uses an updated, modern version of King Alfred as the main character in a novel where Alfred is part of a love triangle with two sisters, one of whom pretends to elope with someone else so that her sister can have Alfred. The book is set in modern times, but this Alfred is very like the medieval Alfred: smart, brave, and artistic, he even goes to Rome twice. Heady presents Dickens’s work as emblematic, since his “contradictory formulations of the problem that the medieval period posed for the Victorians are important, for they reveal the doubled, hazy, and often conflicting attitudes with which the Victorians approached the national past” (93).

Damian Love also addresses issues of Victorian medievalisms in “Hengist’s Brood: Tennyson and the Anglo-Saxons,” *RES* 60: 460–74, although he focuses very specifically on Tennyson’s use of *Beowulf* in

Idylls of the King rather than making more sweeping claims like Heady’s. For Anglo-Saxonists, Love’s most important point is that Tennyson makes “the first significant literary use of *Beowulf*” with his description of the magical mere in the Gareth and Lynette episode of the *Idylls* (466). Love sees a further specific allusion to the funeral of Scyld Scefing in Tennyson’s depiction of Arthur’s death at the end of the *Idylls* (468). Love also provides an engaging narrative of Tennyson’s experience with Old English—he very much admired John Mitchell Kemble, a fellow undergraduate at Cambridge; he owned Bosworth’s dictionary; he did a translation of *The Battle of Brunanburh* in 1876; he wrote a play about Harold, the last Anglo-Saxon king. In short, Tennyson was very aware of England’s Anglo-Saxon past, both historically and linguistically. Love also more generally ties Tennyson’s mourning for Arthur Henry Hallam, both in *In Memoriam* and in general, to the “elegiac and heroic modes of *Beowulf*” (474). Love concludes his analysis by noting the potential inherent conflict between Tennyson’s view of the Anglo-Saxons as his ethnic and literary ancestors and his perception of them as heathen warriors who “stand for humanity’s most regressive and brutal aspects” (460).

Tennyson’s admiration of Kemble stems from their time together at Cambridge, but Kemble’s major achievements in Anglo-Saxon studies came in the years after Cambridge, when he tried and failed to secure an academic post at his alma mater. John Scattergood’s introduction to *The Kemble Lectures on Anglo-Saxon Studies 2005–2008*, ed. Alice Jorgensen, Helen Conrad O’Brian, and John Scattergood (Dublin: School of English, Trinity College), 1–11, delineates Kemble’s life from his birth into a noted theater family (his sister was the famous actress Fanny Kemble) to his impoverished death as an independent scholar who had alienated most establishment figures who could have provided him with the security of an academic position. Kemble was distracted by law, politics, and the church before he settled on philology as his life’s work; his well-known professional relationship with Grimm led him to use Grimm’s philological tools in his presentation and analysis of Old English. A long-running feud with the Oxford Anglo-Saxonists made him a controversial figure who was passed over for a number of academic positions, so he was often challenged to provide for himself and his family. He edited and/or translated *Beowulf*, *Andreas*, *Elene* and *Solomon and Saturn*; as well, he published the monumental six volumes of charters (1839–1848) and the popular *Saxons in England* (1849). Scattergood credits Kemble with an almost multicultural sensitivity in his remarks about Kemble’s

final public lecture: “He ends with a call for collective effort and a mutual respect for each other and each other’s cultures” (11).

Tom Shippey’s presentation of Kemble in the same volume, “Kemble, *Beowulf*, and the Schleswig-Holstein Question” (64–80), seems at times to be about a completely different person. Shippey places Kemble’s work squarely within the nationalistic/linguistic debates of the nineteenth century. While Thorkelin had claimed *Beowulf* for Denmark, Kemble (and others) placed it in Schleswig-Holstein, which was culturally Germanic even though politically a part of Denmark in the mid-nineteenth century (69–70). Kemble’s basic argument was that Schleswig-Holstein was Anglian/Saxon, and thus English, since the Angles and the Saxons were the ancestors of the English (73). Shippey argues that Kemble was the “natural candidate to take on the task of re-editing *Beowulf* for the English-speaking world, in the process exposing Thorkelin’s linguistic errors and political bias—if unfortunately adding a marked political bias of his own” (71–72). Shippey states that Kemble occasionally just invented points that would support his arguments (Kemble stated that the Angles occasionally referred to themselves as Geats) (78), and indicts him for lack of professionalism and maturity: “His involvement with the poem [*Beowulf*], however, like so much of his life in general, was marked above all by a sense of angry muddle, with positions confidently held and as passionately discarded, semi-apologies covered up by noisy bluster, offence continually given and taken, and overall a distinct lack of generosity in recognizing or acknowledging the discoveries of others” (72). Taken together, Scattergood’s and Shippey’s depictions of this originary figure of Anglo-Saxon studies provide a nuanced and rounded portrait.

Paloma Tejada Caller provides an analysis of an almost-contemporary but very different Anglo-Saxonism in her reading of the Anglo-Saxon section of Jacinto Salas y Quiroga’s 1846 *Historia de Inglaterra*. While Salas is much more well-known for his poetry than for his history writing, his progressive Romanticism infused both. In “Salas y Quiroga’s Anglo-Saxon England: A Psychological and Sociological Portrait of Power,” *Atlantis* 31: 73–90, Tejada shows that Salas’s presentation of Anglo-Saxon history “may be said to reproduce the author’s romantic ideals and his literary practices rooted in a social, psychological, and critical framework” (87). Throughout the narrative, Salas “denounces power, defends the weak, and promotes the figure of the reformer” (82); these political beliefs are most apparent in his characterizations of Dunstan, Alfred, Athelstan, Cnut, and Edward the Confessor.

Tejada then sees this Anglo-Saxon history to include an implicit critique of the mid-nineteenth-century Spanish regime, especially around issues like education, public service, legal justice, and “hard-working, non-abusive monarchs” (84).

A final note in the nineteenth-century history of discipline concerns reprints, copyright, and digitally available material. All Anglo-Saxonists know that a wealth of out-of-print material, especially work from the nineteenth century, is available online through Google Books and a variety of other internet archives. William Barnes’s *Early England and the Saxon-English: With Some Notes on the Father Stock of the Saxon-English, the Frisians* (1869) has been reissued by Kessinger Publishing’s Legacy Reprints. The 2009 appearance of this book is interesting not because of its content (it is a vaguely racist and largely outdated linguistic history), but because it is representative of an important issue of copyright and access in Google Books and similar digital depositories. Kessinger Publishing is one of a number of presses that routinely files for an ISBN number for an out-of-print text and then takes that text out of public domain when it issues a reprint (there are a number of interesting threads and comments about this practice on Google Books / librarian chat sites and forums). The 2009 reprint of Barnes’s book is identical to the 1869 text, which is actually still available in full on Google Books (as of April 2012).

Ross Smith examines the translation theory and practice of that most eminent early-twentieth-century Anglo-Saxonist, J. R. R. Tolkien, in “J. R. R. Tolkien and the Art of Translating English into English,” *English Today* 25: 3–11. Smith begins by noting the oddity that Tolkien’s translations of *Gawain* and other Middle English poems have been published but that his *Beowulf* translation remains in an archive (Smith does not mention that Michael Drout was working on editing the translation, but that project is not presently moving forward). Smith shows that Tolkien’s translation theory and practice focused on maintenance of the rhyme, alliteration, and meter of the original—he felt that prose translation of poetry was useful as a student crib, not as a literary endeavor. Tolkien valued “compactness,” “colour,” and “texture” in poetic translation (5) and regularly warned against the “etymological fallacy” of assuming that an Old English word shares meaning with its Modern English cognate (Smith provides OE *mod* vs. MnE *mood* as an example) (6). Smith also makes the interesting point that Tolkien presents his prose fiction as translations. In Appendix F of *The Lord of the Rings*, Tolkien informs his readers that he has translated the epic from “Westron” into English,

imitating a romance convention and placing Tolkien's prose fiction even more firmly on a continuum with medieval adventure/hero narratives. This "fictitious translator" role, according to Smith, was "a conceit to reinforce the authenticity of his greatest work" as well as a way to connect Tolkien's fiction more firmly to his translation and scholarship activity.

Beowulf is still important even in our contemporary history and culture. While Anglo-Saxonists never have doubted that the poem belongs firmly in the canon, Jack Murningham includes it in his list of classic works that most adults have never read but should. In *Beowulf on the Beach: What to Love and What to Skip in Literature's 50 Greatest Hits* (New York: Three Rivers Press) (*Beowulf* entry at 58–62), Murningham's preface states that he's providing a guide for the reader who plans to "go back to the classics as an adult" (1). Murningham's title refers not to the "hero on the beach" motif analyzed so thoroughly by Alain Renoir and others in the 1980s but to Murningham's belief that the "Greatest Hits" should be read while the reader is on vacation, preferably on a beach. In order to tempt readers to put down *The Girl with the Dragon Tattoo* and pick up *Beowulf* (he recommends the Donaldson prose translation), Murningham provides the selling points that "Beowulf is a badass" (58), that "this is no *Pride and Prejudice*" (58), and that the poem is one of the shortest of the world's classics (59). For Murningham, the Grendel fight is the best section, and "from then on the action sort of goes downhill" (61). He recommends skipping fitts 16, 17, and 27 as well as the second half of fitt 13, presumably because one of the shortest of the world's classics is not quite short enough.

While Murningham hopes that *Beowulf* will find a general readership among vacationers, Richard Scott Nokes provides insight into a darker side of contemporary culture in his analysis of the reception of one of the recent *Beowulf* films in "Beowulf: Prince of the Geats, Nazis, and Odinists," *OEN* 41.3 (2008): 26–32. In 2007/2008, Scott Wegener produced a "no-budget" film version of *Beowulf* that was made entirely by volunteers in order to raise money for cancer research. Overshadowed by the 2005 indie *Beowulf and Grendel* and the 2007 Robert Zemeckis *Beowulf* film starring an image-captured Angelina Jolie, *Beowulf: Prince of the Geats* attracted very little critical or popular attention; Nokes narrates the harassment that the film-makers received during and after production because Jayshan Jackson (a black actor) was cast as Beowulf. Wegener added a back story to the film that shows Beowulf's father's travels from Africa to Scandinavia in order to explain his main character's race. Wegener, Jackson, and

others involved in the film production were subjected to a substantial amount of protest and harassment by email and other digital media from Aryan, neo-Nazi, and neo-Odinist groups; the complaints centered upon their perception that Beowulf is a Germanic, Aryan (i.e. racially pure, white) hero of a canonical text. Nokes's final, sobering point is that "Those of us who deal with Beowulf in the relatively sanitized conditions of academia might do well to remember that the poem has an ardent readership among those who find in it support for ideologies most scholars would find ridiculous or repugnant" (32).

Martin Carver advocates very differently for the importance of Anglo-Saxon culture in the twenty-first century in an interview he provided to the popular magazine *Current Archaeology* 236: 44–45. In the course of answering some basic questions about his work and the field as a whole, Carver advocates for the importance of commercial as well as academic archaeology. He celebrates the relevance of the Staffordshire Hoard, stating that it will reveal knowledge "drawn from Christianity and from the traditional religions of northwest Europe" (45). Very intriguingly, he terms the seventh century "Not only the most exciting intellectual century Europe has lived through, but the one that set the agenda right up to our own time" (45).

2B. BIBLIOGRAPHIES AND REPORTS

Part of the history of the discipline is the record of activity in the discipline, and Anglo-Saxonists continue to be diligent in keeping these records. Bibliographies and reports include: Clinton P. E. Atchley's bibliography of the works of Robert D. Stevick in a special issue of *Philological Review* 34 (2008): 223–28; the 2007 *Year's Work in Old English Studies*, edited by Daniel Donoghue *et al.* in *OEN* 42.2: 3–225; Joan Holland's 2008 and 2009 Progress Reports for the *Dictionary of Old English* in *OEN* 41.3 (2008): 22–25 and in *OEN* 42.1, respectively; Stacy S. Klein and Mary Swan's "Early Medieval" contribution to *YWES* 88: 147–96; Rhonda McDaniel's report on the paleography and codicology manuscript studies seminar held at the University of New Mexico in 2008 in *OEN* 41.3 (2008): 19–21; the annual bibliography compiled for *Anglo-Saxon England* by Paul Remley *et al.* in *ASE* 38: 225–348; Mary Swan's report on the "Record of the Thirteenth Conference of the International Society of Anglo-Saxonists at the Institute of English Studies, University of London, 30 July to 4 August 2007," *ASE* 38: 1–6. Many of the papers listed in that report are now available in the conference's proceedings volume, *Anglo-Saxon Traces* (Tempe: ACMRS, 2011).

2C. MEMORIALS AND TRIBUTES

Patrick Wormald's death in 2004 was a huge loss to the discipline, and Stephen Baxter, Catherine Karkov, Janet Nelson, and David Pelteret have edited a substantial and impressive tribute volume, *Early Medieval Studies in Memory of Patrick Wormald* (Burlington: Ashgate). The memorial section of the volume begins with a bibliography, "The Writings of Patrick Wormald." The three essays in that section of the volume all acknowledge Wormald's enthusiasm for academic debate and provide a rounded and realistic (as opposed to idealized) presentation of his complexity. Sarah Foot even states that her chapter on "Patrick Wormald as historian" is intentionally "less-than-adulatory" since Wormald enjoyed the contentiousness that some of his analyses engendered. Foot provides an overview of Wormald's work, showing how his writing focused on intersections among the major and important themes of language, church, law, and nation. Stuart Airlie's "Patrick Wormald the Teacher" remembers the excitement of Wormald's lectures and tutorials at Glasgow and Oxford. Airlie notes that "charismatic, and very much a star, with a real ego, Patrick was as a teacher peculiarly selfless" (30). Jenny Wormald's "Living with Patrick Wormald" concludes the volume's memorial section. Although they divorced in 2001, Jenny Wormald affirms that in the best of times, they had a "rewarding and mutually supportive academic partnership" (43). The other essays in this memorial volume are recorded in the appropriate sections of this bibliography.

The untimely death of Robert Deshman at the age of 54 spurred his colleagues Herbert Kessler and Adam Cohen to collect Deshman's essays into a memorial volume, *Eye and Mind: Collected Essays in Anglo-Saxon and Early Medieval Art* (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute). In addition to Deshman's *magnum opus*, *The Benedictional of Æthelwold* facsimile, these essays constitute the body of his academic work. Kessler's forward, "An Honest Scholar," is a tribute essay to Deshman that emphasizes his dedication to his work and his students; Kessler shares the heart-rending anecdote that Deshman was sending emails about medieval art history from his last hospital bed. Adam Cohen's introduction to the collection discusses Deshman's focus on "the meaning of works in their cultural contexts" rather than simply on date and localization. For Cohen, Deshman's work "ultimately demonstrated the intrinsic connections among visual culture, theology, philosophy, political theory, and ecclesiastical doctrine and practice" (xiii). Cohen ends his introduction by noting that art history is still something of a sideline interest for Anglo-Saxon

studies, and he hopes that this essay collection will give art in general, and Deshman's work in particular, more attention in the wider discipline.

Jo Ann Kay McNamara was not an Anglo-Saxonist, but her work on gender and history affected the breadth of the world of medieval studies. In "Jo Ann Kay McNamara, Feminist Scholar: A Pioneer in Transforming Medieval History," *Medieval Feminist Forum* 45.1: 120–23, Dorothy O. Helly pays tribute to this important historian who died in 2009. McNamara's "most widely acclaimed book, *Sisters in Arms: Catholic Nuns through Two Millennia*, was published by Harvard University Press in 1996 and reviewed in the *New York Times Book Review* by Antonia Fraser. McNamara argued that women as nuns have struggled through the ages to create a separate life which subverts the traditional gender roles assigned to women in every era" (120). An important figure in the first generation of feminist scholars working on the Middle Ages, McNamara sought to "convey the concept that gender for men was as problematic and socially constructed as it was for women" (120–121). In addition to her scholarship, McNamara was a renowned and beloved teacher, an active contributor to research groups and committees in the discipline, and a vocal participant in civil rights and feminist causes. She has also been celebrated in two festschrifts.

Always much happier than a memorial essay or volume is a tribute volume that can be enjoyed by the honoree, and the final three items in this section fall into that category. Helen Damico has become an emerita in the University of New Mexico English department, and *Poetry, Place, and Gender: Studies in Medieval Culture in Honor of Helen Damico*, ed. Catherine Karkov (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications) presents fourteen essays, all related to Damico's interdisciplinary and wide-ranging work, as well as an introduction by Patrick Conner. Conner provides an entertaining academic biography for Damico; he summarizes the essays, which range in topic from a seventh-century sculpture to Dante, but also shows how each is indebted to Damico's extensive scholarship.

To honor Heinrich Härke's retirement from the University of Reading Archaeology department (although he remains an Honorary Fellow there), Duncan Sayer and Howard Williams present the proceedings of a 2007 conference at Reading in *Mortuary Practices and Social Identities in the Middle Ages: Essays in Burial Archaeology in Honour of Heinrich Härke* (Exeter: U of Exeter P). Härke has not retired from the field, so the volume's focus is on one principal theme of his work: "the relationship between mortuary

practices and social identities in the Middle Ages." The introduction's overview of Härke's work in the field of medieval mortuary practice is an excellent introduction for the non-archaeologist. The editors divide Härke's contributions into five main categories/themes: martial identities (with special attention to military grave goods); identities on the move (issues of migration/ethnicity); identities in material and place (the effects of landscape on culture, mortuary and otherwise); modern identities (the ways that scholars' nationalities and training affect their conclusions); and analogies, methods, and data (he used modern events as analogies to help to explain medieval artifacts) (4). Each of the essays engages with at least one of these themes.

One of the festschriften in honor of John McKinnell demonstrates the international appeal of Anglo-Saxon studies. The collected essays in *Studi anglo-norreni in onore di John S. McKinnell: he hafað sundorgecynd*, ed. Maria Elena Ruggerini (Cagliari: CUEC), pay tribute to McKinnell's connections to the University of Rome. Although about half of the collected essays are in Italian (the others are in English), they all focus on the medieval northern European cultures that formed the subjects of McKinnell's work. The first section provides essays on English culture, while the second moves into Scandinavia. Some of the essays are by Italian scholars, a number of whom also studied with McKinnell in Durham. Raffaele Morabito's introduction to this festschrift is subtitled *L'Inghilterra vista dall'Italia* ("England viewed from Italy"); Morabito celebrates the international, academic collaboration between Durham and Rome that McKinnell fostered. Morabito also praises McKinnell's classroom demeanor, his dedication to mentoring students, his common sense, and his insightful scholarship. A second McKinnell festschrift was published by the University of Toronto Press in 2011 (*Myths, Legends, and Heroes: Essays on Old Norse and Old English Literature in Honour of John McKinnell*, ed. Daniel Anlezark).

MDM

■ Works Not Seen

- Bolton, Kingsley, David Graddol and Rajend Mesthrie. "From *Beowulf* to Bollywood." *English Today* 25 (2009), 2. [editorial introduction to issue 25.3 of *English Today*]
- Davies, John, Nigel Jenkins, Menna Baines and Peder I. Lynch, ed., *The Welsh Academy Encyclopedia of Wales* (Cardiff: U of Wales P, 2008); Andrew Breeze, *English Historical Review* 124 (2009), 666–67.

- McGillivray, Murray. "Old English Online at the University of Calgary." *Teaching Literature and Language Online*. Options for Teaching 26. Ed. Ian Lancashire. MLA, 2009. pp. 232–42.
- Owen-Crocker, Gale R. "Image, Fact, and the Critical Imagination: Teaching Anglo-Saxon Studies through Archaeology." *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Teaching* 16.1 (2009), 107–27.
- Sturtevant, Paul B. "Based on a True History?: The Impact of Popular "Medieval Film" on the Public Understanding of the Middle Ages." Ph.D. Diss. Univ. of Leeds, 2009. [uk.bl.ethos.524665]

3. Language

3A. LEXICON & GLOSSES

Concetta Giliberto edits the Old English Lapidary from London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A.iii, fols. 101v–102r, with minimal notes (260–61) and discusses its sources and significance in much greater detail in “Stone Lore in Miscellany Manuscripts: The Old English Lapidary,” in *Foundations of Learning: The Transfer of Encyclopaedic Knowledge in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Bremmer and Dekker (see sect. 5), 253–78. The subtitle of the essay clarifies its real focus, as Giliberto discusses the contents and probable function of Tiberius A.iii at length and supports Helmut Gneuss’s 1997 suggestion that the manuscript may have served not just as a class-book or reference-book but as a “guidebook for an archbishop” (276). The contents of Tiberius A.iii are known to be various and perhaps even eclectic, but Giliberto posits “an examination preceding the ordination of a bishop,” explaining that “[f]rom this perspective, this manuscript is not a random hotchpotch of different matters, but, on the contrary, a collection of texts intentionally selected and combined to produce a handbook intended for an archbishop’s use” (276). This is one of several very definite conclusions offered in Giliberto’s study.

The OE Lapidary, while it may be brief and restricted to the twelve gemstones found in the Book of Revelation, “is the earliest known treatise of this kind written in a Western European vernacular” (253). The narrow focus of the OE Lapidary is unsurprising, since in “Christian lapidaries . . . the symbolic aspect is predominant” (257). Giliberto’s study forges broad links between the school of Theodore and Hadrian nearly the island’s entire educational and intellectual program—not just lapidary lore in early medieval England. This marks a trend in recent scholarship, and it merits some caution if not correction. The allusion to Epiphanius’s ΠΕΡΙ ΤΩΝ ΙΒ ΛΙΘΩΝ (Giliberto’s use of capitals seems to be her solution to the publisher’s refusal to print Greek diacritics; see the review of Griffiths’s study below) as “a mystic commentary on the twelve stones of the High Priest’s breastplate [in Exodus]” could do with reference to *hoshen*, *Urim*, and *Thummim* (257); Epiphanius is seen as being “most likely accessible at Theodore’s school, where even the teaching of Greek language was included

in the curriculum” (271), which seems plausible enough but discounts the role of Irish monks in the education of early Anglo-Saxon clerics. This matter rises again in discussion of the *Collectanea Pseudo-Bedae*, where the Irish are banished to a footnote (274–75, n. 93) but given some notice in its concluding observation that “[i]t can be surmised, therefore, that the *Collectanea* originated either in Ireland or in England or in a monastery of Irish foundation on the Continent, in the middle decades of the eighth century” (275 n. 93). The allusion to Bede is of importance in that his commentary on the Apocalypse is perhaps his earliest exegetical work, and it brings us back to the gemstones of that last book of the New Testament.

Giliberto carefully traces the occurrence of jasper through carbuncle/amethystus in a variety of sources: Revelation 21.19–20, the OE Lapidary, the Anglo-Saxon glossaries, and the Leiden glossae collectae to Theodore’s teaching (which seems plausible but inconclusive). She finds an interesting discontinuity of sorts in the tradition, since “the batches of jewel-names drawn from biblical books do not appear in later glossaries” such as the Harley and Cleopatra glossaries (265). Terms for gemstones and jewels in OE—including *eorcnanstan*—are briefly discussed (266–67) and the development of the OE Lapidary is fairly definitively summed up: “[I]n the last quarter of the seventh century, in England, a batch of *glossae collectae* (used also by the compilers of the four glossaries) was reshuffled to form the Lapidary and to shed light on the gems of the Apocalypse; in the course of the textual transmission, three items (*chrysolite*, *jacinth*, and *amethyst*) disappeared, while two new ones (*onyx* and *carbuncle*) were introduced. Much later, around the year 1000, an anonymous author translated the glosses on the jewels in Revelation into Old English and combined them with an account of stones with special properties that constitutes the second section of the Old English Lapidary” (267).

By the hypothesized Apocalypse gemstone glossary batch, “it is not difficult to draw a first link between the *Old English Lapidary* and the school of Canterbury. In other words, the Old English Lapidary based its first section on a list of gems which is akin to the glossaries originating at Canterbury at the time of Theodore’s school” (268). Presumably, these are the

same texts found in *Biblical Commentaries from the Canterbury School of Theodore and Hadrian*, ed. Michael Lapidge and Bernhard Bischoff (Cambridge: CUP, 1994). This again seems entirely plausible, but it is not a necessary conclusion—if any at present can be drawn at all. Similarly, Giliberto concludes: “[t]he core of the Old English Lapidary stems from the very cultural environment in which the archetype of the Leiden family of glossaries was also produced” (278). Here, one is to imagine the milieu in which a presumed archetype to a partly extant “family of glossaries” was created; many details still need to be worked out, as suggestive as the idea may be. More interesting is Giliberto’s pursuit of gemstone lemmata in the early glossaries. She relates the mistakes and changes in lists of gemstones and the interpretamenta to the lemmata to the Canterbury school and the fate of the presumed teaching of Theodore (see 269 for examples of incorrect renderings of sardonyx and onyx).

Alan Griffiths pursues the fate of Hebrew letters—such as those in the tituli to Psalm 118—in “The Canterbury Psalter’s Alphabet Glosses: Eclectic but Incompetent?,” in *Foundations of Learning*, 213–51. This is a study long in coming, though it is difficult to discern why, unless a sort of language barrier (i.e. knowledge of Hebrew) had heretofore intervened. One is grateful to Griffiths for the thoroughness and evenhandedness of his approach; his subtitled judgement might be singled out for its honesty. On the “eclectic” side, one is intrigued by the patristic and early medieval fascination with Hebrew letters and their symbolic—even mystical—values; on the “incompetent” side, one might find distressing how much Jerome’s successors could get wrong (e.g., the various interpretations of הַבֵּית [beth] that strayed from Jerome’s correct *domus*). In all fairness to Griffiths, it is nonetheless unfortunate that, whereas the publisher manages to print Hebrew serviceably, all of the ancient Greek, which Griffiths quotes fairly often, appears without diacritics. Griffiths focuses on the tituli to Ps 118 in the ninth-century Vespasian Psalter (London, British Library, Cotton Vespasian A.i) and the Latin glosses to the Hebrew letters. Griffiths’s reference to the “Canterbury Psalter” in his title is a bit confusing here as that designation is usually conferred upon “Eadwine’s Canterbury Psalter” (Cambridge, Trinity College R.17.1), a much later ‘triple psalter’ (see the sigla in Phillip Pulsiano, *Old English Glossed Psalters: Psalms 1–50* [Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2001], xix–xxvi).

Griffiths poses a basic question for the rest of the study: “[I]s it possible to trace the origin of the glosses in the Canterbury Psalter—carefully copied with all

their idiosyncrasies in the Mondsee Psalter and at least four other psalters [containing an early extant version of the Romanum text of the Psalms]?” (219). Griffiths pursues first patristic then “other” sources for the Hebrew alphabet glosses in the Vespasian Psalter (219–25). This is where the study takes an unexpected turn; among the “other” sources to Latin glosses on Hebrew letters, Griffiths proposes The Alphabet of Rabbi Akiva. Griffiths cites the text of Akiva ben Joseph (from the first half of the second century AD) from German translations of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Griffiths does not seem to suggest a direct influence of Rabbi Akiva upon patristic writers such as Ambrose or Jerome—whose works were sources of the Vespasian Psalter’s Hebrew letter glosses—so much as a similarity in method between Akiva, Ambrose, and other patristic writers in interpreting Hebrew letters symbolically. For example, in the case of נ ‘nun’, the gloss *mens* “is not encountered outside the Canterbury [Vespasian Psalter] and related alphabets”; however, Akiva’s “Alphabet makes a direct connexion between the letter nun and a person’s soul” (231). This seems rather tenuous, as do most of the parallels between Akiva’s text and the Eusebius, Ambrose, and Jerome commentaries that are actually behind many of the Hebrew letter glosses in the Vespasian Psalter. Griffiths does provide a letter-by-letter explication (225–34) as well as a very useful set of twelve tables of correspondences—known or hypothesized—between sources for the glosses to Hebrew letters (238–48). In conclusion, this is a fascinating study, even if this reader senses that much of this awaits further testing.

Thoroughness marks the sourcing of lemmata in Loredana Lazzari’s “Isidore’s *Etymologiae* in Anglo-Saxon Glossaries,” in *Foundations of Learning*, 63–93. Beginning with a very brief discussion of how Isidore of Seville’s works came to Anglo-Saxon England from Spain—most likely by way of Ireland (63–66), Lazzari then patiently hunts for Isidorean lemmata in Anglo-Saxon glossaries and finds many that had not been noted or identified before. The earliest of these seem to be “[b]atches of glosses derived from the Leiden Glossary [that] appear in the Épinal, Erfurt and Corpus Glossaries rearranged in alphabetical order” (69). Lazzari cites W.M. Lindsay’s idea that the Hermeneumata lay behind much of the Leiden Glossary (70), a point echoed in Patrizia Lendinará’s “Glossari anglosassoni per argomenti” (reviewed below). Thus, thirty-five entries in the Corpus Glossary seem to derive from Book X of the *Etymologiae* (71), and, while a break between the “Leiden family” of glossaries and the three Cleopatra Glossaries is evident, the debt to

Isidore is nonetheless impressive (75–77; the sample of the Harley Glossary’s entries curiously only looks at the first half of its 5595 glosses, 77–80).

While the influence of the *Etymologiae* upon the early Anglo-Saxon glossaries is not surprising—with Isidore’s work preeminent in the field, and works such as those of Varro less known. Lazzari finds it continuous with the class-glossary of Ælfric’s Glossary (85–87). By the late Antwerp-London Glossary, Lazzari sees an evolution in the use of Isidore: “Contary to Ælfric who was guided above all by didactic intentions, the compiler of the Antwerp-London Glossary clearly aimed at a different readership, because he tended to use rare and exotic Latin lemmas, technical terms largely of Greek origin, dipping into the *Etymologiae* more fully than others” (87). One wonders here if this means a displacement of the Hermeneumata-tradition by the Isidorean. Lazzari’s conclusion that the *Etymologiae* “became an all-round didactic tool in every respect and was used not only to define the choice of lemmas to gloss, but also to contribute to the creation of Old English neologisms suitable for expressing the exact meaning of the Latin models” seems odd in its second suggested Isidorean contribution—unless one reads this as the *Etymologiae* serving also as a source of Latinisms and Latin-derived calques in Old English (93).

Three studies concerning words and glosses appeared from Patrizia Lendinara: two dealing with specific words (OE *net* and *max*, terms for ‘Saturday’) and a third study that covers glossaries and glossary-making more broadly, from the Hermeneumata forward with a more theoretical cast. In “Un caso di interculturalità: la denominazione del sabato in antico inglese,” in *Ποικιλία: Studi e ricerche sull’interculturalità*, ed. M. Rosa Manca (Palermo: Edizioni della Fondazione Vito Fazio-Allmayer, 2006), 129–51, Lendinara surveys—across the Germanic languages and between classical and early medieval cultures—the terms for ‘Saturday’ and what could be described as a Kronos-Saturn-Sæter cultural complex. The study opens beyond the terms themselves for ‘Saturday’ (e.g. *Sæterdæg*, *Sæterndæg*, *Sæternesdæg*), which may involve more than orthographical variation, to an investigation of classical reception among the early Germanic-speaking peoples.

The study also makes use of images to indicate the development of Saturn’s conventionalized iconography, including a beard, head covered with a fold of his mantle, and holding a sickle and ear of grain. These illustrations include an early eleventh-century copy of Hrabanus Maurus’s *De rerum naturis* (Montecassino, Archivio dell’Abbazia 132); Saturn as depicted in the Munich copy of Remigius of Auxerre’s commentary on Martianus

Capella’s *De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii* (Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 14271); the Kronos-Saturn in zodiacal figurations (Stuttgart, Württembergische Landesbibliothek, Cod. hist. 2° 415); and Richard Verstegan’s *A restitution of decayed intelligence* (Antwerp, 1605). The last example includes Verstegan’s reconstruction of an Anglo-Saxon pagan pantheon, in which he located a “Seater” (145–46), an instance of more inventive interpretation. Lendinara’s philological focus takes in the preservation of the phonetic form of *Saturni (dies)* in terms for the day in older Germanic languages (OE, OFris., etc.); OE also has *sunnanæfen* (MdGm *Sonnabend*) and the hapax *Sæterniht* ‘Friday’ (occurring in Ælfric, 140–41). Lendinara’s study of Saturn and Saturday exhibits the best aspects of genuine word study: One starts with a term, expands outward from phonetic and lexical detail to variant and cognate or competing forms, and eventually mines an entire cultural complex. She ends on the note that, by the time one gets to the OE *Solomon and Saturn*, we may be dealing with “una divinità autoctona” (148), a pattern repeated by the antiquarians of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and one which provides “una accentuazione della ricchezza e creatività della cultura anglosassone” (148–49).

With “A net of words: Old English net and max,” in *Northern Voices: Essays on Old Germanic and Related Topics offered to Professor Tette Hofstra*, ed. Kees Dekker, Alasdair MacDonald, and Hermann Niebaum (Leuven: Peeters, 2008), 71–82, Lendinara surveys the high-frequency OE word for ‘net,’ *net(t)*, and its word-field (from *nettgearn* to *fugelnett*, or the range of *nett-* and *-nett* formations) in the first eight pages of the study before turning to *max/masc*, “the few occurrences of which should be now taken into examination, not so much for their dialectal distribution, but for the semantic value of the word and its relationship to the more common net” (78). The three occurrences of *max* all occur as glosses to lemmata in Ælfric’s *Colloquy*, in which two of the occurrences gloss Lat. *rete*. Interestingly, the fisherman’s *rete* is rendered as *max*, the bird-catcher’s by *net* (80). Since “there are only a few instances in which a Latin word is glossed with more than one Old English word, according to a technique which was meant not to defeat the didactic aim of the work” in the *Colloquy* (80), Lendinara counts the *max/net* renderings as among those examples of interpretamenta that “yield evidence for the care in the glossing of the Latin text” and observes that “[i]f we look at the meaning of the two words for net chosen by the glossator of the *Colloquy*, it is evident that *max* is used to refer to the device in the form of a net used for

catching fish or trapping (with reference to the meshes of string and their function), whereas *net* glosses *rete* more generally (80–81). Of interest as well is Lendinara's introductory discussion of *nett* and cognates as well as the disputed etymology of the Germanic words and their relation to Indo-European reflexes of presumably **ned-* 'to knot' (if not **nedh-*).

As with Hans Sauer's "Language and Culture: How the Anglo-Saxon Glossators Adapted Latin Words and their World," reviewed below, Patrizia Lendinara's "Glossari anglosassoni per argomenti: *Gebrauchstexte oder nicht?*," in *La Letteratura tecnico-scientifica nel Medioevo germanico: Fachliteratur e Gebrauchstext*, ed. Letizia Vezzosi (Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso, 2009), 119–44, consists of methodological advice from a leading scholar of OE glossographical studies. In a series of studies, Sauer has covered in great detail the language—and especially the derivational morphology—of the Épinal-Erfurt Glossary; Lendinara's word studies have ranged across early to late OE with particular reference to cognates from other early Germanic languages—especially Old Frisian—and beyond (Albanian, for one). Lendinara's methodological exercise revolves around two major themes: firstly, what could be called a sort of *per argomento/argomenti* framework of the topicality of OE lemmata and interpretations and, secondly, the question of to what extent the OE glossaries were *Gebrauchstexte*. The latter concern is answered largely in the affirmative, albeit with some qualification—namely that the evolution of the glossary in Anglo-Saxon England was to an extent, for want of a better term and at the peril of sounding fashionable, "user-driven"; as Lendinara explains, "i diversi contesti culturali d'occorrenza si riflettono sulla tipologica e sul numero dei fruitori" (138).

The story of the development and evolution of the Anglo-Saxon glossary—a textual category that encompassed products native to England or produced in Anglo-Saxon centers on the continent—is framed throughout this survey by the Hermeneumata tradition. In terms of evolution, Anglo-Saxon England entered the picture in the Hermeneumata-framework after that tradition had passed from Greco-Latin glossaries to glossaries in which the Greek lemmata appeared rather as what has been termed "Greek in Latin garb"; nonetheless, all Anglo-Saxon glossaries have their Hellenisms. Sections Four ("Gli Hermeneumata in Inghilterra," 125–26) and Five ("I glossari per argomenti in Inghilterra," 126–31) apply theoretical concerns to Anglo-Saxon England and survey the range of glossaries produced. We never leave these texts for the remainder of the survey, with the *Gebrauchstexte*-question reaching

a natural enough endpoint in Ælfric's *Colloquy and Glossary*. Though the word is never used in Lendinara's study, one has the sense from her delineation of the growth, re-organization, expansion, and rationalization of these texts (from glossae collectae in their "batches" and "bundles" to class-glossaries with their tituli and capitula) of a recursiveness to the textual activity. In a discussion of the capitula to the Hermeneumata, Lendinara cites Dionisotti's observation that "no set of capitula is derivable from any other" (138).

In "Language and Culture: How Anglo-Saxon Glossators Adapted Latin Words and their World," *Jnl of Medieval Latin* 18: 437–68, Hans Sauer offers not just a survey of the fate of Latin lemmata in Anglo-Saxon bilingual glossaries but an examination of the praxis of the Anglo-Saxon glossators, with an especial emphasis upon the sort of "cultural translation" involved in finding the right OE equivalent (or, in some cases, one inexact or even erroneous calque) to Latin words that denoted or expressed Roman and biblical concepts. Sauer limits his observations to just two glossaries, the Épinal-Erfurt a-order glossary—comprised of ca. 3000 entries of which just over a third have OE interpretations, dating to ca. AD 700—and Ælfric's Glossary of ca. AD 1000. Sauer intends for this to provide a sort of bookending framework to his discussion of methods and the development of the texts from *glossae collectae* (such as those thought to be behind Épinal-Erfurt, which Sauer believes to have been one glossary originally) to alphabetic word-lists to word-class proto-thesauric texts. As he notes in his summation (Section Seven of this programmatically arranged survey, 467–68), if Épinal-Erfurt exhibits more errors and Ælfric greater precision, there are three centuries between the glossators's work (see 443 n. 28). More interesting is that Épinal-Erfurt for its errors also demonstrates at turns a good grasp of classical and postclassical Latin—e.g., glossing three senses of Lat. *testudo* (460 n. 85), while Ælfric can be guilty of overspecification, offering renderings "thus also semantically more restricted" (468).

After a general introduction to the topic and to the two glossaries selected as test cases, Sauer turns to "[t]he nature of the Latin vocabulary in the Épinal-Erfurt Glossary and Ælfric's Glossary," a subject never let go of for the rest of the study (441–43). In short, both glossaries have their "hard words," and the earlier glossary may be said to have more overly literal renderings, perhaps reflective of less familiarity with some of the cultural concepts of classical antiquity (441). Nonetheless, Sauer notes that "Ælfric's longest explanations in his Glossary are concerned with two mythical beasts, the unicorn (*unicornis*) and the griffin (*griffes*), where

(rather as an exception in his Glossary) he displays his learning, but does not specify them as mythical” (458). Both glossaries exhibit how many Latin occupational titles could be rendered by OE *gerefa* (*ensor, commentariensis, comes, praepositus, uillicus*; 461). The strength of Sauer’s analysis, as always, is in the details, the dispersal of which throughout the study makes his analysis resemble a glossary itself at some points, but the study also encompasses more discursively a number of methodological, semantic, and semasiological matters, from obscured and elliptical compounds (444–45) to folk etymologies (455–57). A number of glossographical riddles, or traditional “hard words” (to borrow Merritt’s usage), put in an appearance: Épinal-Erfurt *bradigabo: felduuop* (444)—is this a kind of ‘battle-cry’ or plant name?—and *parcas: burgrunae* from the same glossary (453, 457). Many of the examples adduced pertain to names of people and their occupations, a subject treated in the author’s earlier study, “Old English Words for People in the Épinal-Erfurt Glossary,” in *Beowulf and Beyond*, ed. Hans Sauer and Renate Bauer (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2007), 119–181.

Indeed, so many examples are brought to bear that one may not always be convinced by every point raised or, in other instances, might have wished for a little more commentary from the author. Sauer has in a series of articles over two decades offered in installments a sort of lexical and morphological commentary to the Épinal-Erfurt Glossary, and one is always impressed by the range and depth of coverage. Thus, for example, Épinal-Erfurt *plidas: sifunsterri* in which the glossator “[o]bviously . . . knew . . . which constellation Pleiades referred to” is offered as an example of “cultural substitution,” which it may be, though perhaps it is also a pious circumlocution or deliberate literal underspecification (465). The transformation of *respublica* (MS *respública*) in Épinal-Erfurt into *cynedom* (MS *cynidom*) is culturally and politically interesting, even disappointing, from a historical viewpoint. Given particular attention in his “cultural substitution” section (463–67) is the fascinating case of *uia secta* ‘Milky Way’, which is rendered as *iringaes uueg* ‘Iring’s Way’ in Épinal-Erfurt (464). Under the rubric of “imprecise or more general renderings (underspecification)” (461–62), Sauer locates the “nice example” of *falernum: þæt seleste win* (461), which may literally be underspecified, but it nonetheless gives us a sense of an Anglo-Saxon glossator who understood what the Roman poets meant by and felt for that appellation (the *uetuli* . . . *Falerni* of Catullus xxvii).

Immo Warntjes’s “The Earliest Occurrence of Old English *gerim* and its Anglo-Irish Computistical

Context,” *Anglia* 127: 91–105, draws attention to the passage in Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 14456, fol. 28v: *Itaque uterque annus lunaris scilicet et solaris ab XI Kalendas Aprilis cursum incipit et in V Idus Martii parem gerim extendit* ‘Accordingly, both the lunar year and the solar year naturally start their course on 22 March and extend over an equal number of days (*gerim*) up to 11 March’ (99). Here, in the Munich Computus, a text thought to be a definite Irish product (and likely dating to sometime after Easter AD 718 but before Easter 719), *gerim* is ostensibly an OE computistical and technical term—not a common one, but one whose uses are elsewhere traced by Warntjes, who finds that only the Blickling Homilies seems to coincide precisely in usage of the word in a computistical sense. The matter appears much more fully, and can be seen in its broader context, in Warntjes’s published dissertation, *The Munich Computus: Text and Translation: Irish Computistics between Isidore of Seville and the Venerable Bede and Its Reception in Carolingian Times* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2012).

The Munich Computus had been discovered by Bruno Krusch in 1878 and edited for the first time in Warntjes’s Galway dissertation (2007). Linguistically interesting in the Munich Computus are the vernacular forms employed in the text: Old Irish *noiniac* (an “otherwise unattested” *nónaich* ‘having nones’, 97), the macaronic *dies cetene* (compare Old Irish *cétain* ‘Wednesday’), and Old English *gerim*. As no other examples of OE terms in this text have been brought forward, “[t]his quite naturally leads to the question why an Old English term was applied earlier when a Latin term appears to have been readily at hand. The answer may be that the meaning assigned to *gressum* seems to differ from the one assigned to *gerim*; *gressum*, here, refers more generally to the ‘course’ of the lunar year, and does not seem to have the more specific meaning of ‘an interval of Julian calendar days’ or simply ‘number of days’ (in this case the exact number of days of a lunar year) as *gerim* in the previous passage (100). That *gerim* could have been a corruption of *gressum* in the MS is raised and dealt with (100–101)—perhaps with an eye to preserving *gerim* (by the principle *utrum in alterum abiturum erat* MS *gerim* [without macron] is not that hard to derive from an abbreviated form of Latin *gressum*). The reader is given the passage from Clm 14456 to judge for him/herself, and *gerim* is clearly there at the head of fol. 28v line 6 (98). Warntjes also considers that *gerim* was a gloss that may have intruded on the text (100–101).

The OE form in an Irish computistical text is parlayed into a discussion of cultural milieu, though one might quibble that one *Mag Éo* is hardly equivalent to the

more numerous Irish-to-English influences that were raised or could have been (101). The Munich Computus was transmitted in an early ninth-century MS once from St. Emmeram in Regensburg, and the Irish text seems part of a broader cultural movement that saw Irish—and then also Anglo-Saxon—monks establish schools on the continent. In the case of this word, “[t]he application of this Old English term by an Irish computist in AD 719 can be explained by the fact that debates between Irish and Anglo-Saxon intellectuals about computistical matters were widespread in the second half of the seventh and early eighth centuries, presumably leading to the adoption of termini technici from the respective vernaculars” (105).

JMcG

Historical linguists tend to prefer one of two approaches to explain puzzling phenomena: some prefer to rely primarily on explanations based in phonological processes, while others prefer to find solutions based mainly in morphology—in short, there are the “sound people” and the “word people.” Douglas P. A. Simms has taken the latter, morphological tack to a problem earlier approached in the past mostly through lens of phonology in “The Words for ‘Fire’ in Germanic,” *Jnl of Germanic Linguistics* 21: 297–333. The problem centers on the apparent need for a form **pu:r-* in Proto-Indo-European to get the main Germanic forms for “fire” (including OE *fy:r*) from a root traditionally reconstructed **ph₂-uo:r* in the nominative/accusative, **ph₂-un-* in the oblique cases. What might be called the “standard” solution is to posit a form **ph₂-ur-*, either through analogy or from a locative form, which then became generalized through the paradigm (or at least to the nom/acc). But crucially this traditional approach also depends on a sound change that comes in useful elsewhere in PIE phonology whereby the sequence laryngeal + high vowel metathesizes to vowel + laryngeal when that sequence comes between two consonants.

Simms’s approach is to reject the existence of such a phonological rule of laryngeal metathesis. Instead he proposes that four nearly identical analogies occurred completely independently in four separate branches of Indo-European (Greek, Umbrian, Armenian, and Germanic) to get the forms that seem to come from a nominative **pu:r*. On the one hand, the article serves the important role of reminding us that there are other possible morphological explanations for what we have become accustomed to solve by mostly phonological means. On the other hand, in this particular case Simms has neither presented particularly compelling evidence that the laryngeal metathesis rule could not

have existed in PIE, nor has he presented a strong case that his proposed analogical reformations of the root are probable, even if it cannot be denied that they are possible. Independent, parallel innovations can of course occur in related languages. But for a claim that such analogical restructurings occur in four separate languages independently in essentially identical ways, an extraordinary level of supporting evidence is needed, and this level of support is not supplied here. But perhaps further research will be found to give further support to this interesting alternative approach to a difficult problem.

Joseph McGowan’s brief “Elves, Elf-shot, and Epilepsy: OE *ælfād*, *ælfside*, *ælfsogeþa*, *bræccopu*, and *bræcsēoc*,” *SN* 81: 116–20, is packed with promising possibilities, and is itself a call for (or an announcement of?) a major research project to explore the background of all OE forms that include the element *ælf* and terms connected with them, a project that could throw important light on traditional spiritual and medical beliefs of the Anglo-Saxons (and ultimately of the other Germanic groups). After noting the negative associations that many such *ælf* compounds had with physical, mental and spiritual ailments (elfshot, etc.), McGowan goes on to point out that such terms imply a belief (in OE times at least; seemingly less so in Middle English) that actual elves could and did act in the world (or, as McGowan says, had “agency”) to affect humans.

Such agency is particularly clear in the term *ylfig* that can mean ‘affected by elves, babbler, lunatic’ but that is also paired in the Brussels Glossary with Latin *comitialis*, a term which in turn (when modifying *morbus*) is one of the medieval Latin terms for epilepsy. The *ylfig*–epilepsy connection is further confirmed by a number of other texts, and it suggests that the condition was, at some point at least, understood as a kind of possession by powerful supernatural creatures. After an excursion into other OE terms for epilepsy or similar conditions (most of which involve terms for falling, for “breaking” with the probable meaning ‘coughing’ or other loss of control, and for lunar influence), McGowan concludes that *ylfig* “too refers to agency, even if just some vestigial cultural belief in one, by elves (that is, the etymological ‘elf’ in *ælfig*): a disease with physical and mental or spiritual symptoms, likened to madness or possession, perhaps triggered by ‘elf-shot.’”

But in contrast to these and other negative association, OE *ælfscyne* ‘radiant or fair as an elf’ shows that *ælf* could (or at one point perhaps mostly did) have positive connotations. Presumably Christianity played a role in the term’s pejoration by excluding the possibility of any positive spiritual influence from any other source

than God. I might add that epilepsy is not necessarily viewed as an entirely negative condition in all cultures, and in fact is sometimes seen as a kind a possession that leads to great insight or prophecy. (See for example the excellent book by Anne Fadiman, *The Spirit Catches You and You Fall Down*, the title of which is a translation of the Hmong term for epilepsy.) We can only hope that this is the promising start of more such insightful articles exploring more elf-terms and their implications for early beliefs.

JUH

Works not Seen

- Breeze, Andrew. "Bedē's *Castella* and the Journeys of St Chad." *Northern History* 46 (2009), 137-39.
- Fulk, R. D. "Ouer and ouer Again in the Peterborough Chronicle." *PQ* 88 (2009), 431-37.
- Guaraddon, Anelo, María del Carmen. "The Natural Semantic Metalanguage of Old English Compound Adpositions." *ES: Revista de Filología Inglesa* (2009), 61-83.
- Harley, Heidi. *English Words: A Linguistic Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2006. xvii + 296 pp. ill.
- Hussey, Matthew T. "Dunstan, Æthelwold, and Isidorean Exegesis in Old English Glosses: Oxford, Bodleian Library Bodley 319." *RES* 60 (2009), 681-704.
- Kay, Christian. *Historical Thesaurus of the Oxford English Dictionary: With Additional Material from "A Thesaurus of Old English"*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2009. 2 vols.
- Nikolaev, Alexander. "The Germanic Word for 'Sword' and Delocative Derivation in Proto-Indo-European." *Jnl of Indo-European Studies* 37 (2009), 462-88.
- North, Richard. "OE *scop* and the Singing Welsh Bishop." *Northern Voices: Essays on Old Germanic and Related Topics Offered to Professor Tette Hofstra*. Mediaevalia Groningana, n.s. 11. Eds. Kees Dekker, Alasdair MacDonald and Hermann Niebaum. Leuven: Peeters, 2008. 99-122.
- Pierce, Marc. "Modern English key and the Problem of Loan Words in Germanic." *Historische Sprachforschung* 122 (2009), 305-10.
- Rowley, Sharon M. "The Fourteenth-Century Glosses and Annotations in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS. Tanner 10." *Manuscripta* 53 (2009), 49-85.
- Sato, Kiriko. "Old English geond Expressing Duration of Time: The Winchester Usage." *SELIM* 16 (2009), 23-45.
- Sayers, William. "Names for the Badger in Multilingual Medieval Britain." *ANQ* 22.4 (2009), 1-8.

Shields, Kenneth. "Some Comments about Early Germanic Cardinal Direction Words." *Historische Sprachforschung* 121 (2008), 219-25.

Slade, Benjamin. "How (Exactly) to Slay a Dragon in Indo-European? PIE *bheid- {h₃éwhim, kwrmi-." *Historische Sprachforschung* 121 (2008), 3-53.

3B. SYNTAX, PHONOLOGY, OTHER ASPECTS

Syntax

In "On the Syntactic Differences Between OE Dialects: Evidence from the Gospels," *English Language and Linguistics* 13: 57-75, Cristina Suárez-Gómez examines Old English relative constructions in selections from three versions of the Gospels in the Helsinki Corpus: the West Saxon Gospels (WSCp), the Mercian Rushworth 1 (Ru1), and the Northumbrian Lindisfarne Gospels (Li)—all from the period 950-1050. There is a built-in problem with this selection of texts: only one of them, WSCp, represents fairly natural Old English; the remaining two, Ru1 and Li, are glosses. The author is aware of this problem but still thinks that Latin-based texts can provide valuable data for the study of syntax.

Suárez-Gómez starts from the hypothesis that the diatopic North-South divide could be reflected in the choice of the relativizer and in the position of the relative clause in relation to the main clause. Her most important findings concerning the relativizers can be summed up as follows: WSCp and, to a lesser extent, Ru1 favor *þe*, whereas this connector comes second in Li, where *se(þe)* is the most common relativizer. The relative frequency of the invariable relativizer *þæt* gradually increases when we move from the WSCp through Ru1 to Li. Suárez-Gómez sees a possible connection between the somewhat higher frequency of *þæt* in Ru1 and Li and the Middle English spread of *þæt* from the Midlands towards the south.

She also finds differences between the three texts in the placement of the relative clause in relation to the main clause. She distinguishes between two word order patterns: (1) the relative clause is intraposed, or (2) the relative clause is non-intraposed. This latter alternative comprises both extraposed and left-dislocated clauses. In WSCp, intraposed relative clauses represent one third of the data studied; in Li their share rises to two thirds. Ru1, with extraposition almost as frequent as intraposition, mediates between these two texts.

Agnieszka Pysz's monograph, *The Syntax of Prenominal and Postnominal Adjectives in Old English* (Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars), is a revised version of her doctoral dissertation. The

contents of the five chapters of this book comprising over 300 pages can be summarized as follows. Chapter One is descriptive, analyzing the inflectional patterning of adnominal adjectives and the extent to which adjective stacking—i.e. multiple adjectival modification—is possible in the prenominal position. Table 1-2 calls for a couple of critical comments. It gives what the author calls a “standardised set” of strong adjectival endings; however, the instrumental masculine and neuter singular ending *-e* is missing as well as the nominative masculine and neuter singular of *ia*-adjectives ending *-e*. The latter omission in particular is not trivial, as it has obviously prevented Pysz from clearly analyzing the inflectional paradigm of these adjectives. There are thirteen different adjectival lexemes in *-e* among the examples cited in the book, most of them *ia*-adjectives. Example 120 on page 77 marks the postposed nom. pl.neut. adjective with a zero (*unliþe-∅*), which suggests that Pysz mistakenly sees this strong form as endingless although it in fact has the inflectional ending *-e*.

Chapter Two is devoted to an analysis of the placement of the adjectives both with respect to the noun and with respect to complements. Forty-two texts of non-Latin origin from the *York-Toronto-Helsinki Parsed Corpus of Old English Prose* (YCOE) provide the data for analysis. In Chapter Three, Pysz discusses the status of nominal phrases from the perspective of generative syntax, assessing previous research and adopting the Determiner Phrase (DP) framework as the starting-point for her own analysis. The chapter concludes with an examination of the syntactic status of adnominal adjectives. According to Pysz, prenominal adjectives are attributive adjuncts to NP, while postnominal adjectives are predicative and best analyzed as reduced relatives. The last suggestion—although obviously applicable to most instances—is too sweeping a generalization. It would be difficult to give a reduced relative reading to *deadne* in the following example, which Pysz cites: *sum wif bær hire sunu deadne* ‘some woman bore her son dead’ (15).

Chapter Four starts with a discussion of the inflectional patterning of adnominal adjectives. Among other things, Pysz notes that prenominal adjectives can take weak or strong inflection while postnominal adjectives can only take strong inflection. The other issue addressed in Chapter Four is stacking, which is allowed in the prenominal position but arguably not in the postnominal position. Chapter Five deals with the derivation of the surface placement of adjectives with respect to the noun and with respect to their complements in light of the generative framework adopted.

The strength of Pysz’s monograph lies not so much in its application of corpus evidence as in her rigorous and thought-provoking account of the syntax of Old English adjectives within her chosen theoretical approach. The rich cross-linguistic material marshaled in the study puts the Old English system of adjectival syntax into perspective.

Janusz Malak makes another contribution to the vivid ongoing discussion of early English accusative and infinitive (ACI) constructions in “The Categorisation of the Infinitive in the Old English ACI Constructions” in *De Laurer of Oure Englische Tonge*, ed. Marcin Krygier *et al.* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang), 35–48. Malak points out that Old English ACI constructions differ from their Present-Day English counterparts in a number of ways. Old English normally lacks formally passive ACIs unlike Present-Day English, which allows passive constructions like *I expect the kitchen to be painted by John*. Furthermore, Old English only rarely has ACIs representing ‘Exceptional Clauses’ such as *I expect John to paint the kitchen*. Although Malak recognizes the verb-like character of the Old English infinitive, which can take a case-marked Determiner Phrase in a way that is analogous to a verb taking an object, he also points out that it has nominal properties in that it can function as the subject of a clause. According to Malak, its nominal character can be further seen in that the infinitival phrases in ACI structures do not allow a propositional reading. In his analysis of the ACI, the infinitive should be treated as a noun, so that “the collocation consisting of the accusative marked noun and the infinitival expression form one constituent which is not characterized by a propositional interpretation” (35).

Bettelou Los’s article, “The Consequences of the Loss of Verb-Second in English: Information Structure and Syntax in Interaction,” *English Language and Linguistics* 13: 97–125, covers the long diachrony from Old English to Present-Day English. She makes the following observations about Old English. Although Old English is a verb-second language, it is not consistently so, and there are four relevant word order patterns, of which two survive in Present-Day English: the ‘residual verb second’ and—to a limited extent—the subject-verb word order, when the first constituent is a topicalised nominal or prepositional object, or adjunct, and the subject is a pronoun as in *Æfter þysum wordum he gewende*. As Los outlines, the loss of the verb-second rule in Middle English led to a regularization of word order. This in its turn led to a situation where the needs of information structure triggered a number of therapeutic solutions such as the rise of new passive

constructions, clefts, pseudoclefts, and Hanging Topic Left Dislocations.

Old English is the starting point for Markku Filppula's article "The Rise of *It*-Clefting in English: Areal-Typological and Contact-Linguistic Considerations," *English Language and Linguistics* 13: 267–93, but he extends his corpus both diachronically and geographically. Section Three of this study describes and analyses clefting and "cleft-like" structures in Old and Middle English. The subsection on Old English *it*-clefts deals with seven subtypes of these clefts. It appears that the expletive subject is only infrequently *hit*; but Filppula rightly asserts that this construction is already present in Old English. In quite a few of the cited examples, there is no overtly expressed subject.

The descriptions of all the seven types have "Rel-clause" as the last element—a decision obviously deriving from the syntactic parsing of YCOE. Thus, the "time clefts" frequent in Bede have the following description: (**Adv-Time**) **BE Prep Phrase Rel-clause**. As an illustration of this subcategory, here is Filppula's example in an abbreviated form: *þa wæs æfter hire deaðe þæt þa broðor oðerra weorca swiður gemdon* 'Then [it] was after her death that the brethren were more occupied with other works' (13). The *þæt*-clause obviously cannot be a relative clause; instead it is most naturally interpreted as a noun clause. The past tense form of *beon* then represents the lexical verb sense 'to happen' (see DOE s.v. *beon* A.2.b.i). The same terminological question arises with the Old English examples (14–18) and (23). In Middle English, clefting becomes more common and is grammaticalised to an increasing degree. The second half of the article is dedicated to the geographical distribution of clefting, with special reference to possible contact influence from Celtic. Clefting is widespread in western European languages (e.g. the Celtic languages, English, French and Portuguese). According to Filppula, it is likely that Celtic exerted substratal—and possibly also adstratal—influence on the rise of *it*-clefting in English.

The loss of *weorðan* in Middle English is traditionally assigned to language-external factors. In their article, "Constructional Change in Old and Middle English Copular Constructions and Its Impact on the Lexicon," *Folia Linguistica Historica* 30: 311–66, Peter Petré and Hubert Cuyckens approach this loss from a language-internal point of view. Although the demise of *weorðan* is the most important topic discussed in this corpus-based study, the authors also discuss other copulas: *is*, *beon*, *wesan*, *becuman*, and *weaxan*. Working within Croft's Radical Construction Grammar, they posit a number of schematic constructions, which are the result of a systematic overlap in the types of subject

complements with which different copulas can occur. The following construction types emerge from the discussion: (i) Non-copular, (ii) Copular Location Constructions, (iii) Copular Event Constructions (Resultative Constructions), (iv) Copular Property Constructions, (v) Copular Object Constructions, and (vi) Identifying Clause. The copulas studied in greatest detail—*is*, *beon*, and *weorðan*—occur in types (i) – (v); only *is* and *beon* are found in type (vi) to the exclusion of *weorðan*. Copular Event Constructions contain structures, which are called passive constructions and perfect constructions in traditional analyses. Petré and Cuyckens argue that the passive only developed in Middle English, although they admit that the beginnings of this development can probably be seen in the Old English period. They see the loss of *weorðan* as at least partly the result of the inability of this verb—due to its schematic structure—to adjust itself to a new situation, when a number of changes were driving the schematic Copular Event Construction and the schematic Copular Property Construction apart. In addition to the loss of *weorðan*, the article discusses a number of other developments mainly taking place in Middle English such as the emergence of the new copulas *becuman* and *weaxan*. The rise of these copulas is closely linked up with the decrease in productivity of Class II weak verbs of the type *ealdian* 'grow old'.

MK

Erich Poppe's "Standard Average European and the Celticity of English Intensifiers and Reflexives: Some Considerations and Implications," *English Language and Linguistics* 13: 251–66, deals with Old English only indirectly. Poppe approaches the Celtic hypothesis by focusing on two features shared by Standard English and Insular Celtic languages, which distinguish them from Standard Average European (SAE). This *Sprachbund* comprises the languages of Europe, with French and German in the center. (See Martin Haspelmath, "The European Linguistic Area: Standard Average European" in *Language Typology and Linguistic Universals*, ed. Haspelmath *et al.* [Berlin: de Gruyter], 1492–1510). One of the features studied by Poppe is intensifier-reflexive differentiation, which is not found in Insular Celtic or Present-Day Standard English (e.g. *herself* vs. German *selbst / sich*), and the other is labile alternation—i.e. the use of the same verb for both inchoative and causative senses—which is common in English and Insular Celtic, while SAE prefers distinguishing the two senses (e.g. *It broke* vs. *She broke it*). Poppe concludes, "The striking and unusually high incidence in [Standard English] of labile verbs (from the perspective of SAE) is

a result of the emergence of a new system of reflexives in English on the basis of, and ultimately identical to, intensifiers . . . [T]he hypothesis that linguistic contacts between Celtic/Welsh and English played some role in the emergence of a new system of English reflexives . . . remains an attractive option" (261).

In "Evidence for Syntax as a Signal of Historical Relatedness," *Lingua* 119: 1679–706, Giuseppe Longobardi and Cristina Guardiano suggest a new method for historical linguistics. The authors draw a parallel between evolutionary biology, which aims at classifying human populations into groups and explaining their shared properties, and historical linguistics, which aims to classify human languages and explain their similarities and differences. Just as traditional classifications in biology make use of externally accessible characteristics, the language families established by the classical comparative method and Greenberg's mass comparison are based on surface features. In both fields, the variability of the criteria creates problems—most notably for measuring relatedness. In biology, a solution has come from developments in molecular genetics, in the form of finite lists of options at the molecular level, and Longobardi and Guardiano argue that, in parallel fashion, theoretical syntax could provide a basis for genealogical classifications in linguistics—in the form of syntactic parameters, as defined in the Principles and Parameters theory. In the parametric comparison method (PCM) they suggest, any languages can be compared in terms of the selections they make between binary options in a universal list of parameters. In addition to revealing relationships between languages, the sets of selections can also be used for measuring distances between related languages and for drawing taxonomies based on statistically proven similarities.

In this study, Longobardi and Guardiano focus on the nominal domain, "the internal syntax of the determiner phrase (DP)" and investigate the selections on sixty-three parameters in twenty-three contemporary and five ancient languages (1687). The parameters include features such as person, gender and definiteness, properties of genitive case, possessive pronouns, adjectival and relative modifications, and demonstratives and other determiners. From the Germanic family, the languages include Old English, Modern English, German, Norwegian, and Gothic. To test the validity of PCM, the authors compare their results to the traditional language families. In all of the tests, the relations and groupings based on syntactic parameters largely agree with the taxonomies based on lexical and phonological features, but there are some

differences, which may lead to new questions about diachronic developments.

For English, the genealogical tree based on Longobardi and Guardiano's syntactic parameters has subgroupings unlike the traditional ones for the Germanic languages, with Gothic and Old English together in one node, Modern English and Norwegian in another, and German alone in a third node. Longobardi and Guardiano suggest that this may be due to historical factors: The two old languages are chronologically closer to their common origin, and English was influenced by Scandinavian and also by Norman contacts—the former explaining its closeness to Norwegian and the latter its distance from Old English and German. Interestingly, in the tree for the modern languages, English appears as expected together with German, while Norwegian appears alone in its node. As a more general point, comparing the genealogical trees based on syntactic distance with the trees based on lexical distance for the modern Indo-European languages, the authors note that the syntactic distances are consistently smaller than the lexical distances, and they suggest that "syntactic differentiation proceeds more slowly than lexical differentiation from the same common source" (1694).

In "Word Order in Old and Middle English: The Role of Information Structure and First Language Acquisition," *Diachronica* 26: 65–102, Marit Westergaard argues that the word order change in English should not be seen as a catastrophic shift from V₂ (verb-second) to non-V₂, but instead as a gradual shift, progressing step by step through changes in the micro-cues that determine word order in different contexts. When the frequency of a micro-cue which triggers V₂, falls too low, language learners can no longer acquire the relevant word order rule, and that leads to a small change in the grammar. In addition to diachronic English data, Westergaard also considers present-day Norwegian dialects, which similarly display variable V₂ order. Working with a Split-CP model of clause structure—including an extended version of Lightfoot's cue-based approach to language acquisition and change, Westergaard argues that the word order variation found in Old and Middle English need not be explained by a competition between V₂ and non-V₂ grammars but instead by differences between V₂ grammars applying at different stages of the development. She identifies "a default non-V₂ grammar with remnant cases of V₂ (late ME), a mixed grammar (early ME), a default V₂ grammar (northern dialects), and a mixed grammar with several frequent initial elements which require V₂ (OE, southern dialects)" (98).

These grammars differ from each other in the ways in which the micro-cues of information structure and certain initial elements trigger V2 word order. As to information structure, the tendency to begin with given information promotes V2 order with new subjects and non-V2 order with given subjects. Because given subjects are usually more common, non-V2 order is dominant in the input. Considering information structure as a micro-cue solves the problem of non-V2 orders with pronouns in Old English: since the micro-cue does not trigger V2 with given subjects, which are typically pronouns, there is no need to treat pronouns as clitics to explain the word order. The second type of micro-cue consists of specific initial elements that trigger V2 order in Old English. The most notable of these elements are *þa* and *þonne* ‘then’, which are quite regularly followed by V2 in Old English but gradually shift to non-V2 over a long period of time. Instead of treating them as members of the special category of operators, Westergaard accounts for this aspect of the word order change as a gradual decrease of the role of *þa* and *þonne* as triggers for V2. These adverbs became less frequent, and their frequency finally fell below the critical level of a micro-cue in the input for language acquisition. In conclusion, Westergaard points to the advantages of this view of word order changes. Besides providing a simpler account of the role of pronouns and *þa/þonne* in word order choices, “the micro-cue approach takes into consideration the enormous variation that exists in historical and present-day V2 languages with respect to the contexts in which this word order appears. Finally, this approach also reflects new findings in acquisition data” (99).

In “Word Order and Linear Modification in English,” *Brno Studies in English* 35.2: 17–28, Jana Chamonikolasová studies the roles of information structure and syntactic functions in determining word order in Old and Modern English sentences. Working within the Functional Sentence Perspective framework, she tests the hypothesis that the shift from flexible to fixed word order in English involved a shift from a dominance of the linearity principle (order according to information structural roles) to an adherence to the grammatical principle (order according to syntactic function). For this purpose, she studies a sample of one hundred main clauses from the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle (MS D) and one hundred from a Modern English chronicle. First, Chamonikolasová identifies the syntactic role (subject, verb, object, complement and adverbial) of all the sentence elements in the data and categorizes the sentences into basic word order patterns. As expected, the Old English sentences show

more variety in the patterns, reflecting the greater flexibility of word order in that stage of the language. After classifying the initial and final sentence elements according to their degree of communicative dynamism into thematic, transition, and rhematic, she compares the information structural patterns in the Old and Modern English data.

While initial elements turn out to be mostly thematic in both samples, the Modern English text also contains nine rhematic subjects in this position in presentative sentences. Moreover, there are differences in the syntactic roles of initial thematic elements. A category absent from the Modern English sample is the initial thematic object, which occurs fifteen times in the Old English sample. Whereas fifty of the Old English sentences start with a thematic adverbial and twenty with a thematic subject, in the Modern English sample, forty-nine of the sentences begin with a thematic subject and twenty-five with a thematic adverbial. The final elements in the data are typically rhematic, though there are some differences between the samples. One is the greater number of thematic elements in final position in Modern English, most of which appear to be adverbials. Another difference is the greater number of rhematic verbs in final position in Old English. Chamonikolasová concludes that the differences between the Old and Modern English samples tally with a change towards reduced flexibility of word order and a concomitant shift in dominance from the linearity principle to the grammatical principle, but there is no “significant increase” in favor of the grammatical principle because of constructions such as existential *there* and cleft sentences, which fulfill the demands of both principles (25).

Anna Kamińska-Cichosz’s study of verb-final word order in Old English and Old High German subordinate clauses, “The Use of the ‘Subordinate Word-Order’ in Old English and Old High German: A Text-Type Dependent Comparative Analysis,” in *Pe Laurer of Oure Englische Tonge*, ed. Krygier *et al.*, 59–76, is part of a larger project investigating the influence of text type on word order in Old Germanic languages. The term *text type* is here used to refer to poetry, authentic prose, and translated prose. After noting the problems in the identification of subordinate clauses in Old Germanic data, Kamińska-Cichosz agrees with Mitchell (*Old English Syntax*, 1985) that the distinction between main and subordinate clauses was fuzzy in Old English and none of the criteria that have been used—subordinating particles, correlation, doubling, subjunctive mood, context, intonation, the Latin source text, and word order—are fully reliable. For maximal coverage, her

sample includes all potentially subordinate clauses in the corpus, a total of 1,296. These are divided first into nominal, relative, and adverbial clauses and then, according to their word order patterns, into V-final, V-3, V-2, V-1, V-2=final, and V-1=final.

A comparison of the word order patterns in the three text types in the two languages reveals significant differences between poetry and prose in both languages—with poetry preferring V-final order—and between authentic and translated prose in Old High German—with authentic prose preferring V-final and translations V-2 order. Thus, text type appears to be a stronger factor in determining word order preferences than language. The investigation of word order in different types of subordinate clauses starts from the hypothesis by Stockwell and Minkova that word order plays a more important role in adverbial clauses, where the introductory element is most ambiguous, than in relative clauses, which can be unambiguously marked by a subordinator. Focussing first on V-final order, Kamińska-Cichosz finds some support for this hypothesis, as the highest frequencies of V-final appear most often in adverbial clauses. As a further step, she examines V-final and V-3 patterns together as forms of *Spätstellung*. This investigation shows on the one hand that the hypothesis works for poetry in both languages and for prose in Old English and translations in Old High German, but it is undermined by the high frequencies in nominal clauses, which are mostly unambiguously marked. On the other hand, *Spätstellung* is generally more frequent in the Old High German samples, suggesting that its status was already stronger, which tallies with its later development in the two languages.

In her conclusion, Kamińska-Cichosz notes first that the lower frequency of V-final order in translations supports its status as a native Germanic feature. Secondly, the consistent findings of word order patterns in poetry tally with the view that it is the type of material most likely to contain the oldest Germanic structures. Finally, she underlines the importance of taking into consideration the type of data, since “[t]he so-called ‘subordinate word-order’ appears to be a tendency of varying strength, frequent in Old High German and Old English poetry, and slowly disappearing from Old English prose, perhaps under the influence of foreign languages, since the position of this structure is weakest in translations” (73).

Remus Gergel studies the syntax of comparative inversion in “Comparatives and Types of *þonne* in Old English: Towards an Integrated Analysis of the Data Types in Comparatives Derivations” in *The Fruits of*

Empirical Linguistics, eds. Sam Featherston and Susanne Winkler (New York: Mouton de Gruyter), 103–23. The article concerns two competing analyses of comparative inversion presented in Generativist approaches. According to the standard analysis, the auxiliary is in C, while the subject is in Spec, TP. This C-based analysis is similar to genuine V2 structures—also applicable to questions in English and various V2 structures in other Germanic languages. Another theoretical advantage of this analysis is its compliance with the EPP (requiring all English sentences to have the subject in Spec,TP). The alternative is a T-based analysis, an English-type of V2, in which the auxiliary is in T and the subject in Spec,VP. The theoretical advantage of this analysis is that it is simpler and thus more economical, but it involves the problem of violating the EPP. Gergel first presents synchronic arguments against the standard analysis, including studies showing that comparative clauses do not always obey EPP and that comparative inversions involve contrastive focus. Then, he presents the results of two studies of diachronic material. The first of these investigates comparative inversions in the Penn-Helsinki Corpora of Historical English. To determine whether the Old English constructions are instances of genuine V2 or the English type of V2, Gergel uses what he calls the pronoun test: as pronouns are placed high, the verb can appear to the left of pronoun subjects—or inversion occurs—only in genuine C-based V2. Gergel finds that—in all clauses with an overt subject and finite element—comparative inversion does not invert pronouns in Old English, and thus it is an English type of V2 and should be explained by the alternative T-based analysis.

In the second empirical study, Gergel focuses on *þonne* in *Beowulf*. While the majority of the total seventy-three cases are temporal conjunctions or adverbs (‘when’, ‘while’, ‘whenever’, ‘then’), seventeen occur in comparatives. Very few of the comparatives are full clauses, and only one displays inversion—but with a full noun phrase subject, not a pronoun. One conclusion that Gergel draws from the scarce data is that Old English differed from other West Germanic languages in allowing for comparative inversion already in its earliest stages. Secondly, he notes that his findings of the comparative inversions are in line with observations about the uneven headedness developments (head-final order in VP, variation in TP) and the hypothesis of the directionality of syntactic change (changes of head-final structures proceed from top to bottom). Turning to phrasal comparatives, Gergel points out that they represent several different types—including bare nouns, prepositional phrases, and pronouns—but what they

all share is verse-final position. This suggests that they were focused, which tallies with the characterizations of comparative inversions as involving contrastive focus.

Summing up the main points, Gergel argues that comparative *þonne* was syntactically different from the other types of *þonne* already in earliest Old English and that the most adequate analysis of comparative inversion is the T-based alternative, the English-type V2. In his concluding remarks, Gergel also takes up the issue of the primacy of information structure over syntax and calls for more studies of focus constructions because comparative inversion appears to be syntactically “hard-wired” (119) from the start, as it simultaneously expresses contrastive focus. As a final theoretical point, Gergel notes that the contrast properties of comparative inversion provide support for the alternative analysis: both the auxiliary and the subject must stay lower because “if the auxiliary stays under T and *at the same time* the subject is contrasted and supposed to be isolated at the right-edge of a phonological phrase, then the subject must not comply with the EPP, in that it cannot bypass T and get to Spec,T (or else it would not comply with its right-edge isolation)” (119).

In “Grammatical person and the variable syntax of Old English personal pronouns,” *English Language and Linguistics* 13.3: 433–51, Rhona Alcorn studies the placement of bare personal pronouns functioning as objects of prepositions. These pronouns occur in various positions before or after the preposition (illustrated by *comon to him*, *com him to*, *him þær comon to* in examples 1a–1c [433–432]), whereas other types of pronouns and full noun phrases follow the preposition (e.g. *to þam halgan* in example 2 [434]). While several factors have been suggested as influencing word order in such cases, Alcorn investigates the role of grammatical person in the positioning of bare personal pronouns in special placement—i.e. before the preposition—in a sample of 9,698 pronominal prepositional objects from the YCOE. Third-person pronouns turn out to be specially placed significantly more often than first- and second-person pronouns. In order to ensure that this person effect is not a result of some other factor, Alcorn studies the role of humanness, narrative mode, pronoun case, the choice of the verb and the preposition, the position of the preposition in relation to the verb, and Latin influence. The studies reveal a positive correlation between the special placement of personal pronoun prepositional objects and narrative mode (vs. direct speech) and the position of the verb after the preposition (vs. before it). However, these correlations are independent of the association of the third person with special placement. Alcorn concludes that “while this article

goes some way towards establishing a main effect of grammatical person, it is only through the application of multivariate analysis techniques that main, interaction and epiphenomenal effects may be fully differentiated, and the predictive ability of different permutations of conditioning factors may be calculated” (448).

The late Göran Kjellmer’s “On the Old English Nonoccurring Auxiliary,” *Studia Neophilologica* 81: 24–32, focuses on cases where an auxiliary appears to be missing from a perfective construction with an auxiliary and a past participle. While Modern English perfectives without the auxiliary *have* are fully accepted in certain genres—most notably headlines—similar instances in Old English texts are typically considered errors and consequently emended by editors, either adding an auxiliary or changing the participle into a finite form. Specifying the focus of the article, Kjellmer notes that non-occurrence of verbs in Old English is evidenced by various cases without finite verbs, including co-ordinated clauses sharing the verb, copular constructions, exclamations, and absolute participles, in some of which the absence of the auxiliary can be the default. Apart from these, there are genuine cases of nonoccurring auxiliaries, and Kjellmer provides ample illustration of past participles occurring without finite or nonfinite forms of the auxiliaries *beon*, *weorðan*, or *habban*. As they cannot all be attributed to scribal errors alone, he suggests a number of other explanations. First, they may be results of Latin interference in cases where the original has no auxiliary. Secondly, they may be explained by language-internal influence, because the pattern of co-ordinated participles without repetition of the auxiliary may have provided a model for other constructions with participles. Thirdly, they may be due to a reanalysis of a past participle as a finite past tense form. Moreover, the nonoccurrence of the auxiliary may be pragmatically motivated when the information expressed in the finite auxiliary is redundant because it is available in the context. In conclusion, Kjellmer emphasizes that the Old English instances should not be seen as deviant or exceptional but should instead be considered as manifestations of the same “natural Germanic tendency” as similar constructions in Modern English and other Germanic languages (31).

Mark Sundaram’s “Anterior Future Constructions and the Structure of Old English Narratives,” *Neophilologische Mitteilungen* 110: 267–81, contributes to the study of pragmatic markers in Old English by investigating the discourse-structuring functions of mood and modality. He focuses on the anterior future—or future perfect—expressed by the preterit subjunctive and preterit forms of *willan*, **sculan*, and

weorðan. A typical context for this construction is indirect speech and thought, where it corresponds to an expression of future in the direct speech. In addition to this temporal function, the construction can have pragmatic functions. Sundaram refers to Edward Costello's studies on the anterior future in French (*Modality and Narration: A linguistic theory of plotting*, Diss., University of Wisconsin, 1975, and "Modality and textual structuration," *PTL: A Journal for Descriptive Poetics and Theory of Literature* 4 [1979]: 299–614). He elaborates on the idea of narrative anticipation—i.e. the references to events that have not yet taken place, but which may be realized later in the narrative.

Examining a number of instances in Old English narratives, mainly *Beowulf* and other poems, Sundaram finds two main pragmatic uses. The anterior future is used for "foreshadowing" thematically crucial events (275). For instance, in *Beowulf*, the repeated references to the hero's death create "an inexorable sense of doom and tension" (277). At the same time, the occurrences of the anterior future structure the narrative by segmenting it into units. As an example, Sundaram cites the dragon fight in *Beowulf* (ll. 2200–820), where the construction co-operates with other discourse markers—most notably *þa* 'then'—to divide the narrative into "distinct scenes, [creating] a narrative rhythm which heightens the expectation of the realised narration of Beowulf's death" (277).

BMW

Anna Helene Feulner's "Kuhns Gesetze im *Beowulf*," *Die Sprache* 48: 55–65, addresses, primarily, the status of OE finite verbs throughout the poem's alliterative lines. To provide her study with a framework, she begins by restating Kuhn's two laws on sentence particles and sentence openings. Sentence particles include those finite verbs, unstressed or weakly so, in a metrical unit. The positions in sentences of such particles (also prefixes and words with little or no stress) are largely fixed. Sentence openings include finite verbs, as in *Beowulf*, that typically occur in the on-verse and alliterate with the first stressed word. On the other hand, *Beowulf* has numerous sentences that do not open with particles, including finite verbs. These laws on particles and openings have been subject to careful reviews, among them Bliss's and Kendall's, the work of both benefiting from their analyses of *Beowulf*.

To begin, Feulner points to Bliss's argument that particles, unstressed in the first dip of a sentence, may carry stress if they occur elsewhere. For Kuhn, the displacing of particles (including finite verbs) is due to optional orders of stress; for Bliss, however, stress

on particles results from displacement in the ordering of words. Kuhn regards the position of particles in sentences as the chief determinant of their significance; alliterative patterns and lift arrangements may bring about only apparent, inadmissible variations. The upshot is: (1) that accentual sequences and details of position in lines are not inferable from sentence particles and (2) Kuhn's laws, as originally framed, are neither demonstrable nor refutable in the light of alliterative patterns and verse arrangements.

Feulner then turns to Kendall's modification of Kuhn's concepts on syntax, alliterative patterns, and lifts. Using sentence particles and patterns of opening clauses, Kendall classifies syntactic structures subject to the onset of verses as clause-initial, clause-non-initial, or unrestricted. He also distinguishes "internal" and "external" displacement: Internal displacement modifies arrangements of words in a verse; external displacement moves an entire verse (half-line) to a different position in a sentence. Displacement is possible only for verses with opening clauses that contain no more than one sentence particle and exhibit an extrametrical alliterative pattern with the contour of a long line. Kendall's alliterative principle separates alliteration from the metrical contours in a line. Using Kendall's notation (A = lift that alliterates; N = lift that does not alliterate; a = extra-metrical alliteration) Feulner presents her five sets of on-verse, off-verse patterns. Displacement occasions sentence particles that are not necessary for lifts, yet to validate Kuhn's two laws, Kendall recognizes, say, the metrical function of the finite verb in off-verse 1441b as a lift (*Gyrede hine Beowulf*), but not in on-verse 217a (*Gewat þa ofer wægholm*).

Here, Feulner turns to Bliss's account of finite verbs. In 580 verses, excluding half-lines consisting of a single predicate and those containing a form of the copula, Bliss's examples contain no verb preceded by a stressed word. Of these, 165 verses have auxiliaries and quasi-auxiliaries. The bulk of his inventory, 415 verses, is divided into groupings based on their positions in sentences. Feulner reproduces Bliss's table of grouped verbs, occupying nine different positions. To each group, she adds an example from *Beowulf*, notes the total of on- and off-verses, and provides a scheme that shows their connections to stressed words. Then, for each group, she provides full examples of half lines (on- and off-verses) and an account of whether the finite verb under study alliterates. For each such group, she indicates the position of the verb under study. The upshot of this survey results in a partial concord between Bliss's analysis of finite verbs and the claims of Kuhn's laws. As Feulner shows, groups 1 and 2 of that analysis fall inside

Kuhn's formulations. For group 1, the verb follows a stressed element; for Group 2, the verb *won*, for example, in *holm storme weol / won wið winde* (1332a), is an appositive of *weol*, itself illustrative of verbs in group 1. Otherwise, Bliss's findings for the status of verbs lie in a complex relation to Kuhn's laws. Feulner quotes Bliss on this complex relation. In brief, many finite verbs occupy a "halfway house" between particles and stressed elements. This finding depends on various positions of finite verbs, particles, and stressed elements in a line of verse. And in a half-line, when a finite verb stands alone before a first stressed element, as in *bat banlocan* (742a), Bliss's analysis falls short. Contextually, one cannot say whether the finite verb works as particles do or as *banlocan*, a stressed element, does. Feulner finds thirty-six instances of finite verbs with uncertain status. As for Kendall's approach, she finds it also falling short of clear results. Kendall observes that in four of Bliss's groups (1, 2, 3, and 7), the finite verb is the only sentence particle subject to displacement. This optional possibility in regard to displacement limits severely the determining of a predictable link between alliterative patterns and syntax.

Feulner now turns to her reanalysis. The shortcoming of Bliss's findings lie in their leaving unresolved, despite his interpretation of Kuhn's laws, the status of many verses—some classified as unmetrical, others ignored. She also regards his idea of "ornamental" alliteration to be adventitious. Instead, Feulner directs attention to the work of Lehmann and Watkins on the earliest stages of Germanic poetry as attesting to stressed finite verbs at the opening of clauses, and this incidence of stressed, finite verbs accommodates all 33 examples that accord with that given above for line 1332a. Furthermore, this early pattern—found also in the *Rig Veda*—pertains to 64 finite verbs that follow a stressed element as in *hringiren scir / song in searwum* (323a). In regard to line 742a, given above, Feulner finds that of 82 finite verbs in this group, 62 alliterate, and they are in sentence opening position. In ten instances, the verb opens an off-verse that otherwise has no alliterative pattern. There remain nineteen finite verbs that do not enter an alliterative pattern in the opening clauses of sentences. In part, this lack of alliterative force is due to lexical-semantic considerations—divisible into six groups that are illustrated but not discussed. This review of verbs continues in Bliss's remaining six groups of verbs. For each, Feulner indicates the number of verbs included and groups them as stressed or not, while noting the criteria for her choices. She concludes her analysis with a summarizing table.

Feulner's appropriation of initial, stressed, finite verbs from the earliest examples of Germanic verse and from other Indo-European languages poses for her a challenge to Kuhn's laws. In her view, Kuhn did not sufficiently look to earlier poetic practice in regard to finite verbs to strengthen his framework. This promising result of course invites study of finite verbs in other poems coeval with *Beowulf*. As for her reliance on semantic-lexical categories to separate groups of finite verbs that draw stress from those that do not, fuller analysis also lies in wait. What appears in her account does not yet supply the arguments needed to make it convincing. This is an intriguing study. [Feulner's article is also reviewed in the *Beowulf* part of section 4b.]

EG

In "Construing Old English in the Thirteenth Century: The Syntax of the Winteneý Adaptation of the Benedictine Rule," *Leeds Studies in English* 40: 27–46, Maria Artamanova examines the "changes introduced by the reviser(s) to the syntax and word order of Aethelwold's original" (32). Artamanova argues that an early thirteenth-century revision of an Old English version of the Benedictine Rule would likely have had three varieties of changes: those related to the original Latin text, those aimed at updating obsolete language, and those related to general stylistic revisions. Alterations made by the Winteneý reviser(s) included changing actives to passives (and vice versa), moving the position of pronouns and verbs in the sentences, changing the order of objects and prepositions, and even rewriting several passages of the original. Artamanova concludes that the changes in the Winteneý adaptation represented "a need for a vernacular Rule, which would have been equally welcomed by the Cistercian nunnery in Winteneý and by any other community of religious women or men in the South of England" (44).

RFJ

■ Phonology and Other Aspects

‡J.H. McWhorter asks "What Else Happened to English? A Brief for the Celtic Hypothesis," *English Language and Linguistics* 13: 163–91, and decides that the periphrastic *do* in English bolsters the not-very-widely-adhered-to position that the Celtic languages imposed structural influences on English. As a thoroughgoing creolist, McWhorter's prominence as a public intellectual has not derailed his linguistic interest in languages in contact, and this contribution modifies and builds on his 2002 *Diachronica* paper in which he argued that some features of English are the result of Scandinavian

speakers acquiring an incomplete version of the language—essentially a pidgin, which was then passed on to subsequent English speakers with a permanently altered grammar—essentially a creole. McWhorter's title is honest: The article is a fine piece of lawyering that condemns as unscientific the traditional stance that English did not borrow periphrastic *do* from Celtic but, as most observers have suggested, developed the pattern internally. In linguistics, "scientism" consists of the adoption of rhetoric that appeals to the scientific method, while linguists greatly inflate the role of scientific reasoning in linguistic argumentation—and especially in historical linguistics—which mostly relies not on testing hypotheses but on inductive reasoning. McWhorter surely knows this, for his article is largely a demonstration of inductive reasoning in historical linguistics. Thus, his frequent disparagement of competing explanations for the rise of periphrastic *do* in English as lacking scientific rigor seems disingenuous, such as when he concludes his paper with: "I submit that . . . dismissal [of the Celtic Hypothesis for the origin of periphrastic *do*] qualifies as unscientific" (187). Before dismissing opposing views as unscientific, however, McWhorter provides a much brasher formulation of his own stance: "My claim is that Welsh and Cornish shared a genetic feature of Brythonic Celtic, this feature was passed on to a descendent of Cornish, and that later, Cornish passed the feature on to English. Supporting this is that, quite simply, English is the only Germanic language with a semantically empty syntactic place-filling *do*. Occam's Razor renders this account preferable" (168). I cannot understand why—in the absence of evidence supporting contact between English and Cornish speakers—supposing that English adopted a complex structural feature from Cornish, a lower prestige language, is simpler than the traditional explanation that English developed the feature internally—a theory for which there is some evidence. Perhaps McWhorter's appeal to Occam's Razor is merely part of the rhetorical strategy of the article, which relies on impressive-sounding logical and legalistic reasoning to support his theory.

After modeling the Cornish uses of periphrastic *do* (and let it be noted that forms of Cornish *gul* 'to do, to make' have no phonological similarity at all with Old or Middle English *dōn*), McWhorter considers five major objections to the general notion that Celtic languages influenced the trajectory of English. First, he dismisses the reverse of his proposal—that English passed periphrastic *do* to Cornish—since this would suggest that the similar syntactic feature found in Welsh and Breton was not a Celtic inheritance. Puzzlingly,

as a reason for rejecting the hypothesis that Cornish borrowed the pattern from English, which has never been proposed by anyone, as far as I have been able to determine, McWhorter states that "contact' alone, unqualified, cannot stand as grounds for a case for syntactic transfer" (168), but this is effectively the crux of his overall argument: English developed a syntactic feature similar to that found in a language with which it was in contact, so that feature must have been borrowed. McWhorter then moves to reject the possibility that periphrastic *do* arose in English as a Germanic family trait. Here, he suggests that similar constructions with *do* in nonstandard German and Dutch dialects show their pragmatic use in those languages as opposed to English's use of *do* as a dummy auxiliary or empty operator for carrying tense in negative and interrogative constructions. McWhorter's article, which repeatedly refers to English *do* as a semantically neutral syntactic place-filler, never acknowledges *do* as either an emphatic particle (as in Present Day English) or an auxiliary in free variation with basic declarative sentences (as in Early Modern English). Suppressing this not-so-small detail certainly makes for an easier case.

Similarly, in opposing the theory that, in English, periphrastic *do* arose through internal processes of change, McWhorter seems unaware that *do* was used frequently in Old English in a semantically reduced fashion in constructions like *We sceolon don swa swa we on þysum wordum behatað* (ÆCHom I, 19, "We should do just as we promise in these words") and *Swa swa hi ær mid nette fixodon on sælicum ypum, swa dyde crist þæt hi syððan mid his heofonlican lare manna sawla gefixodon* (ÆCHom I, 38, "Just as they before fished with a net on the sea waves so did Christ that they afterwards fished for the souls of men with his heavenly teaching")—that is, in anticipative and substitutive constructions. If McWhorter were searching for an explanation of why later English might have adopted a semantically neutral use of *do*, he need not have looked outside of the English language for it. He then dismisses objections that periphrastic *do* appeared too late to have been borrowed from Celtic (about 1300), suggesting that the lateness of its appearance in our extant texts simply proves that the construction was "restricted to the vernacular register for a very long period, considered low speech unsuitable for the print medium" (178). Of course, the beauty of this argument is its impervious circular logic: The absence of empirical evidence for periphrastic *do* provides evidence of its existence as an underground, unrecorded speech pattern. On the whole, McWhorter assumes far more standardization than existed in this period to explain why periphrastic

do may have been suppressed in writing. Finally, McWhorter addresses the objection that there are far too few Celtic loanwords in English to indicate a contact situation of the extent thought necessary for the borrowing of syntactic features. He claims that this objection is unsubstantiated and points to evidence of Uralic influence on Russian and Dravidian influence on Sanskrit as examples of structural borrowing from lower prestige languages without heavy lexical borrowing.

Though the paper is well-written, the subject interesting, the thesis vigorously pursued, and the legalistic rhetoric well-honed, it basically ignores a wealth of evidence unfriendly to McWhorter's idea: the semantic reduction of *do* in Old English constructions, the frequent grammaticalizations of verbs like *do* in natural language, the concurrent rise of periphrasis more generally and of periphrastic *do* in English, and the cementing of SVO word order. McWhorter seems to believe that the balance of evidence clearly shows that periphrastic *do* is a borrowing from Cornish, but the degree of certainty he expresses is difficult to reconcile with the actual evidence he presents, much of which is of a cross-linguistic nature and is not in any sense an empirical demonstration of borrowing. Could he nevertheless be correct? Yes, he could; after all, the nature of evidence in historical linguistics means that proof is not absolute. But there is little in McWhorter's "legal brief" to persuade us that nativist interpretations of periphrastic *do* have had it all wrong all these years, unless dazzling lawyering in the service of a vacuity is as persuasive to scholarly audiences as it apparently is to some popular ones.

CC

‡In "What Else Happened to English: A Brief for the Celtic Hypothesis," *English Language and Linguistics* 13: 163–91, J. H. McWhorter argues that the English periphrastic *do* has its origins in the equivalent construction in Cornish. The article deals with Old English only tangentially when it refers to the absence of Celtic influence in English during that period. One of the common arguments against a Celtic origin is the late appearance of periphrastic *do*. Despite long contact between English and Celtic speakers, the construction appears first in Early Middle English around 1300. Against this, McWhorter points out that unequal relations between language groups typically stigmatize features of the lower language, which are consequently unlikely to appear in written records without a considerable time lag. As he maintains, "For it [periphrastic *do*] to have occurred in Old English texts would have been a stark contradiction of sociolinguistic realities typical of

written languages worldwide since time immemorial" (179). Another argument against the Celtic origin of this construction is the scarcity of Celtic loanwords in English. As lexical items are typically easier to borrow than syntactic features (cf. Longobardi and Guardiano), there should be more words of Celtic origin in English. Here, McWhorter refers again to the unequal sociohistorical situation, noting that "a group without prestige (i.e. the Celts under English rule) can *not* contribute significant lexicon" (183). In parallel situations, substrate languages have been found to influence the grammar of the superstrate language, and, moreover, Celtic loanwords may have been more common earlier, though they have not stayed in the language.

BMW

‡In "Celtic influence on Old English and West Germanic," *English Language and Linguistics* 13: 227–49, Angelika Lutz argues for substantial Celtic substratal influence on proto-Old English. The geographical area where this is most noticeable is the Southern Lowlands, where there must have been a sizeable Celtic-speaking population. The most important evidence adduced in the article is the twofold Old English present indicative paradigm of the verb "to be," closely paralleled by Cymric, which—like Old English—distinguishes between *b*-forms and non-*b*-forms. The former are used in a "habitual," the latter in an "actual" sense. Continental Germanic languages also exhibit a number of *b*-forms in their present tense paradigms of "to be" but nothing like the full Old English parallel paradigms. According to Lutz, the Old English twofold paradigm is the result of substratal influence, while the simple paradigms of Continental West Germanic languages reflect adstratal influence. The second part of the article deals with Old English words for 'slave'. It is noteworthy that the lexemes deriving from *wealh*, which in attested Old English or in proto-Old English also denote 'Celtic', occur in West Saxon, the dialect spoken in the Southern Lowlands. According to Lutz, "[t]his suggests that in the early centuries at least, slaves in Anglo-Saxon England were frequently of Celtic extraction in this Southern core area and that in the same area female slaves were typically of Celtic origin" (242).

MK

‡Angelika Lutz begins her "Celtic influence on Old English and West Germanic," *English Language and Linguistics* 13: 227–49, by surveying opinions on early contact between Anglo-Saxon invaders and the overcome denizens of Britannia. With only Gildas and Bede to hand, modern historians such as Baugh, Cable, Coates,

Freeman, and Jespersen differ on the survival of Lowland Britons and their influence on Old English. Gelling relies on the survival of many British place names to argue that Celtic denizens survived the invasions peacefully enough for at least two centuries. But she, too, has to speculate on the few instances of loanwords in Old English traceable to Celtic. Lutz takes issue with Gelling's idea of "peaceful coexistence" between invaders and indigenous denizens because of battles recorded by Gildas, Bede, and the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. Nor does Gelling explain how her view of coexistence tallies with the provisions of Ine's laws that weigh heavily on the rights of Celts living in his kingdom.

Moving away from these diverse views, Lutz infers that, in the light of research on conquering *superstrata* and conquered *substrata*, Celtic-Anglo-Saxon contact accords with findings that the interlingual transfer of vocabulary is one-sided. The dominant group usually adopts few words from those made subordinate. Moreover, there was little British flora and fauna not already familiar to the invading Germanic tribes. Outside of vocabulary, however, the phonological and grammatical influence of the substratal language may be considerable in cases where many denizens adopt the language of invaders.

Scholarly views differ on the influence of Celtic—as a language made subordinate—on English, whether in the Anglo-Saxon or post-Norman Conquest eras. Recent studies explain the problems inherent in determining influence, since documentary evidence manifests the usage of elite Anglo-Saxons, not that of indigenous Celts who shifted to the invaders' speech. There is evidence for the speech patterns of new speakers of Old English, but only after the Norman Conquest. Secondly, the denizens encountered by the Germanic invaders in Lowland Britain spoke Latin rather than a form of Celtic. If so, an influence of Celtic on early Old English seems, again, problematic. Lutz's own position derives from her analysis of structural features in Old English texts, a procedure that temporarily sets aside the contexts of historical occurrences.

For Lutz, the chief example of Celtic structural influence lies in the conjugation *bēon*. In form and function, this verb resembles Celtic practice much more nearly than Germanic dialects contemporary with Anglo-Saxon—including Old Saxon, a close congener. In function, Old English *bēon* contributes to a distinction between the "habitual" and "actual" present, just as Cymric does. Although Germanic dialects contain such forms as *bium* (Old Saxon), *bim* (Old High German), *em* (Old Norse), and *im* (Gothic), only Old English has both. Yet Cymric—close enough in territorial reach to

Old English—also has a double conjugation, as in *byðaf* and *wyf*. This comparable array is well-established, first discussed by Wolfgang Keller in 1925. Functional parallels exemplify uses of future tense, actional condition, and durative aspect, and these functions are widespread in the Old English corpus. Lutz also implies, without providing evidence, that substratal influence affected the use of the present participle in early Wessex.

To help clinch support for the formal and functional parallels in verb use between Old English and Cymric, Lutz addresses Fladieck's reservations of 1937. Fladieck observed that, unlike Cymric, Old English *bēon* does not contain forms for the past tense, yet substratum speakers' adaptation need not be wholesale. Lutz speculates that their use of *bēon* in the present tense may have exceeded significantly that of the past tense. Fladieck also assumed that Celtic speakers adapting Old English were denizens of northern areas, where there was considerably diminished use of *bēon*—a mistaken premise in Lutz's view. Thirdly, Fladieck indicated the occurrence of the Old Saxon *bium* conjugation, but not the absence of an analog to the Old English *eom* pattern.

One further complication is due to the array of forms in the single conjugations of *bium* in Old Saxon and *bim* in Old High German: Old Saxon has *is(t)*; Old High German *is*. That Old Saxon and Old High German may have had a double paradigm, as Old English does, is a possible yet unattested finding. Weighing against this potential paradigm is the fact that no one has argued for a functional difference in Germanic conjugations on the continent like that which obtains in Old English *bēon* and *eom*.

To supplement substratal influence on conjugations, Lutz reviews lexical and semantic evidence. Her argument supports a noteworthy presence of Lowland Celts among speakers of early Old English. Her strategy centers on forms, not from Celtic, but adapted from Old English to designate Britons. In particular, she presents Pelteret's family of words, formed with OE *wealh*. Often this form has the gloss 'slave' but not in all contexts: In some constructions, *wealh* designates 'a Briton, a person of Celtic-speaking origin.' Lutz suggests that the presence of Celtic Britons in Anglo-Saxon areas was substantial enough to locate them at several levels of society. And even if Britons did not match Anglo-Saxon nobles in high rank, the difference did not make them altogether subordinate. Lutz supports the idea that the time intervening between Ine's and Alfred's rules saw an increased assimilation of Celts into Anglo-Saxon culture.

In Pelteret's family of words, the form *wīln* < **wealhin* 'female slave' (pre-i-formation and thus very early) is

particularly valuable. Lutz implies that *wiln* applies to enclaves of southern British women who often lived in bondage, sexual and otherwise. That this form prevails in the lowland areas indicates a putatively large group of Celtic women who varied considerably in their command of Old English and particularly of its phonology and syntax. Supposing that a fairly large group of Celtic women spoke regularly with children, Lutz further traces a path for substratal influence on Old English.

Lutz accommodates her argument to Schrijver's view that Celts in the Lowlands spoke a variety of Latin. Her approach is sociolinguistic: Those who could fled the invaders and resettled in the North Highlands (they probably spoke Latin); those left behind probably spoke Celtic and entered servitude. And so it is that a Celtic substratum, composed mainly of women, worked its influence on Old English. Lutz concludes that further analysis would bring to the history of the English language rather strong indications of Celtic influence in other features of syntax and phonology.

Peter Schrijver's "Celtic Influence on Old English: Phonological and Phonetic Evidence," *English Language and Linguistics* 13.2: 193–211, suggests considerable contact between indigenous and incursive populations. Beginning with the onset of the fifth century, he summarizes the substantial evidence for Latin among British Celts in the Eastern Lowland zone and its reduced presence in the western and northern Highlands. Schrijver's discussion of Latin in the Highlands distinguishes a first stage of plentiful lexemic borrowings in British Celtic—separate from unrecorded phonologic and morphosyntactic adaptations—and a second stage, which sharply reversed this trend from the later fifth to seventh centuries. Influenced by late Latin, this second stage of Highland speech patently differs from earlier British Celtic patterns by adopting many of the linguistic characteristics of Welsh, Cornish, and Breton. The contrast is due to large shifts in population, as the speakers who identified with the earlier stage of Highland Latin found themselves engulfed by refugees from the Lowlands, who had gone north and west—away from the gradual advance of Anglo-Saxon settlers. These Lowlanders brought with them the Latin known to them since the Roman period, while those remaining in the Lowlands exposed the Anglo-Saxons to Late British Latin.

Schrijver then details the linguistic history of British Celtic and its divisions. In the Lowlands, evidence for Celtic—but not for its morphologic and syntactic structures—occurs in names for people and places before the fifth century. The uniformity of extant spellings precludes analysis of local phonetic and phonologic patterns. The sole departure from this uniformity appears

in the "Bath pendant" with the meaning of its inscription not altogether settled. The pendant's inscribed leftmost form *adix-ou-i* < **adix-ū-mi* (**ū* a verbal ending, **mi* a first-person pronominal clitic) suggests a diphthongization of the long vowel; its rightmost form *cuamiinai* < **kōmignāi* < **koimgnāi* also shows the diphthongization of a long vowel: *ō* > *ua*. The diphthongization of long vowels also occurs in Late Latin. In general, the phonology of Lowland British Celtic resembles more closely that of Northern Gaulish—where both were in contact with Late Spoken Latin—than that of Highland British Celtic.

For these reasons, Schrijver assesses the phonological influence of Late British Latin and Lowland British Celtic on Anglo-Saxon, rather than that of Highland British Celtic. Of course, such an assessment must remain provisional, owing to a paucity of evidence. In an effort to overcome a lack of direct attestation, Schrijver proposes a review of phonological systems in contact: (1) North Sea Germanic as developed by the eighth century in Anglo-Saxon; (2) developments in Celtic; (3) developments in nearby Romance languages.

One distinctive characteristic of Anglo-Saxon phonological history is that "the scale and systematic nature of . . . diphthongization . . . is incomparably more elaborate than in any other Germanic language" (201). From the onset of Insular Anglo-Saxon until the eighth century, the process of breaking brought about the long and short counterparts of *io*, *eo*, *ea*, although Anglian smoothing produced monophthongs. In West Saxon, breaking resulted in **iu* as well as long and short **ea* > *ie*.

To posit that dialect contact underlies this diphthongization is to run into apparent difficulties. Systemically, the Old English dialects include a comparable array of diphthongs; however, the lexis presents numerous variants as in *hēh* and *hēah*, *sēc* and *sēoc*, *fallan* and *fealan*. For Schrijver, these variants imply that "the dialects adopted the same phonemic and phonetic system without contact with one another" (200). And so he turns to the possibility of "a common substratum . . . of a language shift by a non-Anglo-Saxon population to Anglo-Saxon in the period between c. 450 to 700" (200).

The identification of a plausible substratum is hardly straightforward. Highland British Celtic (ca. 500) has no diphthongs in its phonemic system; Northwestern (Picardan) pre-Old French has *ie* and *ye*. These two systems are "at best close *comparanda* for the lost language of the people who shifted to Anglo-Saxon, not that language itself" (202). With a sense of the unexpected, Schrijver introduces Old Irish as a language similar in development to Old English phonetics. Reviewing

manuscript evidence and Modern Irish phonetics, he concludes that in early modes of pronunciation, “long diphthongized and short rounded front vowels, and long and short front-to-back diphthongs” also obtained (203). Such phonetic parallels prompt Schrijver’s search for sociolinguistic support.

The gist of this support is that, due to social and historic affinities, Old Irish and Lowland British Celtic exhibit phonologies with similar diphthongs. The origin of Old Irish derives from Lowland British Celts fleeing across the sea at the Roman incursion of the first century CE. What is not certain, however, is the degree of contact between Celts remaining in Britain and those removing to Ireland, nor do historic documents offer immediate comparisons of phonologies. Schrijver notes that unlike Germanic and Slavic languages in the Middle Ages, Old Irish was a monolithic language, but he can barely say anything about developments in Lowland British Celtic phonology beyond the two diphthongs cited earlier.

This analysis is insightful but speculative. A large question remains regarding a supposed paucity of contact between early Old English dialects. The evidence from Bede’s history does not support the idea that those in Anglia and those southward did not often encounter one another. Also, the idea that variants in the lexemes of Anglo-Saxon dialects impeded easy communication requires fuller analysis than that given.

Two Old English words, the ethnonym **Rumwalas* and the common noun *brōc/brēc*, contribute to David Stifter’s “The Proto-Germanic Shift **ā > *ō* and Early Germanic Linguistic Contacts,” *Historische Sprachforschung* 122: 268–283. These two words are among a handful cited as putative evidence for a shift from **ā > *ō* relatively late in Proto-Germanic. Stifter suggests that this shift may have taken place between 100 BCE and 100 AD. Arguments for which time witnessed the shift depend on the quality of the vowel in the first syllable of **Rumwalas* and like cognomens (Gothic **Ruma*, OHG *Rūma*, ON *Rūm*). Compared to one another, these forms support a reconstruction of a Proto-Germanic toponym **Rūmō* ‘Rome’ and ethnonym **Rūmōnaz* ‘Roman’, yet this reconstruction—traced to L. *Rōma* and *Rōmānus*—departs from the expected L. *ō > Gmc. *ā* and L. *ā > Gmc. *ā* to the atypical L. *ō > Gmc. *ū* and L. *ā > Gmc. *ō*. Explanations offered for these atypical shifts appear plausible, with the date of borrowing supposedly early enough to approximate the expression of L. *ā* as some form of Gmc. *ā* and L. *ō* as Gmc. *ū*.

Here, Stifter offers an alternative phonological and political history. His argument posits Central-European Celtic (any possible variety, including Gaulish) as

a conduit for the transfer of Latin words to Germanic. Though hard evidence for such forms as **Rūmā* and **Rūmānos* in a Celtic variety is lacking, Stifter supposes L. *ō > Old Celtic ū*. (He also imagines that Etruscan may have served as an intermediary between Latin and Old Celtic.) The advantage of this supposition is that it supports early contact between Roman and early Celtic speakers—the fourth century BCE—whereas the earliest date for Germanic contact is one or two centuries later. Furthermore, Germanic groups had to pass through Celtic areas to make contact with Romans, resulting in a pattern of movement that very likely affected the processes of language contact.

The second Old English word that enters Stifter’s account of Germanic-Celtic-Roman lexical and phonological contacts is *brōc* (pl. *brēc*). The plural form appears in L. *brācae* (rarely *brācēs*) to designate a form of clothing like modern ‘breeches’. The Latin borrowing, first attested between 116 and 110 BCE, is more likely from a Celtic rather than Germanic model. In the first half-century BCE, Diodorus mentions Gaulish βράκαϝ. Since an inherent relation of Gmc. **brōk-* and Early Celtic **brāk-* has no basis, one language must have borrowed from the other, but which served as model and which as target, remains unclear. For Stifter, who outlines the model-target possibilities, the direction of borrowing does not affect his overall argument on trilingual contacts.

The article’s conclusion outlines Stifter’s preferred direction and period of borrowings. The toponym *Rōma* passes from Latin—possibly first through Etruscan—to Central-European Celtic by the fourth century BCE and then to Germanic sometime between the first and second centuries BCE. The word for ‘breeches’ has a less secure history. If the Gmc. **brōkiz*, modeled by Celtic **brākes*, comes first then the time of occurrence falls between the effects of Grimm’s Law and the second century BCE. If Celtic supplies the model for the Germanic borrowing, then the time of occurrence falls after Grimm’s Law had already taken effect. The alternatives evidently leave the time of word transfer from one language to the other unchanged. The Latin *brācae*, in Stifter’s review of the documents, comes unambiguously from European Celtic, at a time after the workings of Grimm’s Law.

As a whole, the article presents plausible, though somewhat opaque, alternatives in an otherwise formidably difficult history of sociolinguistic contact.

In “An Explanation for the Early Phonemicisation of a Voice Contrast in English Fricatives,” *English Language and Linguistics* 13: 213–26, Stephen Laker revisits a much-studied issue. His thesis is that

phonemic contrasts between voiced and voiceless fricatives arose from contact with Brittonic. He begins his analysis with a summary and a table that lays out the currently accepted rules for allophonic contrasts among fricatives. Against the rules that work broadly, Laker cites post-junctural, productive morphemes such as *-pu* and *-pa* that retain a voiceless quality regardless of which consonant or vowel precedes. He also endorses Fulk's argument that phonological evidence alone is insufficient for establishing a consistent, allophonic contrast between homorganic fricatives.

To account for the development of voicing, as in *bōsm* 'bosom', Laker examines chronological sequences. Such voicing had to follow the lenition of medial [x] > [h], because [x] should otherwise have become [ɣ], as in *burh* (<*burg). When this lenition first occurred, however, is hard to say, or whether it fell in a sequence that included medially a change of [x] > glottal aspirate [h] > voiced [ɦ] before disappearing. Since chronology provides no reliable guide to the voiced-voiceless patterns for Old English fricatives, Laker considers other, putative explanations. He rules out possible early influence from other Germanic languages, since none have a voiced-voiceless phonemic distinction. As for Jespersen's thesis that phonemic contrasts among fricatives is due to a French model, Laker brings differences between southern and northern dialects of Middle English to bear on inconsistencies. In the South, phonotactic patterns influenced the pronunciation of French borrowings, as in [varmər], rather than a straightforward modeling of Old French *fermier*. In the Midlands and in the North, however, initial fricatives in words derived from Old English, many voiceless, did not exert a like influence on initially voiced fricatives borrowed from French. Laker infers that the Southern dialect had a contrast less well established than the Middle English Midland and Northern dialects.

Bohumil Trnka proposed a third possibility, arguing that borrowings from French were partially marked by occurrences of *z* and *v* as "secondary variants of the phonemes *s* and *f*" (*A Phonological Analysis of Present-Day Standard English*, 1935, 62). The apocope of unstressed vowels in final syllables brought on a full contrast between voiced-voiceless fricatives; voiced and voiceless contrasts became a fixed feature of English, as in *leaf*, *leave*. Hans Kurath proposes still another argument, focusing on the simplification of intervocalic geminate fricatives, which retained their voiceless feature. From this process, Kurath aims to account for the development of phonemic contrasts. The shortcoming here is that the geminates occurred after short vowels; the voiced fricatives after long vowels, so

the contrasts—based on voice—are predictable, and this predictability, in turn, counts against phonemicisation. Roger Lass, in turn, invokes all three explanations for the development of phonemic contrast in voiced and voiceless fricatives. French borrowings provide the basis for initial contrasts, degemination for medial contrasts, apocope for contrasts in final position. By and large, nowadays, most discussions of the Middle English fricatives attribute their voiced/voiceless contrasts to the substantial borrowings from French.

Here Laker turns to a possible Brittonic influence from the fifth century onwards that he regards as a catalyst for the phonemicization of voiced fricatives in Old English. He quickly agrees with current views that Britons and Anglo-Saxons had geographic contact wider than previously believed. Secondly, he endorses the idea that language shift need not depend on a count of loanwords to determine "intensity of contact" (218). Such shifts may well involve morphosyntactic and phonologic/phonetic influence. The possibility of a Brittonic impact rests on a premise that it was hardly meager or geographically limited. This impact partly relies on the presence in Celtic of phonemic contrasts for the fricatives /f-v/ /θ-ð/ and /s-z/. From this phonemic pattern for fricatives there arises the possibility that Britons speaking Old English would have pronounced it as if it accorded with Celtic practice—an "over-differentiation of phonemes" (219, quoting Weinreich). Furthermore, these contrasts—except for the absence of [z] in late British and Medieval Welsh—obtain in initial, medial, and final position. In Old English, the variants [s(:)] and [z] occur only in medial position. To address this complication, Laker cites patterns of pronunciation, especially in Northern English and Scots, that instance unpredictable exchanges of these two sibilants. A second qualification designed to overcome the lack of a phonemic contrast between sibilants depends on the experience of Irish speakers with eighteenth- and nineteenth-century English. Although Irish has /s, ʃ/ and lacks /z, ʒ/, the presence of voicing contrasts in other pairs of fricatives eased the articulation of all four English sibilants among Goidelic language learners.

To summarize, Laker offers five points to buttress his argument. (1) The influence of Brittonic voice patterns is discernible in Old English, as in the voiceless sibilant of *cærse* and *hyrse* for the expected [z]. (2) Habits of pronunciation carried over in language shifts proceed more readily in establish phonemic contrasts than even widespread borrowing and diffusion. If voiced contrasts were already phonemic before large-scale borrowing from French occurred, then the assimilation of borrowings must have proceeded unimpeded

by any phonologic element in fricatives. (3) Trnka's argument on Middle English apocope to account for voiced fricatives in final position fails if they already obtained, as in *bathe* /beið/, *house* /hauz/ versus *bath* /ba:θ/ and *house* /haus/. (4) Unlike other Germanic languages, English had widespread contrasts of voice in its fricative series early on. (5) Analogies are still evident in the voiced/voiceless contrasts of fricatives in Modern English and Welsh. Between voiced consonants in both languages, fricatives are strongly voiced, partially unvoiced, or voiceless initially and finally. There is the caveat that this analogous pattern may not stem from early contacts. This study is largely speculative and worth serious consideration, yet it does not stand as a persuasive argument.

An introductory essay for *English Language and Linguistics* 13: 155–161, Markku Filppula and Juhani Klemola's "Special Issue on Re-Evaluating the Celtic Hypothesis," is an exercise in bilingual history. Hitherto, textbook summaries of Brittonic and Goidelic contact with Old English have presented it as negligible, underscoring the sparse borrowing of words and the somewhat greater occurrence of names for places and rivers. The paucity of such borrowings or adaptations has been traditionally explained by a view of socio-cultural history that largely casts early Insular Celts as a people almost entirely dismissed, if not entirely vanquished, from the early inroads of Anglo-Saxons on. Jespersen gave voice to this view of historical contact and its consequences for linguistic developments in Old English and later periods. Against Jespersen's thesis, a growing resistance—assisted by imaginative, linguistic analysis—has shaped a counterargument of considerable merit.

Filppula and Klemola outline four dimensions that support the counterargument. (1) Archaeological and historical findings yield a better sense of Insular Celtic-English contact than the model supported by Jespersen. This new dimension substantially revises earlier views on social and cultural contact in the pre-Conquest centuries. It also furnishes a sense of demographic movements and a re-assessment of Insular Celtic responses to Anglo-Saxon invasion. This new thesis promotes the view that, far from vanishing, the Insular Celts adapted themselves to life under the invading Anglo-Saxons—an undertaking that fostered, at least at the outset, their bilingual abilities. Genetic study has also brought fresh vitality to the idea that the Insular Celts flourished despite military defeat. (2) Widespread study of language contact bolsters a fresh approach to bilingualism that does not stop at loanwords. Facing up to the scales of language learning among peoples

in contact, linguists nowadays advance phonologic, morphologic, and syntactic features in language shift that do not produce unexceptional adherence to models in the target language. Within the scope of this linguistic approach, Filppula and Klemola include recent theoretical positions in language contact, typology, and areal linguistics. (3) Recent studies in post-Conquest centuries of English and Insular Celtic contacts provide a basis for understanding linguistic history hitherto unappreciated. (4) Scholars must review the ways in which past political stances have colored appreciations of the contacts between peoples in the pre-Conquest period.

Filppula and Klemola conclude their introductory essay with a brief reference to the studies following theirs: McWhorter on emergent periphrastic *do*; Schrijver and Laker on phonetic/phonologic contact; Lutz on syntactic and selected lexical features; and Poppe on reflexives, intensifiers, and verbs that in context are either inchoative or causative. Filppula, in a separate essay, "The Rise of *It*-Clefting in English: Areal-Typological and Contact-Linguistic Considerations," *English Language and Linguistics* 13: 267–93, examines the *it*-cleft construction; Klemola, also in a separate essay, "Traces of Historical Infinitive in English Dialects and their Celtic Connections," *English Language and Linguistics* 13: 295–308, analyzes unusual adverb + infinitive constructions largely identified with the southwestern and west Midlands. All of these essays draw on putative parallels between Insular Celtic practices and those in English. The conclusion drawn, though not altogether decisive, is that these languages have had intimate relations that help to clarify, at least for English, linguistic elements either largely unexplained or unrecognized. These essays also prompt a question still in need of exploration on whether English, in turn, has affected in still unappreciated ways the phonologic, morphemic, and syntactic development of Insular Celtic languages.

Éric Dieu presents a comparative analysis in "Les formes de gradation vieil-anglaises *sētra* 'meilleur', *sēlest* 'le meilleur' et le superlatif latin *sōlistimus*/*sollistimus* 'très favorable,'" *Historische Sprachforschung* 122: 31–8). He lays out the known cognates as follows: *sels*, *selei* (Gothic), *sæll*, *sæla*, *sæld* (Icelandic), *sālig*, *sāl(i)da* (OHG), *sēlich* (Frisian), *salda* (Saxon), *sæl*, *sælig*, *sæli* (OE). He also alludes to forms of verbs cognate with OE *sælan*. Among these forms, those specifying gradation are alone derived from a reconstructed *ō: *sētra* < Cmn. Gmc. *sōlizan*-; *sēlest* < Cmn. Gmc. *sōlista*- . This derivational pattern differs from other forms derived from Cmn. Gmc. *ē; it is possible, however, to

suppose that a reconstructed positive form for these comparative and superlative forms also had an *ē vowel. Such a derivational history supposes a contrast with that connected with the form *gōd* and its comparative and superlative gradations (suppletives): *bet(e)ra*; *betst*; *betest*, *betost*. These cognates, together with the contrasted, paired comparatives and superlatives, and the reconstructed *ō contribute to Dieu's thesis that this posited vowel, unaccountable within Common Germanic, stems from an earlier era.

Dieu's thesis presumes that in form and meaning Old English *sētra* and *sēlest* have plausible connections with the Greek verb *ἰλάσκειν* (with *ī*) 'to become favorable, to appease' and the Armenian verb *սրբաբերել* *āḷač'em* 'to supplicate', traceable to a root **selh₂*- 'seek to become favorable', 'seek to find favor with a god', 'to be favorable, to be agreeable' (the Greek perfect carries this second meaning). The semantic evolution of these forms contributes to the validity of their posited histories: the glosses proceed from an active sense 'that which holds favorably, or disposes one favorably' to the sense 'good, favorable' of Gothic *sels* or from a passive sense 'favorably disposed' to an active sense, 'happy', as in Old English *sælig*. A further possible gloss, common to all Germanic tongues, is the intransitive 'to be favorable, to be favorably disposed'. The semantics of 'disposition' is characteristic of Germanic *-i- adjectives. To undergird this semantic development, Dieu cites several Gothic passages. He quotes and explicates lines from Paul's *First Letter to the Corinthians* and from his *Letter to the Ephesians*.

However plausible this semantic development is, it does not find support in phonological continuities, stemming from a pre-Germanic period. Thus, adjectival forms bearing *ē for the positive and *ō for the comparative **sōl-izan-* and superlative **sōl-ista-zi* have gone unexplained. One possibility lies in some past connection between the Germanic forms and Latin *sōlor* (infinitive form *sōlārī*). This Latin verb is an iterative, meaning 'to console, allay, alleviate'—of the same type as Greek *πυλάωμαι* 'to fly'. This iterative pattern regularly recurs in the genre of prayer. The difficulty for this possibility, however, is that Germanic has no evidence of an iterative, nor does such a formation help to explain *ē.

Here, Dieu proposes a new approach. Latin has an attested *solistimum*, also *solistumum* an adjectival modifier for *tripudium* in Cicero's *de Divinatione* and *sollistimum* in Festus. This modifier serves as a superlative for *sollus* 'whole, intact' and is itself glossed as 'wholly adequate, perfect'. These superlatives apparently include the vowel *ō* yet accord with *sollistimum* and its

short vowel before the geminate *-ll-*. Dieu notes that his proposal differs from that proposed by C. Watkins in 1975 with the difference lying in the formation of the suffix: Dieu *-istimus*; Watkins *-*isto* > *-*is^omo-*, attested in a Latin form *iouiste* (vocative for a superlative) and akin to forms with the same function in the *Rigveda*. Dieu's interpretation centers on the initial *sol-* (which may also be read as *sōl-*). For him, its relation to *sollus* (with geminate *ll*) is secondary—a development in Latin. If *-*isto* is a tenable reconstruction, then in religious practice in pre-Latin periods **sōlistos* may have been glossed as 'the most favorable, very favorable'. Moreover, this reconstruction jibes well with that for **selh₂*-, although Dieu argues that some readjustment in meaning—from a gloss of seeking favor to a gloss of appeasing—is necessary.

The history of **sōlistos* yields an attestable form in Latin and in Old English *sēlest*—on the premise that its pre-Germanic use in religious contexts yielded in Germanic to abstract and profane uses. Even so, the connections between the vowels under study—*ē and *ō—remain unsettled. So far, explications of one kind or another are at best speculative. The essay as a whole helps partly to clarify some enigmas but leaves open the initial question of how to interpret the connections between these long vowels.

In "Text types and Methodology of Diachronic Speech-Act Analysis" in *Methods in Historical Pragmatics*, eds. Susan M. Fitzmaurice and Irma Taavitsainen (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2007), 139–66, Thomas Kohnen analyzes corpora from OE on. His focus lies in determining criteria for identifying diverse forms of speech acts and for ferreting out their "hidden manifestations." To begin with, an exhaustive inventory of speech acts seems a goal beyond realization. Owing to the absence of spelling conventions—especially in incunabula, the likelihood of fully tagging corpora for every instance of a speech act is scarcely probable. The task of identifying instances of speech acts "by hand" is a Sisyphean labor.

Kohnen instead focuses on speech act verbs. The advantage of this strategy is that recording the uses of such verbs throughout the history of English is a practical goal. The information culled provides revealing linguistic and ethnographic results, yet the issue of full coverage for all speech acts remains unresolved. As for "hidden" speech acts, the challenge currently stands almost beyond the capacity of extant methods, and the diversity of speech acts across time continues to elude mapping. Kohnen offers the example of directives as they have been traced throughout the centuries. A preliminary analysis of directive

performatives indicates their greater incidence in OE than in subsequent periods, yet this finding overlooks much potential data. Even though eMnE appears to manifest an increase of indirect directives, even this finding is subject to review. The challenge stems from a recognition that the directive performative does not depend on a limited use of speech act verbs but may make itself apparent through an ample variety of linguistic structures. Ethnographic considerations also come into play, since different periods of English history vary in their concern for politeness. The difficulty also stems from a lack of certain knowledge of which expressions—among all expressions in various stages of the English language—taken together actually work as speech acts.

Kohnen offers an approach that depends on a close, comparative analysis of well-established types and genres for each period of linguistic history. A study of religious instruction over time is one plausible approach for ferreting out types and instances of speech acts. Even so, the difficulty of identifying direct and indirect speech acts in an established genre remains a challenge. To exemplify what the possibilities are, Kohnen examines five relatively small sub-corpora of sermons. For OE, Kohnen chooses among homilies, selecting texts plausibly recognizable as tools for preaching, whose use before actual audiences is, however, indeterminate. The homilies studied comprise about 129,000 words found in the tenth- or eleventh-century *Helsinki Corpus*. In the three later periods Kohnen examines, the word count in later sermons is about one-fifth of that taken from OE. In his analysis of directives in the homilies, only those addressed to a (putative) audience provide data. In defining the pragmatics of the directive, Kohnen confines his examples to those that find expression in single sentences. For the directives identified, he classifies them as instancing performative verbs, imperatives, modal expressions, and indirect manifestations. For this classification, Kohnen discusses a number of variants in these groups, underscoring their particular features as they appear in OE and in later stages. The speech act verbs so underscored include *ich myngige & manige*; the collective *uton*; the hortative subjunctive *geearnie we*, *gecyrran we*, and *gebencan*; as well as *be we war* and *trowe we*. Second person imperatives include *scyldað*, and third person *beo nænig man*, while modal constructions include *þearf nan man* and *mote we*. Kohnen also cites the impersonal *is mycel neodþearf [& nytlic]*. Together with these citations of formal units, Kohnen comments on their force—from strict to polite, a gradation based on context and whether they include the person *ic* and *we*

or not. If the speaker excludes himself, the force is likely to be greater.

This analysis by linguistic period finds the greatest number of directives in Old English, yet the numbers presented do not have an accompanying statistical test, so it is not clear whether the finding is significant. One interesting point that emerges from the analysis is that by and large OE directives are not as strict or forceful as might be expected. What implication this unexpected result carries remains unexplored. As a whole, the analysis invites further consideration on the contextual implications of the directive in OE and in other periods, let alone those of other speech acts.

EG

Justyna Rogos's article, "A Synchronic Approach to Old English Nominal Paradigms in the Study of Ælfric's Catholic Homilies" in *De Laurer of Oure Englische Tonge*, ed. Krygier *et al.*, 49–57, belongs to the field of morphology. Rogos criticizes the traditional presentation of nominal paradigms in grammars of Old English for not reflecting the synchronic reality of the types of nominal inflections found in the language. Studying a corpus of 20,290 nouns extracted from the second series of Ælfric's Catholic Homilies and assigning all nouns into one of the nine traditional classes, Rogos notes problems in the underrepresentation of some declensions and the overrepresentation of others and in the uncertain class and gender assignments of certain nouns. As a solution, elaborating on a proposal by Krygier ("A re-classification of Old English nouns," *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 38 (2002): 311–19), Rogos suggests a classification based on "the most marked of all inflectional endings in the nominal system in Old English"—i.e. the genitive singular ending (54). In the new classification, nouns are divided into three classes: "the es-nouns (former a-stems and minor classes like i-, root-consonant-, ru-, rd- and eventually r-nouns), the e-nouns (former ð-stems) and the an-nouns (former weak paradigm)" (54–55). A class of a-nouns may be added to subsume former u-stems, but other deviations—such as various umlaut-forms—are considered exceptions to the three regular paradigms.

As the major advantage of this new classification over the traditional one, Rogos points to the fewer classes that represent real distinctions made in the inflectional system of Old English. In conclusion, she urges for an abandonment of Neogrammarian methodology: "[W]hat has been suggested [in this study] as a corpus-based implementation of synchronically relevant regularities into a historical description of Old English should be treated as an initial link in a chain of parallel

re-considerations, extending to other subsystems of Old English morphology” (56).

BMW

Tsukusu Itó considers the always vexing question of communication between Old English and Old Norse speakers in Anglo-Saxon England in “The Gosforth Fishing Stone and *Hymiskviða*: An Example of Inter-Communicability between Old English and Old Norse Speakers,” *Scripta Islandica* 60: 137–57, through the experiment of the reconstruction of a hypothetical Old English version of eleven stanzas of *Hymiskviða* that feature an episode of Old Norse mythology — Þórr’s fishing adventure with Hymir—that appears to be depicted on a stone in the parish church of Gosforth, Cumbria. The lower panel of the stone depicts two occupants of a boat, one an angler attempting to bait a snake-like animal with an ox head. As Itó and other scholars have pointed out, the image can be interpreted as a biblical depiction of the Leviathan (Job 41.1) or as a mythological depiction of Þórr and Hymir. The author asks how the Norse mythological interpretation of the stone’s imagery could have resonated with Anglo-Saxons in Gosforth (the sculptor or parishioners and clergy) if they did not have access to one of the three sources of the episode known to us—*Hymiskviða*, *Ragnarsdrápa*, and Snorri’s “Gylfaginning”—and suggests that the stone offers an opportunity to reconstruct something of the conditions of cross-intelligibility of Old Norse and Old English in those parts of Anglo-Saxon England, like Cumbria, with large numbers of Scandinavian settlers.

Itó argues that the imagery of the Gosforth stone reflects the episode as related in *Hymiskviða* because in sculptural depictions of the episode from Sweden and Denmark, Þórr is shown with his foot beneath the bottom of the boat—a detail related by Snorri in “Gylfaginning” but absent in *Hymiskviða*; “[t]hus it is quite feasible that the Gosforth sculptor heard a narrative of the same version of Þórr’s expedition as that in *Hymiskviða*” (140). The author takes this scenario, rather thin gruel though it is, and uses it as the basis for “an experiment into how much 21st-century scholars can reconstruct of the situation in Gosforth when OE speakers evidently heard and saw performed the recital of a song about the Scandinavian pagan god Þórr rowing out to sea to catch his rival, the *miðgarðsormr*” (153). The “experiment” in this case is comparison of the author’s hypothetical version of the relevant stanzas from *Hymiskviða* in Old English—essentially a translation project—with the Old Norse text in order to gauge what degree of intelligibility may have existed between the two. After a detailed line-by-line analysis

of the texts presented for side-by-side comparison, Itó concludes, “[w]hen we see both OE and ON texts side by side, it is obvious how the two languages resemble each other in written form” (153). But, of course we already knew that, and I am still uncertain about just what Itó’s experiment may tell us about the mutual intelligibility of speakers of Old English and Old Norse in places like Cumbria. Could not a single bilingual speaker have translated and performed the *Hymiskviða* for Anglo-Saxons—including, perhaps, the sculptor of the Gosforth stone—instead of supposing, as Itó suggests, that the similarities of the languages meant that an Anglo-Saxon sculptor made sense of a performance of the verse in Old Norse? And why should we assume that the sculptor was Anglo-Saxon and not Scandinavian? Itó’s theory is not implausible, and his close examination of the language of his hypothetical text is instructive, but the experiment’s results are inconclusive. It has long been assumed that speakers of Old English and Old Norse enjoyed a high degree of mutual intelligibility due to their languages’ similar vocabularies, phonologies, and accidents, and how these similarities may have facilitated cross-cultural interaction has long been a subject of speculation. Itó’s paper, while highly speculative, is nevertheless thought-provoking.

CC

Other Aspects: Handbooks, Textbooks, Histories of the English Language

Teachers and scholars of the history of the English language should feel gratified by recent years’ seemingly endless general publications and textbooks on the subject, but—as someone who has written about many of these publications in these pages—I remain somewhat mystified by publishers’ eagerness to offer titles in a marketplace brimming with product choices so similar that their existence seems to defy market fundamentals. And, yet, here we are again: Joan C. Beal and Philip A. Shaw have published a second edition of Charles Barber’s *The English Language: A Historical Introduction* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP). Like the first edition of the book (1993), this new edition is not really a textbook of the kind that is usually found in history of the English language classrooms: there are no exercises or accompanying workbook, and it is not very rich in charts or pictures, but it provides a quick “narrative history” of English with an emphasis on internal language change. The book is most suitable for non-specialist students or scholars seeking a general history of English, as the introductory chapter, “What Is Language?” makes clear

with its basic explanations of phonology, linguistic regularity, and morphology.

As Barber pointed out in the preface to his first edition, prejudice and ignorance about language persist even among those with a professed interest in the subject because so few of them possess the technical knowledge of grammatical organization or the historical information required to place the subject of language in its proper contexts. The book certainly provides a firm grounding in both for a general readership, which, of course, is laudable. Beal and Shaw suggest in the preface to this second edition that an updating is required because of advances in the study of the history of the English language over the last fifteen years. This is true, and, furthermore, I think we can safely say that the jury is in on the twentieth century. But how much of the advance in scholarship from the book's first edition really requires a second edition of a text aimed at a general readership? The development of electronic corpora and the concomitant rise of corpus linguistics as central to the study of the English language have been critical advancements for scholars, but have they really changed the basic formulation of the history of the English language to such an extent that we now have to rewrite the subject for general readers?

Beal and Shaw state that chapters on "Late Modern English" (a completely new chapter), "English as a world language," and "English today and tomorrow" most thoroughly reflect changes in the discipline since the first edition's publication, but even here revisions to the first edition are quite conservative. However, the new edition offers more sample texts—with corresponding close readings emphasizing grammatical structures and language change—and, though the book promises corresponding online resources, my repeated attempts to connect to the URL listed on the cover (www.cambridge.org/barber) directed me to a completely different title in the Cambridge catalog, and my searching on the Cambridge website for a dedicated page offering resources specific to Barber, Beal, and Shaw's text turned up nothing.

Nevertheless, *The English Language: A Historical Introduction* remains a valuable source for non-specialist readers. Chapter Two, "The flux of language," is especially valuable for general readers since it directly attacks pervasive, mistaken notions (mainly about language as defined by constant "good" and "bad" alternatives) that stand in the way of acceptance of languages as linguistically, historically, and culturally determined systems with none of the "moral" components imputed to them by non-technical observers. As James Milroy put it some years ago, the only languages that are

not constantly changing are those with no speakers. Abundant examples adorn the narrative, lending clarity to matters—like sound changes—that can otherwise become rather confusing to non-specialists. The chapter also includes discussion of linguistic genetics and language families and concludes—very appropriately for early twenty-first century linguistics—with a nod to the idea of convergence in language change as a force that works to reduce linguistic diversity over time. This challenges the received view of language change as primarily a figure of divergence, reinforced by the ubiquitous "family tree" analogy unthinkingly offered to beginners, as if "consanguinity" is a violation of the natural law of language. Chapter Three, "The Indo-European languages," begins the book's tour of the history of English proper, while Chapter Four, "The Germanic Languages," zooms in on the linguistic features that differentiate English and its sub-family.

Chapter Five, "Old English," covers the major aspects of the internal and external history of the period, while the authors' characteristic terseness cuts through complicated matters by giving readers the "bullet-points" version of the subject. One example of this approach suffices to show the book's economy: The authors summarize the difficult question of standardization in Old English by saying, "[f]or various reasons connected with Viking settlement north and east of England, and its unification under the West Saxon kings, a written form of the West Saxon dialect developed, towards the end of the Anglo-Saxon period, as a literary language that influenced written forms of the language outside the areas in which it was spoken" (110). Throughout the book, this characteristically light touch offers rather less in detail than is really needed for a history of the English language textbook. But, at the same time, the book often delves rather too deeply into the linguistic nitty-gritty for a general readership. For example, again in the Old English chapter, the authors' discussion of combinative sound changes (120–23) is bound to bewilder the self-directed general reader who is seeking the broader outlines of the subject; in reading this section, one can imagine the relief of a general reader at having avoided a course on the history of the English language in the first place. The remainder of the chapter on Old English covers (very briefly) morphology, syntax, vocabulary, and a close reading of a sample text.

Chapter Six, "Norsemen and Normans," offers an interesting—and uncommon—transitional narrative from Old to Middle English as a time of linguistic accommodation to non-native speakers of English, and subsequent chapters on "Middle English," "Early Modern English," "Late Modern English," "English as

a world language,” and “English today and tomorrow” follow the same fairly uneven pattern of bypassing some complex issues with breezy pronouncements and probing others with more energy than some might expect in a book of this kind. In the end, Barber, Beal, and Shaw’s *The English Language: A Historical Introduction* never quite overcomes the limitations of the sort of text it is, and—like lots of texts on aspects of the English language published for beginning students and general readers in recent years—it wishes to deliver a complex subject while dispossessing the subject of many of its complexities.

Miriam Balmuth offers a revised edition of *The Roots of Phonics: A Historical Introduction* (Paul H. Brookes: Baltimore), a book aimed at teachers of reading. The term “phonics” is rarely encountered in discussions of modern historical linguistics, but it has been deployed in reading pedagogy for some time to describe a method of teaching the relationship between writing patterns and speech in language. Accordingly, the book is essentially a history of the English language textbook for primary school teachers who teach reading (or for those training to become reading teachers). Many who teach subjects dealing with the English language at any level of education, whether it be reading, writing, or literature, have little or no background in the direct study of English language and often struggle with the fundamentals of language and linguistics (or, as I have observed, simply get the fundamentals wrong). So it is laudable that the author frames her book as targeted to an audience that tends to be woefully ignorant of how the English they are teaching came to be, but I must admit that I am confused about what specific methodology connects the history of the English language to the teaching of reading, outside of the general intrinsic interest of the language’s history.

One gets the sense that the book, which in its historical details is entirely derivative (and often the sources are quite dated), is the record of a reading teaching specialist discovering for herself the history of the English language and the parts of Present Day English that are reflexes of that history. This is all very well, of course, and in this reader’s opinion, people who teach reading, writing, or literature at any educational level should know a lot more about the history of the English language than they usually do, but Balmuth’s book too often misses historical connections to present-day realities of the language, which, ostensibly, form the reasoning for the book’s purpose. Take, for example, the author’s discussion of vowel length throughout the book: In the chapter on “Old English Pronunciation,” Balmuth points out that short and long vowels meant

a difference of duration, although modern short and long pronunciations are not differentiated by duration; she states, “Each of the two lengths was a different phoneme; that is, each was treated as an entirely different vowel rather than merely as a variation of the longer or shorter member of the pair” (81). This statement strikes me as rather murkier than the situation on the linguistic ground: the point to make here, simply stated, should be that Old English had *contrastive* vowel length, that Present Day English does not, and that when reading teachers (or others) teach the vowel sounds in *cat* and *Kate* as short *a* and long *a* they are mistaking vowel *quality* for vowel *quantity*. The point could be further clarified through discussion of minimal pairs, demonstrating that while pairs like Old English *god/gōd* establish contrastive vowel length no such contrast can be established in Present Day English. Then, the larger story of how English became a language with no phonemic vowel length from one with a complete system of long and short vowel pairs can be subsequently described as a shift from contrastive distributions to semi-complementary distributions in conditioning environments (with reflexes in spelling).

But the author never makes explicit the connection between contrastive vowel length in Old English and its absence in Present Day English through intermediate changes like Middle English Open Syllable lengthening, homorganic consonant cluster lengthening, closed-syllable shortening, trisyllabic shortening, or the Great Vowel Shift; though such sound changes are briefly discussed, discussions of them are never explicitly connected to the loss of contrastive vowel length as one of the important narratives in the history of the language. It seems to me that if the purpose of the book is to explain segmental histories in English to teachers of reading, quite a bit of those histories is left untold. Yet, such over-simplifications are merely venial because it would be most ungenerous to condemn the author for venturing to deliver the history of the English language to a constituency of readers and teachers who badly needs it. Not quite a history of the English language and not quite a history of English spelling, *The Roots of Phonics* nevertheless offers readers who wish to acquire some basic familiarity with the realities of the past that have contributed to the shape of Present Day English pronunciation and spelling a friendly and brief guide to the exposed tip of an otherwise very large and very deep iceberg.

Eric Haeberli’s review essay, “Histories of English,” *Diachronica* 26.1: 103–16, offers a stimulating overview of the current state of the study of the history of the English language in consideration of the recent

publication of three books on the subject: Elly van Gelderen's *A History of the English Language* (2006), Richard Hogg and David Denison's (eds.) *A History of the English Language* (2006), and Lynda Mugglestone's (ed.) *The Oxford History of the English Language* (2006)—all titles reviewed in the 2006 *Year's Work in Old English Studies*. Haeberli begins with the obvious question: What is happening in history of the English language studies to prompt three publishers to release books on the same subject—two with identical titles—at the same time? The first answer, Haeberli posits, is capitalism: the publication of extensive titles in the field of history of the English language must mean a rather extensive marketplace for titles in in the discipline. I suppose that is true in some sense; college and university libraries are largely the paying customers in the academic publication marketplace, and subjects like history of the English language probably benefit in that marketplace from the presumption of their seriousness, while, perhaps more narrowly defined or experimental scholarship is less likely to make the cut for resources in institutional libraries' increasingly difficult budgets.

But there actually are some reasons to explain the sudden burst of history of the English language publications that have more to do with the recent development of the field and less to do with the spirits of naked commercialism, as Haeberli points out. First, the last decade or so has witnessed a critical reevaluation of the study of the history of the English language that has resulted in serious questioning of what were once the solid foundations of the discipline. As Haeberli points out, the rise of a standard from a "chancery standard," as expressed in the scholarship especially of John H. Fisher, has been the subject of intense critique by recent scholars of the history of the English language—particularly as "chancery standard," it appears, was itself quite heterogeneous. Second, Haeberli suggests that some part of the recent publication eruption in the history of the English language is owing to the role new technologies have come to play in the discipline. This is undoubtedly the case. Electronic corpora have fundamentally altered the scholarly discourse on the history of the English language in ways that have remade the discipline. Corpus linguistics was once a very minor part of the broader study of the history of the English language, but, as annual bibliographies demonstrate, it has become a dominant approach to the discipline. In this respect, the history of the English language is in the process of reinventing itself quite thoroughly, so it is to be expected that new publications follow the introduction of new paradigms (although, in truth, I do not find that any of the volumes under consideration in

Haeberli's review essay are radically progressive in their view of the discipline).

Finally, Haeberli suggests that the sudden burst of publication activity in the history of the English language stems from new theoretical developments, although he is talking about "the Labovian approach" and "the Chomskyan revolution" (105)—hardly new theoretical developments, though it must be admitted that historical linguistics generally has been very slow to adopt and adapt the insights of modern linguistics. But none of the reasons for the existence of the Van Gelderen, Hogg and Denison, and Mugglestone volumes is exclusive from the others: the variationist focus of Labovian approaches (reason three) vivified by electronic corpora in corpus linguistics (reason two) is a critical reevaluation of the foundations of the discipline (reason one), which tended to view Englishes of the past as stable, easily analyzable, and linguistically representative in the extant records. Each of the three volumes Haeberli offers a chapter-by-chapter review of assumes something of the new history of the English language paradigm to varying degrees, with the Mugglestone volume expressing the most modernized version of the discipline. Haeberli highlights several of the main differences between the volumes and presents some modest criticisms of each (such as typographical errors or faulty examples) while producing what amounts to a glowing review of three books on the same subject.

Wayne Harbert's *The Germanic Languages* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007) is a triumph for readers seeking a clear, well-written account of the Germanic family of languages "as assemblages of grammatical units, rule systems and constructions" (1). *Germanistik's* strong historical bias carries with it something of an automatic assumption that a book on the Germanic languages would be primarily historical in its orientation, and readers can find very good studies on the Germanic languages from a chronological perspective in abundance. Harbert's book departs from the form by presenting an organizational description of the Germanic languages, which naturally puts the focus on the linguistic patterns common to all of the languages in the family. The great appeal of Harbert's approach is that he is able to offer side-by-side comparisons of how the Germanic languages organize themselves and express specific constructions, revealing structural commonalities and differences along the way. The image of Germanic that emerges from Harbert's profoundly learned study emphasizes the linguistic characteristics of the whole family rather than the family members' individual intra-organizational design; readers who

lack familiarity with more than one or two Germanic languages will find the volume instructive not only for its description of linguistic organization but also for its wide-angle view of the full range of Germanic languages, from Afrikaans and Bokmål Norwegian to Pennsylvania German and Yiddish. But older Germanic languages, like Old English, also figure into Harbert's exposition since his construction-by-construction approach does not demand that chronological distinctions be slavishly observed—differences between Germanic languages that have emerged through diachrony are, of course, relatively minor parametric variations in comparison to the overall structural similarities of the family. While Harbert is a syntactician who leans on Government-Binding/Principles and Parameters explanations, the book assumes of its readers no deeper expertise in linguistic theory than might safely be assumed of the general readership of such a text; thus, a modern linguistic theoretical approach underpins all of Harbert's descriptions, but theory in *The Germanic Languages* exists as an ambient condition of modern understandings of language rather than as a model to be justified (although, accordingly, morpho-syntax is more prominent than phonology and lexicon). And though the overall thrust of the book is synchronic, Harbert does not avoid historical explanations for structural features where typology matters, and, more infrequently, he provides some historical overview of particular parts of the structure of the Germanic family when fullness of explanation requires it.

The introductory section of the book presents the genetic and typological classification of the Germanic languages. The genealogy of Germanic is handled in relatively short order, but the author is careful to discuss the profound shortcomings of the usual tree-diagram of the Germanic languages as discretely branching linguistic entities, using the example of German to show how the model fails to capture that language's origins in originally separate groups of West Germanic. Harbert's general approach, however, favors typological relationship, so the introduction sets the stage for his focus on grammatical patterns, although the chapter also provides a very short overview of the Germanic languages' histories. Chapter Two, "The Germanic lexicon," covers loanwords, derivation and compounding, discourse particles (not present in English to the extent found in the other Germanic languages), and phrasal verbs—again, Harbert's emphasis is on the characteristic lexical types found in Germanic. Chapter Three, "The sound systems of Germanic: inventories, alternations and structures," surveys phonology on the basis of segment and natural

class and on suprasegmental features like syllable structure, stress, the foot, and vowel length. Though the author hits all of the bases of suprasegmental Germanic phonology here, the book's emphasis on morpho-syntax means that important issues well explored in recent scholarship, like minimal bimoracity, do not receive as full of a treatment as one might expect in typological study.

Harbert's work really takes flight in its final three chapters. Chapter Four, "The Germanic nominal system: paradigmatic and syntagmatic variation," covers nominal morphology (with some historical coverage to account for Indo-European reflexes and Germanic innovations); noun, genitive, and adjective phrases; determiners; and pronouns. The last section of the chapter considers the syntax of the noun phrase in the subject position, focusing on principles of agreement, expletive arguments, imperative clauses, derived subjects, and raising constructions. Chapter Five, "The verbal systems of Germanic: paradigmatic and syntagmatic comparison," includes discussion of inflection, modal auxiliaries, tense, voice, nonfinite constructions, valency, and verb phrase syntax. The final chapter, "The syntax of the clause," considers sentence adverbs, negation, V-2 and inversion, finite noun clauses and complementary infinitives, and fronting constructions in relatives and questions. An extensive bibliography and a slightly parsimonious index conclude the volume.

A book of this kind is necessarily derivative, but one of its great strengths is the genius Harbert demonstrates in synthesizing an impressively large body of complex scholarship and making it comprehensible to a fairly general readership; the author is a master jigsaw puzzle solver. Although the chapters on phonology and lexicon leave much to be desired in a book on the Germanic languages and do not achieve the distinction of the final three chapters, the book nevertheless makes a strong addition to the library of the student of Germanic linguistics. In his review of the book, Ekkehard König (*Language* 85: 933–36) takes issue with Harbert's description of the referential properties of pronouns in the Germanic languages (197–214) by objecting to Harbert's assumption "that the two formally distinct reflexive anaphors in 'two-reflexive languages' like Dutch and Scandinavian (e.g., *zich* vs. *zichzelf* in Dutch and *sig* vs. *sig själf* in Swedish) are essentially indicators of different binding domains" (935). Here, König's criticism is not so much of Harbert's book as it is of the scholarship on Germanic referential dependence of pronouns, which Harbert simply summarizes and organizes for his readers, presenting them with the

standard view of such constructions. In a book of this kind, which is not at all designed to present new analyses, Harbert is appropriately deferential to the received view advanced by a veritable mountain of scholarship, and, despite König's modest demur, he finds the book "remarkable for the breadth of coverage, for the depth of analyses, and for the wealth of information and generalizations it contains" (936).

Dan McIntyre's *History of English: A Resource Book for Students* (London: Routledge) is another introductory textbook in the apparently booming history of the English language industry, but the book offers an arrangement that is quite unlike other history of the English language textbooks. Its four sections on the external history and synchronic stages of English, on exemplary texts from those stages, and on recent scholarship separate topics that usually appear within individual chapters. McIntyre explains that this format follows that of the Routledge English Language Introductions series, but it is difficult to see what practical difference such an arrangement might make to teachers and students of the history of the English language. Surely, regardless of the book's somewhat forced insistence on a non-chronological arrangement, teachers would assign and students would read those sections of the text that belong together chronologically. Yet, the separation of the book's contents in this way is nevertheless somewhat appealing because it emphasizes content—especially sample texts and scholarly commentary—that tends to get drowned out in the usual chronological format.

The first chapter, "An External History of English," offers a very quick run-down of the usual historical highlights presented in the context of the development of English, the rapidity of which may be demonstrated by the section on the origins of English and the history of the Anglo-Saxons, which are both covered in a brisk eight-and-a-half pages. Accordingly, McIntyre's external history of the language is rather unsubstantial, but he nevertheless succeeds in penning a taut narrative history of the language that touches on the historical matters beginning students most need to know: the notion of Englishes, the impact upon the language of the polyglottal context of medieval England, the decline and rise of English after 1066, the cultural forces of early standardization, the influence of explosive print capitalism, English in colonial contexts, and the emergence of English as a global language. The second section of the book, "A Developing Language," is meant to provide readers with "a sense of what English was like at each of its various stages of development, from Old English to Present Day English, and to examine in

more detail some of the linguistic and social elements responsible for the development of English" (36). Indeed, one gets only a sense of these things. Following a recent trend in grammatical textbooks of all kinds to confront beginning students with as little grammar as possible, McIntyre's book says so little about the formal structure of English at its various stages that it is hard to imagine teachers of the history of the English language not supplementing this section. In fact, in the section on Old English, the grammar of the language is covered in just four pages of mostly narrative paragraphs about the differences between Old English as a synthetic language and Present Day English as an analytic language, only cursorily discussing the case and verb systems of Old English. The exposition of the language's subsequent stages remains similarly slight, and the basic linguistic terms and concepts necessary to present a more detailed internal history of English are only introduced sporadically—as when basic vowel phonology is introduced only as a part of the discussion of the Great Vowel Shift—or not at all. The second section of McIntyre's book, then, really could not be used to teach a course on the history of the English language if instructors wish to provide students with anything more than a very superficial introduction to the structure of English at its various stages.

In contrast, the final two sections of the book contribute fairly strongly to history of the English language pedagogy. The first of these, "Exploring the History of English," provides exercises targeted at cementing a few key points in the internal history of English, usually focused on samples from texts that demonstrate the features under discussion. This chapter provides an especially good treatment of the history of the English language as in part a history of texts and textualities—an important aspect that is often underrepresented in textbooks. The final section of the book, "Readings in the History of English," provides students with short excerpts from scholarly articles on focused elements of the history of the language. For example, in the section on Old English, McIntyre includes selections from Bruce Mitchell's *An Invitation to Old English and Anglo-Saxon England* on the major differences between Old and Modern English and from Joseph P. Crowley's 1986 *English Studies* essay on Old English dialects. This section is the most unusual and perhaps the most appealing feature of the book, since it provides students with examples of how the history of the language has been written, while treating some of the topics covered elsewhere in the book with greater detail. On the whole, McIntyre's work is unusual for a history of the English language textbook and seems to

represent his attempt to redesign history of the English language pedagogy in a way that minimizes the content beginning students find difficult or obnoxious. While these efforts succeed in catering to beginning students' preferences, one wonders how well they succeed in actually teaching beginning students the history of the English language.

Jeremy J. Smith's *Old English: A Linguistic Introduction* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP) bridges Old English primers and philologically advanced handbooks, like Campbell's grammar. This is a useful book for undergraduate and graduate students, who—having cut their teeth on Old English classroom grammars, which, following the current trend, offer only enough instruction to develop modest reading skills (and some, in this observer's opinion, even less than that)—wish to extend their understanding of the linguistic processes that underlie matters like sound changes and morpho-syntactic alternations in Old English. One assumption of many recent classroom grammars that I find troubling is that more intensive study of Old English language is merely chalcenic philology, providing students with no interest in the language *per se* with no net benefits for their explorations of literature, history, and culture. But, in addition to paradigm and vocabulary study, learning about sound changes, dialectal variants, and morpho-syntactic alternations develops the level of reading knowledge required to be a scholar of Old English literature, history, or culture. As the study of Old English becomes more intensely focused on manuscripts, Old English pedagogy curiously appears to be creating future generations of students—and, eventually, some scholars, too—of Old English less equipped to handle the linguistic complexities found in manuscripts. Smith's book is a step in the right direction; his text cannot replace the usual Old English classroom grammars widely in use, but it does provide a very meaningful complement to them that addresses their linguistic shortcomings in brief, understandable prose aimed at non-specialists.

Chapter One, "About Old English," briefly outlines the Indo-European and Germanic origins of the language without losing readers in the linguistic detail found in the handbooks and touches on how the material evidence for Old English has come down to us. Chapter Two, "Describing Language," provides the terminology necessary to study an ancient language and, thus, the kind of basic linguistics crash course that most teachers of Old English have to provide to their students. This chapter describes basic phonology, morphology, and syntax in terms of Present Day English but smartly follows each one of those sections

by relating their elements to the organization of Old English. This is an excellent pedagogical strategy for beginning students of Old English because it uses the familiar to teach the unfamiliar and demonstrates likeness between the stages of the language. Chapter Three, "The Structure of Old English," examines *The Lord's Prayer* in Old, Middle, Early Modern, and Present Day English; Gothic; and Old High German in order to discuss major structural distinctions like inflection and word order. This long-range view of the language is a good way to give students an overall sense of what Old English is like before proceeding to the nuts-and-bolts task of internalizing elements of the formal grammar. In addition to the text of *The Lord's Prayer*, the chapter includes a short passage from *The Life of King Edmund*—with commentary on the relatively flexible word order of Old English, clause structure, and case marking—and lines 39–45 of *The Dream of the Rood* with part of the corresponding passage from the Ruthwell Cross.

Chapter Four, "Spellings and Sounds," introduces students to elements of Old English phonology with a strong emphasis on its representation in the orthography. The first section covers the futhorc, and the next three sections describe the basic phonemics of the Old English consonant and vowel systems. The core of the chapter, however, is a section on "Sound change and dialectal variation" (47–51), which includes a list of sound changes affecting vowels in stressed syllables. The sound changes enumerated here are printed in the form of generative rules. Smith calls this a notational convenience; however, for students unaccustomed to the technical language of phonological rule formulation, the presentation here may obscure what is intended to be a quick reference guide. More and clearer Old English examples would have been helpful here, too. The list of "Dialectal distinctions in the OE vowels in stressed syllables" (51–52) also suffers from an abridgment of adequate examples as well as some slight inaccuracies, such as when Smith writes, "Proto-Germanic \bar{a} (so-called \bar{a}) is reflected in WS as $d\bar{a}d$ 'deed' $str\bar{a}t$ 'road, street', Old Anglian $d\bar{e}d$, $str\bar{e}t$ " (52). The author surely means "so-called \bar{a} ," as distinct from the traditionally designated \bar{a} ² (the umlaut of \bar{a} from West Germanic $*ai$), and it would be best to speak of this distinction as southern versus Anglian, since there is strong reason to believe that Kentish texts showing \bar{e} were written under Mercian influence, and later evidence from Middle English suggests a strong isogloss bisecting England from east to west. Chapter Four also includes a brief section on the vowels of unstressed syllables and on consonant phonology. Most interesting, though, is Smith's section on "The problem

of the 'short diphthongs'" (55–57), which he calls "one of the most controversial problems in OE philology," giving beginning students the opportunity to observe how the vagaries of spelling data in Old English can produce radically divergent scholarly interpretations. It is worth noting that Smith gets the "controversy" right in emphasizing that, although a few splashy arguments have been made over the years declaring that Old English short diphthongs are purely orthographical or otherwise not representative of a length contrast in diphthongs, it is very difficult to explain away later developments in the language without phonemically short diphthongs in Old English.

Chapter Five, "The Old English Lexicon," explains lexical morphology, borrowing, and semantics. The first part of the chapter is especially useful for beginning students because Smith so adroitly explains why nouns group as stem classes, an issue almost completely obscure in Old English since the thematic segments on which stem classes are based have almost always disappeared from the language. Smith also covers affixation and compounding. Chapter Six, "Old English Grammar I: Syntax," is a clearly written overview of phrase and clause structure in Old English that begins with an explanation of basic constituent arrangement in Present Day English. Again, he understands that most beginning students need concepts like case and aspect explained and demonstrated to them in Present Day English before studying the expression of such categories and structures in Old English. The chapter is by itself a very fine exposition of Old English syntax for beginning students with abundant illustrative examples, and the sections on sentence structure are particularly good, as they cover basic element order, subordinate clause operations with an emphasis on verb-final constituent structure, and common stylistic structures like parataxis.

Chapter Seven, "Old English Grammar II: Inflectional Morphology," concludes the book's discussion of Old English language where most primers and classroom grammars begin. But, again, the emphasis here is not on the raw presentation of paradigms for memorization but on the explanation of matters like differences between *a-*, *ja-*, and *wa-* stem nouns; morpho-phonemic alternations within ablaut series; and, briefly, diachronic and dialectal variation in inflectional paradigms. Appendix One provides brief Old English texts and excerpts, each with an explanatory introduction and a following translation. Texts collected here include some early Germanic runic inscriptions; the non-runic Old English inscriptions on the Alfred Jewel and on the Brussels Reliquary; some examples of Alfredian Old

English, including an early passage from the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and a selection from Alfred's Preface to the *Pastoral Care*; verse, including *Cædmon's Hymn* and a brief selection from *Beowulf*; examples of non-West Saxon texts, like a passage from the gloss on the Lindisfarne Gospels; and a sample of late Old English from the *Peterborough Chronicle*. Appendix Two lists some fairly banal discussion questions, such as "How far, and for what reasons, is it important for historians of OE to have a wider knowledge of Anglo-Saxon archaeology and history?" (143). Smith also includes his suggestions for further reading, and his "Glossary of Old English-Present-Day English" (147–82) collects "all OE forms used in this book"; however, the glossary does not collect all of the forms found in the sample texts in Appendix One, which is most necessary for students translating those texts. For example, for the selection from the Kentish *Psalm 50* (140–41), beginning with line 31, *Miltsa ðu me, meahta Walden*, the glossary's "*miltsa*" points students to the feminine noun *milts* rather than to the verb (*ge*)*miltsian*, which does not occur in the glossary at all. This is but one example that I spotted which underscores the unsuitability of this book as a classroom grammar for Old English, in spite of its usefulness as a complementary text. The book concludes with an excellent glossary of key terms, a solid list of references, and a thorough index.

Given the relatively low cost of Smith's book—particularly from booksellers with used copies, teachers of Old English will find the text a worthy addition to lists of required books in their courses. One use I can well imagine is that instead of using limited class time to explain general topics like declensions and verb conjugations, teachers can assign the sections of Smith's book that dole out clear answers and copious examples on subjects like these. But more than this, Smith's book does an excellent job of filling in with clear prose that never loses sight of beginning students' needs the blanks often left by classroom grammars, lacunae—like the relationships between sound changes in Old English and vowel series in strong verbs—that often trouble even the brightest students. Facility with reading Old English goes beyond a loose recognition of inflections and vocabulary; Smith's book is a useful contribution to help students—even some advanced ones—achieve a deeper knowledge of the language and develop better reading skills than the usual classroom grammars promote by themselves.

■ Works Not Seen

- Adamczyk, Elżbieta. "Evolution of Germanic Nominal Inflection: The Case of West Germanic Kinship Terms." *Sprachwissenschaft* 34 (2009), 399-433.
- Bragg, Melvyn, Robert Bee and Michael Cronin. "The Adventure of English 500 AD to 2000." (2009), 1 DVD.
- Breitbarth, Anne. "A Hybrid Approach to Jespersen's Cycle in West Germanic." *Jnl of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 12 (2009), 81-114.
- Fujiwara, Yasuaki. "Old English Pronouns for Possession." *Germanic Languages and Linguistic Universals. Development of the Anglo-Saxon Language and Linguistic Universals* 1. Ed. John Ole Askedal. Benjamins, 2009. pp. 69-82.
- Hancil, Sylvie. "Le parfait en vieil-anglais: émergence du niveau énociatif." *Bulletin de Anglicistes Médiévistes* 78 (hiver 2009), 1-32.
- Hotta, Ryuichi. *The Development of the Nominal Plural Forms in Early Middle English*. Hituzi Linguistics in English 10. Hitsuzi Syobo: Tokyo, 2009. xix + 291 pp. ill. map.
- Kahlas-Tarkka, Leena. "Muinais- ja keskienglanti." *Keskiajan avain*. Eds. Marko Lamberg, Anu Lahtinen and Susanna Niiranen. Helsinki: Suomalaisen kirjallisuuden seura, 2009. pp. 458-76. ["Old and Middle English"]
- Kwon, Young-Kook. "[An Analysis of Homorganic Cluster Lengthening in Late Old English]." *Jnl of English Language and Literature* 55.4 (2009), 719-44.
- Lancri, Annie. "L'adverb *sophlice*: comment interpréter son sens et sa fonction dans certains textes du vieil-anglais?" *Bulletin de Anglicistes Médiévistes* 75 (hiver 2009), 33-56.
- Lowrey, Brian. "Causative Verbs in West Saxon Old English." *Bulletin de Anglicistes Médiévistes* 75 (hiver 2009), 57-88.
- Nitzkin, Aaron. "Cognitive Universality and Cultural Variation in the Conceptual Structure of Language about Meaning: A Cognitive Semantic Lexicography of the Intangible in Old English, Kiswahili, and Yucatec Maya." Ph.D. Diss. Tulane Univ., 2008. [Proquest 3338122]
- Ogura, Michiko. "The Interchangeability of the Endings *-ende* and *-enne* in Old and Early Middle English." *ES* 90 (2009), 721-34.
- Pack, Wesley D. "Analogy and the History of the English Plurals." M.A. Thesis Brigham Young Univ., 2009.
- Sato, Kiriko. *The Development from Case-Forms to Prepositional Constructions in Old English Prose*. Linguistic Insights: Studies in Language and Communication 88. Bern: Peter Lang, 2009. 231 pp.
- Sauer, Hans. "How the Anglo-Saxons Expressed Their Emotions with the Help of Interjections." *Brno Studies in English* 35.2 (2009), 167-83.
- Suzuki, Yasuko. "Finite Verb Stress and Clitic Verbs in Old English 'Beowulf.'" Ph.D. Diss. Univ. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2008. [Proquest 3347543]

4. Literature

4A. GENERAL AND MISCELLANEOUS

“Lexomics for Anglo-Saxon Literature,” *Old English Newsletter* 42 (2010): 1–7, presented by Michael Drout *et al.*, reports on the current state of computer-based information management, as applied to the Old English corpus using methods borrowed from genetic research. Stated simply, lexomics relies on computers to find patterns within a body of data that would be almost impossible for an individual to trace, but which a digital search might turn up rather easily. Just as genetic searches establish patterns within DNA sequences, the patterning of words becomes a crucial point of reference in corpus linguistics, although the authors judiciously point out that this is a problematic notion when applying computer search methods to linguistic data. Funded by an NEH grant, this program has a number of benefits for the field, including a cost-effective database search engine, which can provide statistical analysis heretofore impossible or impractical. Drout’s corpus consists of the edited texts drawn upon by the *Dictionary of Old English*, and his lexomic search engine is freely available to DOE subscribers. Besides introducing the Anglo-Saxonist community to lexomics and exemplifying the usage of the search engine, Drout *et al.* argue for open-source solutions, which are becoming ever-more necessary in the economic climate many universities and scholars face. As the authors point out, this software might not replace the role of scholars in pursuing long-standing problems, but it will outfit scholars with new tools.

Sung-Il Lee’s “Questioning the Validity of Some Notes by Prominent Old English Scholars,” *Medieval and Early Modern English Studies* (Korea) 17: 1–16, is a copy of an invited lecture first presented at the 2008 MEMESAK conference. Lee focuses on three editorial notes in *Beowulf* (with Klaeber’s 1950 edition as the standard to which he refers) and *The Wife’s Lament*. Lee first takes issue with Mitchell and Robinson’s note to *Beo.* ll. 884b–889 that perhaps the phrases *wiges heard* and *æpelinges bearn* refer not to Sigemund, but rather to the unnamed Siegfried who slays the dragon in the tale’s analogues. Lee then questions the interpretation of *Beo.* ll. 1343b–1344a, *nu seo hand ligeð / se þe eow welhwylcra*, demonstrating that many prominent editors and

translators—Donaldson, Liuzza, Heaney, and Jack—view the hand as belonging to the lamented Æschere. Lee, in contrast, suggests that the hand may very well refer to Hrothgar himself and cites ll. 1341–43 in support, noting that Hrothgar’s power and standing are ebbing away. His final quibble with *Beowulf*-scholarship is whether the *frætwe*, which he cannot bequeath to his retinue (l. 2919), is the famed Brisingamen, as argued by Mitchell and Robinson, or simply treasure in general. Regarding *The Wife’s Lament*, Lee presents the notion that, whereas ll. 1–41 are spoken by a female speaker, ll. 42 to the end belong to a second voice—that of the moralizing poet and not of the lamenting woman of the first half. Certainly, one ought to consider Lee’s alternate interpretations of these cruces; however, he fails to support his initial claim that the established interpretations are accepted “simply because they happen to be observations made by prominent scholars” (15). Lee’s article would be equally interesting to read and to consider if this straw man were absent.

Matt Low’s “‘Heard Gripe Hruson’: (The Hard Grip of the Earth): Ecopoetry and the Anglo-Saxon Elegy,” *Mosaic* 42.3: 1–18, applies the ideas of ecocriticism—an approach to a literary work in which the work’s natural setting is of prominent interest—to elegiac scenes in Old English poetry. After first providing examples of *Beowulf* criticism, which see natural details as literary devices (3–5), Low turns to John Niles’s work, *Beowulf and Lejre*, as an exemplar of ecocriticism. However, Low also points out the absence of a true ecocritical approach to Anglo-Saxon poetry in anthologies such as J. Scott Bryson’s *Ecopoetry* (7–8). In remedying this lack, Low turns his attention to *The Wanderer* and *The Seafarer* and examines the parts played by natural references (8–13). He concludes that the Anglo-Saxon view of nature is chaotic and unpleasant, which contrasts starkly with the post-Renaissance idyllic presentation of nature. *The Ruin*, in Low’s interpretation, inverts the Romantic presentation of nature in conflict with civilization, in that the lost idyll is the city, now beset by the elements (14–16). In summation, Low argues that ecocriticism of Anglo-Saxon literature can be integrated with ecocritical approaches to post-medieval works.

In “Old English Feet” in *Versatility in Versification: Multidisciplinary Approaches to Metrics*, eds. Tonya

Kim Dewey and Frog (New York: Peter Lang), 105–22, Chris Golston highlights an interesting characteristic of *Beowulf's* metrical organization, namely that there is a statistically significant tendency to avoid identical metrical patterns in on- and off-verses. A prime example of this tendency appears among the 1125 half-lines with the (x.x.) metrical structure (in Golston's notation of 'x' as stressed and '·' as unstressed syllables), where only six occur adjacent to a half-line with identical meter. In statistical terms, one would expect eighty-eight occurrences within the entire text of *Beowulf*, though only 6 are found. This represents a probability of 0.000001, or one in a million (107). Other metrical types with sufficient numbers to conduct similar statistical analyses reflect highly significant probabilities as well (107–8). The second part of the article claims that earlier critics have ignored the role of unstressed syllables (such as anacrustic syllables or polysyllabic dips). Problematically, the works of Cable and Suzuki are absent, and Golston focuses primarily on the works of Sievers, Heusler, Bliss, and Russom, among others. Golston makes the claim that "every syllable in the poem is metrically important" (111). He then puts forth his own theory that *Beowulf's* meter is a "quantitative tetrameter, where each metrical position holds one or two moras" (116). However, in order to make this claim, Golston must treat every CVC syllable as light—a position which may be contentious. In conclusion to the article, Golston places *Beowulf's* meter in a typological classification compared to other meters found across the world (Greek, Vietnamese, Japanese, and Arabic).

Golston's statistical evidence regarding the avoidance of paired identical metrical structures is certainly of interest; however, his article may find some critics as well. Golston's statement that "previous theories of this meter all require not counting certain syllables" is unsubstantiated in the text. Furthermore, although the issue of unstressed syllables in anacrusis is avoided, it has been a long-standing observation that anacrusis is limited to one syllable in classical Old English poetry. As to the avoidance of matched sequences, Golston's theory may explain why one half-line possesses anacrusis but not its paired verse; however, it does not address why anacrusis is isolated to the on-verse and does not appear in the off-verse.

Alfred Bammesberger's "The Oldest English Proverb in Verse," *N&Q* 56: 4–7, addresses the interpretation of the word, or words, *daedlata*, in the proverb attributed to St. Boniface and found in the continental manuscript MS 751 of Austria's *Nationalbibliothek*. In treating the piece, Bammesberger reviews the problems

in identifying the direct object of the verb *forǣdit*. Previous treatments, primarily those of Dobbie and Stanley, have viewed *domę* as the object, which does not accord to other instances of *forieldan*, which normally governs the accusative. Bammesberger's solution lies in parsing what is normally read as *daedlata* as two words: *daed* and *lata*. In order for *daed* to represent a feminine accusative singular, Bammesberger argues, we must view it as exhibiting normal *i*-stem accusative endings rather than the later *dæde* with the accusative taken from the *o*-stem paradigm. If this is correct, then *daed* is the object of the verb, and *lata* is a masculine nominative singular *n*-stem meaning 'the procrastinator' derived from the adjective *læt* 'late, slow' (5–6). As a whole, then, he reads the first three verses of the proverb as "often the procrastinator delays the (real) deed for glory, for every victorious exploit" (7)

The chapter on "Old English Poetry" by Cathy Clark in the *Blackwell Companion to the Bible in English Literature*, ed. Rebecca Lemon (Chichester: Blackwell), 61–75, is less a panopticon of the biblical poetry of the Old English corpus as it is an overview of key pieces. Beginning with *Riddle 26* and *Riddle 94* of the Exeter Book (61–63), Clark then turns to issues of reception in Ælfric's biblical translations and Cædmon's work (63–65). Focus then turns to the works in the Junius Codex. Here Clark addresses the unity of works such as *Genesis A* and *B* and *Exodus* (67–70). Germanic elements of the poetic diction take the forefront in Clark's discussion of *Judith* and *Dream of the Rood* (65–71). Although the chapter provides an essential overview of these works, the question of which pieces of Old English poetry were included and which were omitted raises a question. Clark does not justify inclusion of *Dream of the Rood* and exclusion of *Daniel*, *Azarias*, or Cynewulf's *Christ*. For those interested in an overview of biblical poetry in Old English literature, it would be helpful to include a mention of the key pieces deriving from scripture.

Nigel Fabb and Morris Halle's *Meter in Poetry: A New Theory* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2008) briefly addresses the meter of *Beowulf* (263–67) within its larger generative framework, the bulk of which is devoted to the metrical theory as applied to modern traditions. Chapter 1 explains the foundations of this metrical framework, based on a system of "gridlines." A metrical line's syllables are represented by asterisks. Higher organizational units are marked by additional gridlines, where syllables in a line are grouped into smaller number of units with each successive level of increased complexity. Organized syllables are grouped, represented by right or left parentheses, and parentheses bind these units together. Iteratively underlies these

groups, and each gridline's direction of organization (either right-headed or left-headed) is marked by direction of parentheses and arrows next to each line. Well-formedness of metrical lines is defined as each line's according to a specific and finite set of rules (1–33).

Subsequent chapters are devoted to “strict” and “loose” English meters, Southern Romance and French meters, meters in Greek, as well as meters of Classical Arabic, Sanskrit, and Latvian. Of principal interest to Anglo-Saxonists is the section on *Beowulf* in Chapter 10, “Meters of the World,” which makes use of Halle and Keyser's 1971 study. For Fabb and Halle, only stressed syllables are allowed to be counted in the gridlines, and the stressed syllables are separated into alliterating and non-alliterating. The relevant syllables are then grouped left-to right beginning with the first alliterating syllable. At the first gridline, the projecting syllables are grouped in binary units left to right, and then again in the superordinate gridline in the opposite direction. Restrictions exist limiting the number of ungrouped alliterators (263–65).

Difficulties presented in this metrical framework lie in its inability to deal with unstressed syllables. Despite Fabb and Halle's claim that “unstressed syllables are invisible” (264), this analysis falls short by its lack of constraint concerning their number or placement. Similarly there is no account of the role which syllable weight plays and how alliteration interacts with syllable weight. Nonetheless, the simplicity of the model is interesting, as is the formation of both left- and right-headed rules. This simplification may lead to insights in comparing *Beowulf*'s meter to those of later Old English literature and to the alliterative verse of the Middle English period.

Antonia Harbus, “Travelling Metaphors and Mental Wandering in Old English Poetry,” *The World of Travellers: Exploration and Imagination*, ed. Kees Dekker, Karin E. Olsen, and Tette Hofstra (Walpole: Peeters), 117–32, investigates the ways in which travel appears in Old English poetry, and the associated imagery. Primary attention is given to the metaphor of “mental travelling” and how that reflects the Anglo-Saxon ideation of travel (117–18). Before turning to the texts, Harbus first addresses the notion of and theory of metaphor. Her contribution is novel in raising the importance of a diachronic approach, not often employed in theories of metaphor, as this provides insight into categorizing metaphor as an element of speech or thought (120). Following her discussion on metaphor and metaphors of the mind, Harbus turns her attention to the overlap between “travel” and “mind” within the elegiac poems of Old English. With respect to the *Wanderer*, Harbus's

investigation of the metaphors views the representation of travel—both spatially and temporally—in combination with sea-faring and the flight of birds, which represent our inability to control the direction our thoughts will turn (125–26). Similarly, for *The Seafarer*, the imagery of birds, flight, and the travel of the soul play a significant part. What *The Wanderer* and *The Seafarer* have in common is the “journey within a journey” motif, which produces a highly complex set of metaphors conveying a greater interest in the act of travelling than in the reaching a goal (128). After linking the boat and sailing metaphors of *The Seafarer* to a similar passage in *Maxims I*, the movement of the mind found in *The Riming Poem* is investigated. In *The Riming Poem*, Harbus sees the movement of the mind and soul in lines 43–50 as a garden-like space open for travel and growth, in this case the growth of evil and sorrow (130–1). The conclusion of Harbus's essay lies in pointing out that the ability to think metaphorically allows modern readers to appreciate these texts. Our ability to appreciate the non-literal meanings of these metaphorical representations lies in a commonality of human perception within literary language, a feature not often accounted for by modern theorists of metaphor (131–2).

An interesting and not-so-obvious perspective appears in Joseph Harris's “The Rök Stone through Anglo-Saxon Eyes,” *Anglo-Saxons and the North*, ed. Kilpiö, *et al.* [see sec. 2], 11–46, which investigates the oral sources for the longest-known runic inscription. Harris naturally begins with an overview of the stone, its situation and inscription, as well as with the scholarship of the Rök Stone. The scholarship, however, is massive and daunting, and Harris restricts himself to the major relevant works. He adopts, as a starting point, the analysis put forth by Wessén in the division of the text (11–21). Harris begins his analysis of the narrative with the second narrative section, relating to the sons of twenty kings lying dead on a battlefield. The names of these sons appear to be West-Germanic in origin, based on linguistic features and the different onomastic tendencies in Scandinavia (23–25). Similarities between this *pula* and the *pula* found in *Widsith* point to the Rök Stone belonging to the genre of *Zeitgedicht*, and suggests an oral-historical component to the narrative (28–29). Regarding the first narrative section, which involves Theodoric the Great, Harris sifts through the various problems in interpretation and compares the narrative to similar descriptions in *Widsith*, in order to argue that the *fornyrðislag* stanza (if one reads runic *þiaurikr* as a trisyllable formed from the Low Germanization of Lat. *Theodoricus*) betrays West Germanic origins (29–38).

Harris concludes his essay with the framing elements of the verse, paying particular attention to the phrase *sakumukmini*. Placed against competing interpretations, Harris argues that one might read *mukmini* as ON *mōgminni*, meaning a remembrance or hint toward remembrance of a son (38–43). Given the breadth and depth of the literature, the essay is dense but focused and well-argued. Crossing over the North Sea and looking beyond the Old Norse corpus enlightens this special text as well as presents a view of the Northern world as possessing the mobility among peoples we often forget was likely a historical reality.

The third edition of Joyce Hill's *Old English Minor Heroic Poems* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies), presents an updated version of the text. Given the twenty-five years between the first and third editions, most of the changes involve additions to the secondary literature. The introductory material is clearly written, with the background to each poem provided without excessive information, as befits a student edition. The third edition has equipped the front material with references to primary sources alongside the usual editions and translations. Spacing of the texts themselves is copious, which provides suitable space for notes. Editorial practices are clearly marked, and emendations are few and well-annotated. The textual notes focus on grammatical and textual problems, with some providing direction toward the secondary literature for cultural and interpretive problems. A copious ten-page select bibliography is organized according to editions, translations, and secondary literature. The glossary of proper names, a *sine qua non* for working with *Widsith*, is replete with references and additions for the newer secondary literature. In this form, the edition is likely to continue to be a useful text for students approaching these poems.

John Corbett's review of *Old English Poems and Riddles*, by Chris McCully, *Translations & Literature* 18: 239–41, is positive and praises the work for accurate representation of the texts in a twenty-first century manner. Corbett juxtaposes his review of McCully alongside a similar work by Michael Alexander, and concludes that students are in a favorable position to have several translations at their disposal. A feature which the two translations share is an uneasy relationship with philology, in which one must dabble in order to make a creative, yet accurate, translation (241).

Joseph McGowan seeks to pin down the meaning of OE *þyrs* in "Giants and Snake-Charmers: OE *þyrs*," *N&Q* 56: 487–90. Despite the overwhelming presence of 'giant', 'demon', and 'sorcerer' in lexicographical

works, the last meaning seems at odds with the usage of *þyrs* in the literature, for example in *Beowulf* and *Maxims II*, and with the Old Norse cognate *þurs* (487–8). McGowan reviews the occurrence of *þyrs* in glosses of Latin texts and traces a particular usage to the works of Aldhelm. In reference to his *De Virginitate*, references to the central Italian people, the Marsi, are provided as *þyrs* and *wyrmgaleras* (488–9). McGowan provides background to this commonplace of classical literature and finds that only here does *þyrs* represent a word meaning 'sorcerer, wizard'. It is unlikely that the OE word independently referred to wizards, rather, the Aldhelmian gloss exhibits a semantic overlap between the otherness of giants, creatures inseparable from a magical context, and the otherness of the Marsi (489–90).

M. R. Nenarokova's "Toposy 'khvaly' k karolingskoï ekloge: Ot imperatora k sviatomu," *Izvestiia Akademii Nauk, Seriiia Literatury i Iazyka* 68.5: 36–46, investigates the resurgence of the bucolic topos in Carolingian poetry. Although the majority of the works addressed are Continental, Nenarokova discusses works of interest to Anglo-Saxonists, principally those of Alcuin, but also of Winfrid (37, 44) and Bede (38) to a lesser extent. Alcuin, for example, makes use of Virgil's *Third Eclogue* in advising Charlemagne against taking part in war activities (37). Nenarokova considers Alcuin a man who perceived himself as a "new Virgil" ("новым Виргилем") to Charlemagne's "new Augustus" ("новом Августе") (40). Elsewhere Alcuin portrays Charlemagne as a David, a king and protector, whose judgements Alcuin awaits. For Alcuin, the Virgilian eclogues provided a source for worthy panegyric material which could be molded together with biblical references for verse addressing Charlemagne (40–1).

"The Word Made Flesh: Christianity and Oral Culture in Anglo-Saxon Verse," *Oral Tradition* 24: 293–318, by Andy Orchard, collects aspects of the vernacular poetic tradition found in Christian texts. By demonstrating the common formulae and poetic collocations Orchard aims to present a glimpse of vernacular poetry that was spoken and remembered, rather than read, written, and copied. Orchard begins with the earliest scraps of Old English poetry, the *Proverb from Winfrid's Time*, *Cædmon's Hymn*, and *Bede's Death Song*. Each of these, however, is too short to provide meaningful comparanda. The more important works addressed are found in *Guthlac B* and Cynewulf's *Elene* and *Christ B*, which share commonalities in their depiction of sea voyages. Orchard analyzes not only the poetic compounds employed, but goes into the poetic devices bound within their usage, such as rhyme and assonance.

Similar echoes are heard in versions of the Psalms in Old English. The sum of these commonalities support Orchard's conclusion that Anglo-Saxons must have had a store of poetry remembered, which could be cited or used as models for new compositions. The electronic version of this article is supported with audio files so that one may hear the verse spoken, a helpful feature when addressing poetic devices. An appendix of the commonalities across the corpus provides data for his essay and may prove useful for further studies.

Jonathan Roper, "On Finnic and English Alliterative Metres," *Anglo-Saxons and the North*, ed. Kilpiö, *et al.* [see sec. 2], 12–44, compares two alliterative traditions with the purpose of formulating questions we may raise regarding the Old English poetic corpus. Roper's decision to pair the two traditions as comparanda rests in the parallels in word stress placement and alliteration. It has long been noted that these alliterative traditions are found in languages which place stress on the initial syllable of the word. Typological similarities form the basis of Roper's comparison, which proceed from these similarities to noted differences. Although both poetic traditions are alliterative, the manner of alliteration differ, primarily in vowel alliteration and the combination of onset and syllable peak in Finnic alliteration. Additional similarities are stichic composition, binding of verses through alliteration, syntactic parallelism, use of kennings, and four metrical units per line (93–101). Roper proceeds then to look at aspects of the Finnic traditions which are unknown to us regarding Old English poetry. Performance might not be by a single individual, melodies may have been simple and applied to any number of lyrics, and the tradition fell into decline due to a combination of linguistic and social changes, such as literacy (101–8). These are very important factors when considering how the living Old English tradition might have been. Some contentious issues, however, do arise. One lies in Roper's distinction between classical Old English verse, and what he terms "pre-classical," drawing on the works of Kemp Malone and Gay Marie Logsdon. The assumption that end-stopped lines represent a more archaic form than enjambed lines stands at odds with the late nature of non-classical OE verse, like the metrical charms and the *Battle of Maldon*, which are cited as examples (94–97). Further considerations lie in the typological basis. Whereas he makes a strong argument that a typological implication lies between initial stress and alliterative meter, the nature of stress placement between the languages differs slightly. Both are word-initial stressed languages; however, Old English permits unstressed syllables in prefixes prior to the first syllable of the root

of the word. More troublesome, though, is that the issues of genre, performance, melody, and decline of tradition need not be typological implications of word-initial stress placement. Examinations of other historically observed oral traditions, regardless of stress-placement or alliteration, may well complicate the factors Roper brings to our attention.

Elizabeth Rowe's "Helpful Danes and Pagan Irishmen: Saga Fantasies of the Viking Age in the British Isles," *Viking and Medieval Scandinavia* 5: 1–21, pursues the representation of the British Isles in the *fornaldasögur* in contrast their portrayal in Snorri's *Heimskringla*. Whereas Snorri presents an unconquerable land with effective leadership, the tales of less than a century later reverse the roles. The Scandinavians of the *fornaldasögur* become heroic saviors of impotent kings. Reasons behind the inversion of qualities lie perhaps in Iceland's changing self-image and cultural ties with the rest of Scandinavia. Once opposed to Norway, the Icelanders of the fourteenth century and later found a heroic past in their heroes who bettered a country which at the time was a mercantile and political power far above those of Scandinavia. Ireland too, once a source of pride for Icelanders, was later portrayed as a backwards land meant to be pillaged. Rowe presents in this article an interesting perspective to the use of non-historical sources to inform us of historical trends.

Geoffrey Russom's "On the Distribution of Verse Types in Old English Poetry," *ASSAH* 16: 108–18, applies his Word-Foot theory of Old English verse with respect to the employment of non-normative variants in *Beowulf*, the *Cynewulf* poems, and the *Battle of Maldon*. Not only are the variants measured in a 100-verse long sample, but their distribution in proximity to similar variants is accounted for as well. The statistic sampling of these variants and their distribution give an objective measure of "orchestration" for each poet. Plotting the distribution of more versus less normative variants in relation to one another quantifies Russom's notion of "interest," that is, employment of different forms for the sake of metrical variation. As one might expect, the *Battle of Maldon* adheres less strongly to the metrical norm of two word feet with patterns most unlike that of prose. The *Cynewulf* poems and *Beowulf* have much more similar distributions. Russom explains that the deviation of *Maldon* is due to the fact that the linguistic situation for late Old English required the use of more unstressed particles which stand at odds with the syntax of poetry (112–13). Outside of these samples, Russom also measures the distribution of the same in *Fates of the Apostles*, which shows some peculiarities in the use of type B and C variants. Russom's study is an empirical

method of measuring metrical variation. An appendix with the full analysis of the samples follows the essay. One helpful addition, however, would have been to include statistical analysis of Russom's control sample of prose, the story of *Cynewulf and Cyneheard*.

Katrin Thier reviews nautical etymology focusing on terms in Old English and Old Norse in "Ships and their Terminology between England and the North," *Anglo-Saxons and the North*, ed. Kilpiö, et al. [see sec. 2], 151–64. The OE words in question are *scip*, *scegð*, *barda*, *cneor*, *floege*, *bat*, *snacc*, *æsc*, *ceol*, all terms for 'ship, boat' or a variety thereof, and *segl* 'sail', *ar* 'oar', *rowan* 'to row', and *roðor* 'rudder, oar'. Each lexeme is examined for earliest attestation and problematic sound changes in the phonological side of the etymology. In the cases of *scegð*, *barda*, *cneor*, and *floege*, the prospects of borrowing into Old English from Old Norse are presented, and the reverse case for ON *bátr* as well. The essay presents a concise picture of the etymological problems and presents issues which at present have not yet been solved. Some problematic aspects of this piece lie in the appearance of the Germanic substrate theory, with the suggestion that lack of viable etymologies for words may reflect borrowing from an unknown, pre-Germanic language of Northern Europe (regarding the problems of the Germanic substrate theory see Günter Neuman, "Substrate im Germanischen?" *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen* 4 (1971): 78–99). Problematic too is the presentation of the etymology of OE *rowan* 'to row'. Without citation, Thier begins with the assumption that the technology of rowing was introduced through contact with the Romans. This lies at odds with the hypothesis that OE *rowan* and its Germanic cognates are inherited from a Proto-Indo-European word for 'to row'. Thier attempts to rectify the problem by suggesting that *rowan* and its relative originally meant 'to paddle' and had their meanings change after the introduction of rowing technology. If this is the case, it would be helpful for Thier to reassess the Proto-Indo-European etymon, as the possession of a word 'to row' in ca. 3,500 bc, becoming 'to paddle' in the Iron Age, then again 'to row' after contact with the Roman Empire poses some difficulties.

Elizabeth Tyler presents a fresh perspective of eleventh-century England and its literary contributions in "From Old English to Old French," *Language and Culture in Medieval Britain*, ed. Wogan-Browne, et al. [see sec. 2], 164–78. She avoids the typical "narrative of loss" (164) found in most works addressing the end of the Anglo-Saxon period, and finds rather a vibrant and influential literary world which contributed to European

culture as a whole. Multilingualism before and during the Anglo-Norman period is a key element to her essay, as is the prominence of female patronage in abbeys and the court. Important documents she discusses include *Apollonius of Tyre*, *Orosius*, the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, and the *Encomium Emmae Reginae*. Part of England's importance lies in the roles played by Latin versus the vernacular as compared to the situation in France. For the Anglo-Saxons, Latin was the language of the elite to a higher degree than in the Romance-speaking world. Different too was the reluctance of the English to connect themselves to Roman progenitors such as Aeneas (168–71). In addition to Queen Emma, the queen of Henry I, Edith/Matilda assumed an influential role through her patronage of the *Vita Ædwardi*. Tyler ends on a note that Anglo-Saxonists may do well to look toward the works of Gaimar, translator of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle for a foreign audience, in viewing the "juxtaposition of Scandinavians and Trojans" when seeing *Beowulf* as part of eleventh-century culture, and not a relic from a prior age (177–8).

Jeffrey Bardzell's *Speculative Grammar and Stoic Language Theory in Medieval Allegorical Narrative: From Prudentius to Alan of Lille* (New York: Routledge), does not discuss Old English language or literature.

DS

In his study of same-sex male relations, *Between Medieval Men: Male Friendship and Desire in Early Medieval English Literature* (Oxford: Oxford UP), David Clark proposes new categories of male bonds in Anglo-Saxon literature and re-envisions Anglo-Saxon attitudes toward them across a wide range of texts: heroic poetry, Christian poetry, and prose. He debunks restrictive, polarized readings of Anglo-Saxon literature—either heterosexual or homosexual—and argues that the rich complexity of Anglo-Saxon culture requires a more nuanced approach to articulate issues of gender and sexuality among male same-sex relations in secular and religious communities (209). Clark explains,

[m]y work seeks to approach the texts without making rigid *a priori* assumptions about gender, sexuality and the boundaries between erotic and non-erotic, and thus raises more questions than it answers. It engages with issues such as the interrelation of religious and secular discourses of sex and the sexes, medieval concepts of friendship, subjectivity and the individual, and thus fits into the growing body of research from a similar perspective that has been published within the field of later medieval literature (7).

Clark analyzes texts, points out a range of meanings associated with pivotal concepts around male homosocial bonds, and discusses the significance that secular and monastic communities may have ascribed to them. Thus, Anglo-Saxon scribal innovations and authorial censorship involved in textual production are as important as the narrative of the text itself.

This study is broken down into three major parts: "Part I: Introduction" (3–36), "Part II: Same Sex Acts and Identities" (39–107), and "Part III: Homosocial Bonds in Old English Literature" (111–209). In the introduction, Clark criticizes modern binaries and stereotypes that distort reader perceptions, as indicated in the heading "Gay, straight, or bi? The categorization and labelling of sexual identity" (x). Readers will enjoy Clark's comical and melodramatic renderings of modern gendered reconstructions of the Anglo-Saxon elegies *Wulf and Eadwacer* and *The Wife's Lament*. Clark cites sentimental readings and blatant homophobic statements that even the most revered scholars impose on ambiguous texts (22–36). This is a valuable section for his thesis, for it reveals the limitations of modern idioms and the extent to which modern readers are confined by heteronormative binaries.

Five premises guide Clark's arguments. First, the monastic community censors the writing it produces, making certain homosocial practices visible through depictions of Anglo-Saxon life while hiding others. Therefore, the "gap between textual concepts and constructions of homosexuality and people's actual experience of homosexualities may be wide" (12). Second, a text may convey "two or more conflicting notions of same-sex relations" that reflect the attitudes of an individual or community (13). The dominant discourse of same-sex bonds overlays subtler levels of discourse. This view is examined throughout Part III but is most obvious in analyses of the cross-dressing saints Eugenia (184–94) and Euphrosyne (195–203). In the third premise, Clark asserts that varied notions of sexuality co-exist with diverse notions of gender, which he applies in Part III to *The Phoenix*, the cross-dressing saints, and others. Then, Clark postulates in the fourth premise that erotic activity is not restricted to genital contact. Finally, Clark asks the reader to consider erotic and non-erotic as co-existent and to "leave open the question of where platonic and erotic love part company (if indeed they can be truly said to do so), and how far sexual and emotional relations coincide" (18). Clark rejects the false homosexual/platonic binary advanced in the pioneering research that he draws upon for phrases that capture a broader range of same-sex male affection such as "same-sex male bonds," "male

homosocial relations," and "male homoerotic relations." Such terms may include sex acts, yet male homosocial identity remains distinct from sexual activity (10).

At the heart of the study is Clark's assumption that medieval attitudes conveyed in the literature expose social realities and the author's response to them. Clark contends that Ælfric, for example, betrays anxiety at times about homosocial bonds when he tries to mute male same-sex impulses in his translations of primary sources. As a result, Clark contends that the texts may reveal suggestive or ambiguous diction and other literary devices used by the religious community in certain works, as in the anonymous *Life of Euphrosyne*. Clark maintains, "it is primarily with in-house elite religious discourse that same-sexuality becomes explicitly associated with the discourse of natural and unnatural desires" (88). Clark concludes that Ælfric and other Anglo-Saxon translators condemned unnatural acts but left their descriptions vague so that acts associated with bestiality or masturbation could only be "dimly imagined" by the secular audience (100). Such layers of discourse suggest anxiety on the part of the Christian translator and/or writer to "warn those in the know [the monastic community] in the strongest terms against same-sex activity yet not give the ignorant a new source of temptation" (107). As a result, modern interpretation should include the possible Anglo-Saxon responses to the range of possible meanings in the work. Clark acknowledges the difficulty in reconstructing social views based on limited evidence, noting, "[w]e are left with traces in what texts survive, some of which go against religious orthodoxy, and with what inferences can be made from the anxieties and the tensions displayed in orthodox religious texts" (207).

In Part II, Chapter 2, Clark presents a range of non-literary evidence to provide the foundation for literary analyses in Part III. His primary source materials include ethnographic descriptions, law codes, penitentials, and theological materials, which, he argues, reveal social values and practices. Clark begins with a survey of Greek, Latin, and Syrian historians, philosophers, and chroniclers who describe homosocial practices among Celts and pre-migration Germanic tribes. Passages ranging from Aristotle through Caesar and Tacitus present numerous instances of institutionalized pederasty and same-sex activity (39–53). Clark finds a correspondence between the Anglo-Saxon disdain for men who assume the passive sexual role, as described by Tacitus, and the Norse contempt for effeminate men in homosocial culture. Such men are described in terms of the concepts of *nið* and *ergi*, which signify men assuming the passive role in male sexual intercourse. Yet,

they also convey cowardice. Clark applies these terms and Anglo-Saxon terms related to them throughout his analyses of the literature. In Chapter 3, Clark examines the semantic field of terms for effeminacy and cowardice in the Norse term *ergi*, its cognates in Langobardic *arga*, and the Anglo-Saxon term *earg* and the conceptually related noun *bædling*. In his discussion of *bædling* in the Anglo-Saxon Penitentials, Clark refers to the Latin *Canons of Theodore* and the vernacular translation, where the term *bædling* signifies passivity and is related to the term *bæddel* to signify a hermaphrodite (63). The author posits a continuum of sexuality from “manly-men” at one extreme to effeminate men, then to women and children at the other. Among the weak men, the *bædling* would be ostracized for his choice to be the passive partner, whereas other weak men—such as the elderly and disabled—cannot help their effeminacy and are not judged for it (66).

In the remaining chapters in Part II, Clark examines same-sex discourse in religious writing. These chapters present close readings of the texts, and from these analyses Clark surmises authorial intent or the extent to which authors minimize or veil same-sex activity. In Chapter 4, Clark turns to patristic writers. Bede and Aldhelm briefly note that same-sex acts are sinful and include them among a range of other sins (74-76). In his discussion of Boniface and in later chapters, Clark criticizes modern readers who excerpt and highlight church writers’ minor statements about same-sex relations in Sodom as a sensational sin. Boniface, as with the other writers Clark discusses, associates same-sex acts with other sex acts as sinful. In the same manner, Ælfric of Eynsham associates Sodom with a range of sins and does not identify same-sex acts in the *Catholic Homilies* and the *Blickling Homilies* (89-92). Clark likewise concludes that same-sex sin is not addressed in either the letter of Ælfric to Sigeward or in the translations of Orosius and Gregory the Great associated with King Alfred (93-99).

Clark introduces Part III with an examination of different forms of sexual relations in the biblical vernacular poem *Genesis A*. Clark asserts that the poet exalts the sacred union of Abraham and Sarah as the holy parents of God’s chosen people. This divinely sanctioned union frames descriptions of deviant sex acts. Various forms of sexual deviance are presented in two major groups: endogamic sexual relations, which are associated with incest, and exogamic sexual relations, which are associated with beings that are too diverse—racially or ontologically in the case of unions between man and beast or man and devil. In contrast to these categories, *Genesis A* depicts homosocial bonds

between men, which are at times sanctioned—such as Lot and Abraham—and at times unsanctioned—such as homosocial relations in the Sodomite army, whose flight from battle reveals their weakness and corruption (126).

In Chapter Seven, Clark examines heroic desire among Anglo-Saxon warrior heroes. He finds that in *Beowulf*, homosocial bonds are ultimately problematic because they are sterile (140). The thematic force of the poem rests upon the failure of dynasties. Clark asserts that the poem advocates for a “wider conception of society, one not centred solely on homosocial, kinship, or marital ties” (140). In contrast to the ambivalent attitude toward homosocial bonds in *Beowulf* are the celebrated bonds in *The Battle of Maldon* (143-47). In further variation and contrast, *The Dream of the Rood* inverts the category of submissive effeminacy associated with cowardice, as established in other Anglo-Saxon heroic poems. Instead, the cross’s status as heroic retainer is overturned within the larger cosmic topos of the world-upside-down, in which “torture brings life” (151). Clark concludes, “[h]eroic obedience is paradoxically to slay one’s lord; to be a warrior, a man, is to submit to being feminized, impotent, placed in the passive” (151).

In contrast to these heroic poems, homosocial bonds merge with spiritual asexuality in *The Phoenix*, which symbolizes the idealized homosocial relations in the monastic life. While the symbol of the phoenix bears the traditional patristic signification of Mary and Mother Church, Clark notes that masculine terms of parent and child—*fæder* and *sunu*—describe its self-generation. This presents “a sexless but masculine generation” that corresponds to “the terms in which religious writers speak of monastic communities founded on single-sex families of fathers, brothers, sons, preserved by spiritual production” (161). The language of sexual reproduction among a same-sex community creates a sense of anxiety for the monastic community and the ways in which it might have been read by the secular community, since both audiences read the Exeter Book (167). To limit transgressive readings, the descriptions of the phoenix as beautifully transcendent over human relations are crafted to signify the purity of the spiritual community of the monks (171).

In the final two chapters, Clark continues his examination of religious texts written for clerical and secular audiences and the levels of same-sex discourse within them. In Chapter Nine, Clark elaborates on his argument that Ælfric de-emphasized the discourse of same-sex activity in his translation from his *Lives of Saints*. In the *Life of the Forty Soldiers*, same-sex bonds

are positive among the Christian soldiers, unless they have martial consequences, as *Ba ergode heora an* (178–80, “Then one of them turned coward”). In his analysis of Christian conversion as a homosocial action, Clark examines the *Life of Crysanthus and Daria*, in which the model of marriage is replaced by spiritual same-sex reproduction. Through doctrinal instruction, Crysanthus converts young men, and Daria maidens to Christianity (181). This is also the case with Julian and Basilissa and likewise the story attributed to Terentianus appended to the *Life of Saint Agnes*. In each case, the chaste spiritual reproduction parallels the asexual spiritual reproduction of the phoenix to underscore a pattern of same-sex spiritualized reproduction (181). The hagiography most charged with sexual tension in Ælfric's *Lives* is the *Life of Saint Eugenia* (184–94). Clark argues that Ælfric tries and fails to “de-eroticize” her (185). Clark's study exposes contradictory descriptions of Eugenia as a celibate man, a eunuch, and woman. These disruptions in the text reveal Ælfric's own anxieties about gender and same-sex attraction (187). In a further move to bend Eugenia's gender, the scribe of BL Otho B.X continuously inserts phrases that describe her masculinity. This, Clark concludes, elevates her status beyond womanhood to that of a man, who enjoys a more noble status (190). Eugenia, as with Euphrosyne below, is the sympathetic heroine who inspires desire, and gendered desire creates anxiety.

Similar dynamics around gender and sexuality are expressed in the anonymous *Life of Euphrosyne* in the last chapter. Like Eugenia, Euphrosyne is perceived as a eunuch, although the audience of monks would have felt anxiety about an attractive character who “both is and is not their gender” (198). Euphrosyne's transcendent status further complicates notions of gender. She is “more than man” because she pre-figures the ideal state of asexual blessedness in heaven (199). In his final study, *The Colloquies of Ælfric Bata*, Clark concludes that Ælfric had a pragmatic view of same-sex relations, which he expressed through the humor in his moral teaching. *Colloquy 7* presents an example of homosocial bonds that violate the Benedictine Rule (204). A bawdier example in *Colloquy 10* compares drinking from the horn to giving oral sex (205). In contrast to these examples, *Colloquy 29* expresses the official, condemning view of the church.

In each chapter, Clark debunks erroneous assumptions in current as well as older scholarship and then follows with close readings to argue for more complex dynamics in the literature than have been previously articulated. Ultimately, he believes that literature reflects social practices and values so deeply

that it betrays the anxieties of its authors. With this in mind, the author and medieval readers become vital participants in the margins of the text and must be considered in modern interpretations of a work.

The collection of essays, *The World of Travellers: Exploration and Imagination*, ed. Kees Dekker, Karin E. Olsen, and Tette Hofstra (Leuven: Peeters), explores the notion of travel in the medieval imagination. Several essays in the first section of the collection are studies based on physical journeys. These include accounts by early travelers: Herodotus, Pliny, Strabo, Egeria, and St. Helen. Studies by Michael Herren, Patrizia Lendinara, Judith Jesch, Lars van Wezel, Linda Honey, and Karin Olsen examine how travel documents were “appropriated, translated, recontextualised, and ultimately found their way into the literary production of the Scandinavians, Anglo-Saxons, and Continental Germanic peoples” (1). While the first four chapters focus on the transmission of fantastic and mythological elements, essays by Linda Honey and Karin Olson examine early Christian pilgrimages to Jerusalem. In her study of Egeria's journey, Honey investigates the range of Egeria's narrative strategies, which vary according to her intent. Olsen examines the role of St. Helen in three different Anglo-Saxon narratives, with special attention to the anonymous *Invention Homily*. The final section of the collection addresses metaphysical travel—journeys of the soul or intellect. These analyses study the ways that elements of language and rhetoric reveal cultural meaning associated with travel. Antonina Harbus decodes metaphors for travel and their association with actions of the mind in Old English literature. She combines historical linguistics with theories of metaphor to highlight patterns of thought that Old and Modern English share. Janie Steen examines translation strategies in *Riddles 35* and *40* of the Exeter Book to evaluate each poet's close translation of Aldhelm's Anglo-Latin poems. Jennifer Neville studies the unique relationship between the body and the soul in Exeter Book *Riddle 43*. Sharon Rowley merges concepts of historiography with apocalyptic literature and the soul's otherworldly journey in Bede's descriptions of Drythelm and St. Fursa in his *Historia Ecclesiastica*.

In his essay, “The *Cosmography* of Aethicus Ister and Ancient Travel Literature,” Michael Herren examines the *Cosmography* as a form of *periplous*—a Greek genre of travel narrative that integrates a description of the earth's shape with factual information and fantastic elements (6). The author asks: How could a Western European writer in the pre-Carolingian Dark Ages with only a scant knowledge of Greek produce a work that

reveals such a wide range of influences from ancient travel literature and a broad array of Greek literary techniques? Herren asserts that the work was originally composed sometime between 700 and 710 at Canterbury and Malmesbury (27–30). He traces sources in the *Cosmography* that were also housed in the libraries at Malmesbury and Canterbury during the abbacy of Aldhelm (28). Furthermore, the cosmographer refers to allusions in Aldhelm's writing, including Lucan's *Orpheus* among others (20–25). Herren further notes that the writer of the *Cosmography* combines Irish sources with his extensive knowledge of Greek literary genres and Greek lexicon. As a result, Herren concludes, the writer may well have been a student who based his work on notes taken from lectures by Theodore of Tarsus at the Canterbury school. While the intellectual center of Malmesbury provided the library of sources, Archbishop Theodore combined his own travel experiences with descriptions of the fantastic elements derived from his knowledge of secular and religious literature (30).

In "The *Letter of Fermes*: Not only Marvels" (31–60) Patrizia Lendinara examines a fictitious letter addressed to either the Roman emperor Hadrian (117–138 AD) or his predecessor Trajan (98–116). Lendinara asserts that the *Letter* influenced Latin and Anglo-Saxon works, including Isidore of Seville's *Etymologiae* (44–45), the *Marvels of the East* (45–49), and the *Liber Monstrorum* (49–51). The *Letter* both contributed to the lore around Alexander the Great and preserved earlier material pertaining to the legend (41–44).

Judith Jesch addresses teaching and storytelling from lived experience rather than from texts in "Namings and Narratives: Exploration and Imagination in the Norse Voyages Westward." One strategy that is not dependent on texts is that of naming. Jesch observes, "[a]s naming is an important function of both exploring and imagining new places, it can also be an important clue to the geographical knowledge of the time" (61). Jesch asserts that narratives based on experience display three elements: visible landmarks such as prominent mountains, steep cliffs, and peninsulas; visible moving elements such as birds and whales to show proximity between landmarks; and distance between landmarks expressed in sailing times (65). Jesch observes that travel accounts become more fantastic as these markers disappear (68–78). While Jesch focuses on naming as documentation of actual travel, Lars van Wezel explores how the Norse readers imagined the story of Troy, as conveyed in Dares the Phrygian's account of the tale brought to Iceland. In his chapter, "Narrative on the Move: Mythological Elements in *Trójumanna saga* (the

Hausbók version)," Van Wezel compares the saga to other Norse versions and exposes the innovations of its mythological references. He finds that the Scandinavian gods are not overshadowed by Greco-Roman myth but remain "important for the explanation and understanding of foreign affairs" (90).

Linda Honey analyzes the range of styles and their different aims in the written travel account by the fourth-century figure Egeria. In her chapter, "Pilgrimage by Proxy," Honey challenges two misconceptions about Egeria's *Itinerarium*: first, that early medieval pilgrims traveled to identify with the biblical past, and second, that Egeria's writing style was restricted to the way that she spoke, indicative of a woman with average intelligence (91). In one respect, Egeria adheres to the Greco-Roman tradition of travel writing when she interprets her surroundings in terms of Scripture so that, by reading her account, her sisters may join her "in the communion of salvation history" (92). Egeria relates that as she gazes upon an object from the sacred landscape, it joins her "to the people, event(s), and God represented by the marker" (91). However, at other points, Egeria halts her description and refers the reader to Scripture. Honey argues that these moments signify a shift in discourse to first-person narrative and break with tradition to assert her individuality (94). Ultimately, "the genre of travelogue is radically transformed from an apersonal compendium of data" to a vibrant personal narrative that will find its echo in later narratives of pilgrimage in the Middle Ages (101).

This spiritual individuality in St. Helena, expressed in the Latin source text of the *Legend of St Helena's Journey to Jerusalem*, gives way to greater political demands upon the figure of St. Helena in the Anglo-Saxon *Invention Homily*, as explored by Karin Olsen. In "Traveller and Mediator: St Helena in the Old English *Invention Homily*," Olsen considers Helena's role in the homily in comparison to Cynewulf's *Elene* and Ælfric's *Finding of the Holy Cross* in his second series of *Catholic Homilies*. The anonymous *Invention Homily* recalls Ælfric's work in its emphasis upon strengthening Constantine's rulership. This political concern "forces Helen to undergo a significant transformation from an independent authority . . . to an effective aid who helps to maintain the political and spiritual integrity of her son's empire" (104). Olsen argues that political turmoil in late Anglo-Saxon England influenced the anonymous author's version of Helena as primarily a pious mediator who "unreservedly acts on behalf of her son and his Christian Empire" (115). [Also reviewed in sect. 4c.]

Antonina Harbus applies modern linguistic notions of language and imagination in her study, "Travelling Metaphors and Mental Wandering in Old English Poetry." These metaphors signify a separation from the mind as traveler from the self, which attempts to control or guide the mind (123). Harbus argues that these Anglo-Saxon metaphors "have influenced the development of later metaphors for imagination, many of which are still current in Present Day English" (117). In this contribution to the field of cognitive science, the author combines historical linguistics with a theory of metaphor as discussed by George Lakoff and Mark Johnson. Her premise is that metaphors form cultural habits of thought, which modern English speakers have inherited (122). As Harbus explains, "[e]ven though metaphors might have become lexicalised or normalised along the way, they still encode culturally specific constructions of concepts and regularised expressions, which can be transmitted across generations and cultures" (120). As poems such as *The Seafarer* and *The Wanderer* reveal, the mind inclined to travel dramatizes the "misery of the present" that arises from "a dislocation between the mind and the self" (125). Modern readers comprehend the sorrow of the exile from their familiarity with this cultural norm (132).

Janie Steen analyzes two Anglo-Saxon translations of Latin riddles in her study, "Translation or Transformation? Aldhelm's *Enigmata* and Exeter Book *Riddles* 35 and 40" (133–46). Each riddle contains unique Latin diction and classical references that one translation imaginatively recasts and the other renders closely. *Riddle* 35, based on Aldhelm's *Lorica* recreates the Pauline imagery of the breastplate as the "garment of faith" through wordplay between weaving and swordplay (138). *Riddle* 40 closely follows the Latin source text *Creatura* in content and style. This riddle preserves Aldhelm's classical mythological references, indicating that the riddle was composed for an audience educated in the classics (138–45). In a related study, Jennifer Neville interrogates Christian theology in a riddle detailing the journey of the disembodied soul in "Pondering the Soul's Journey in Exeter Book *Riddle* 43" (147–62). Neville asserts that the riddle breaks with conventional notions of the relationship of the body and the soul. The riddle meditates upon the dynamics of the soul and body, leading the reader to understand that neither the soul nor the body is entirely responsible for Christian salvation. Instead, the riddler teaches that "self, responsibility, and agency reside not in the soul or body, but rather in the two together" (161). As Neville concludes, this riddle urges the Christian to monitor his daily conduct (162).

Sharon M. Rowley further highlights Christian anxiety about the afterlife of the soul in her chapter, "The Role and Function of Otherworldly Visions in Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum*" (163–82). Rowley asserts that certain passages of Bede's work indicate his anxiety over the relationship between history and revelation— anxiety increased by the debate surrounding his calculation of the *annus mundi* (164). Rowley examines Bede's descriptions of the afterlife of the soul in visions of Drihthelm and St. Fursa, among other passages. Rowley suggests that "rather than offering answers, Bede includes and interprets otherworldly visions in his history to represent the potential opacity of signs— whether divine or historical—and the corresponding limits of human knowledge" (164). To conclude, these texts emphasize the unknowability of grace in Bede's historiography.

In his expansive study of northern European lyric from medieval, early modern, and modern periods, *Lyric, Meaning, and Audience in the Oral Tradition of Northern Europe* (Notre Dame: Notre Dame UP, 2006), Thomas A. DuBois examines "the sophisticated and nuanced ways in which traditional audiences in northern Europe have made sense of traditional songs" (33). He presents lyrics from England, Wales, Scotland, Ireland, Norway, Sweden, and Finland in their original languages followed by his own English translations. He applies models of interpretation that focus solely upon perceptions of the lyric shared by the immediate audience and performer, as articulated in the subheading of the first chapter, "Toward a Receptionist Approach to Folk Lyric" (31). DuBois proposes that a lyric's meaning is generated by the community of a singer and an audience familiar with lyric tradition. Communities "share norms for interpreting lyric," interpretive strategies constructed around rules that govern the performer, his work, and the audience's interpretation of it (31). Three different interpretive axes form the framework around which the community interprets the lyric: the generic, the associative, and the situational axes. These axes form "ambient systems of meaning" that vary according to the individual lyric; that is, each lyric conforms to the characteristics of each axis to a different extent, depending on the cultural norms and expectations associated with the lyric tradition in each community (36).

The generic axis is characterized by commonplace content such as courtship or the loss of a friend (2). These are universal experiences across time and space expressed with intimate force. In each case, the audience expects certain elements of style and expression in language and music. In the associative

axis, the interpretation of the lyric depends entirely on the person, place, or thing associated with the song. At one end of the axis is personalization—the act of directing the meaning to one’s own life as one listens to the song. At the other end, the lyric imagines a third-party recipient, such as a deity or lover. In this case, the song captures a moment within the grander narrative of the character’s life. The lyric then becomes a “slice of life, a souvenir from another’s world of experience” (3). In the situational axis, the immediate context of the narrative gives the lyric its meaning. In the lyric, all three axes come into play at different levels of intensity.

DuBois gives a brief overview of previous methods of folklore studies into which he places his own work. In its earliest stages, the field of folklore studies used the lyric as an abstract concept that supported larger cultural ideals, such as national identity in the work of Gottfried Herder. Then, structuralism shifted the focus from abstract concepts to individual lyrics and, more specifically, to the outer structure of a lyric or its textual logic. Most important for DuBois’s study is the functionalist approach, which maintains that meaning in folklore is generated by the reciprocal interactions between performer and audience (32). DuBois finds an example of the functionalist approach in Dorothy Whitelock’s 1951 study, *The Audience of Beowulf*, in which she reconstructs the knowledge the audience brought to the performance of the poem. This ethnographic approach reaches fuller realization in John Miles Foley’s *Immanent Art: From Structure to Meaning* with its detailed analysis of the stockpile of formulas among other poetic ideas, which the audience recalls as it listens to the poem. As these studies demonstrate, cultural norms shape the interpretive strategies of the listeners of the lyric as much as the beauty of its form.

In Chapter 2, “Pausing in a Narrative’s March: The Interpretation of Lyrics within Epics,” DuBois examines lyric laments in heroic poetry. He finds that lyrics in Scandinavian and Irish epics are narrativized to emphasize specific moments and events, while in Old English, the laments are proverbialized to create empathy through the universal experience of grief. DuBois discusses the *Father’s Lament* (*Beowulf*, ll. 2444–67) as a proverbial lament in that it describes the sorrow of the nameless father over the loss of his son. Through the figure of the anonymous father, the audience is able to come to a closer understanding of King Hrethel’s deep grief over losing one son to the arrow of another, which, DuBois indicates, would otherwise be unfathomable to the audience (52). Gnomonic statements in Anglo-Saxon poetry, such as *The Wife’s Lament*, *The Seafarer*, and *The Wanderer* frame personal expressions of intimate

loss within universal human experience to exemplify the impulse of the proverbial (48–56).

In the same chapter, DuBois examines the extent to which the lyric depends on the larger epic narrative for meaning in the laments by Guðrún (*Lay of Guðrún*), Egil (*Egils Saga*), and Deirdre (*Book of Leinster*) from the Irish Ulster cycle. In all cases, the associative and generic features are similar: the elegies are generic in their expression of grief over the death of a hero or loss of his love and thus stand alone as monuments. For example, the Irish lay is so well-known in Old, Middle, and Modern Irish that versions of the tale remain consistent over centuries. Thus, the lay may be sung independently of the epic, and the audience will recall the context for it. In contrast to associative and generic axes, these tales differ along the situational axis. While the Old English laments are gnomonic at one end of the situational axis, the Norse laments are narratively specific at the other end of the axis.

In Chapter Three, “In Ritual and Wit: the Hermeneutics of Invocational Lyric,” DuBois examines different forms of invocations in the Sámi *joik*, cattle calls, charms, and invocational laments. The invocational lyric makes use of all three axes: generic, associative, and situational. It is generic in its conventional and predictable style, associative as an exchange between the inscribed speaker and his recipient (lover, friend, deity), and situational in its description of a narrative moment. While the *joik* is descriptive and presents a vivid portrait of a character through a short musical and verbal invocation, the cattle call and the charm are denotative commands that give the speaker control over his situation. Du Bois presents Swedish, Scottish, and Anglo-Saxon charms as invocations that result in answers from the cosmos, for the words in the charm “share in the essence of their referents” (82). In the last section of the chapter, he examines laments in wedding and funeral songs as invocational generic lyrics. Operating within the traditions of lament in various northern cultures, each lyric transcends the specific occasion for its performance, and its atemporal quality provokes contemplation (83).

The atemporal quality of the lament, the expectation of response in the charm, and the invocational quality of both forms appear again in the religious lyrics examined in Chapter 4, “Conversing with God: Medieval Religious Lyric and Its Interpretation” (98–141). DuBois finds that over time, hymnody develops gradually from a lyric style that expresses unique circumstances within a narrative situation to one that bears a proverbial, meditative quality that crosses over into secular song. DuBois examines the syncretic quality of hymns that

adapt Christian language to native melodies to produce “highly personalized, contemplative hymnody” over time (98). The familiar tunes express ideas from the Christian mysticism associated with Saint Bernard of Clairvaux and later Dominican and Franciscan orders. The emotional power of hymns expressed popular religious thought, heresies, and—in later times—protestant teachings. As DuBois clarifies, “[i]n their vivid emotional force and relative brevity, lyric songs could convey substantial symbolic and interpretive significance, intensified by repeated performance,” especially in comparison to prose sermons (103).

DuBois gracefully articulates the hymn's role as a bridge between divine and human realms in the medieval imagination. Christians praying in the voice of a biblical figure participate “in that transcendent framework of sacred time, which allows the present to fold back upon and actualize the miracles of the sacred past” (103). As part of his discussion of the transition from oral to written lyric traditions, Du Bois examines the Welsh appropriation of Latin hymnody. Welsh hymns in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries signify divine and political kings both distributing rewards for praise (122–25). Likewise, Norwegian hymns align King Olaf with the divine (126–28). As a result, these hymns become more strongly attributive as they develop within the culture.

In Chapter Five, “Confronting Convention: Reading Reception in Shakespeare's Use of Lyric Song,” DuBois argues for the value of conventional elements in medieval and post-medieval lyric along the generic axis. Whereas modern critics dismiss such conventions as the “hackneyed clichés” of lesser poets, these predictable tropes intensify the rapport between audience and performer and provide an interpretive framework for the audience (142). DuBois examines lyrics in Shakespeare's plays as case studies in audience responses to Elizabethan lyrics. DuBois presents evidence that the lyrics in the plays were already well-known to the audience as independent songs. The characters on stage represent how people should relate to songs (35). The Renaissance song “Willow,” for example, serves a dramatic purpose when performed by Ophelia, Desdemona, and Claudia. The audience must be familiar with the song in order to appreciate the rich dramatic irony or foreshadowing that it suggests when sung by the characters on stage (149–52). One unspoken rule of interpretation with which the audience must be familiar is that of musical sensibility. DuBois sheds provocative light on the relationship that characters have to music and how this relationship reveals aspects of character. For example, characters sensitive to music

are generally insightful, while others “lose themselves” in lyric to reveal madness (160–68). These instances rely on the audience's knowledge of appropriate responses to conventional lyrics.

The last two chapters address the associative axis from third-person attribution to first-person personalization. In Chapter Six, “Attribution and the Imagined Performer,” DuBois examines third-person attribution from medieval to modern lyrics. In contrast to earlier studies, which view the lyric as emblematic of cultural identity, he focuses on the singer-poet as a bearer of meaning. This orientation redirects the locus of meaning from the scholar's interpretation of the culture as one collective voice to the point of view of the performer. Through the axis of attribution, lyrics reveal the complexity of a historical or legendary figure, as “[t]he image of the poet-singer tends toward characteristics regardless of culture or period, implying norms by which audiences use biographical details to interpret and appreciate the songs they attribute to particular singers” (170). At times, the bard intervenes to present his own commentary on the lyric (181–85). In the final chapter, “Personal Meanings in the Performance of One Man's Repertoire,” DuBois examines personalization in the lyric in his interview with one contemporary Irish artist, Michael Lyne, and his wife, Lizzy, on Lyne's engagement with tradition. DuBois concludes that the lyric sentiment is intensely personal yet endures over time.

Noise in Old English battle poetry is a device that emphasizes courage and violence in Anglo-Saxon imagination. In “The Trumpet and the Wolf: Noises of Battle in Old English Poetry” *Oral Tradition* 24: 319–36, Alice Jorgensen analyzes sound as the intersection between the body and mind engaged in violence, for it records the mood of the warriors, the clash of weapons, and the screams of animals to create a “sensory onslaught of war” that inspires terror and is thus itself a species of violence (320). Noise reveals the relationship between violence and language—a point central to Jorgensen's study. Language is consistently associated with reason. In contrast, noise distorts and destabilizes language as violence increases. Jorgensen studies the significance of noise as a destabilizing force in several poems with a focus on the Old English poem *Exodus* in the second half of her study.

As Jorgensen argues, destabilized language conveys the chaos of violence. One example of the distortion of language is the “anthropomorphized song” of the beasts, predators who speak as part of the beast of battle motif (323). In *Beowulf* (ll. 3025–26), for example, the animals sing in ironic harmony, which is described in terms that

evoked speech and song (*singan, leod*). Likewise in *Elene*, the wolf ironically speaks in the poet's voice (28). He acts as a commentator, who—like Cynewulf himself—tells the story of the battle; as Cynewulf relates, the wolf “did not conceal the battle-runes” (*wælrune ne mað* 28). By associating language with predators, the poet merges the concept of rational speech with violence. Language is split apart from humanity again in *The Fight at Finnsburg* and *The Battle of Maldon*. In these poems, human speech alternates with the noise of battle so much that words deteriorate into violent noise (324).

In the Old English *Exodus*, the beasts of battle topos and the imagery of noise transform the biblical narrative into battle poetry. A major feature in the sound imagery is the trumpet, which operates as “an extension of the human voice” to organize the troops (327). Mirroring the leader's mind, the trumpet embodies the courageous, heroic speech of leadership, as it outlines the process of “conflict, crisis and triumph” (327). The sound of the trumpets signifies the power of speech, as the Israelites regain faith (329). At the same time, the Egyptians lose their power of speech, signifying their loss of control (329). As a result, Jorgensen argues, the noise of battle and the “speech” of the trumpet in *Exodus* reinforce Christian ideology in an unsettling way. Perhaps the most ironic combination of bestial noise and human language is in the description of the animals singing a Christian ritual, which is suggested in the lupine performance of evensong *æfenleoð* (328). The wolves' song heartens the Israelites whose faith is further intensified in the morning, when Moses commands them to follow their divine path as God's people. In all of these examples, the noise of the non-human merges with human speech to destabilize language and increase the sense of violence.

In *Stealing Obedience: Narratives of Agency in Anglo-Saxon England*, H.M. Chadwick Memorial Lectures 19 (Cambridge U, Department of Anglo-Saxon, Norse and Celtic), Katherine O'Brien O'Keeffe analyzes the “intimate inter-connection between monastic identity and a construction of agency markedly different than our own” in three narratives based on Benedictine monastic life and its idealized vision of unified will among all members as they serve the divine will (1). The narratives exemplify the dynamic between the monastic subject—or potential subject—and his superior, through a series of interpretive acts. The monk must correctly interpret what his superior expects of him. The superior must be able to understand his subject's response to his command in order to evaluate the degree of his obedience. O'Brien O'Keeffe argues that “[p]ursuing the forms and demands of agency in late

Anglo-Saxon England requires attention to a master narrative of obedience that understands (and requires) every act to result from the will of a free agent” (2). This master narrative is a series of intelligent negotiations among the members that align individual agency with the monastic community to fulfill divine law. The narratives bring to light the interplay between free will, predestination, and providence. At the center of the analysis is the concept of “obedient agency,” the alignment of individual will with divine will in every action in Benedictine monastic life (13).

The first narrative is from Wulfstan of Winchester's *Vita of Æthelwold*—specifically Wulfstan's account of the abbot testing the obedience of his subject, Ælfstan, at Abingdon. The monk cooks the meal and cleans the kitchen before Æthelwold orders him to do so. Without consulting the abbot first, the monk has “stolen obedience”—the obedience that Æthelwold must exact from his monks in order to fulfill his proper role within the Benedictine monastic community. The abbot recovers his role by then commanding the monk to dip his hand into the boiling water to retrieve a morsel and serve it to Æthelwold. The monk's success in completing the ordeal—the trial to judge his obedience—is a divine sign that he has acted correctly to maintain his identity as Æthelwold's subject, a determination that the abbot is unable to make. This narrative presents an idealized view of monastic identity, as the wills of the superior and his subject are unified. The monk displays O'Brien O'Keeffe's concept of “obedient agency.” The abbot's inability to be certain of his subject's intention reveals an authentic tension in monastic life.

The second narrative, from Ælfric's homily translated from Gregory the Great's *Dialogues* II.24, operates as a counterexample of intelligent obedience. In the narrative, a young boy is given to St. Benedict of Nursia's monastery by his parents as an oblate. Out of excessive love for his family, the boy runs away from the monastery and dies on that day. When he is buried, the grave expels his body. Gregory concludes that this spontaneous exhumation is a miracle that reveals Benedict's powerful rule, for the earth itself rejects the body of the person who refuses to serve him. In contrast, Ælfric's version forcefully positions the boy's rebellion against Benedict's authority by suggesting that the boy had spent time at the monastery and could no longer bear remaining there. This sense of history dramatizes the polarity between his kinship with earthly and spiritual families, and the child's choice to act on his greater love for his earthly family is his sin (11).

In the third narrative, Osborn of Canterbury calls attention to the negotiation between individual will and

obedience in his account of Dunstan's conversion to monastic life. In the source narrative, Dunstan initially rejects monastic life for an earthly existence. Then, he suffers illness, understands the illness as a sign of divine disapproval, and joins the monastery. Osborn emphasizes Dunstan's power to choose a monastic life rather than join merely in response to divine reproach. In Osborn's version, Dunstan addresses the bishop and argues that his choice to obey and commit his life to the church is of far greater value than obedience without agency (15–20). These three narratives underscore medieval monastic notions of obedience as a complex coordination of individual wills that continuously required interpretation and negotiation in shared obedience to the divine.

In "Animals in Religious and Non-Religious Anglo-Saxon Writings" in *Tiere und Fabelwesen im Mittelalter*, ed. Sabine Obermaier (Berlin: de Gruyter), 235–59, Kathrin Prietzel explores two distinct psychological and cultural meanings that arise from her analysis of animal symbolism in Anglo-Saxon religious and secular texts. Prietzel notes that her study is the first to analyze the use and symbolism in both worldviews (236). The author finds that in secular poetry, animals were associated with protection and power, whereas animals most often represent human vice in early Christian writing, although Prietzel examines exceptions to this pattern as well (236). Prietzel cites numerous studies of animal symbolism in her examination of Norse and Germanic influences in secular Anglo-Saxon poetry. While most studies of animals in poetry focus on Germanic influences, Prietzel argues that poems such as *The Phoenix* and *The Whale* reinforce religious and moral teaching as homilies do and should thus be placed within the homiletic tradition (241).

A critical area in her study is the dynamic between animal-human transformations in secular and Christian texts. In Germanic culture, "the idea that an effigy of a strong animal conveys its abilities on the bearer led to belief that animals possess some transformative powers and that participation in these powers results in changes within humans" until eventually the powers "become part of that person's nature" (237). Yet in Christian literature, as exemplified by Ælfric's homilies and saints' lives, "humans project their vices and virtues upon animals" (237). Prietzel discusses examples of saints, such as Cuthbert, who appear to humanize animals in their presence by taming them. In contrast, when a human loses his virtue, the animal deteriorates into corruption in an allegorical reflection of human nature, as discussed by theologians (239). In certain cases in Ælfric's writing, the same animal can signify good in

one text and evil in the next (242). Ælfric describes animals within the tradition of the three-fold soul. Since animals do not possess intellect, they are driven by the appetitive natures of desire and anger (244).

In the remaining section of the article, Prietzel presents a catalogue of animals. Readers will appreciate the range of meanings associated with the boar, the lion, (250–51), the wolf (252–54), the raven, and the eagle (254–56). With regard to the boar, the author examines its earliest meanings in Anglo-Saxon culture. These include Roman descriptions by Tacitus, who notes that the Aestyan tribe believed it held apotropaic powers and associated it with the mother goddess (248). Prietzel outlines the boar's association with kingship and fertility, which arguably derives from the cult of Woden and is linked to Norse mythology (248–49). Kingship and Christ's resurrection are associated with the lion, while several works such as *Daniel*, *Andreas*, *Christ I*, *Fortunes of Men*, and *Maxims I and II* describe the wolf's ferocity. According to Prietzel, the wolf is not portrayed in a positive light in either Christian or secular texts (244). While Ælfric describes the raven and eagle as predatory birds that signify greedy men, these birds are associated with prophecy in secular poetry and, more importantly, with the beasts of battle motif in Christian and pagan texts (256).

Renée R. Trilling's new study, *The Aesthetics of Nostalgia: Historical Representation in Old English Verse* (Toronto: U of Toronto P), offers new methods for the interpretation of poetic form, while it challenges the reader to consider the ways in which the Anglo-Saxons viewed themselves within their own history. Trilling states,

the purpose of this book is to illuminate the role of this nostalgia for the past in Old English literature by exploring the relationship between poetic form and historical consciousness in early English vernacular verse. I take as my starting point the current trend in literary studies toward reconsideration of aesthetics and formalism, but I do so with the explicit intention of thinking historically about both aesthetics and form (6).

In this melding of formal analysis with historiography, Trilling asserts that two types of nostalgia motivate the poetic forms that express them: restorative nostalgia and reflective nostalgia, as defined by Svetlana Boym (59). Trilling clarifies that "[w]hereas reflective nostalgia focuses on individual memory and meditates on history and the passage of time, restorative nostalgia seeks to reconstruct that history, to restore the lost origin. It is the restorative form of nostalgia that gives birth to tradition and provides the blueprints for national

identity” (131–32). Thus, restorative nostalgia imbues the present with meaning reclaimed from the past. This view of nostalgia is reflected in rhetorical and formal patterns in Anglo-Saxon poetry.

The poet and his audience—medieval and modern—realize these forms of nostalgia through the theoretical construct of constellation, as conceived by Walter Benjamin: the nonlinear associative process of recalling a range of allusions to the historical subject or event, as one views a random cluster of stars and recognizes a constellation from their relative positions (31). The narrative, the reader, and the poet form a similar constellation. At the heart of this concept is the lively interplay of ideas traditionally in opposition to each other. Trilling indicates that her approach is more comprehensive than previous studies that focus only on formal poetic aesthetics or merely on narrative structure. In support of this integrative approach, Trilling maintains that “[s]ituated at the intersection between form and content, Anglo-Saxon historical poetry is also a nexus for a variety of interrelated binaries and the ideological processes that emerge from them: Latin and English, prose and poetry, history and legend, Christian and Germanic, sacred and secular life, and reality and representation” (22–23). Trilling shores up these binaries to frame her investigation of historical consciousness (23). Freed from hierarchy and linearity, these oppositions endow the poem with significance that resists a totalizing meaning. Her approach is unique in another way, since the arrangement of abstract ideas stays rooted in the material realm, unlike Platonic forms (31). Thus, art is artifact. Because it prompts reminiscence of the past, the art, or literary work is perceived as an object worn by time rather than in its pure state (31). The poem that most fully captures constellation theory and its application to Anglo-Saxon poetics is *The Ruin*. This poem imagines its Anglo-Saxon audience “as inhabiting the continuing presence of the past, not as succeeding or supplanting it” in contrast to the view of Christian teleological salvation, which separates past suffering from future redemption (23).

In her analysis of *Beowulf* in the introduction, Trilling applies essential concepts, which will govern her study, to poetic form and content. To frame the concept of constellation, she begins with a review of the scholarly studies of the appositive style in *Beowulf*. She argues that the half-lines pair pagan and Christian worldviews in equal tension. Their structural equivalence “defies the dominance of one world view over another” (10). Likewise, *Beowulf*’s fight with Grendel appears in between past and future narratives—the accounts

of Sigemund and the dragon and *Beowulf* and the dragon. Temporal hierarchies disappear, since the *Beowulfian* present is subordinate to neither legend nor foreshadowed future events. Trilling argues that “[t]his narrative strategy reminds the readers that *Beowulf*’s deeds have meaning not in isolation but as part of a larger constellation of events” to allow for “their simultaneous comparison and differentiation” that “resists a totalizing reading in a historical sense” (11). This thematic tension has its counterpart in the formal structure of the poetry, for Anglo-Saxon poetry is nonlinear. The half-line structure and shifting verb tenses in *Beowulf* break verbal and temporal borders. Likewise, the meter suggests continuing movement, while other poetic devices create pauses (12). As a result, Trilling’s application of formal analysis to constellation theory establishes the framework for her book.

While Chapter One provides demonstrations of constellated historiography in Anglo-Saxon secular poetry, Chapter Two focuses on Christian poetics that prompt meditation on the ultimacy of the soul, yet—even as these poems focus on salvation—they involve the reader in the immediate present. In this way, Old English poetry presents two forms of nostalgia: restorative nostalgia in secular poetry and reflective nostalgia in Christian writing. Thus, salvation history in Christian writing merges with Anglo-Saxon poetic aesthetics in the vernacular poetry. The Germanic heroic tradition in *Beowulf* and the patristic tradition in Bede’s *Historia Ecclesiastica* form two opposite ends of “the spectrum of historiographic possibilities” (21). Anglo-Saxon translations of Christian poetry richly negotiate both views of history. Each of Trilling’s chapters examines the dichotomy between past and present and how such a binary formally produces historical consciousness (23). The last two chapters examine verse forms and historiographic practices in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, spanning the ninth through the twelfth centuries from the south—in Winchester and Canterbury—to the north—in York and Worcester (25–26).

In the first chapter, “Art and History in Old English Heroic Poetry,” Trilling applies constellative analysis to the three poems *The Ruin*, *Deor*, and *Widsith*. Trilling suggests that these poems must be read as texts shaped by a range of elements “embedded in [their] textual and cultural production”—just as a manuscript may contain a range of materials, such as law codes and homilies, and bear the traces of their origins in royal courts and monastic scriptoria (35). A work accumulates meaning in the transition from an oral to a written tradition. The reader negotiates meaning to “confront not only

the historical reality of the text and the moment of its creation, but also the historicity of his own present moment”—that is, his own constructions of historical meaning (32). Thus, readers are incorporated into the constellation of meaning and become part of the “multiple sites of reception through literary history” (39). *Deor* captures multiple views and voices. It exemplifies the aesthetics of constellation in its formal use of structural recursion and allusion. The refrain prompts meditation throughout its range of elegiac voices, which embraces differences in gender, geography, history, and legend. No single speaker dominates the work. *The Ruin* likewise captures a range of differences in its elegiac meditation on the passage of time. The reader confronts tensions between decay and wholeness, death and birth, which bring the reader to a closer understanding of Anglo-Saxon concerns.

Chapter 2, “*In Principio: Origins of the Present in Anglo-Saxon Biblical Verse*,” presents the hybrid poetics of form in vernacular translations of Christian works. Trilling indicates that in this unique model of Christian writing, temporal boundaries collapse to create new constellations of meaning that will reinforce a history of salvation: “In the same way that Germanic tradition places present and past alongside each other in a constellation in order to establish meaning between them, Anglo-Saxon biblical verse juxtaposes characters like Adam, Noah, and Abraham with one another and with the poetry’s readers, thereby bringing its audience into the presence of biblical people and events” (68). Likewise in *Christ and Satan*, the narratives of Satan, Eve, and Christ are juxtaposed to emphasize the torments of Hell as they explore genealogy and the reader’s place within it (111). As Anglo-Saxon hybrids, these Christian poems—*Exodus*, *Caedmon’s Hymn*, and *Genesis A*—combine exegetical commentary with heroic diction and its tropes and themes (75). In *Exodus*, for example, the crossing of the Red Sea is described in terms of the Germanic migrations. Its primary focus is historical rather than figural, although the figural is still present. *Caedmon’s Hymn* and *Genesis A* are rich case studies for constellative historical analysis (79–101). The traditional typological reading of *Genesis A* is transformed into a constellative one, when events in the Old Testament are no longer subordinated as prefigured events. Rather, they bear the same narrative vibrancy as their New Testament counterparts to proliferate the meanings associated with each allusion in the composite text (85). In *Genesis A*, the concept of time is divided among three realms to produce three narratives—each given equal importance: the eternal God and the realms of created and fallen angels.

Through these multiple narratives, an Anglo-Saxon reader would have understood his own relationship to the divine, characterized by the heroic values of loyalty and obedience (89). When each voice is given equal importance, then the reader is more apt to read himself into the text as another participant. Just as *The Ruin* presents layers of history to memorialize the past and imbue the present with greater meaning, *Genesis A* merges the moment of creation with the narrative of causality that is reenacted throughout the ages of human history (90). In a single instance in *Genesis A* (ll. 995b–1001), the poet clusters four historical periods in the space of seven lines in order to link the audience with “divinity, humanity, the Creation and Fall, punishment, and a nascent sense of redemption” (101). In the final section of the chapter, Trilling explores the constellative structure of biblical glossing and vernacular poetry in contrast to the linearity of Ælfric’s prose. Ælfric’s singular focus on salvation separates the past from the present and contrasts with the constellative approach of the poetry (115–21).

The following chapters focus on the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* in its different versions. In Chapter Three, “Verse Memorials and the Viking Conflict,” Trilling examines the use of reflective nostalgia in Christian writing in contrast to restorative nostalgia in secular poetry to memorialize the viking conflict. Both historical ideologies reinforce Anglo-Saxon identity—one Christian and the other national. Wulfstan’s sermons focus on salvation in the tradition of Eusebius, Orosius, Gildas, and Bede. These narratives characterize invasions as divine vengeance against human sin (133–51). In contrast, Germanic heroic poetry reinforces heroic codes in the present. *The Battle of Maldon* and *The Battle of Brunanburh* from the *Chronicle* exemplify national identity and thus reify heroic values most powerfully (190).

Chapter Four, “Poetic Memory: the Canonical Verse of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*,” presents Trilling’s formal analysis of historical poetics. The A-text of the *Chronicle* combines Christian and pagan worldviews in a teleology that extends from Woden through Noah and Adam. Set in heroic verse, the genealogies “evoke a series of moments in time and show how the moments are connected by means of the formal devices of alliteration and invocation of the continuity of history” (177). Further, these layered genealogies resist a totalized reading that would privilege one version of the *Chronicle* over the others (178). The multiple perspectives capture the concept of constellative historiography. The range of styles within the texts—epideictic verse, encomia, apostrophes, and commentary—range from the heroic

to the hagiographic to further broaden this sense of multiplicity and constellation (179). In the rich analysis that follows, Trilling focuses on the prosimetrical form of the *Chronicle* (179–95). Poetry alternating with prose underscores the “shifting relations between English identity and the documentation of an English past,” which are exemplified by the heroic poems *Brunanburh*, *Maldon*, and *The Capture of the Five Boroughs* (190–203) and verses dedicated to Kings Edgar and Edward the Confessor (203–11). Because of its keen emphasis on tone, poetry captures shifts in sentiment from praise for the heroic actions of West Saxon kings to homiletic commentary on providential history in verses written to memorialize Edgar and Edward the Confessor. Although the poetic devices are similar, the tone and historical worldviews in the poetry differ greatly.

In the final chapter, “Transitional Verse in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*: Changing the Shape of History,” Trilling asserts that poetic form changes with the cultural values of the content—from the classical heroic style celebrating Wessex hegemony to rhythmical alliterative verse that challenges it. In the freer poetic style of the later northern version, “verse passages offer commentary rather than commemoration; their tone is frequently homiletic, rarely heroic; and they give voice to opinions and concerns that are critical of secular powers” (220). In the rhetoric of salvation, later writers emphasize the failures of secular kingship (251). At the center of this analysis, Trilling challenges conventional methods for evaluating poetic form. Following Thomas Bredehoft’s argument, she claims that envisioning poetry through traditional metrics restricts modern understanding of poetic aesthetics in later Old English writing (225–29).

In conclusion, poetic form is a product of cultural consciousness and identity. The poetics of nostalgia in Old English verse offers modern readers a tool by which they may observe how Anglo-Saxons understood themselves in terms of their own history. As Trilling concludes, “these poems do not adhere to an absolute separation between past and present and they do not imagine time as unidirectional. They transcend time and space to separate elements from their original contexts and recontextualize them, and when this mode is applied to history . . . the past continues to live each time it is evoked in the present” (255). In the open-ended text, the succession of readers continuously generates new meaning.

In “Stairway to Hell: Infernal Journeys in Some Old and Middle English Texts,” in *Travels and Travelogues in the Middle Ages*, ed. Jean-François Kosta-Théfaine (New York: AMS), 189–204, Katrin Rupp considers

the psychological effects of trauma and its medieval counterpart, mania, that travelers suffer after their journeys to Hell or places that simulate Hell. Rupp examines three vision narratives: those of Saints Fursey and Drihthelm from Bede’s *Ecclesiastical History* and *Tundale*, a fifteenth-century work translated from Latin. Rupp indicates that her aim is “to examine the paths that lead to this infernal otherworld and map its special geography, which has . . . a traumatic effect on the traveler” (190). In her analysis of the volcanic terrain of Hell, Rupp indicates that volcanoes are suggestive of Mount Etna in Anglo-Saxon culture, for Isidore of Seville states that Mount Etna is a site of Hell (193). The vision of a hellish place becomes more vivid in Tundale’s journey through a wild landscape that signifies the corrupt passions of the soul.

Rupp then turns to John Trevisa’s fourteenth-century Middle English treatise, *On the Properties of Things*, and specifically to the threefold model of the brain, which he adapted from theories set forth by Galen and Aristotle. In this model of the brain, the first cell is the imagination, which receives sensory information. The second cell—the domain of reason—processes the sensory input. The third cell, memory, stores the information. Each traveler encounters violent and vivid images that bombard his imagination. As a result, the traveler suffers the “passions of the soul” that Trevisa describes (199). Each responds by withdrawing “from the noise of the world” (199). Likewise, Rupp asserts, the travelers change their eating habits—a behavior associated with modern notions of trauma (199). Rupp acknowledges that fasting and retreating from the world are monastic behaviors assumed by Saints Fursey and Drihthelm after their journeys, but she emphasizes that these behaviors conform to modern theories of trauma—seen in eating disorders—and Trevisa’s late-medieval theory of mania or retreat from the world. While Anglo-Saxonists may well question the relevance of Trevisa’s theory and its application to Anglo-Saxon thought, readers will appreciate the ways in which Trevisa’s description of the mind sheds light on Tundale’s tormented mind—besieged as it is by visions of murderous souls melting in iron, the greedy beast devouring the covetous, gluttons eating vermin, and snakes slithering through the orifices of lechers (196). In the Anglo-Saxon works, Rupp seems to argue that these medieval vision narratives document the effects of trauma before either the late medieval or modern theories described them.

Mary T. Welch presents a broad survey of poetic and prose forms in Christian writing from *Cædmon’s Hymn* through the homilies of Ælfric and Wulfstan in

her English master's thesis at the University of Central Oklahoma, "Early English Religious Literature: The Development of the Genres of Poetry, Narrative, and Homily." She finds that prose sermons achieve the richest synthesis of rhetorical devices adapted from poetic oral tradition (7). As Welch suggests, "[t]he gradual changes in style and technique that occurred from Bede through Ælfric and Wulfstan . . . show a progression of the genre" (99). These sermons revitalize oral techniques to produce a new literary language that flourishes well beyond the Norman Conquest (104). To chart the progression of stylistic and formulaic development, Welch examines three genres: Old English poetry, including *Cædmon's Hymn*, the *Dream of the Rood*, and *Genesis B*; prose narrative in the prose *Andreas*; and homilies (7). The homilies range from Bede's "Allegory of Mercy and Justice" to those of Ælfric and Wulfstan. In her examination, Welch focuses on Christian and pagan influences in the poetry, such as the parallel structure in Anglo-Saxon poetry imitative of the structure of biblical verse (21). She examines Christian and pagan elements in the *Dream of the Rood* (52–52). In the second half of the study, she turns her attention to the growth of prose during King Alfred's reign to closely examine the influence of oral techniques and rhetorical style on poetic style.

In his doctoral dissertation at the University of Notre Dame, "The Psychology of Wisdom in Old English Poetry," Corey J. Zwikstra takes a lexical approach to the study of wisdom literature, as he examines the lexemes *snotor*, *gleaw*, *frod*, and *wis* and finds that their use in collocations and phrases signifies mental actions fulfilled in speech. In combination with other words, these lexemes operate as psychological catalysts (196–97). Mental actions make the mind comprehensible to others, since "[t]he mind is what it does" (4). Anglo-Saxons understood wisdom through the mental acts associated with it. These descriptions of wisdom by Anglo-Saxon writers should be central to the modern classification of the genre of wisdom literature. As a result of his findings, Zwikstra calls for a revision of the canon of wisdom literature, so that all works within it explore wisdom applied to mental acts and speech. Challenging conventional characterizations of wisdom literature as too restrictive, he states, "I do not agree that Old English wisdom literature is essentially a matter of syntactical structures and generalized or universal expressions . . . What is needed is a study of wisdom in Old English that is . . . not so small that it dwells on overly local structures like maxims, proverbs, gnomes and their formal characteristics" but views the genre in terms of "lexical wisdom" (2). Zwikstra presents comprehensive

data for each lexeme and its related forms, drawn from the *Dictionary of Old English* database. He appeals to these findings for close readings of numerous texts—often revealing *hapax legomena* in various works—that indicate the range of acts associated with wisdom in the mind. He also compares Anglo-Saxon perceptions of the psychology of wisdom with modern theories of learning in four chapters: Chapter One, "*Snottor on Mode: Snotor in its Intellectual Context*"; Chapter 2, "*Boca Gleaw: Gleaw—for Learning, Teaching, or Salvation?*"; Chapter 3, "*Wintrum Frod: Frod and the Aging Mind*"; and Chapter 4, "*Word ond Wisdom: Wis and the Fulfillment of Wisdom Through Speech.*"

Each chapter analyzes mental actions related to wisdom such as memory, reflection, learning, and speaking. For example, using the phrase *snottor on mode* to signify intellectual activity is uniquely poetic in contrast to its strictly moral value in prose (24). Poetic collocations that add intellectual and performative actions to the concept of *snotor* include *ðancsnottor*, *rædsnottor*, and *hygesnottor* (27). In contrast, its meaning is restricted to 'prudence' or 'discretion' in prose works, including the homilies of Ælfric, the Benedictine Rule, and glosses to the Psalms.

Zwikstra asserts that wisdom in the Anglo-Saxon poetic imagination is shaped by a combination of academic works on the moral value of wisdom—found, for example, in the *Distichs of Cato* from Anglo-Saxon schools and also from the poets' habits of thought (48). Zwikstra applies Benjamin Bloom's taxonomy of the hierarchy of mental actions to his analysis of the poet's artistic process. Bloom's taxonomy includes memory, organization, application of learned material, comparison, synthesis, and evaluation (48). Analysis allows poets to break apart and recreate structures, synthesis inspires creativity, and through evaluation poets internalize and repeat material through habitual preference (50).

Just as *snotor* signifies moral value in prose works, so does *gleaw* (58). Yet, as examined in Chapter 2, *gleaw* conveys religious wisdom and bears a close relationship to speech as the fulfillment of wisdom in the poetry. Poetic compounds such as *ægleaw* 'law-wise' and *cræftgleaw* 'skillful' or 'learned' suggest learning and teaching (58–68). The *hapax* compounds *wordgleaw* in *Daniel* (ll. 416b–17a) and *gereordgleawnes* in the Lambeth Psalter (32.2–3) further emphasize its close tie to speech (68–69). The remainder of the chapter closely examines the phrase *boca gleaw*, which refers specifically to the biblical wisdom literature at the core of the Anglo-Saxon school curriculum (77–96).

The lexeme *frod*, examined in Chapter 3, is an exclusively poetic word that signifies age in combination with wisdom or intellectual maturity. In reference to age, Zwikstra observes, “[w]hereas Old English prose tends to focus on the body and associate old age with decline, Old English poetry . . . focuses on the mind and associates old age . . . with increase” (101). Ultimately, the mental age associated with *frod* is positive, for it rewards the perseverance required to survive into old age (114). Zwikstra examines the “winter” of mature age in the topos of the ages of man, which inscribes the human life within a seasonal progression. The fruit of wisdom learned through life experience is wise counsel, as shown in poems such as *The Battle of Maldon*, *Daniel*, *Andreas*, *Elene* and *The Wanderer*.

In his study of the lexeme *wis* in Chapter 4, Zwikstra discusses its earliest Indo-European associations with vision and then explores its unique use in Old English, where the lexeme *wis* is associated with speech and hearing, not seeing (136). This finding supports his larger claim that Anglo-Saxon literature highlights speech as the goal of wisdom. In the catalogue of wise teachers and counselors associated with the term, certain figures pass on their learning to their students, who in turn speak wisely to others. This is demonstrated by the Virgin Mary in Ælfric’s homiletic *Nativity of the Virgin Mary* (178–79) and St. Paul in Æthelwold’s *Anglo-Saxon Benedictine Rule* (81–82).

While these lexemes appear in both prose and poetry, Zwikstra primarily focuses on poetry, which fluidly merges wisdom with mental actions. He rightly asserts that the Anglo-Saxons most likely inherited the idiom of thought as spoken words from biblical rhetoric. How would Zwikstra revise the canon of wisdom literature to include works that conform to this notion of wisdom? He would add *Elene*, *Daniel*, *Andreas*, and *Christ B*, and he would discard *Homiletic Fragment II*, *Charms*, *Latin-English Proverbs*, *A Proverb from Winfrid’s Time*, the *Rune Poem*, and *The Fortunes of Men* (201–202).

KL

Works Not Seen

Boryśławski, Rafał. “Slash and Burn? The Rhetoric of the Conquered City in Anglo-Saxon Didactic Verse.” *Images of the City*. Eds. Agnieszka Rasmus and Magdalena Cieślak. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars, 2009. pp. 38–49.

———. “Twist and Turn: On the Visual Rhetoric of Old English Variation.” *Pe Laurer of Oure Englische Tonge*. *Medieval English Mirror* 5. Eds. Marcin Krygier,

Liliana Sikorska, Magdalena Cieślak and Lukasz Hudomiet. Peter Lang, 2009. pp. 127–39.

Bredehoft, Thomas A. *Authors, Audiences, and Old English Verse*. Toronto Anglo-Saxon Series 5. U of Toronto P, 2009. xviii + 237 pp.

Clark, David. “Old English Literature and Same-Sex Desire: An Overview.” *Literature Compass* 6.3 (2009), 573–84.

Dumitrescu, Irina Alexandra. “The Instructional Moment in Anglo-Saxon Literature.” Ph.D. Diss. Yale Univ., 2009. [Proquest 3361905]

Griffiths, Bill. “The Start of Everything Wonderful: The Old English Poetry of Northumbria.” *Northumbria: History and Identity 547–2000*. Ed. Colls. [see sect. 7] pp. 33–47.

Kessler, Rachel C. “Reading Gnostic Phenomena in Old English Literature.” Ph.D. Diss. Univ. of Toronto, 2008. [Proquest NR44797]

Reading, Amity Alissa. “Soul and Body: Reading the Anglo-Saxon Self through the Vercelli Book.” Ph.D. Diss. Univ. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2009. [Proquest 3399027]

Roberts, Jane. “On the Dissapearance of Old English.” *The Kemble Lectures on Anglo-Saxon Studies*. Ed. Roberts. [see sect. 2] pp. 12–44. [Kemble lecture for 2005]

Solopova, Elizabeth. “Alliteration and Prosody in Old and Middle English.” *Approaches to the Metres of Alliterative Verse*. Leeds Texts and Monographs, n.s. 17. Eds. Judith Jefferson and Ad Putter. Leeds: School of English, Univ. of Leeds, 2009. pp. 25–39.

Stanley, Eric. “Fear, Mainly in Old English.” *The Kemble Lectures on Anglo-Saxon Studies*. Ed. Roberts. [see sect. 2] pp. 46–63. [Kemble lecture for 2006]

———. “The Uneven Length of Old English Metrical Half-Lines.” *Studi anglo-norreni in onore di John S. McKinnell*. Ed. Ruggerini. [see sect. 2] pp. 32–40.

Valtonen, Irmeli. “On Descriptions and Perceptions of the North in Ancient and Early Medieval Geography.” *NOWELE* 56/57 (2009), 53–87.

Wilcox, Jonathan. “The Ghost of M.I. Steblin-Kamen-skij: Interpreting Old English Literature through Saga Theory.” *Anglo-Saxons and the North*. Eds. Kilpiö, Kahlas-Tarkka, Roberts, and Timofeeva. [see sect. 2] pp. 131–49.

4B: INDIVIDUAL POEMS (EXCLUDING *BEOWULF*)

Andreas

In “Demythologising Urban Landscapes in *Andreas*,” *Leeds Studies in English* 40: 105–18, Michael D. Bintley

argues that the Anglo-Saxon poetic corpus records a shift in attitude about the ruined cities abandoned by the Romans in the fifth century. These stone structures were viewed as alien by early Germanic settlers in Britain, who built using timber, not rock, and this stance persisted throughout the migration and conversion periods (108). The author cites archeological evidence suggesting that the Anglo-Saxons consciously avoided the repurposing of former Roman settlements, preferring instead to maintain “the organizing principles of Germanic society” (108). The resistance to reusing Roman buildings indicated by the archeological record is reflected in Anglo-Saxon poetry, as well, especially in works like *Beowulf*, *The Ruin*, and *The Wanderer*, all of which depict such edifices in largely derogatory terms (though Bintley recognizes that it can be difficult to establish an early date of composition for all of the poems he lists). But this position, Bintley finds, begins to change in the late ninth century as a response to a “[t]he transformation of the rural Anglo-Saxon settlement landscape to one that was dominated by urban centres of power,” a transformation brought on by factors including “population growth, economic development, and the Viking activity” (113). Viking activity is especially important in this process since it prompted “both ecclesiastical and secular authorities to centralise power for the benefit of both the general populace and their rulers” (113–4). “This conceptual resettlement,” Bintley argues, “required a significant reimagining of the sorts of derelict urban landscapes found in *The Ruin* and *The Wanderer*” (114). The author finds in *Andreas*, a poem likely written at a time contemporary with this shift in attitude, another example of this reimagining, specifically in the way it depicts the “cleansing” of Mermedonia (114). Early in the poem, the city is described using terms reminiscent of those found in *The Ruin* and *Beowulf*: stone buildings as alien, the *enta geweorc*. After *Andreas* unleashes the flood upon the city and washes away its evil character, however, these descriptions change in notable ways. The city is now referred to as a *beorhtan byrig* (‘bright city’), a *goldburg* (‘golden city’), and a *wynbyrig* (‘wine city’) (117).

Alexandra Bolinteanu, “The Land of Mermedonia in the Old English *Andreas*,” *Neophilologus* 93: 149–64, explains, following the work of several other critics, that the *Andreas*-poet distances the Mermedonians from the civilized, Christian West by describing their savage customs, especially cannibalism, and through the depiction of their land as inexorably foreign and remote. Notably, the author suggests, the *Andreas*-poet establishes this difference “at much greater length and with much greater intensity” than the other analogues

of the poem (150). While the Greek and Latin analogues of *Andreas* also describe the cannibalistic tendencies of the Mermedonians, they do so in ways that suggest a good deal of thought is involved, which perhaps to some degree humanizes them: the Mermedonians in these texts have engineered a complex system ensuring that the consumption of human bodies will be at its most efficient. The Mermedonians in the Old English poem, by contrast, engage in a cannibalism that is frenzied and without restraint: “Underscoring this abnormal diet even further, the *Andreas*-poet makes his Mermedonians’ grisly consumption of human beings vivid through an anatomical view of the process, a view that invites the reader to imagine the Mermedonians eating their victims layer by anatomical layer—first the blood, then the skin, and then the underlying flesh” (152). Likewise, Bolinteanu argues that poet emphasizes the remoteness and wildness of Mermedonia to a greater degree than any of its analogues: it is both *igland* and *mearcland*, two apparently contradictory terms that together suggest geographical, cultural, and moral distance (154). And regarding the urban landscape of Mermedonia, Bolinteanu, like Bintley, also notes the negative connotation associated with terms used to describe the buildings found there. *Andreas*, the author argues, works to “correct” these two primary affronts, first by twice preventing the Mermedonians from engaging in cannibalism, and later, through his partial martyrdom, cleansing the city and rendering it more like the Christian West from which it had remained so distant. *Andreas* also oversees the transformation of pagan sites into churches and, in doing so, rehabilitates both this once-alien region and its people. This transformation is all the more impressive, Bolinteanu suggests, because of the poet’s earlier efforts to depict the Mermedonians and their environment as irredeemably savage.

Shannon Godlove, “Bodies as Borders: Cannibalism and Conversion in the Old English *Andreas*,” *Studies in Philology* 106.2: 137–60, employs “[c]ontemporary theories of the body and incorporation” to demonstrate not only the link between cannibalism and conversion in the poem, but also the link between Mermedonians and Jews, two similarly non-Christian Others (138). The poem does this, Godlove argues, “through its use of shifting metaphors of incorporation, that is, by focusing on images of the physical and spiritual assimilation of human beings, first into the bodies of other humans and subsequently into the communal body of the Church” (138). Godlove notes that in the depiction of the Mermedonians, the *Andreas*-poet is careful not to render them as wholly alien, since doing so would

preclude their eventual conversion. He accomplishes this “by presenting the Mermedonians’ own very literal act of incorporation—their ritualistic anthropophagy—as a parodic version of the Christian ritual of the Eucharist”: an action that Godlove, quoting Maggie Kilgour, recognizes as participating in a “delicate balance of simultaneous identification and separation” (140).

While the Mermedonians are described as consuming both foreign prisoners—generally Christians—and members of their own community, their preference seems to lie with the former. Before eating them, however, the Mermedonians first remove their humanity, and thus bring them closer to identification with their barbaric captors. This cultural incorporation is only later rendered literal when the Mermedonians consume them, piece by piece. In her discussion of this practice, Godlove explains that “[f]or the Mermedonians, the Christian foreigner stands opposed to their bestial and demonic ‘civilization,’ and they police their borders by capturing, converting (in the sense of changing), and literally consuming the ‘fearsome Other’ whose existence challenges their way of being” (146). Godlove also demonstrates how the Mermedonians’ paradoxical existence as simultaneously bestial and civilized is evident in their use of writing technology, as well. “[W]riting signifies civilization,” she notes, “but their perversion of this technology”—by using it to indicate the freshness of their prisoners, and thus their suitability for literal incorporation—“marks another boundary between them and the Christians outside” (146).

In the next section of the essay, Godlove suggests that the *Andreas*-poet establishes a connection between the Mermedonians and the Jews through several features they share—“their literality, their use of magic, and their carnality symbolized by cannibalism” (148)—which returns her to the central question of precisely whose conversion is being effected. She goes on to explain that “[t]he conflation of the Mermedonians and the Jews through accusations of cannibalism paradoxically works to define the boundaries of the Christian community even as it disturbs the easy differentiation of ‘good’ from ‘bad’ motives for incorporation. The implicit similarities between the doctrine of the Eucharist as the real blood and body of Christ and the Mermedonians’ ingestion of the real blood and body of Christians creates an uncomfortable tension that is difficult to resolve” (150).

Andreas’s body, which undergoes extreme torture at the hands of the Mermedonians, is the focus of the final portion of this piece. Godlove argues that its “dislocation . . . seems to be the most horrific part of this torture, because it implies the vulnerability of the body, and by

analogy, the vulnerability of the Christian body of the Church to invasion, dispersion and destruction” (155). The subsequent healing of the apostle’s wounds—the knitting together of his disjointed body—“recalls both Christ’s resurrection and the image of Christ’s body as universal, unifying Church” (155). The description of the flood that Andreas calls forth after he is healed picks up the poet’s use of incorporation metaphors: it “functions simultaneously as a baptism and a kind of Eucharistic experience—they [the Mermedonians] take in water and are taken in by it,” and as such, “[t]he threat of the Others, the pagans and the Jews, is neutralized” (158).

■ *Battle of Maldon*

In “An Anglo-Norman Nun: An Old English *Gnome*,” *N&Q* n.s. 56: 16–18, Jane Bliss briefly examines a possible connection between the twelfth-century *Vie d’Edouard le Confesseur*, a translation and adaptation of Ælred’s Latin text by a nun of Barking Abbey, and *The Battle of Maldon*. Specifically, Bliss identifies a short passage describing a dying Edward, which she translates as “As his body grew weaker, so his heart strengthened itself the more,” with the famous words spoken by Byrhtwold toward the end of the Anglo-Saxon poem. The line that appears in the *Vie d’Edouard* is absent from its source, leaving Bliss to wonder about the nun’s reason for including it and also to consider a larger question about knowledge of Old English literature in Anglo-Norman England. It stands to reason, Bliss argues, that *The Battle of Maldon* is a particularly good candidate for such an inquiry, not just because Byrhtnoth’s popularity persisted beyond the Anglo-Saxon period, especially in religious circles, but because of “the widespread interest in the twelfth century concerning the Anglo-Saxon past” (17). In the end, though, Bliss is cautious about her findings, suggesting that the anonymous nun probably did not come across Byrhtwold’s speech in its original setting, but rather that it seems “very likely that it had some kind of proverbial status that has not been recorded” (18).

■ *Charms*

Debby Banham’s short essay, “The Old English Nine Herbs Charm,” *Medieval Christianity in Practice*, ed. Miri Rubin (Princeton: Princeton UP), 189–93, introduces Edward Pettit’s translation of the *Nine Herbs Charm* and addresses some of the major challenges one faces when reading it. These include understanding the connection between the plants mentioned in the text of the charm itself and those described in the instructions

that accompany it; reconciling the presence of several apparent internal contradictions in the text; and determining the relationship between Christian and non-Christian elements.

In "An Arithmetical Crux in the Woden Passage in the Old English *Nine Herbs Charm*," *Neophilologus* 93: 691–702, László Sándor Chardonnens identifies a fourth arithmetical crux to add to the three that have been long discussed, which concern "the exact number of herbs, poisons and infections enumerated in the charm" (692): the number of pieces of the snake mentioned in the Woden passage. Woden strikes the snake with nine *wuldortanas*, which should, Chardonnens explains, split the snake into ten parts. The text, however, clearly indicates that there are only nine. The author acknowledges that the compiler's reason for equating the number of wonder-twigs and snake-pieces might rest in the fact that "he was more interested in numerical parallelism (sympathetic magic) or number symbolism than in arithmetical exactitude" (696). But Chardonnens offers an alternate explanation: if the snake was circular—that is, engaged in biting its own tail—and not linear, then the nine *wuldortanas* would produce nine parts, one of them consisting of head + tail. (The author includes two figures containing images of variously chopped-up snakes.) Literary and material evidence suggests that the Anglo-Saxons knew of circular snakes, which makes this solution to the fourth arithmetic crux a plausible one.

Kevin Teo Kia-Choong examines the applied function of Old English charms "for a society which was highly plagued by high mortality rates and low life expectancy" (70) in "Practical Magic and the Literary Archaeology of the Pagan Past in Two Anglo-Saxon Charms," *In Geardagum* 29: 69–84. In his study, Kia-Choong includes an analysis of the *Nine Herbs Charm* and the charm "Against late birth," and argues that to separate pagan and Christian elements in the texts, as many critics have sought to do, is unnecessary. Instead, readers should work to understand how these two elements function in tandem, as in the homology between Christ and Odin in the *Nine Herbs Charm*. That charm "stands as a test-case of Anglo-Saxon magical medicine, a body of knowledge with its own cultural ways of thinking as distinct from our own, where Christian scribes conscientiously adapt pagan-Germanic beliefs and motifs for early medieval Christian use in a context of healing" (79). A similar syncretic, practical performance is at work in the "Against late birth" charm, Kia-Choong suggests, another text that demonstrates an "assimilation of both worldviews through both spoken word and action" (80). This charm "shifts in between these two

modes of belief, between oral pre-Christian Germanic culture rooted in fertility magic, and Christian worship wherein the prayer before the altar is meant as a part of the confessional rite" in ways that "are not diametrically opposed to each other" (84).

Andrew Rabin, "Hypermetric Verse in an Old English Charm against Theft," *N&Q* n.s. 56: 483–85, seeks to add the coda of a charm against theft to the catalogue of Old English hypermetric verse. The lines in question, which represent a translation and revision from an earlier Latin text, shift the emphasis from hiding a crime to the punishment that attends it. Following the guidelines for scanning hypermetric verse established by Gregory Russom and Thomas Bredehoft, Rabin identifies the second and third lines of the coda as "clear examples of 'standard' or 'Type 1' versification" (484). The first line is more complicated and can be scanned as either a "Type 1" or a "Type 3" verse. In contemplating the reason the redactor chose to render these lines in hypermetric verse, as opposed to a more expected verse form, Rabin posits that he was "fluent in Latin, conversant with Old English poetic norms, and—if we accept [Stephanie] Hollis' argument concerning the thematic re-orientation of the incantation—mindful of concerns central to the legal texts with which it would be grouped" (485).

■ *Christ II*

In a short essay, "A Reference to Martyrdom in Cynewulf's Ascension Poem (*Christ II*, 679a)," *ANQ* 22.2: 5–8, Alfred Bammesberger reevaluates one section of the "gifts of men" section found in lines 664–82 of *Christ II*: the reference to tree-climbing in 678b–79a ("Sum mæg heanne beam / stælgne gestigan"). The difficulty of interpreting this section rests, Bammesberger argues, in the analysis of the adjective *stælgne*, which critics have generally understood as meaning 'steep' (5). While this definition can stand, it should be accompanied by an alternative, "the figurative meaning of 'sheer', in the sense of 'unmitigated'" (6). The ascension described here, then, could be a reference to martyrdom, which Bammesberger believes was "germane to Cynewulf's thinking" (7).

■ *Deor, Widsith, The Ruin*

David N. Klausner, "Petitionary Poetry in Old English and Early Welsh: *Deor, Widsið, Dadolwch Urien*," *Poetry, Place, and Gender*, ed. Karkov [see sec. 2], 197–210, argues that *Deor* is more than just a poem memorializing loss and seeking consolation, as modern critical readings have generally maintained. While scholars

have attempted to advance alternative interpretations over the years, many of which aim to position the poem in a generic category beyond consolation, including “begging, reconciliation, blame,” they have not done so convincingly, “because the new genre has been too narrowly defined” (198). Klausner proposes a new category, petitionary poetry, which he defines as poetry “written with the purpose—explicit or implicit—of extracting something from a patron” (198). This genre reached its height in Wales during the later Middle Ages, but appears earlier, as well. One early incarnation is the *dadolwch*, a petition poem that seeks reconciliation with a patron, as seen in the sixth-century *Dadolwch Urien* attributed to Taliesin. Klausner points to centuries of contact and conflict between the Welsh and the Germanic people who became the Anglo-Saxons to account for such literary “cross-pollination” (209).

Before examining *Deor* closely, however, Klausner undertakes an analysis of *Widsið*, another poem whose genre has long been disputed. The *Widsið*-poet, though he ranges widely through diverse subject matter, still devotes a “substantial part of the poem” to “patronal generosity” (205). While Klausner recognizes it is difficult to determine what the poet seeks from his patron—unlike the more direct fictional *scop* depicted in the narrative of the poem itself—he argues that the allusive quality of the text suggests the poet does not seek goods, but a job: “the intention of the lists is to tantalize the audience/potential patron with a plethora of possible story-material” (206). *Deor*, Klausner suggests, which also offers an impressive breadth of story telling possibility, performs a similar function. It is not simply a “begging” poem; instead, the poet “presents his credentials in a petitionary stance, hoping only by inference for a position” (209).

Renée R. Trilling, “Ruins in the Realm of Thoughts: Reading as Constellation in Anglo-Saxon Poetry,” *JEGP* 108: 141–67, in an essay that undertakes close examinations of *Deor* and *The Ruin*, argues for the benefit of applying Walter Benjamin’s model of the constellation to the study of Old English verse. “In the critical constellation that Benjamin describes,” Trilling explains, “concepts, rather than stars, appear to the critic in such a way that their relative arrangement is suddenly perceived as meaningful and becomes an image, or idea” (143). Reading in this way enables critics to approach texts afresh. For example, since “the constellation’s engagement with concepts is not linear,” it enables “the critic to avoid assigning hierarchies of privilege or precedence” (143). It also “honors a commitment to the idea of aesthetic sensibility while simultaneously demanding a more materialist

treatment of the work of art as historical artifact” (143). For this reason, Benjamin invokes the image of the ruin as a hallmark of his approach, since it “embod[ies] both the image of original wholeness and the reality of present decay, and . . . connects the past moment of its creation to the present moment of its reception through the dialectical mediation of two temporally separated contexts” (143). Regarding the utility of Benjamin’s model for her own critical purpose, Trilling states that “[t]he constellation is not just a way for an artist to offer a moment of reflection on the relationship between past, present and future, although it is that. It is also a means by which modern readers might begin to apprehend meanings in individual texts, not in a necessarily vague historical context or through medieval mentalities that we cannot recreate, but rather as constellations of aesthetic fragments that afford an opportunity for creative and philosophical reflection, and that embody in their ruinous state the accumulation of cultural and critical history up to and including the present. It may even serve as a salutary reminder that the problems encountered in studying medieval literature are hardly foreign to modernity, either” (145).

In her study of *Deor*, Trilling focuses primarily on two of its most prominent features: “its copious reference to Germanic legend, and its use of a stanza-refrain structure” (152), which together evoke a set of allusions to myth that occur and recur in a fragmentary way. Reading the poem through Benjamin’s idea of the constellation helps organize these fragments, however contingently: the constellation “illuminates and refracts the poem’s formal elements, giving shape to meaning and anchoring that meaning through the repeated philosophical refrain; deep ruminative currents run below its carefully constructed surface, constellating a meditation on transience from a series of individual examples of suffering” (153). Read in this way, “events have meaning in *Deor* not because of their place in a linear progression from past to present, but because of their associative connections and relations to other events from other places on the chronological spectrum” (155). But in the end, the piece does not resolve itself, and the “desire for the consolation of a totalizing meaning remains unfulfilled” (158). Trilling argues, however, that this frustration is borne from an abundance of possible meaning, not a lack: “the promise of inexhaustible possibility is the final consolation that the poem affords, even if it is not precisely the consolation that is sought” (158).

Reading *The Ruin* in a similar manner challenges the widely held interpretation that the poem is primarily a study in nostalgia. While nostalgia is certainly one

interest of the poem, Trilling notes that it is also about the immediate present: its “emphasis is on simultaneity rather than linearity; the past may be something separate and foreign, but it is something that constitutes a part of the present as well” (160). Additionally, “[r]eading the poem through the figure of the constellation . . . can bring us closer to the problems and concerns of the Anglo-Saxons without subsuming them into purely modern categories of analysis” (161). The poem studiously avoids a rigid temporality; instead, by “[o]scillating continually between present and past, the speaker’s (and, by extension, the reader’s) thoughts do not belong to a particular historical moment” (164). By unceasingly affirming the connection between past and present, “its final image is not one of destruction, decay, or ruin, but rather of the very full lives of the people who once inhabited this spot: it ends, not in nostalgia, but redemption” (164).

GD

■ *Dream of the Rood*

Alfred Bammesberger offers a succinct review of “*Fusæ* in the Runic Inscription on the *Ruthwell Cross*,” *N&Q* 56: 7–9. Bammesberger revisits J. M. Kemble’s work in the mid-nineteenth century on the *Ruthwell Cross*’s runic inscription and concludes that although Kemble misreads the line *æththilæ til ænum* as *æththilæ ti lænum*, his previous translation of the larger passage is credible. Bammesberger notes that Kemble was most likely unaware of the *Ruthwell Cross*’s connection to the *Dream of the Rood* because information on the *Vercelli Book* only became available after Kemble had written his translation of the inscription. Bammesberger’s brief analysis focuses mostly on *fusæ*, and he concludes that the word serves different functions in the *Ruthwell Crucifixion* poem and the *Dream of the Rood*. He argues that the mention of *fusæ* at l. 57 in the *Rood*-poem is adjectival, whereas *fusæ* is adverbial in the *Ruthwell Cross* poem. Thus, Kemble’s early translation should be reconsidered, despite his lack of access to the *Rood*-poem. Bammesberger’s brief analysis further explores the connection and differences between the *Ruthwell Cross* and the *Rood*-poem and offers a reminder that revisiting old scholarship can shed new light on old material.

In “The *Passio Andreae* and *The Dream of the Rood*,” *ASE* 38: 1–10, Thomas D. Hill argues that *The Dream of the Rood*-poet used the apocryphal *Passio Andreae* as a model for his narrative. Hill acknowledges that recent scholarship has identified some relationship between the two texts; however, “the significance

of such a claim is determined at least in part by the number of details in the derivative or target text which can be explained in relationship to the source, and these scholars do not offer a detailed discussion” (2). Hill establishes a connection between the *Rood*-poem and the *Passio Andreae* through an analysis of their respective narratives of the history of the cross. He discovers that the *Rood*-poem’s account “is paralleled exactly in the *Passio Andreae*” (6). His comparative analysis identifies key points in both texts that reveal similar tropes; in the *Passio Andreae*, for instance, “Andreas, like Christ in *The Dream of the Rood*, went of his own free will to the place of execution” (8). To conclude, Hill contends that since the *Rood*-poem is a “narrative of cosmological triumph and human suffering, and the poet in effect ‘split’ the Deus-Homo . . . the *Passio Andreae* provided an authoritative model for the apparently innovative narrative of *The Dream of the Rood*.” Despite the copious amount of scholarly attention, which *The Dream of the Rood* receives, this paper offers fresh insights into the poem’s sources and narrative connections.

Andy Orchard considers various parallels within and outside of the *Vercelli Book* in an attempt to reveal the popularity of *The Dream of the Rood* in Anglo-Saxon England. In “The *Dream of the Rood*: Cross-References,” *New Readings in the Vercelli Book*, 225–53, Orchard commends the poet for his “sheer artistry and brilliance” and highlights various poetic techniques that attest to scholars’ continued admiration for the poem as well as ongoing (re)considerations (228). Orchard compares *The Dream of the Rood* to other *Vercelli Book* poems, including *Elene* and *Andreas*, as well as to some Old English riddles and to the *Ruthwell Cross* inscription. Orchard also examines the features of the Anglo-Latin *enigmata* as discussed in Aldhelm’s seventh-century *De metris*. Orchard argues that the poem’s continued transmission and transmutation over at least three centuries during the Anglo-Saxon period are testimony to its popularity, as some Anglo-Saxons “sought to echo its scintillating words in ways that make sense only if the poem was widely known” (253). His hypotheses about textual transmission and dissemination are intriguing and will no doubt stimulate further analysis concerning not only the various poetic and narrative features of *The Dream of the Rood* but also audience reception over time.

The number of speakers and their obscured individuality in the *Rood*-poem is discussed in Dongill Lee’s “The Implication of the *Dream Vision*: Transformation and Coalescence of Speakers in “The *Dream of the Rood*,” *Medieval and Early Modern*

English Studies 17: 17–39. Lee identifies four speakers: the dreamer, the speaking tree, the cross, and Christ. The speakers' respective voices become obscured and ambiguous as their roles overlap, and Lee argues that this coalescence of voices achieves a unified narrative. This unity does not necessarily mean that the text's converging voices share the same identity, however. Lee's textual analysis offers insight into the various speakers in *The Dream of the Rood*. The original article was written in Korean, although an English translation is available.

■ *Poems of the Vercelli Book*

The soul's figurative journey to Heaven is the focus of Patrick McBrine's "The Journey Motif in the Poems of the Vercelli Book" in *New Readings in the Vercelli Book*, 298–317. McBrine's examination of the six Vercelli poems—*Andreas*, *The Fates of the Apostles*, *Soul and Body I*, *Homiletic Fragment I*, *The Dream of the Rood*, and *Elene*—identifies words and phrases in all of the texts that bear a larger thematic message which permeates the poetic collection presented in the Vercelli Book. The word *sið* 'journey' is examined in each of the Vercelli poems, and McBrine argues that all of the poems "strive to leave this impression of hopefulness, despite their persistent emphasis on earthy sorrows" (317). Each poem contains narrative elements that deal with personal struggle; for instance, *Andreas's* spiritual battle, the plight of the apostles, the narrator's sufferings and the poet-persona's grief in the *Rood*-poem, and the journey-motif altogether serve to "persuade the audience to prepare their souls for Heaven." Although there is still much to be said about the relationship between the texts as they exist in the Vercelli Book, McBride reveals "at least one point of convergence among the poems." Combining a linguistic and literary analysis, this chapter offers a thought-provoking consideration of the thematic structure and compilation of the Vercelli Book as a whole, while it also illuminates the journey-motif's significance in terms of the Christian message of Salvation, which is evident in a number of Old English poems.

MR-O

■ *Elene*

In her study of *Elene*, "Things in Doubt: *Inventio*, Dialectic, and Jewish Secrets in Cynewulf's *Elene*," *JEGP* 108: 449–80, Christina M. Heckman argues that the True Cross, the object sought after so diligently by the poem's protagonist, is more than a tangible symbol of

Christ's suffering. It is also "an intersection through which arguments supporting Christianity are discovered" (449). The Jews who keep the secret of its location, then, are not just preventing access to an object, but to knowledge, as well. The Cross, kept hidden by the inaccessible knowledge of the Jews, represents for Heckman the literal crux of the argument. By finding it—through a literal and figurative process of *inventio*—*Elene* has the potential not just to establish the foundations of Christianity without doubt, but to expand the wisdom-seeking potential of the religion beyond its current, limited state. Yet she is ultimately thwarted from identifying the location of the Cross solely through dialectical exchange, or *disputatio*, her first method for attempting to gain the knowledge she seeks, and must rely instead on the torture of Judas Cyriacus to achieve her goal. This reliance, Heckman suggests, shows the limits of the dialectical approach before conversion, when Christian and Jewish wisdom will be integrated. With the *inventio* of the Cross later in the poem comes the potential "to lay all doubts about the truth of Christianity to rest," since now "further proofs can emerge from the discovery of new arguments in support of the truth of Christ" (475). What *Elene* reveals, then, is that Christianity must embrace Jewish wisdom, and also "that Christian learning cannot sustain itself, but rather must depend on the coercive power of secular authority to support its pursuit of truth" (479).

GD

■ *Homiletic Fragment*

The neglected *Homiletic Fragment I* of the Vercelli Book is examined in detail by Jonathan T. Randle in "The 'Homiletics' of the Vercelli Book Poems: The Case of Homiletic Fragment I" in *New Readings in the Vercelli Book*, ed. Zacher and Orchard (see section 4c). By analyzing the poem's structure and linguistic features and by drawing comparisons with analogous homiletic texts, Randle reveals that "the poem sits squarely within the homiletic context of the *Vercelli Book* as a whole" (185). Additionally, Randle argues that the poet "employs three prevalent techniques—biblical quotation, aural repetition, and the central metaphor of the bee" in order to emphasize the poem's main theme: the negative portrayal of deceitful men (189). Randle also traces this theme through other Old English poems such as *The Battle of Maldon*, *Beowulf*, *Precepts*, and *Vainglory* (187). Here, Randle offers many engaging examples of Old English texts that use literary techniques similar to the composer of *Homiletic Fragment I* to emphasize the theme of deceitful men (e.g. 190–95). He also

compares the fragment to Old English texts that liken deceivers to a bee that has a mouth of honey but a stinging tail behind (205–9). After his comparative analysis, Randle reminds readers that the label given to *Homiletic Fragment I* is often taken for granted, but he makes a strong case in support of the title, arguing that close examination of the “poem’s structure can often indicate homiletic influence” (223). Despite the fragmentary nature of the text, “the composer’s use of rhetorical technique offers some indications of the poem’s conjectured [homiletic] structure.” This long overdue analysis of *Homiletic Fragment I* draws strong connections to the homiletic tradition in Old English literature and mounts a convincing argument in support of its place among other homiletic texts in the *Vercelli Book*.

Riddles

After reviewing the linguistic ambiguities present in the first seven and a half lines of *Riddle 49*, and largely concurring with the analysis of A. N. Doane and others, Elena Afros, “Exeter Book *Riddle 49*: Linguistic Ambiguities Revisited,” *N&Q* n.s. 56: 171–75, proceeds to examine lines 8b–11, which is where her analysis departs from earlier positions on the text. In particular, she argues that “the relative *þe*-clause modifies the noun phrase *þæt cyn* with which the pronoun *him* is coreferential” (174).

Dieter Bitterli’s impressive study of the Exeter Book *Riddles*, *Say What I Am Called: The Old English Riddles of the Exeter Book and the Anglo-Latin Riddle Tradition* (Toronto: U of Toronto P), provides innovative readings of the texts themselves and also an erudite discussion of their relationships with an extensive tradition of Latin and Anglo-Latin riddles. This aspect of Bitterli’s analysis includes the well-known collections that circulated in Anglo-Saxon England, such as those of Symphosius and Aldhelm, and lesser-known ones, too: the *Collectanea* of Pseudo-Bede, the anonymous *Berne Riddles*, and the *Disputatio Pippini cum Albino* and *Propositiones ad acuendos iuvenes* of Alcuin. The comparative approach Bitterli uses continually reminds his readers that “[l]ike their Latin models, the *Riddles* were not produced in a cultural vacuum, but emerged from an intellectual milieu of monastic literature and Latin book-learning. Yet they also participate in the indigenous tradition of vernacular poetry, exemplified in the very heroic and ‘elegiac’ pieces that are preserved alongside the *Riddles* in the Exeter Book. This dialogue between vernacular and the Latin riddles, and between enigmatography and heroic poetry, is many voiced and multilayered and is by no means one-sided” (4–5). In other words,

the author or authors of the vernacular riddles are not slavishly indebted to these Latin analogues and sources, but rather push against them as they work to articulate a fresh perspective on an established tradition.

The first group of riddles Bitterli examines, in a section he labels “Contexts,” are those that deal with animals and numbers, and whose study “alert[s] us to the inventive ways in which the Old English poets respond to an authoritative Latin canon and how they succeed in redeploying and redefining received rhetorical strategies and themes in the autochthonous context of their vernacular poetry” (5). The opening chapter of this section begins with an analysis of the “river and fish” riddle, which appears in some form in many collections of Latin and Anglo-Latin texts, and also in *Riddle 85* of the Exeter Book. In a departure from its treatment in the Latin versions, where the silence of the fish is set in opposition to its noisy, watery surroundings, the fish in *Riddle 85* speaks, giving it an agency and volition it does not enjoy elsewhere. Further, the fish’s use of comparatives “sets up a dynamic contrast, and informs the poem with a sense of discovery and heroic pride” (17). And its musing on its fate suggests a wisdom not typically associated with the breed, but one that is consonant with what is found in other works of vernacular poetry. Bitterli, in the end, finds in this fish an analogue of the riddler himself: “Just as the travelling fish delights in its freedom, so the Old English author self-confidently explores the literary space of a long-established genre and negotiates its rhetorical strategies while using his own idiom with almost subversive liberty, vivacity, and panache” (18). Also examined in this section are the various literary and rhetorical techniques—especially Isidorian etymology—the author of the *Riddles* uses in the composition of enigmas about animals, which make up a substantial portion of the collection. Bitterli attributes the popularity of animal riddles in the Exeter Book to Aldhelm, whose own collection was replete with them. Bitterli’s extended examination of the “ox” riddles (12, 38, and 72) and of two of the “bird” riddles (7 and 8) reveals that they all owe a debt to the Latin tradition, but as with the “river and fish” riddle, depart in meaningful ways from their source material. The “ox” riddles, for example, “develop their themes and imagery from the authoritative body of the Latin *enigmata*,” and “transform these themes and images into something genuine and new” (34). *Riddle 7* plays with and complicates the etymological principles established by Isidore: “Just as Isidore relates the meaning of Latin *cygnus* ‘swan’ to the verb *canere* ‘to sing,’ so the Old English author exhibits what may be called the latent etymology of the bird’s vernacular

name, which is likewise based on the relation between noun and verb. In other words: the *swan* is so named because it is silent (*swigað*) when it rests or swims, yet loudly sings with its feathers (*swogað . . . swinsiað*) when it flies” (45). *Riddle 8* “Nightingale” approaches language similarly. In a departure from its substantial source material, *Riddle 8* “focuses almost exclusively on the variety and musicality of the bird’s song,” offering ten different verbs to describe the action of its subject’s voice and, in doing so, establishes the bird as poet (54). Etymology is again an important feature for the resolution of the riddle: *æfensceop* ‘evening poet’ and *scirenige* ‘actress,’ two words used to describe the subject, both invoke the idea of nightly performance, which is itself encoded in the answer to the riddle: *nihtegale* (54). The last chapter of this section examines those riddles that employ numbers and which are linked to another group of Latin texts that, while they share many features of the riddles, were intended to be “problems,” such as those found in Alcuin’s *Propositiones ad acuendos iuvenes*, a series of mathematical conundrums constructed for the education of the young. Bitterli finds analogues for several combinatorial riddles in these texts. These include *Riddle 22* “Charles’s Wain,” which he places in the tradition of “river-crossing” problems (59). *Riddle 86* “One-eyed garlic seller,” Bitterli argues, employs numbers to misdirect readers. The one-eyed garlic seller joins two similarly grotesque subjects found in Aldhelm’s riddles—“A woman pregnant with twins” and “pregnant sow”—in a club of “shape-shifting creatures who mask their true identities behind our cultural concepts of the normal and the abnormal” (71).

The three chapters in Part II: Codes examine the six runic riddles of the Exeter Book. Inspiration for the vernacular logographic play contained there seems to have come from various collections of Latin riddles. But, as with the relationship between Latin and vernacular texts discussed in the first section, here too Bitterli recognizes innovation on behalf of the Anglo-Saxon poet or poets: “[t]he runes in the *Riddles*, therefore, not only participate in the author’s playful rhetoric, but also exemplify the epistemological transformation implied in the transition from pre-Conversion forms of communication to the Christian scribal culture of later Anglo-Saxon England” (7–8). Unlike their more usual, if still infrequent use in Old English manuscripts, where they act as abbreviations or shorthand, runic symbols in the *Riddles* are employed for the purpose of “encrypting solutions” (84): “Each time, the runes or rune-names have to be transliterated into the roman alphabet in order to spell out a word or several words in Old English that either name the enigmatic subject or describe it. In

this linguistically complex process, different modes of encoding require specific strategies of decoding from the erudite reader” (86). This need for decoding can be seen, for example, in *Riddle 19* “Ship,” which includes seventeen runic symbols that make up a total of four words, each spelled backwards. Additionally, the first letter of each of the four words also forms an acronym, *snac*, which Mark Griffith has argued is a variant of OE *snacc*, ‘a swift-sailing vessel’ (89). The multiple layers of linguistic obfuscation require the serious engagement of the reader. Bitterli also examines two fragmentary runic riddles in the collection, *Riddles 58* and *75*. *Riddle 58*, “Well-sweep(?)” refers to its solution as having three “straight runic letters,” the first of which is *rad* (99). A riddle by Symphosius, which includes mention of water being pumped from underground with no small effort, provides a clue for solving *Riddle 58*, Bitterli suggests: “Here, the water is equally passive, while the labour is performed by the sweep and its ‘master’; but it is their relationship and mutual dependence that enables the author to fully explore the technical side of the beast-like thing he describes” (104). Bitterli identifies the other two runic symbols as *os* and *dæg*, which are both vertically oriented and thus “straight,” and therefore concludes that “[w]hile the rune is primarily an alphabetic clue, the author simultaneously exploits its phonetic and logographic potential insofar as its name, *rad*, provides a pun for *rod*, the possible name of the toiling and ‘riding’ well-sweep” (105). *Riddle 75* presents a similar challenge of runic interpretation, although one that is perhaps even more difficult because it consists of just one line. The four runic symbols found there represent letters *d*, *n*, *l*, and *h*, though *l* has been often emended to *u*, which paves the way for *hund* to be the solution. The poem’s emphasis of the “swiftness and sagacity” of the animal, however, places it at odds with an analogous Latin riddle by Aldhelm, which underscores the animal’s “fidelity and strength” (109). In the final chapter of this section, Bitterli examines a tradition of using letters themselves as the subjects of riddles, which he traces to Aldhelm, and which also appears in the work of Tatwine and Eusebius. Exeter Book *Riddle 13* “Ten chickens” participates in this tradition, as does *Riddle 42* “Cock and hen,” which additionally employs “both runes and numbers” in the exploration of its subject (121) and, as such, demonstrates a negotiation of “the transition from orality to literacy and the shift from one linguistic system to another: from the obsolete practice of runic communication that harked back to the pagan past to the roman alphabet and its use in a Christian scribal culture” (131).

The last three chapters, all of which explore riddles engaged with the material work of the scriptorium, including pens, inkhorns, and books, fall into a category Bitterli calls "Tools." As with the other vernacular riddles he has studied, these too "operate from within a basically Latin monastic tradition, which they not only emulate, but also claim for themselves and reassess by means of their own literary strategies and cultural determinants" (136). Yet the "inkhorn" riddles (88 and 93) analyzed in the eighth chapter do not appear to build on a strong tradition of direct Latin sources; only Eusebius includes a riddle on this subject, which he treats in an understated manner. The author of *Riddles* 88 and 93 goes well beyond this earlier material, which he "develop[s] into moving accounts of separation, exile, violence, and enslavement" (152). These two texts are also "replete with statements about the speaker's emotional condition," an elegiac feature Bitterli associates with many of the non-enigmatic poems in the Exeter Book (163). Chapter Nine performs an extended analysis of *Riddles* 26 and 28, both of which describe the violence required to transform a living beast into a salvific book, and which also share analogues in the work of Tatwine and Eusebius. Regarding this metamorphosis, Bitterli explains that "the martyred and transformed bodies in the *Riddles* not only celebrate the book as a powerful vehicle of Christian literacy and doctrine, but also reflect the notion that the scriptures are the written testimony of God and a holy manifestation of the Word made flesh" (190). In a short coda that analyzes *Riddle* 47 "Bookworm," Bitterli synthesizes his general argument about the relationship between the vernacular riddles and their Latin counterparts: "the Old English author himself becomes the nimble occupant and parasitic thief who freely appropriates and consumes the literary model and its established genre—even if he jokingly concedes that he is 'not a whit the wiser' for digesting the glorious speeches and statements of others" (193).

Dieter Bitterli published a second piece on the Exeter Book *Riddles* this year, titled "The 'Cuckoo' in the *Collectanea* of Pseudo-Bede—An Unnoticed Latin Analogue to Exeter Book *Riddle* 9," *N&Q* n.s. 56: 481–82. This short work proposes an alternate solution to a riddle from the eighth-century *Collecantea* of Pseudo-Bede, which was recently edited by Martha Bayliss and Michael Lapidge. Bayliss suggests "chick in an egg," which Bitterli finds insufficient to account for the fact that the solution has three parents. "Cuckoo" is preferable for that reason, since the bird was recognized in the early Middle Ages as having a foster mother in addition to two biological parents. This answer, since it serves as an apparent analogue to Exeter Book *Riddle* 9,

"provides yet another case in point for the intertextuality of early English enigmatography, whose subjects and themes were constantly varied, transformed, and re-created by several generations of authors reading and writing in Latin and the vernacular" (482).

Shannon Ferri Cochran, "The Plough's the Thing: A New Solution to Old English *Riddle* 4 of the Exeter Book," *JEGP* 108: 301–09, proposes a novel solution to the notoriously challenging *Riddle* 4: "plough team," and more specifically, "a yoke of oxen attached to a wheeled plough," which the author suggests "easily satisfies all of the difficulties" that have stymied other critics (302). After establishing the material viability of the wheeled plough in Anglo-Saxon England, Cochran undertakes an extensive analysis of numerous words and phrases that have been defined variously by previous attempted solvers of the riddle, including *hringum hæfted* ('bound to rings'), *bæg* ('wheel'), *bed* ('ground'), and *slæpwerig* ('weary for sleep'). The most radical reanalysis Cochran proposes is of *wearm lim*, in line 7b. Other critics have typically translated this phrase as 'warm limb,' but Cochran suggests that *lim*, "lime, mortar, or glue," or "anything that causes adhesion," including "mud, muck or slime" is preferable (307–8). In the context of this riddle, *wearm lim*—'mucky ground'—could be responsible for breaking the wheel of the plough, as is described in line 8.

■ *Fates of the Apostles*

Alfred Bammesberger, "Old English *Ende Gesealdon* (*Fates of the Apostles*, Line 85b)," *N&Q* n.s. 56: 170–71, unpacks the meaning of line 85b of *The Fates of the Apostles*, *ende gesealdon*, in a short note. This phrase is usually translated as "gave up [their] end," a rendering that Bammesberger discounts. Some critics have understood *ende* as 'life,' which makes more sense to Bammesberger, but which he still finds inadequate on linguistic grounds. After reviewing several possibilities, he settles on the following reading: *ende* should be understood as *anda*, 'zeal,' which suits the immediate context of the phrase.

■ *Finnsburg Episode*

Keri Wolf, in "Enacting Ties That Bind: Oath-Making vs. Oath-Taking in the Finnsburg 'Episode,'" *Comitatus* 40: 1–24, calls for a reanalysis of the exchange between Finn and Hengest. Using Henri Lefebvre's work on the space and social relationships, Wolf argues for the importance of what she calls "the spatial context" of oaths made in Old English poems like *Beowulf* and *The Battle*

of *Maldon*, where oath-makers recall the place where their promises were made in “oath-making rituals” (3). Understanding this component of the oath is important for analysis of the Finnsburg “Episode” because there, Hengest omits any reference to location when swearing peace with Finn, which Wolf recognizes as anticipating his subsequent decision not to uphold the terms of the treaty. While the words spoken by Finn and Hengest in lines 1089b–1108 appear to mirror those spoken in other such rituals, “[t]he location in which this agreement is made is conspicuously omitted while ceremonial components are also absent” (19). Wolf suggests that the reason the poet chooses not to describe this scene in conventional terms is to “lessen the impact of Hengest’s obvious later violation” and “portray Hengest’s actions more compassionately and honorably” (20).

■ *Dream of the Rood* and *Genesis A & B*

Catherine A. M. Clarke’s contribution (“Old English Poetry”) to *The Blackwell Companion to the Bible in English Literature*, ed. Rebecca Lemon (Chichester: Blackwell), 61–75, takes on the daunting task of identifying the complex and varied role of the Bible in Anglo-Saxon England, and specifically in Old English verse, in a total of fifteen pages. Clarke begins her survey with a study of Exeter Book *Riddle* 26, arguing that exploring the material, cultural, and spiritual dimensions of the that text “enables us to recognize several key issues regarding the Bible in Old English poetry: its role in the developing literacy and textual culture of Anglo-Saxon England, its relation to concepts of treasure and worth . . . and its assimilation into traditional literary heroic culture” (63). What follows her reading of this riddle is an examination of representations of the Bible itself, and also the stories it contains, in a host of Old English poems. These include Cædmon’s *Hymn* and the “Cædmonian” texts of the Junius Manuscript, *Beowulf* and *Judith*, and *The Dream of the Rood*. In her discussion of two of the Junius poems—*Genesis A* and *Genesis B*—Clarke recalls her analysis of *Riddle* 26 by demonstrating how the poet or translator recasts his biblical source material in distinctly Germanic heroic ways: *Genesis A*, for example, includes a “representation of the angels [that] conforms to a series of Old English poetic conventions for depicting treachery or dishonour, with their broken boasts (‘gylp’) recalling the empty bragging of the malicious Unferth in *Beowulf*, and their betrayal of loyalty resonating with the oath-breaking deserters in *The Battle of Maldon*” (66). Clarke also provides an overview of the critical controversy surrounding the “editorially titled” *Exodus*, which includes

material from books other than that from which its title is derived (68). Rather than attempt to explain away the apparent inconsistency and possible authorial confusion, as some critics have done, Clarke embraces it, suggesting that in it “we see biblical material mediated and modified by liturgical context and allegorical interpretation” (69). Clarke saves her most extensive analysis for *The Dream of the Rood*, which, with its clear interest in a Germanic heroic ethos and use of prosopopoeia, “confront[s] paradoxes and tensions that are particularly acute and problematic in the context of transitional secular-heroic/Christian Anglo-Saxon England” (71). Taken together, Clarke argues, the representation of the Bible in these texts reveals “daring ambition and aspiration for the vernacular, sophisticated reflection on scriptural texts and traditions, and a desire to explore the meeting-points between Christian and Germanic heroic cultures” (73).

In “Heavy Hypermetrical Foregrounding in the Old Saxon *Heliand* and *Genesis* Poems,” *Heroic Age* 12 (online), Douglas Simms undertakes an analysis of hypermetrical verses in three poems: the Old Saxon *Heliand* and Vatican *Genesis*, and *Genesis B*, an Old English translation of a portion of that poem. Simms proposes a link between form and function. In particular, he suggests that hypermetrical verses occur in places where a poet or translator wants to “catch the audiences’ ears and redirect their attention to passages of particular import” (1.1). After establishing a set of formal criteria for defining hypermetricality and “heavy hypermetricality,” based largely on the work of Cable, Pope, Timmer, and Bliss, Simms proceeds to examine thirteen heavy hypermetric half-lines in the three poems. Of particular interest to Anglo-Saxonists are analyses of three hypermetrical lines from *Genesis B*. The first, line 356a, marks the beginning of Satan’s description of his imprisonment. The second, line 403a, “highlight[s] Satan’s inability to struggle in any meaningful way against the might of God” (2.1.3). The final example Simms considers is line 507a, which comes in the middle of Satan’s attempted temptation of Adam. In this case, the hypermetric verse serves as a boundary between a temptation that contains “a bit of truth” and one that is wholly false (2.1.4). All three emphasize sections deemed important by the poet/translator, either for the way they mark a shift in speaker or the way they foreground important thematic elements. Simms performs similar analyses of two half lines of the Vatican *Genesis* and six from *Heliand*, and ultimately argues for the importance not just for recognizing the hypermetricality of these lines, but also of working to

understand the possible rhetorical motivation the poet might have had for including them.

Judith

In surveying the landscape of recent critical studies of *Judith*, Howell Chickering, "Poetic Exuberance in the Old English *Judith*," *Studies in Philology* 106.2: 119–36, notes numerous works that seek to put the poem in conversation with medieval texts and also with a variety of postmodern concerns as well. Chickering ascribes the host of such readings to the slippery, multivalent, and "exuberant" nature of the poem itself, which has an abundance of "imaginative energy" (121). In his own study, however, he seeks to examine "the poem on its own terms, in order to describe what is *poetically* remarkable about its celebratory energy" (121). Chickering defines "exuberance" in his study as both "the poem's irony and temporal scheme" as well as "its half-line rhymes at emphatic times and its purple patches of pulsing polysyndeton" (122). This exuberance acts paradoxically as a stabilizing force, not an entropic one, and as such Chickering suggests that reading the text on its own, and not in concert with others, is a preferable approach. Chickering begins his analysis with an overview of other critics' assessment of the ironic tone adopted by the narrator, which highlights, for example, the mock-heroic behavior of the Assyrians and the numerous asides he makes at their expense. Paronomasia is also part of the poet's irony: "And then there is the lovely pun of *heofodweardas*, which usually means 'leaders' or 'bodyguards,' but here, with obvious and gleeful irony, anticipates the Assyrian discovery that there is no more head to guard" (130). The hypermetrical nature of the opening section of the poem serves as still more evidence of the poet's exuberance, as it affords ample opportunity to delay resolution as a means of heightening a reader's response to the work. Chickering concludes his analysis with an examination of the poet's use of polysyndeton and half-line rhymes, which enhances the action of the narrative. These features, together with the ones already discussed, indicate a poet "in full tonal and ideational control of his material" (136).

Exeter Maxims

Brian O'Camb's essay "Bishop Æthelwold and the Shaping of the Old English *Exeter Maxims*," *English Studies* 90.3: 253–73, challenges what he refers to as the "stratification" of *Maxims I*, a process by which critics seek to identify ways it acknowledges "different historical

layers" (253), such as a pagan or secular past. By contrast, O'Camb wants to understand why this poem was written down in the tenth century: his focus is not on the past, but on the present. Lexical analysis of *Maxims I* reveals several correspondences with words also used in texts associated with Bishop Æthelwold, including *forcweþan*, *styrān*, *cildgeong*, and *acyþan*. This connection "helps explain the poem's social function, which is in part to confirm the best way to care for monks of too young an age to be governed by the strict discipline that was found suitable for adults" (255). Michael D. C. Drout had previously argued that portions of *Maxims I* shared vocabulary with the *Enlarged Rule of Chrodegang*, which he believes was translated by Æthelwold. O'Camb finds lexical affinity between lines 45–50a of *Maxims I* and a text that has been more definitively shown to be part of the reformer's canon: his translation of the Rule of St. Benedict. Not only does this analysis allow O'Camb to posit a late tenth-century date of composition for at least part of *Maxims I*, it also "help[s] us limit the range of possible texts available to the *Exeter Maxims*' poet, allowing us to identify the particular type of monastic textual community that we should see as the context for the poem's production" (257). Specifically, O'Camb shows that the maxim on child-rearing, which advocates for leniency when dealing with children, echoes Chapters 27–37 of the Rule, which instruct abbots to exercise patience when working with young monks who have not yet learned how to act appropriately. (He notes, however, that there is some inconsistency in the Rule about exercising such leniency.) O'Camb also identifies a stylistic connection between the two works: both employ marked use of doublets (263). In his conclusion, O'Camb considers a possible answer to the question of how "the *Maxims*' poet came to know the vernacular Rule," suggesting that he came in contact with Æthelwold's translation of that text "in a reformed monastery within the ambit of Winchester" (270). It is possible, though, O'Camb notes, that the contact was made even earlier, in Abingdon (ca. 954–63).

Brian O'Camb also defended a Ph.D. dissertation on the *Exeter Maxims* in 2009: "Toward a Monastic Poetics: *Exeter Maxims* and the Exeter Book of Old English Poetry" (U of Wisconsin-Madison). This impressive work argues that the *Exeter Maxims* should be recognized as "reflect[ing] the influence of texts produced and circulating in an intellectual milieu closely connected with the highest echelons of the Anglo-Saxon Benedictine Reform" (4) and as sharing a particular affinity with those works associated with Æthelwold, one of that movement's most active players. In service of this argument, O'Camb coins the useful

phrase “monastic poetics,” which he describes as the way “Anglo-Saxon poets, such as the ones whose works are included in the Exeter Book, borrowed, adapted, and applied ecclesiastical discourses and monastic rhetorical modes when crafting Old English poems” (5). O’Camb devotes the rest of the introduction to a thorough discussion of the Benedictine Reform, and in particular of Æthelwold’s role in shaping the religious and political landscape of the latter half of the tenth century, which included enlisting royal support for shifting power away from secular clergy and consolidating it under ecclesiastical control. Study of the “social function” of the Exeter Book in this context is the primary focus of this project. The *Exeter Maxims*, because its “formal structure and contents provide a microcosm of the manuscript as a whole,” can serve as an especially useful model for such an analysis (25). The analysis that makes up the remaining chapters in the dissertation includes, among others, lexical, art historical, and codicological approaches to the text.

Chapter One, “Æthelwoldian Vocabulary in *Exeter Maxims* and Other Exeter Book Poems,” argues that lines 45–50a of the *Exeter Maxims* show “the influence of a Reformed monastic vocabulary” (36). One portion of this chapter was published in 2009; a synopsis can be found in the previous entry. The chapter also includes two additional sections, however: an extended analysis of the Æthelwoldian compound *cildgeong* and a discussion of Mary Carruther’s work on medieval ekphrasis, which O’Camb argues has direct relevance for the study of *Maxims*, which is organized in such a way as to serve a specifically monastic audience. In Chapter Two, “The Inscribed Form of *Exeter Maxims* and the Layout of Quire XI of the Exeter Book,” O’Camb challenges a commonly held belief that *Maxims* is a product of a “non-ecclesiastical oral culture,” and, following a thorough codicological analysis, concludes that “the claims for *Exeter Maxims*’s seemingly ‘direct’ relationship to orality and exclusively lay culture is difficult to reconcile with the material evidence provided by the manuscript and the Exeter Book scribe” (85). This analysis focuses on five statements in the *Maxims* that have “near-equivalent parallelism in other Old English poems” (88) and ultimately finds that direct influence for them can be found within quire XI of the Exeter Book itself. Chapter Three, “*Exeter Maxims* and the Making of an Anglo-Saxon Historical Imagination,” builds on the work of the previous chapter by exploring thematic links among those poetic texts that occupy quire XI: a section of *The Seafarer*, *Vainglory*, *Widsith*, *The Fates of Mortals*, and the first two parts of *Exeter Maxims*. The five statements that recur throughout this

section “establish a principle of contrast between heaven and earth and secular and spiritual communities” (116). What follows is a persuasive reading of the connections between *Vainglory* and *Widsith* that demonstrates how these two poems promote a brand of spiritual kingship that could have been readily endorsed by practitioners of the tenth-century Reform. This chapter also examines the presence of the fallen angels trope in documents central to the Reform, including “Edgar’s Privilege to New Minster, Winchester,” where the cast-out angels come to stand for the expelled secular clergy. O’Camb convincingly argues here that the poems found in quire XI “exemplify the notion of a ‘monastic poetics’ that [he has] been discussing by incorporating contemporary theo-political concepts drawn from verbal and visual texts associated with Bishop Æthelwold and King Edgar, two major sponsors of the Benedictine Reform movement” (167). In the dissertation’s fourth chapter, “*Exeter Maxims* and the Legacy of Cain,” O’Camb undertakes a close study of lines 196b–7a. His analysis traces the history of representations of Cain in Anglo-Saxon texts in order to determine how that fraught biblical figure might have been understood both allegorically and historically by “ecclesiastical and monastic readers of the *Exeter Maxims*” (169). Specifically, he argues that “[t]he allegorical significance of Cain’s legacy provides a crucial element for understanding how ecclesiastical readers may have received *Exeter Maxims* as an historical discourse” (169). O’Camb finds references to Cain, who might serve as a negative example to monks living in the coenobium, in both “Edgar’s Privilege” and several chapters of Æthelwold’s translation of the Rule of St. Benedict. This chapter also includes an examination of the influence on *Exeter Maxims* of Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Rawlinson C.697, which contains numerous works by Aldhelm. In the conclusion to the dissertation, O’Camb synthesizes the analysis of the previous sections into a powerful and ultimately persuasive argument that Æthelwold serves as a critical nexus for understanding the intellectual, literary, and ecclesiastical contexts of the Exeter Book.

■ *Menologium*

Kazutoma Karasawa, “Some Problems in the Editions of the *Menologium* with Special Reference to Lines 81a, 184b and 206a,” *N&Q* n.s. 56: 485–87, disputes a recent assertion by Katherine O’Brien O’Keeffe that line 81a of the *Menologium* should be emended to “Philippus 7 Iacobus.” O’Keeffe bases her reading, which appears to correct a metrical anomaly, on a scribal *punctus*

that she believes indicates an abbreviation. The author argues, however, based on stylistic grounds, that the manuscript reading "Philippus and Iacob" should stand, since elsewhere in the poem the poet has also "modifie[d] word-forms in order to attain metrical half-lines" (486). Karasawa concludes by counseling editors of the *Menologium* to "pay closer attention to the poet's prosodic characteristics, avoiding hyper-corrections of the original text" (487).

■ *Waldere*

In his edition, *The Old English Epic of Waldere* (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars), Jonathan B. Hines offers a new version of the text of *Waldere* that he arrives at after a thorough examination of the manuscript evidence, including the use of ultraviolet analysis and also a comprehensive reevaluation of earlier critical editions, many of which have perpetuated readings he believes are flawed. In addition to providing an edition and translation of *Waldere*, Hines also presents a good deal of information useful to readers interested in the literary, historical, paleographical, and material contexts of this short poem. This information includes a section on the Walter story, which offers insight into how the Anglo-Saxons might have experienced the Gothic legends the poem contains; speculations into the nationality of the author of the poem, whom Hines believes, based on several apparently anomalous forms in the text, might be Frankish (12); and a detailed transcription of the two fragments based on the editor's own paleographical analysis. Another section of the apparatus, titled "The Epic Hero," explores the dense, allusive texture of the poem, which belies the brevity of the actual text. Here, Hines examines "*Waldere's* scale of heroic action, its proportions of triumphant themes, and its tone of a Christian ethos," which together contribute to the epic nature of the text and also indicate possible connections with other similarly epic works (37). Perhaps most interesting in this discussion is Hines's recognition of the way lexical patterns and repetitions in the poem "reveal much about its heroic ethos" (41). For example, the recurrence of *hand* in Fragment II "certainly makes one reconsider the possible connection between Ekkehard's *Waltharii Manufortis* 'Walter of the Strong Hand' and *Waltharius*, where the hero loses his hand in the duel. The repeated focus on Walter's sword grip in *Waldere* may lead up to an injury of great irony" (41). This section also identifies the lexical means by which the poet indicates his disdain for Guðhere (44). As for evidence of a possible Christian aspect of what appears to be a memorialization of a decidedly

pre-Christian, Germanic ethos, Hines notes several parallels between Walter's final speech and poems such as *Judith*, *Christ and Satan*, and *The Dream of the Rood*. In the end, however, the editor acknowledges that absolute determination of this syncretism is difficult, if not impossible, to establish: "The tale of a hero emerging from a shelter in the wild to fight fairly and thus maintain his tribal integrity, despite ever-threatening neighbors, could be attributed to Christian influence, but it is also possible that early Germanic poets celebrated at least one chieftain whose epic heroism lasted into old age without a qualm" (53). In the final section of apparatus that precedes the edition proper, Hines tackles one of the most enduring challenges presented by the poem: determining the identity of the speaker of each fragment, "an issue directly related to the order in which the two leaves ought to appear in the epic" (55). After exploring a variety of possibilities, Hines concludes that Hildegyð is the speaker of Fragment I, and that, based largely on an analysis of the possession and use of the sword Mimming, that Walter or Hagen could conceivably be the first speaker of Fragment II. Two appendices provide still more information about early medieval weaponry, armor, and martial practice, and also on the lexicon and versification of the poem.

■ *Wife's Lament, Wulf and Eadwacer*

In service of her argument about Chaucer's representation of the woman's lament, Corinne Saunders, "Sorrowful Songs: Chaucer and the Tradition of the Woman's Lament," *Studi anglo-norreni in onore di John S. McKinnell*, ed. Ruggerini [see sec. 2], 132–48, engages in a brief discussion of notable female characters in Old English verse, including Hildeburh, Freawaru, the anonymous mourner at Beowulf's pyre, and more thorough examinations of the speakers of *Wulf and Eadwacer* and *The Wife's Lament*. The speaker in *Wulf and Eadwacer*, Saunders explains, with its emphasis on the "introspective, immediate, and personal," reminds readers "of both the power and the limits of memory" (137). The narrator of *The Wife's Lament* explores similar ground, leading Saunders to suggest that together these two poems indicate "that whereas the male heroic ethic of a shame-honour culture was active and military, women, at least within imaginative writing, were associated with the expression of emotion and the lyric voice" (137). What follows is an analysis of how this paradigm is taken up by Chaucer in works such as the *Canterbury Tales* and the *Legend of Good Women*. GD

■ Works not seen

- Anlezark, Daniel, ed. *The Old English Dialogues of Solomon and Saturn*. Anglo-Saxon Texts 7. Woodbridge: D. S. Brewer, 2009. xi + 167 pp.
- Bammesberger, Alfred "Altenglisch *scepen* in *Cædmons Hymnus* (M)." *Anglia* 127.1 (2009), 106-14.
- Hall, Thomas N. "Prophetic Vision in *The Dream of the Rood*." *Poetry, Place, and Gender: Studies in Medieval Culture in Honor of Helen Damico*. Ed. Catherine E. Karkov. Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute, Western Michigan UP. Pp. 60-74.
- Keefer, Sarah Larratt. "The *Dream of the Rood* at Nones on Good Friday." *Poetry, Place, and Gender: Studies in Medieval Culture in Honor of Helen Damico*. Ed. Karkov. Pp. 38-59.
- Koppinen, Pirkko Anneli. "Swa þa stafas becnap: Ciphers of the Heroic Idiom in the Exeter Book Riddles, 'Beowulf,' 'Judith,' and 'Andreas.'" Ph.D. Diss. U of London, 2009. [uk.bl.ethos.537519]
- Lendinara, Patrizia. "Olaf Guthfrithson: un re vichingo travestito da menestrello." *Epica e storia: Le vie del cavaliere in memoria di Antonio Pasqualino. Gli archivi di Morgana: atti e testi* 19. Ed. Mario Gandolfo. Palermo: Associazione per la conservazione delle tradizioni popolari, 2005. pp. 569-96.
- Neville, Jennifer. "Pondering the Soul's Journey in Exeter Book Riddle 43." *The World of Travellers*. Eds. Dekker, Olsen, and Hofstra. Leuven: Peeters, 2009. [see sect. 4a] pp. 147-62.
- Princi, Braccini, Giovanna. "Tipi di tombe e segnacoli funerari nel *Seafarer* e nel *Beowulf*: Possibili rettifiche di interpretazioni vulgate." *Linguistica e Filologia* 28 (2009), 7-28.
- Rosselli Del Turco, Roberto. *La battaglia di Maldon*. Bibliotheca Germanica 24.
- Sancery, Arlette. "La *Judith* anglo-saxonne: un palimpseste biblique?" *Bulletin des Anglicistes Médiévistes* 75 été, 61-76.
- Steen, Janie. "Translation or Transformation? Aldhelm's Enigmata and Exeter Book Riddles 35 and 40." *The World of Travellers*. Eds. Dekker, Olsen, and Hofstra. Leuven: Peeters, 2009. [see sect. 4a] pp. 133-46.
- Szöke, Veronka. "'Cadet repente gladius e caelo': la Dimensione giudicante in Exodus (vv. 492-495)." *Studi anglo-norreni in onore di John S. McKinnell*. Ed. Ruggerini. [see sect. 2] pp. 41-84.

4C. BEOWULF

■ Text, Language, Meter

Tom Shippey offers an appreciative and detailed description of "Klaeber's *Beowulf* Eighty Years On: A Triumph for a Triumvirate," *JEGP* 108: 360-76, referring to the fourth, thoroughly revised edition of this much loved version of the poem published in 2008 by R. D. Fulk, Robert E. Bjork, and John D. Niles. Shippey concludes that "[j]ust as Klaeber's third edition has dominated the field for almost sixty years, Fulk, Bjork, and Niles's fourth is set to do so for future generations unknown, the more surely as supplements can be and already are being made available electronically, see <http://www.indiana.edu/~klaeber4/index.htm>" (376).

In contrast, Kevin Kiernan argues in favor of fully digital editions of the poem, like his own *Electronic 'Beowulf'*, 3rd ed. (2011), in "The *nathwylc* Scribe and the *nathwylc* Text of *Beowulf*," *Poetry, Place, and Gender: Studies in Medieval Culture in Honor of Helen Damico*, ed. Karkov [see sec. 2], 98-131. Kiernan believes electronic editions "have some clear advantages over traditional print editions such as Klaeber's," since editorial decisions and their rationale can be linked to a high-resolution facsimile of the actual manuscript text "for all to examine and assess. Print has fostered the idea of an established text, whereas digital editions are now free to present texts in a less-settled state, the way they exist in manuscripts" (131). This openness is especially important, Kiernan believes, in cases like folio 179 of the *Beowulf* MS (London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius A.xv), which is seriously damaged but significantly placed in the narrative development of the poem, beginning precisely at line 2200, which constitutes an abrupt break of fifty years between *Beowulf*'s early triumph against monsters in Denmark and his later demise as an old king against the dragon in Geatland. An accurate account of the condition of this folio thus has important implications for our understanding of the genesis and structure of the poem, which Kiernan believes once comprised two separate works spliced together at just this juncture. He identifies four distinct stages that account for the state of folio 179 as it now stands, involving the two known (but anonymous) Cotton Vitellius scribes, plus a third (hypothetical) scribe whom he believes took an active role in the process.

In stage one the original text was completely removed from both sides of the folio by an overall scouring . . . In stage two an Anglo-Saxon scribe (perhaps the same person), working with the two other *Beowulf* scribes, replaced the original text with a new and different one that bears some convincing signs of a draft still in progress. I call this person the *nathwylc* scribe, for the repeated use of the rare word *nathwylc* ("I know not

who" and "I know not what") three times in the space of sixteen lines on this folio . . . In stage three, parts of the *nathwylc* scribe's new text on fol. 179 failed to adhere to the scoured vellum, obliterating parts of words and letters and leaving behind fragments . . . It is impossible to know when this fading occurred, but it was plausibly caused by the 1731 [Ashburnham House] fire, by the water used to put it out, or by a combination of the two, probably abetted by whatever concoction was used to dissolve the ink of the original text. We know the fading happened before Thorkelin and his scribe copied the manuscript around 1787 . . . In stage four someone dabbed and rubbed chemical reagents over the most illegible readings to try to resuscitate the ink in these places. Under ultraviolet [light] these areas appear as dark stains, making it almost impossible to identify any letterforms beneath them. Circumstantial evidence . . . suggests that staff at the British Museum applied these reagents to aid in the preparation of Zupitza's facsimile [of 1882]. (99–100)

Kiernan concludes that rather than imposing the readings of a single editor or editorial team on problematic passages like that on folio 179, digital technology should be used to inspire more active, collaborative research by many eyes and minds into the textual questions the manuscript raises.

Matthew T. Hussey considers "The Possible Relationship of the *Beowulf* and the Blickling Homilies Manuscripts," *N&Q* 56: 1–4. The codices containing these two works—British Library, Cotton Vitellius A.xv and Princeton University Library, W. H. Scheide Collection, MS 71, respectively—share a number of features beyond the well-known similarity between their descriptions of Grendel's mere in *Beowulf* and Hell in Blickling Homily 17. These are (1) the conjunction of the very same two scribal hands in one manuscript, that is, late tenth-century Anglo-Saxon square minuscule and early eleventh-century English vernacular minuscule; (2) an irregular number of sheets per quire or gathering of leaves; (3) an inconsistent arrangement of the hair and flesh sides of the vellum pages; and (4) modest page size, allowing fewer lines per page than usual. These resemblances suggest that the books may have been copied in a provincial scriptorium, either the same one or similar institutions with limited resources and weak production standards.

In "The Date of *Beowulf* and the Arundel Psalter Gloss," *MP* 106.4: 677–85, George Clark supports Michael Lapidge's argument (2000) that the archetype or first manuscript of *Beowulf* was written before the year 750 based upon five types of "literal confusion" or

the "miswriting of one letter for another" by the two Cotton Vitellius scribes (677), who worked around the turn of the millennium and were unfamiliar with the Anglo-Saxon set minuscule of their exemplar which went out of use around the year 900. In 2002 E. G. Stanley challenged Lapidge's conclusion, offering a "countertext" in an Old English gloss on the eleventh-century Arundel Psalter, which shows the same five kinds of literal confusion (among others), especially of *a* and *u*, and *d* and *ð*. Clark quotes Oess (1910) that the Arundel glossator was merely copying Old English glosses taken from a much older Roman psalter and applying them "mehr oder minder kritiklos [more or less uncritically]" to a Gallican psalter introduced after the Benedictine reform of the latter half of the tenth century (quoted 683), so that his mistakes are not necessarily contemporary with the eleventh-century text. In addition, only 35 percent of the literal confusions in the Arundel Psalter belong to the five types identified by Lapidge, "compared to about 65 percent of the literal confusions in *Beowulf*" (684), so that "we can conclude nothing," Clark believes, "about the date of the archetype of *Beowulf* from the gloss to the Arundel Psalter" (685). Perhaps not, but Stanley's key point still stands: confusion of letters in varying degrees was the norm rather than the exception throughout the entire Anglo-Saxon period, especially of the letters *d* and *ð*, the sole anomalous criterion that Lapidge uses to push the date of the archetype of *Beowulf* from before ca. 900, when Anglo-Saxon set minuscule went out of use, to before ca. 750 when *d* and *ð* began to be regularly, if inconsistently, distinguished.

J. R. Hall describes the manuscript context and editorial history of "*Beowulf* 3179A: *hlaforðes (hry)re*," *N&Q* 56.2: 166–69. Hall personally examined Cotton Vitellius A.xv in the British Library, observing that the first word of this phrase appears as *hlaforðeþ* at the end of MS line 19, folio 198 verso, for which he uses a double dagger to indicate "a possible ambiguous letter fragment" (168). Authority for restoration of this word to *hlaforðes* 'lord's' depends upon Thorkelin's Transcript B made toward the end of the eighteenth century. The first legible letters on the next line are *re*. Grundtvig privately noted in 1829 his suspicion that the whole missing word was *(hry)re* 'fall', a suggestion that Benjamin Thorpe apparently did not know when he introduced this now universally accepted restoration in his 1855 edition of the poem. Hall suspects that Thorpe proposed the doubly alliterating phrase *hlaforðes hryre* '[their] lord's fall' on the model of *hordwearda hryre* 'the hoard-guardians' fall', which formula occurs twice in *Exodus* at lines 35a and 512a, a poem Thorpe had earlier

edited in 1832. Hall reports from his examination of the manuscript: “To the left of *re* and above the right end of the rip mentioned by Wülcker [1881], I discern a blurred *v*-like shape with a faint dot midway above the limbs. Below the rip I see what looks like the blurred bottom of a descender. The fragments are wholly consistent with dotted *y* and cogently support the restoration (*hry*)*re*” (168).

Alfred Bammesberger offers a new understanding of “Hrothgar’s Plight (*Beowulf*, Line 936),” *N&Q* 56.3: 330–32. He suggests that the involved sentence in lines 932–39a can be clarified not by emending the masculine singular accusative phrase *witena gehwylcne* ‘each one of the councilors’ in line 936b to the dative plural *witena gehwylcum* ‘to each of the councilors’, as is customary, but rather by leaving the manuscript reading as it is, taking *wea widsofen* in line 936a as “an absolute participle construction in the nominative” of the Class 2 transitive strong verb *widscufan* ‘to scatter widely, drive away’ (331). The line thus specifies the damaging effect that Grendel’s depredations have had upon Hrothgar’s political authority as king: “woe [having] scattered widely every one of my councilors, who despaired of ever defending the people’s fortress from hated demons and spirits” (lines 936–39a).

In “Philological Inquiries 1: Method and Merovingians,” *Heroic Age* 12 (May, online), Michael D. C. Drout and Scott Kleinman return to Tom Shippey’s 2005 study of the dynastic by-name of the Franks, *Merewioingas* ‘of the Merovingian’, which appears in an unusual form of the genitive singular in line 2921a of *Beowulf*. The authors celebrate Shippey’s analysis of the term as an example of how traditional philological methods can be enhanced by new computing tools. Shippey had reconstructed the likely Frankish form of the name of the putative founder of this dynasty as **Mero-wech*, but was now able to search the newly available electronic database of the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* (2002) for the appearances of the name in Latin. Instead of something like the expected *Merovech*, he found a multitude of very different variants—*Maeroeum*, *Meroeus*, *Merouius*, *Meroeum*, *Meroeo*, etc.—spellings that did not, or did not clearly, indicate the medial Frankish *w* normally spelled in Latin with a *v*. Since **Merewi(o)h* is the likely pronunciation of Frankish **Merowech* in the Northumbrian dialect of Old English—yielding the regular dynastic patronymic *Merewioing* ‘the descendent of Merewi(o)h’—Shippey concludes that the Frankish form this name must have been known in the earlier eighth-century to a Northumbrian poet of *Beowulf*, while the Merovingians still ruled Francia, rather than a Latin form of the name at some later

date, after Carolingian scribes had begun to simplify or garble the name of the defunct dynasty and its founder.

Giovanna Princi Braccini considers “Tipi di tombe e segnacoli funerari nel *Seafarer* e nel *Beowulf*: Possibili rettifiche di interpretazioni vulgate” [“Types of Tomb and Funerary Monuments in the *Seafarer* and in *Beowulf*: Possible Corrections to Common Interpretations”], *Linguistica e Filologia* 28: 7–28. The author argues that *byrgan* in line 98b of the *Seafarer* should be translated not as a Class I weak verb meaning ‘to bury’, but as one of two related possibilities: (1) a verb meaning ‘to raise a funeral mound’, connected to the Class 3 strong verb *beorgan* ‘to fortify, protect’, or (2) an oblique form of a singular weak noun meaning “funeral mound,” related to *beorg* (1) ‘hill, mountain’; (2) ‘barrow, tumulus, burial mound’. Both these speculations suggest that the artifact referred to in lines 97–102 of the *Seafarer* is either (1) a burial chamber containing a dead man interred with gold or (2) a cenotaph in which a kinsman deposits gold, in both cases in the mistaken belief that this treasure will be available to the dead man for his use in the world beyond. Princi Braccini supports these readings with the fact that *beorg* is used fifteen times in the final third of *Beowulf* to indicate two kinds of structure: (1) the dragon’s barrow, which is the gold-filled cenotaph of a departed race, and (2) the hero’s own barrow, which contains his cremated remains along with heathen gold, which is said explicitly by the *Beowulf* poet to be as *unnyt* ‘useless’ now as it was when earlier buried in the dragon’s barrow (line 3168a). The author thus believes that both the *Beowulf* and *Seafarer* poets reject all notion of a pagan afterlife and wish to imply that the dead must face the judgment of God without the benefit of their worldly wealth.

In “Prefacing and Praising: Two Functions of ‘Hearing’ Formulas in the *Beowulf* Story,” *NM* 110: 487–95, Marie Nelson compares formulaic introductions in the poem—*we gefrunon* ‘we have learned/heard’, *ic gefraegn* ‘I have learned/heard’, and *ic gehyrde* ‘I have heard’—with instances in which such verbs of hearing are negated, as in lines 1842b–43: *ne hyrde ic snotorlicor / on swa geongum feore guman þingian* “I have not heard such a young man speak more wisely,” says Hrothgar of Beowulf. Nelson sees in this construction an inversion of the “We/I have heard” prefacing formula to create an even more powerful idiom of praise, a kind of litotes in which the use of a merely comparative adjective actually conveys “superlative commendation” (494).

In his *JEGP* review of the new 2008 Klaeber cited above, Tom Shippey notes the confidence of the editors in using Kuhn’s laws (1933) and other perceived metrical constraints to guide emendation of the text, a

confidence, he notes, that is far greater than Klaeber's own or that of most scholars of the poem (374). Anna Helene Feulner adds her arguments against such use in "Kuhns Gesetze im *Beowulf*," *Sprache* 48: 55–65. Kuhn's "law of particles" and "law of clause openings" are intended to describe the placement of finite verbs among the metrically stressed and unstressed syllables of Old English alliterative verses. Following Orton (1999, not cited), Feulner suggests that these syntactic patterns do not reflect regular metrical conventions recognized by Old English poets, but rather a Common Germanic syntax preserved in the archaic register of oral-formulaic poetry. Feulner thus offers a different system of classifying the placement of finite verbs in the poem: (1) verse-beginning finite verbs; (2) sentence-beginning accented finite verbs, some which appear after a negation and some of which are not immediately obvious as sentence-beginning at all; and (3) finite verbs unaccented for lexical or semantic reasons or otherwise weak in placement. She concludes that Kuhn's "laws," in both their original formulation and as modified by Bliss (1967) and Kendall (1991), have nothing to do with the metrical behavior of finite verbs in the poetry of *Beowulf*. (CD/EC)

[Feulner's article is also reviewed in section 3b, Syntax, Phonology, other Apects.]

In *Anglo-Saxons and the North*, ed. Kilpiö *et al.* (see sect. 2), 69–88, Geoffrey Russom explains "Why There are Three Eddic Metres" in the extant Old Norse mythological and legendary poems of the *Poetic Edda*: (1) *fornyrðislag* 'the meter of old tales,' the traditional long line of Common Germanic poetry comprising an a-verse and a b-verse linked by alliteration; (2) *ljóðaháttir* 'song style,' used for stanzas of gnomic verse like those in *Hávamál* 'Sayings of the High One'; and (3) *málaháttir* 'speech style,' which appears in *Atlamál* 'The Lay of Atli [Attila]' and other texts, considered permissive by nineteenth-century Germanic metrists when compared with the prosodic rigor of more southerly poems like *Beowulf*. To the contrary, Russom argues, these new meters are very strict forms of verse that were independently developed to accommodate phonological changes in Old Norse, especially syncope or loss of unstressed syllables, which changed the stress patterns of many traditional poetic compounds and formulas, displacing them from their customary metrical positions in a line of regular verse. "Despite ingenious efforts" on the part of poets like that of *Rígsþula* 'The List of Rígr' to incorporate such changes into the old *fornyrðislag* line of two linked verses, this form could no longer include all the new metrical types that had developed in the old formulas. Russom

thus postulates that the stanzaic structure of *ljóðaháttir*, which alternates the linked a- and b-verses of the regular *fornyrðislag* line with unpaired c-verses that follow their "own internal system of alliteration" (74), offered a way to accommodate the greater variety of metrical sequences in traditional formulas that had developed. The *málaháttir* of *Atlamál* is yet a third verse form designed to include the few new metrical variants still excluded by the two other eddic meters, especially very "long, heavy verses," such as those illustrated by Snorri Sturluson in the stanza he composed for his *Háttatal* 'Inventory of Verse Forms' (82). The three kinds of Norse eddic meter, then, do not represent a weakening of the traditional requirements of Germanic prosody in the "cultures of the ancient Nordic margin" (69), but rather its disciplined adaptation in response to language change in the north.

■ Sources and Analogues

In "Beowulf's Wealhtheow and the *Deowwealh*: A Legal Source for the Queen's Name," *ANQ* 22.2: 2–4, Nathan A. Breen notes the masculine parallels to this feminine name in Old Norse *Valbjófr* or *Valþér* and Old High German *Wal(a)hdeo* observed by Gordon (1935). However, Breen adduces an analogue much closer to home in the Old English common noun *ðeowwealh* 'foreign slave,' which appears in the laws of Ine of Wessex (ca. 694), incorporated into those of Alfred (ca. 890). Breen believes the poet borrowed the queen's name from one of these two law codes, but transposed its elements as a kind of play on words with essentially the same meaning. He thus accepts Klaeber's analysis (1950) of the name as 'foreign captive,' hence 'slave,' a reading supported by Robinson (1964), Thomas Hill (1990), Olsen (1997), and Orchard (2003). Breen does not explain the purpose of this paronomasia beyond noting the irony that the servile position implied by her name is sharply contradicted by the queen's high status and dignified role at the Danish court, nor does he note the positive resonance of the two name elements, *ðeow* and *wealh*, in other Old English heroic or royal names, like those of Beowulf's father *Ecgbeow* or the Swedish king *Ongenþeow* in the poem, or of the Anglo-Saxon kings *Æðelwealh* of Sussex, *Cenwealh* of Wessex, *Merewealh* of the Magonsæte, and a Sussex king's thegn called *Wealh here*. These compounds all connote noble service in war or peace rather than compulsory servitude. In addition, Fulk (1987) and Jurasinski (2007) have respectively argued that the names Unferth and Wealhtheow do not necessarily bear thematic significance for the characters they identify since aristocratic names were chosen in

Germanic tradition from a repertoire of resonant thematic elements intended primarily to signal family or dynastic affiliation.

Susan Button compares “*Beowulf*’s ‘blacne leoman’ and *Elene*’s ‘hellebryne’: Textures of Light and Flame in OE Literature,” *In Geardagum* 29: 17–32. The first term appears in apposition to the firelight that the hero sees upon entering the lair of Grendel’s mother at the bottom of the mere in line 1517a, which Button translates as “a bleak sheen” (25) rather than the “bright light” suggested by Klaeber’s glossary. She supports this rendering by adducing many other instances of sinister light or destructive flame in both *Beowulf* and other Old English poems, including *Judith* where Holofernes’s soul is cast into *hellebryne* ‘hell-fire’ (line 116b). In *Elene* (lines 1289b–1302a) degrees of suffering in hell are described, ranging from an ungodly but tolerable light for the souls of the righteous to a searing dark heat for those of the wicked. Thus, even though the term *hellebryne* is not actually used in this particular passage of *Elene*, Button believes that poem well illustrates the modulations of baleful light and flame available in the imaginative repertoire of the *Beowulf* poet.

In “Ceī, Unferth, and Access to the Throne,” *English Studies* 90.2: 127–41, William Sayers compares the character of Arthur’s warrior Ceī from Brittonic legend—the Sir Kay of Old French and Middle English Arthurian romance—with the figure of Unferth in *Beowulf*. Sayers observes that in narratives from both Celtic and Germanic tradition access to the king is often checked at three concentric barriers: (1) the kingdom’s territorial frontier at coastal shores, river-crossings or other boundaries; (2) the gate of the king’s castle or door to the royal hall; and (3) the throne itself inside the hall. Each of these three thresholds is guarded by a royal functionary: (1) a coast guard or ford champion, (2) a gatekeeper or door-warden, and (3) a very high-ranking officer of the court, whose job is to confirm the status and bonafides of aspirants to a personal audience with the king. In medieval Ireland the *rechtaire* ‘royal steward’ (< Old Irish *recht* ‘law, authority’) conducted this final screening, as did the *distain* ‘royal seneschal’ in Wales (< from Old English *disc-þegn* ‘dish-servant’). This officer is sometimes depicted in literary sources as a strict, even harsh disciplinarian, who is shown to adjudicate disputes over precedence among competing champions, order the seating and service at banquets, and enforce the customary protocols of the king’s hall. The royal seneschal thus served as a “tester of men” (128 *et passim*), challenging newcomers to demonstrate their worthiness of the king’s attention and regard, sometimes publicly doubting or insulting them so as

to investigate their motives, abilities, and social identity more fully. Sayers sees the rude and truculent Ceī as a character of this type, comparing his function, following Enright (1998), to that of Hrothgar’s unfriendly *ðyle* ‘spokesman’, who, with his lord’s implicit approval, disparages *Beowulf*’s performance in the sea-contest with Breca, thus provoking the hero’s public correction of that account, presentation of his monster-slaying credentials, and declaration of intent to do the same to Grendel or die trying. In both traditions, this royal *agent provocateur* also loses face at the hero’s subsequent success, but not so much so that he jeopardizes his royal office or apparent closeness to the king, since he is just fulfilling the duty to which he has been assigned.

In “*Þyle* as Fool: Revisiting *Beowulf*’s Hunferth,” *Poetry, Place, and Gender: Studies in Medieval Culture in Honor of Helen Damico*, ed. Karkov [see sec. 2], 75–97, Leslie A. Donovan also sees this character, whose name she spells in its non-alliterating MS form, as an important functionary, parallel to the royal fools familiar “to audiences in English and Norman courts at a time not far removed from the composition of the *Beowulf* manuscript” (97). Despite the many apparent contradictions in his depiction, including the fact he is both a fratricide and trusted officer of the king, Donovan sees Hrothgar’s spokesman “as an early literary example of the wise fool,” an enigmatic but essentially noble figure, rather than “a simple entertainer with little social impact” (97). Hunferth challenges *Beowulf*, indeed, but not as his “antithesis or foil,” a strawman to be knocked down only to elevate the hero higher: Grendel is the real villain of this piece, after all. Instead, Donovan sees Hunferth as an intelligent and mature champion worthy of comparison with the young hero, a wielder “of both words and swords,” who reveals the complexities of heroic choice and responsibility that *Beowulf*, too, must learn to negotiate later in his life.

In “Dalla Grecia alla Germania: Fili di Mito e Grani d’Ambra [“From Greece to Germania: Threads of Myth and Grains of Amber”], *Coscienza e potere: Narrazioni attraverso il mito [Consciousness and Power: Narration through Myth]*, ed. Alessandra Dino and Licia A. Callari (Milan/Undine: Mimesis), 111–31, Patrizia Lendinara considers possible contact between ancient Greek and Germanic storytellers via the amber trade routes between the Mediterranean and Baltic Seas. In particular, she explores similarities between powerful mythic and legendary queens in Homeric epic and Attic drama, on the one hand—Hecuba, Antigone—and in Old Norse eddic poetry, on the other, including a discussion of the potent fertility goddess Freyja, whose fabulous adornment, the *Brisingamen*, was stolen by

Loki and recovered by Heimdallr. Lendinara notes (128, n. 52) the common identification of this treasure with the *Brosinga mene* 'necklace of the Brosings' in *Beowulf* at line 1199b, given by Wealhtheow to the hero and called by the poet, "the greatest of all neck-rings of those I have heard of on earth" (lines 1195a–96), mentioning that it had been "carried off" (line 1198b) from the treacherous Gothic king Eormenric by Hama, a human hero possibly analogous to the Norse god Heimdallr.

Yuko Tagaya writes on "Yamata-no-orochi (Serpent) and Oni (Ogre) in Japanese Court Myths: In Relation with the Idea of Regalia," *Bulletin of The College of Humanities, Kanto Gakuin University* 118: 15–49. Following Powell (1901), Shimazu (1929), and her own prior study (2008), Tagaya notes similarities between *Beowulf* and the Watanabe-no Tsuna legend of the fifteenth-century Noh song *Rashomon*, as well as in other tales from the thirteenth century preserved in the later *Book of Swords*. She adds a further comparison between the Old English poem and Japanese legend in that blades symbolic of royal authority, especially Kusanagi-no-tsurugi and the Serpent-Cutting-Sword of China, are lost with a change of dynastic power. Tagaya understands Unferth's sword Hrunting as a similarly significant emblem of Hrothgar's rule, since it is the weapon with which the king's spokesman presumably dispatched his rebellious brothers, thus winning Hrothgar's confidence in his loyalty. Yet, the old king's best blade now proves "useless" against Grendel and his mother, even when wielded by the hero Beowulf, since Hrothgar himself has become a "useless king" (43). Just as former aquatic divinities—Grendel and his mother in the poem, the serpent Yamato-no-orochi and the ogre Oni in Japanese legend—are demonized as water monsters to be destroyed by a later generation, so too the loss of royal swords in the process of the destruction of these monsters signifies a change of political regime. In fourteenth-century Japan, this change is from rule by landed gentry to that of a class of samurai warriors, a process paralleled by a transition in the poem from the hereditary Scylding monarchs of the opening verses to freelance champions like the hero Beowulf.

In "Where Now the Harp? Listening for the Sounds of Old English Verse, from *Beowulf* to the Twentieth Century," *Oral Tradition* 24.2: 485–502, Chris Jones adapts John Foley's concept of "immanent art" (1991), used to describe the collective referentiality of oral tradition, whereby the performance of only one small part serves to activate in the sensibility of its audience the entire narrative universe of a tradition to which its participants have long since been acculturated through their experience of many prior performances. This

whole is far greater in their minds than any part they hear in a particular performance. Jones argues that the literate *Beowulf* poet creates a similar effect by staging oral performances in his poem and imitating an oral-traditional style, thus generating a "conversation" between his own Christian scribal culture and the pre-Christian oral past as it was "remembered, witnessed, or imagined by the book-learned" (497–98). Even though the *Beowulf* poet cannot reproduce in writing "the authentic sounds" of an actual oral performance (497), he nonetheless manages to create in the experience of his readers a facsimile of that old tradition as a transcendent system of story and song. Jones finds that two twentieth-century poets, W. S. Graham in "The Voyages of Alfred Wallis" (2004) and Edwin Morgan in "Spacepoem 3: Off Course" (1990), similarly imitate an "Old English soundscape," one made familiar to readers through Anglo-Saxon texts taught in schools and universities. "Without Old English being directly quoted, but its sounds being ventriloquized, the unspoken corpus finds voice, and the unstated is made present. Naturally, these sounds are not authentic reproductions of the aurality of Old English verse; they are refractions, deviations, mediations: sounds evolved 'off course'" (497), as in the title of Morgan's poem, but as such they are very much like the *Beowulf* poet's own provocative aural pastiche of the traditional poet's art.

■ Criticism

John F. Vickrey considers *Beowulf and the Illusion of History* (Bethlehem, PA: Lehigh UP). In particular, he challenges the historical verisimilitude of two episodes—the Finnsburh lay (lines 1063–1159a) and Beowulf's memory of his encounter with the Frankish champion Dæghrefn (lines 2497–2508a)—which have traditionally been considered by scholars to belong to a more realistic narrative register than that of the hero's fights with supernatural monsters. To the contrary, Vickrey argues, these two episodes are also inhabited by gigantic enemies of the same ilk as the trolls of the Bear's Son folktale first described by Panzer (1910) and thought to lie behind the hero's combats with Grendel and his mother. For the Finnsburh lay, Vickrey takes the genitive plural *Êotena* 'of the Jutes' in lines 1072a, 1088a, and 1141a, and the dative plural *Êotenum* '[among] the Jutes' in line 1145a (as well as, in a different context, 902b), not as the ethnonym of a particular human tribe called *Êotan* 'Jutes' or 'Frisians', but rather as the common noun for a race of giants referred to elsewhere in the poem as *eotenas* in lines 112a, 421a, 761a, and 883b. In this reading, the human champion Hengest avenges

the slaying of his lord Hnæf upon a treacherous king of the giants named Finn, taking his treasure as appropriate recompense for Finn's misdeeds, a pattern paralleled in Beowulf's vengeance upon Grendel and his mother, and his taking of the monster's head and giants' sword-hilt as trophies. The poet has no problem with heroes appropriating the treasure of hostile giants at this point in the poem, Vickrey believes, but this view changes. The author argues that Dæghrefn, too, was once an *eoten* like Grendel or Finn in the tradition the poet is drawing upon, but that he chose in this case to play down the magnitude of Beowulf's enemy's inhuman size in order to put Hygelac more clearly in the wrong by an unprovoked attack upon human neighbors. Hygelac's responsibility for his own demise is thus made to foreshadow his nephew's disastrous attack upon the dragon, an action for which Wiglaf explicitly blames Beowulf. Rather than celebrating the defeat of evil giants and the rightful acquisition of their treasure by human heroes as in the first part of his poem, the *Beowulf* poet now introduces a more complex, elegiac theme, where even good kings are shown ultimately to encompass their own ruin through willfulness and greed. The theriomorphic dragon is a different breed of monster from the humanoid *eotenas* of the earlier episodes, who are categorically legitimate enemies. Beowulf's illegitimate desire to own the dragon's treasure brings ruin to his people rather than their deliverance, since we are told three times that news of their king's death will arouse human enemies against the Geats to retaliation, so that "the dire certainties of struggle with manlike monsters become the dire uncertainties of conflicts among men . . . fusing folktale and history into an illusion of historical truth" (206).

Heike Sahn pursues a similar analysis of the hero's final battle by considering his "Unversöhnte Motivierungen: Der Schatz als Hindernis kohärenten Erzählens im *Beowulf*" ["Conflicting Motives: The Treasure as a Challenge to Narrative Consistency in *Beowulf*"], *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 131.3: 442–60. Sahn proposes that the apparently contradictory pieces of information given about the dragon's hoard in the poem are designed to reveal the complexity of the hero's character and motives. On the one hand, Beowulf seeks out the dragon to protect his people from the possibility of further attack, but he expresses ancillary satisfaction at having gained its treasure for them when he realizes he will not survive his wounds. However, it is revealed to the poem's audience in a kind of dramatic irony that the hoard is protected both by the will of God, who allows the thief to escape with a cup unscathed, and by an

ancient heathen curse, that the hero himself unwittingly triggers without being granted similar immunity to its effects. Sahn believes that it is this curse that proves to be the hero's undoing—a punishment appropriate because of his very real desire for the treasure that he displays in his last few moments of life. However, since Beowulf's primary motivation was not greed for the gold at all, but a desire to protect his people, he is appropriately honored and remembered by them in the end as a good king. (CD/EC)

Elizabeth Howard strongly disagrees with this interpretation, arguing that "Beowulf was not *God Cyning*," *In Geardagum* 29: 45–68. The poet uses this assessment of three characters: Scyld Scefing (line 11b), Hrothgar (line 862b), and Beowulf himself (line 2390b), though in this last instance both the Swedish king Ongentheow and the Geatish king Heardred have also been proposed as the intended referent of the formulaic phrase *þæt wæs god cyning* 'that was a good king,' Howard sees this comment on Scyld to be unalloyed praise, whereas the poet's judgment of Hrothgar is tempered by its context: the Danes are praising Beowulf for killing Grendel against whom their own king is powerless, although they realize he was doing the best he could. Howard takes the positive assessment of Beowulf to be "completely ironic" (55), however, since it is uttered when he has just lost his king Heardred on the field of battle after acquiescing in his foolish involvement in Swedish dynastic politics. Beowulf then overreacts to this failure of Geatish foreign policy, becoming "an isolationist king" (56), who acquires no new territories for his people, secures no marriage alliance with former or potential enemies, and finally fails even to produce an heir for his own people, leaving as his successor a dubious distant kinsman who is not a Geat at all and who ignores Beowulf's last wish that the treasure be used for his people rather than uselessly reburied in his mound. For all his risk-taking as a young hero, then, Beowulf "plays it safe" during his career as king, supported by a weak retinue whom he has either chosen poorly or failed to train and inspire properly. Finally, in pitting his old man's strength against the dragon, the Geatish king, unlike Hrothgar with Grendel, does not wisely recognize his own limitations or put thoughtful regard for his people's safety before his personal desire for fame. Even in his dying words in lines 2730b–37a, Beowulf defines himself negatively, not by the good he has done, but by the evil he has avoided. His kingship is thus "marked by inertia, stasis, and passivity" (66), a judgment implicitly joined even by his people, who in the closing lines of the poem "damn him with the faintest of praise . . . for being nice," while realizing at

the same time that “they are now doomed” by his short-sightedness and self-involvement (68).

Francis Leneghan considers “The Poetic Purpose of the Offa-Digression in *Beowulf*,” *RES* 60.246: 538–60, arguing that the Anglian king Offa’s “taming of the shrew,” his uncertainly named wife normally identified as Modthryth, is intended to demonstrate the stabilizing influence of royal marriage in a society riven by crises of dynastic succession, thereby flagging the danger to which the hero exposes his people by later failing to marry and provide a legitimate heir to royal authority.

Alfred Hiatt takes “*Beowulf* Off the Map,” *ASE* 38: 11–40, criticizing the way peoples and places in the poem have been located anachronistically by modern scholars and cartographic illustrators in particular geographical settings. He argues, to the contrary, that the poet is interested not in the precise location of, but in the nature of the relationships between, the various peoples of his poem, whom he imagines generally to inhabit peripheral coastal regions separated from, but also connected to, each other by water. In addition, the dynamic interactions between these peoples in space are mirrored by sudden shifts between their past, present, and future histories in time. While the first two-thirds of the poem celebrates a “successful inter-regional collaboration” between a Geatish prince and a Danish monarch, the final third reveals the much more characteristic pattern of constant “inter-regional feuds” (29).

Stuart Elden also addresses “Place Symbolism and Land Politics in *Beowulf*,” *Cultural Geographies* 16.4: 447–63, focusing on the three sites of battle between the hero and monsters—the hall, the mere, and the dragon’s barrow—with an eye to their significance in the politics of land ownership and territorial control in Anglo-Saxon England. He suggests that these sites are “not simply where battles take place, but often the focus of the struggle itself” (458). This proposition is perhaps most clear in the hero’s defense of the hall Heorot, a place symbolic of the Danish king’s authority over his realm. The mere is a different kind of place—marshy and marginal, rather than solid and central—where water “intrudes into earth” and makes it “treacherous and desolate” (452). However, the expansionist hero extends the king’s hegemony even over this dubious frontier. The dragon occupies another ambiguous space: an earthen and stone burial chamber filled with treasure, partly above ground but mainly below, that is, a human artifact buried in the natural landscape. For Elden, the dragon’s lair symbolizes not an alien, peripheral place secreted in the sea-cliffs at the outer limits of the old king’s realm, but rather a deeply rooted part of his *epel*

‘homeland, patrimony, inherited realm’ over which he is duly constituted *weard* ‘guardian’. The old king is forced to assert his ownership over this space, even if it means losing his life in the process. And when he dies, Beowulf is appropriately buried in an identical kind of place, that is, a treasure-filled barrow at the edge of his *epel*, thereby reasserting his claim over the disputed boundary, but one which is now revealed to be arbitrary, impermanent and ultimately permeable.

Helen T. Bennett pursues a similar train of thought not with land but with buildings in “The Postmodern Hall in *Beowulf*: Endings Embedded in Beginnings,” *The Heroic Age* 12 (May, online). She argues that far from being an image of positive social value and secure meaning in Anglo-Saxon culture and poetry, the king’s hall, at least in *Beowulf*, is used to symbolize the limitations and ultimate indeterminacy of all human activities and relations. Even the structural material out of which these halls are built is significant. Unlike the stone masonry of Roman and some Anglo-Saxon ecclesiastical edifices, intended to symbolize the permanence of the political and religious institutions they embody, the flammable timber halls of *Beowulf* signify instability, dissension, discontinuity—the utter failure of all human constructs to provide the kind of meaning to which they pretend. For instance, the new peace among the tribes of southern Scandinavia, symbolized by the building of Heorot, is shown to be an illusion. The Scyldings’ rise to power does not abolish the violence that these people once suffered for so long without a king (lines 14b–16a). Rather, it institutionalizes that violence through the subjugation and forced tribute of many formerly independent peoples now permanently subjected to Scyld and his heirs. The peace embodied by Heorot is thus inherently self-contradictory, a chimaera. The hall is infested with a violent monster by night and hidden malice by day, including Unferth’s not-so-secret hostility toward Beowulf, the twice-mentioned fact of his fratricide, and of course the impending murderous rivalry among the Scylding royals themselves. In addition, this wooden structure is no sooner built than the poet describes its literal deconstruction in the most complete and totalizing way possible: it will be—or rather, has already been at the time of the telling of its story—incinerated by the flames of renewed hatred between father- and son-in-law, Hrothgar and Ingeld (lines 81b–85). Even Beowulf’s cleansing of Heorot is “almost beside the point since the hall, as well as the heroic Danish society it houses, has already vanished” (§17). And the same fate befalls Beowulf’s own royal hall back in Geatland, which we likewise first hear of in the very moment of

its destruction by the dragon's fire (lines 2324–27a). The ends of halls in *Beowulf* are thus inscribed in their beginnings: they are long gone, we realize, even before they first appear; their presence in the poem signifies their absence from the world. These burning poetic buildings are classic poststructural constructs, then, what Jacques Derrida calls a “play of traces” (1982), casting flickering shadows of an absent past that erase their own presence even as they are called into being.

Eileen A. Joy also meditates on halls in the poem, developing her 2008 reflections on what the philosophy of Emmanuel Levinas suggests about them: “In His Eyes Stood a Light, Not Beautiful”: Levinas, Hospitality, *Beowulf*,” *Levinas and Medieval Literature: The “Difficult Reading” of English and Rabbinic Texts*, ed. Ann W. Astell and J. A. Jackson (Pittsburgh: Duquesne UP), 57–84. Following Derrida (1999 and 2000), Joy understands Levinas's idea of “hospitality” to embrace a radical openness to the Other. In *Beowulf*, such generosity seems to be symbolized by Heorot, the great hall where Hrothgar shares out to young and old all that God has given him. Joy suggests that the doors of Heorot swing both ways, however: inward to a world of apparent peace and plenty (though one obtained through the suppression of political opposition and appropriation of others' resources) and outward to a wilderness of excluded Others. Hospitality to visitors in the hall, then, is not “just a form of charity, but a form of politics—a politics, moreover, that has its breakable limits, evidenced by the poem's multiple digressions into stories about violence erupting within ... the hall itself” (70). The politicized hospitality of Heorot is challenged by Grendel, an uninvited “guest” whose eyes brighten with an *unfæger* ‘unlovely’ gleam in lines 726b–27 when he sees the sleeping Geatish warriors, themselves foreign recipients of Heorot's famed hospitality. Grendel has come to claim his own place at the feast, tearing down the doors that separate the hall's supposedly friendly interior from the Others it is designed to keep out. He signifies a recursion of the State's implicit violence in the form of explicit terrorist revolt. This “return of the repressed” (in Freud's phrase) establishes its own validity in a gesture of desperate self- and Other-destruction. Like a suicide bomber, Grendel succeeds in securing the recognition of those who have sought to exclude him. Even though his body is “partitioned” (71), that is, dismembered and appropriated, by the dominant regime, much like the occupied territories of minority or oppressed peoples, the surviving occupants of the hall now must gaze into the staring eyes of his severed head where they see there

an “unlovely” reminder of their own violence against him and Others like him.

In “Shoulder Companions and Shoulders in *Beowulf*,” *Masculinities and Femininities in the Middle Ages and Renaissance*, ed. Frederick Kiefer (Turnhout: Brepols), 31–44, Victor I. Scherb considers the poem's attention to a different body part. The term *eaxlgestealla* ‘shoulder-companion’ occurs four times in the Old English poetic corpus: twice in the *Exeter Book*, in riddles 79 and 80, where it means a sword, and twice in *Beowulf* at line 1326a, where it is used of Hrothgar's old thegn Æschere, and in the plural *eaxlgesteallan* in line 1714a, where it designates the followers of Heremod wrongfully slain by their king. “In its most literal sense the word refers to how Anglo-Saxon warriors would fight shoulder to shoulder in battle, ideally forming an invulnerable line” (31), but who also sit together side-by-side at the celebratory beer-drinking in the king's hall. Shoulders thus signify the key point of masculine intimacy in both war and peace, so that the strength and integrity of shoulders, shoulder-companions and the swords such companions wield all become crucial synecdoches for the necessary political unity of the king's *comitatus*.

In “Philologie unter komparatistischen und kulturwissenschaftlichen Aspekten—Medialität in *Beowulf*” [“Philology from the Perspectives of Comparative and Cultural Studies—Mediality in *Beowulf*”], *Germanisch-romanische Monatsschrift* 59.1: 129–48, Andrew James Johnston studies how the poem represents communication in spoken words and writing, invoking an oral, pre-Christian past, but introducing anachronisms that reveal how linguistic signs in any medium are not interpretable without adequate cultural knowledge and an understanding of the system of signification. In particular, the poet stages two “media events” which challenge the narrative decorum of his poem: (1) Hrothgar's *scop* sings of the Christian God's creation of the world (lines 86–114), even though the pagan Danes, including presumably the *scop* himself, must only dimly grasp the significance of his words, nor do they realize that the singing of this song provokes Grendel's attack upon Heorot; and (2) in lines 1557–62 and 1687–98a *Beowulf* presents Hrothgar with a sword hilt depicting the destruction of the giants by the great Flood as described in Genesis 6, an event of which the Danes are ignorant. These two media—one oral, the other written or engraved—communicate information that the Christian audience of the poem immediately recognizes, while seeing that the pagan Danes cannot interpret it accurately or, in the second instance, possibly even at all. It is left unclear as to whether the inscription on the hilt is a pictorial image or written

text, whether that text is in Germanic rune-staves or the Latin alphabet, or whether Hrothgar can read what it says in either medium or is just staring without comprehension at the obscure signs. Johnston suggests the poem's ambiguity on these points serves to illustrate the factitiousness of all media of communication and the extent to which linguistic and other signs can be inadequate, ambiguous or completely unintelligible to their recipients. (CD/EC)

Manish Sharma more generally considers "Beowulf and Poststructuralist Theory," *Literature Compass* 6.1: 56–70, summarizing these new approaches to literary criticism introduced by (mainly) French theorists and their followers in the late 1960s and afterwards: Derrida, De Man, Deleuze, Foucault, Lacan, Riffaterre, Bakhtin, Eagleton, Kristeva, Jameson, and others. He reviews the various readings of *Beowulf* responsive to these poststructuralist critics, especially Hermann (1989), Overing (1990), O'Brien O'Keeffe (1990), Frantzen (1990 and 1991), Lehrer (1991), Near (1993), Lees (1994), Liuzza (1994), Earl (1994), Pasternack (1995 and 1997), Dockray-Miller (1998), Hala (1998), DeGregorio (1999), Christie (2003), Sharma (2005), Davidson (2005), Thormann (2006), Jordon (2006), Joy and Ramsey (2006), and Acker (2006). The main influence of poststructuralist criticism upon *Beowulf* studies, Sharma finds, has been to undermine totalizing interpretations of the poem, what he calls the "transcendental signified" (57), and to encourage an appreciation for *Beowulf's* "asignifying intensities" (quoting Bogue [2003] on Deleuze, 59), that is, a recognition of the poem's dramatic but unresolved contest of linguistic forms and ideas in the context of Anglo-Saxon power relations—gendered, religious, political, and psychological.

Yvette Kisor reviews arguments for "Numerical Composition and *Beowulf*: A Reconsideration," *ASE* 38: 41–76. She finds some consonance in the general approach of these studies to the organization of lines and fits in the first part of the poem, but notes that their analyses yield very different numerical ratios putatively employed by the poet in arranging his material. Furthermore, Kisor remarks that proponents of numerical patterning in *Beowulf* have never convincingly explained the significance of such ratios, contenting themselves with merely remarking their existence or invoking some larger principle of natural mathematical harmony as postulated by Boethius.

In "Reinterpreting Threats to Face: The Use of Politeness in *Beowulf*, ll. 407–472," *Neophilologus* 93: 511–20, Michael R. Kightley examines the speech in which the hero asks Hrothgar to be allowed to confront Grendel. This request is "Face-Threatening" to its

recipient, according to the politeness model formulated by Brown and Levison (1987), in that the hero implies a failure on the part of the king to protect his people and thereby asserts his own "superior social capital" (511). The king, however, cleverly averts this threat to his honor by re-framing the request in terms of a traditional gift exchange in which Beowulf's desire to help him against Grendel is construed as appropriate recompense for the king's having helped Beowulf's father Ecgtheow years before and settling his feud with his enemies.

Mark Adderley quotes Dizzy Dean—"it ain't bragging, if you can do it"—in exploring the hero's decision "To Beot or Not to Beot: Boasting in *Beowulf*," *In Geardagum* 29: 1–16. Adderley believes the pitcher for the Cardinals in 1934 was expressing a very Anglo-Saxon attitude, one evinced by the hero himself who confidently vows to confront Grendel and his mother, not predicting success exactly, but at least a fight to the death to which he feels himself fully equal. Later, as an old king, however, Beowulf seems much less convinced of his prospects against the dragon. He is still determined to do his best, of course, but this time discreetly declines to vaunt: *Ic eom on mode from, / þæt ic wið þone guðflogan gylp ofersitte* "I am resolute in spirit, so that I may forego boasting against the war-flier" (lines 2527a–28). This stark, but somewhat diffident resolve Adderley finds to be "far more courageous" than the hero's earlier boasting (16).

Keri Wolf considers another form of verbal commitment in "Enacting the Ties That Bind: Oath-Making vs. Oath-Taking in the Finnsburg Episode," *Comitatus* 40: 1–24. She notes that when characters in *Beowulf* or *The Battle of Maldon* recall vows, they characteristically refer to the public space, in particular, the mead-bench in the hall, on which they were made. This formal location, she suggests, is what makes oaths voluntarily undertaken there especially binding, a situation very different from that of the oath extracted from the surviving Danish leader Hengest by his lord's slayer Finn after their tactical stand-off in the Finnsburgh lay recounted by Hrothgar's scop in lines 1063–1159a. This oath to Finn is not "made" by Hengest in the usual way, but rather "taken" from him in circumstances that imply he will not feel as bound by it as to the prior, more publicly valid oath he once made to Hnæf in that fallen king's mead-hall.

Dana M. Oswald examines the hero's two reports—one to king Hrothgar, the other to his uncle Hygelac—on his "*Wigge under Wætere* [Warfare under Water]: Beowulf's Revision of the Fight with Grendel's Mother," *Exemplaria* 21.1: 63–82. Oswald argues that the hero suppresses certain details of his "intercourse"

with Grendel's mother, in particular, the fact that she had "mounted" him in their struggle and come to within an ace of penetrating him with her long knife. Even though this deadly coitus was interrupted by his prophylactic mailshirt, Beowulf does not want to leave in his interlocutors' minds the image of himself as a feminized, even infantilized, victim of the "phallic mother" (63). This image threatened to undermine the masculine and heroic public identity that he has taken such pains to construct for himself elsewhere in the poem. Through a rhetorical sleight of hand, then, the hero distracts attention from the woman who almost had him, even as he cannot help but reveal her real threat, one far greater than that of her son. In doing so, Howard believes Beowulf reveals his own insecurity and sense of "fractured masculinity" (63).

In this published version of his 2007 lecture, Tom Shippey discusses the relationship between nineteenth-century Germanic philology, political nationalism, and early editions of the poem in "Kemble, *Beowulf*, and the Schleswig-Holstein Question," *The Kemble Lectures on Anglo-Saxon Studies 2005–8*, ed. Jorgensen, Conrad O'Briain, and Scattergood [see sec. 2], 64–80. The first edition of *Beowulf* was published in 1815 by the Icelander Jónas Grímur Thorkelín, who claimed it for Denmark by implying in his title that the poem was composed in an "Anglo-Saxon dialect" of the ancient *dönsk tunga* 'Danish tongue', that is, Old Norse. The Englishman John Kemble re-edited the poem in 1833, but claimed it instead for Germany, particularly Angeln, a disputed region of northern Schleswig from which he believed it was brought to *Engla land* 'the land of the Angles, England'. Kemble eventually came to believe that the story of Scyld's son Beowulf—as the name appears in the MS at lines 18a and 53b; more correctly, for Kemble, *Beo* or *Beowa*—preserved the myth of an Anglian fertility god and ethnic progenitor, who was "der Stammvater und Stifter der germanischen Völker [the ancestor and originator of the Germanic peoples]," both in Germany and England (1836, quoted 75–76). For Kemble, everything Scandinavian in the poem, "including Beowulf the hero, the Geatish monster-killer so annoyingly associated with Danish kings, was a later addition" (75). He included among these Scandinavianizing accretions the one almost universally accepted historical incident in the poem, the demise of Beowulf's uncle Hygelac in Frisia, first noted by the Danish scholar N. F. S. Gruntvig in 1817 and demonstrated definitively by the German scholar Heinrich Leo in 1839. It was his hostility to a Scandinavian *Beowulf* that Shippey believes caused Kemble to resist all efforts to parse the poem's historicity,

however strongly suggested by other sources. In fact, he concludes that "the most lasting legacy of Kemble's work on *Beowulf* must be the modern conviction that the poem has no historical value, and that the sense of history it so strongly conveys is, as Tolkien said [in 1936], just the product of literary art, 'the glamour of Poesis'" (79).

In a collection of twenty essays on *The Hero's Journey*, Bloom's Literary Themes (New York: Bloom's Literary Criticism/Infobase Publishing), Harold Bloom introduces and Blake Hobby edits a reprint W. P. Ker's essay, "Beowulf," from his *Epic and Romance: Essays on Medieval Literature* (1908), 25–38.

■ *Beowulf and Material Culture*

Richard Bradley discusses "the archaeology of death" (38) in "*Beowulf* and British Prehistory," *Mortuary Practices and Social Identities in the Middle Ages*, ed. Sayer and Williams [see sec. 2], 38–45. Bradley notes that the funeral of Scyld Scefing in the opening lines of the poem reflects an ancient association in northern Europe between ships and commemoration of the dead that can be traced back to the Mesolithic period. The largest such find from the pre-Roman Iron Age is a forty-meter boat found at Hjortspring, Denmark, of a type also depicted on rock carvings and associated with a major deposit of weapons (40). The story of Scyld raises the possibility that some presumed shipwrecks or other deposits of valuable artifacts in water may be the result of similar ship funerals of which evidence for their commemorative purpose or traces of the wooden vessel and human remains within them have disappeared. Bradley also sees provocative questions for archaeologists in the cremation and tumulus burial of the hero at the end of the poem, since it involves the interment of objects from several different contexts: (1) gifts of the living, manufactured in Beowulf's own lifetime; (2) royal heirlooms, made before the hero was born—both kinds of offering being burned first with the king on his pyre and then later interred with his ashes in the mound; and then finally (3) unburned treasures from the dragon's hoard, apparently a Bronze Age or Neolithic "passage grave," which contained vessels and ornaments of unknown provenance crafted many centuries before their reburial with the king. Parsing the contents of this mixed inventory of materials and dating Beowulf's interment accurately would thus have presented a significant challenge to archaeologists, just as confident dating of the poem's composition itself has stumped *Beowulf* scholars. Bradley suggests that this literary example offers to prehistorians a salutary reminder of the diachronic complexity

and tangled provenance of the material remains they may uncover in any given deposit.

Frank Battaglia considers the key question in interpreting the cultural significance of the poem to be “Not Christianity versus Paganism, but Hall versus Bog: The Great Shift in Early Scandinavian Religion and its Implications for *Beowulf*,” *Anglo-Saxons and the North*, ed. Kilpiö *et al.* [see sec. 2], 11–46. Until around 500 AD, religious practice in southern Scandinavia was marked by sacrificial offerings, sometimes human, in bogs or pools. After this time, similar offerings came to be associated with elite structures, including the post-holes of great halls, implying that political leaders had taken control of religious ritual by the late pagan period, an innovation far more significant than the conversion to Christianity soon thereafter with its similar association of Church and royal court. Battaglia suggests that Grendel and his mother occupy one of these prehistoric bogs or meres in which human sacrifices were once made. *Beowulf* himself says that Grendel will *mearca[n] morhopu* ‘mark his moor-retreats’ (line 450a) as he devours the hero’s corpse, recalling the old rituals that the royalist poet wishes to demonize, including *endocannibalism* ‘the eating of relatives’ of an earlier era, a practice possibly revealed in the excavation of a watery site at Forlev Nymølle in Denmark.

In “A Hrunting We Will Go: *Beowulf*’s Sword and Norse Weapons Technology,” *The Image of Technology: Proceedings [from the] 2009 Conference [of the] Society for the Interdisciplinary Study of Social Imagery*, ed. Will Wright and Steven Kaplan (Pueblo: Society for the Interdisciplinary Study of Social Imagery, Colorado State U-Pueblo): 292–94, Karen Emanuelson notes the irony that while two swords—Hrunting and Nægling—are named in the poem, that is, given a distinct value and an individual identity, human beings are sometimes not so identified, like the thrall who is forced to lead the way to the dragon’s lair. This discrepancy, she believes, is due to the fact that slaves were cheap, while good swords were expensive and extremely difficult to make. Although there are other kinds of weapons mentioned in the poem, Emanuelson remarks, “swords are the stars” (293): they are themselves heroic characters in their own right, whose ancestry and ultimate fate is of no less interest to the poet and his audience than that of human heroes.

Lance Alexander narrates *Life in the Age of Beowulf*, filmed and edited by Keven Phillips (Gwent: ArtsMagic), DVD, comprising a tour of the 125-acre West Stow Country Park and Anglo-Saxon Village in Suffolk, East Anglia. The site was excavated in the 1960s and 1970s and discovered to have been occupied from pre-Roman

times (ca. 420 BC) to well into the Anglo-Saxon period (ca. AD 650), when it was abandoned for unknown reasons. It comprised two to three family groups dwelling in twenty to thirty structures, some of which have been experimentally reconstructed, including a weaving house, an oven, a workshop, a family residence, and a modest hall or meeting house in which Alexander suggests poems like *Beowulf* were recited.

■ *Dissertations and Theses*

In “Finite Verb Stress and Clitic Verbs in Old English *Beowulf*,” (Ph.D. Diss, U of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, *DAI* 70.2: 555), Yasuko Suzuki studies the distribution of unstressed finite verbs in the poem, mainly monosyllabic forms of *wesan/beon* ‘to be’, such as *is* ‘is’ and *was* ‘was’, less often disyllabic forms, like *syndon* ‘are’ and *wæron* ‘were’, as well as monosyllabic clitics, that is, auxiliaries and other verbs that take an infinitive, like *sceal* ‘must’, *wearð* ‘happened’, *maeg* ‘can’, and *com* ‘came’. These “light” verbs in *Beowulf* usually occur after a clause-initial unstressed adverb or pronoun or, less often, after a stressed simplex element. Heavier verbs, like disyllabic auxiliaries or lexical verbs, appear unstressed at the beginning of a clause or stressed late in a clause, but less frequently in the second position preferred for light clitic verbs. Suzuki thus sees a clear distinction in the distribution of the two types of verb in the archaic register of traditional poetry. In later Old English this second position was extended to include non-clitic verbs, that is, those not anticipating a following predicate or infinitive.

Daniel Christopher Singles studies how “Words are Weapons: Boast and Anti-boast in the Poetic Feuds of *Beowulf*, Alexander Pope, and Twenty-First Century Battle Rap,” (master’s thesis, Villanova U). He notes that boasts are designed to enhance the social identity of a speaker, while anti-boasts, that is, insults, are intended to denigrate the value of their intended target and to raise the perceived worth of the speaker by contrast. The author finds such anxious attempts to manipulate relative status inherently counter-productive, comparing examples from *Beowulf*, the literary feud between Alexander Pope and Edmund Curll in the earlier eighteenth century, and contemporary “battle rap” by performers like 50 Cent and Eminem.

■ *Translations and Translation Studies*

Heather O’Donoghue discusses “Heaney, *Beowulf*, and the Medieval Literature of the North,” *The Cambridge Companion to Seamus Heaney*, ed. Bernard

O'Donoghue (Cambridge: Cambridge UP), 192–205. She argues that the Irish poet's "idea of the north" is derived primarily from Old Norse and Old English literary texts among which *Beowulf* is the "big thing" in Heaney's own personal estimation (quoted 192). He is attracted to this poem, O'Donoghue believes, because it is expressed in a mature poetic idiom or literary *koine* that "exudes centrality, authority, a profoundly wide-ranging and secure humanity," even though the poem itself has been marginalized in an English literary canon concentrated on the more linguistically accessible works of Geoffrey Chaucer, William Shakespeare, and John Milton. Heaney's verse translation of *Beowulf* (1999) changed all that, O'Donoghue believes, but the poem's earlier "shift from centre to margin [had been] a precise mirror image of Heaney's own position: though proudly conscious of writing and speaking from what is perceived by literary London as a linguistic and political margin, Heaney has himself centralised that margin, foregrounding the literature, languages and politics of Ulster. Heaney's translation of *Beowulf* is a dizzying amalgam of opposites: very distant meets very recent; centralised margin meets marginalised centre" (201–2). One of the recent arguments for the inclusion of *Beowulf* in university syllabuses is the fact that an important modern author like Heaney considers it to be a classic and has thus made it newly relevant and accessible. O'Donoghue further suggests that although the Irish poet intimates in the Ulsterisms of his rendering a resonance between the recent history of Northern Ireland and the world of the Anglo-Saxon poem—"the tit-for-tat killings, the peace process, mixed marriages, tribal warfare, the legacy of history" (204)—he nonetheless refuses "to allegorise the poem into a costume drama of the Ulster situation" (205), working instead to preserve *Beowulf's* "cultural alterity" in order to establish even more clearly "its indivisible continuity with the present" (205).

Douglas Ryan VanBenthuyzen sees a somewhat different result in "Seamus Heaney's Audio *Beowulf*: An Analysis of the Omissions," *Defining Medievalism(s)*, ed. Karl Fugelso (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer), 161–84. The audiobook version of Heaney's *Beowulf: The Original BBC Recording* (2000) is misleadingly advertised by its American distributor, the HighBridge Company, as comprising "unabridged selections" of the published translation (quoted 162). VanBenthuyzen observes that, in fact, 989 lines (or 31%) of the poem have been cut out or otherwise altered from Heaney's original total of 3,182, often several short excisions from longer passages, so that its selections have indeed been "abridged." He has been unable to determine why these particular

lines were cut, since the BBC studio responsible for producing the audio version has declined to answer his inquiries, nor does he consider that these may have been decisions made in production by Heaney himself. VanBenthuyzen finds that these omissions clearly preserve the main storyline of the three monster fights, but eliminate many of the contextual episodes and allusions, "obliterat[ing] major themes such as the role of women, the relationship between the Christian and Germanic worlds, and the role of nobility, and they tend to oversimplify and even resolve key ambiguities that often appear when these themes surface in the poem" (162). VanBenthuyzen supplies an appendix itemizing the various changes and omissions by type: (1) references to secondary characters; (2) scenes of violence or their renarration; (3) references to fratricide; (4) scenes illustrating social relationships; (5) passages markedly pessimistic in tone; (6) references to feuds, especially with the Swedes; and (7) minor revisions of word choice or phrasing (173–81). This last category VanBenthuyzen finds innocuous, reflective of the poem's oral-traditional style, and the audio version as a whole "beautiful to the ear and full of the many poetic flourishes that characterize the translation" (172). Nonetheless, he concludes that Heaney's Audio *Beowulf* essentially suppresses the poem's sense of historical particularity, what makes it distinctively Anglo-Saxon, "locates it in Scandinavia, places it in the Germanic and early Christian traditions, and allows it to exist in some real place populated by real people, however fictionalized and rendered fantastic by monsters and dragons" (172).

In "Translating *Beowulf* (1999–2008)," *The Medieval Review* (May, online), Craig R. Davis, the present reviewer, contemplates the unusual fate of the poem, which survives in a single damaged manuscript copied around the year 1000:

No one knows when, where, by whom or for whom it was first composed during the previous half millennium, whether it reflects ancient legendary traditions or more recent literary art . . . The story is set not in Anglo-Saxon England, which country is never even mentioned, but in ancient Scandinavia, telling of the last king of a lost tribe once living in southern Sweden. And except for the two Cotton Vitellius scribes, *Beowulf* has no known medieval reader or listener. For centuries it was buried away in an obscure monastic library, unread and soon virtually unreadable, until it appeared among antiquarian book collections in the 16th century. It came within inches of being destroyed by fire in 1731. It is scorched and crumbling around the edges, from which at least

2,000 letters have been lost since the end of the 18th century. The text of this long-forgotten poem would itself seem to exemplify the fate it predicts for all human achievements. Yet, since the time *Beowulf* was first translated into Latin in 1815, the power of its language, the starkness of its imagery, the subtlety of its meaning, and the wisdom of its sad, brave view of life have inspired as many scholarly studies as the combined tragedies of Shakespeare. It is the first great poem in English and speaks for generations of mute speakers of that language, after centuries of silence of its own. It is astonishing that at the beginning of the 21st century *Beowulf* should finally come into its own, finding itself more compelling to poets, scholars, translators, writers, movie-makers, musical composers and other interpreters than at any other time of its existence on earth.

Davis then compares the relative effectiveness and balance of competing priorities in recent translations or revised translations of the poem by Seamus Heaney (1999), R. M. Liuzza (1999), Louis J. Rodrigues (2002), Alan Sullivan and Timothy Murphy (2004), Frederick Rebsamen (1971/2004), Martin Puhvel (2006), Richard N. Ringler (2006/2007), and John McNamara (2007).

■ *Performances, Films, Musical, and Other Adaptations*

On 28 May BBC Four aired a program on *Beowulf* written and presented by Michael Wood, featuring clips of actor Julian Glover's performance of the poem to a reenactment group called *Regia Anglorum*. Glover adapts Michael Alexander's Modern English translation (1973), interspersed with a few lines of the poem in Old English. The program includes a conversation with *Beowulf* scholar Sam Newton about the possible East Anglian origins of the poem; archival footage of archaeologist Basil Brown and the excavation of Sutton Hoo; a retelling of "Black Shuck" (< Old English *scucca* 'demon'), a modern analogue of Grendel's attack, by folklore historian Peter Jennings; the forging of a pattern-welded sword by blacksmith Hector Cole; an interview with the poem's translator Seamus Heaney (1999) on the trajectory of the hero's life and his deepening sense of the *lacrimae rerum* 'tears of things'; and the first televised filming of the *Beowulf* manuscript itself, Cotton Vitellius A.xv, in the British Library in London. In addition, Wood visits Bede's World at Jarrow in Tyne and Wear, the Ruthwell Cross in Dumfriesshire, Wayland's Smithy (a Neolithic chamber tomb) in Oxfordshire, used to illustrate the dragon's barrow, and finally Malmesbury Abbey in Wiltshire, on the former border of the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms Mercia and Wessex, where

Wood suggests the *Beowulf* manuscript itself may have been copied from an Anglian exemplar into late West Saxon around the year 1000, since the library there was known to have possessed the Latin originals of the other Old English texts preserved with the poem in Cotton Vitellius A.xv. Wood calls the early Anglo-Saxons not invaders, but "economic migrants" seeking a new life for themselves and their families in a new land. Much like later refugees in America, these Anglo-Saxons clung tenaciously to memories of their ancestral homelands, a nostalgia reflected in the poem. Even though Wood acknowledges that these immigrants came in small numbers and made little impact upon the British gene pool—"our DNA is generally much older"—he remarks that the newcomers did bring their language and thus their cultural mentality to post-Roman British society, "for language is thought." Wood praises the "pagan humanism" of this Christian poem, its "refinement of manners" and "generosity of spirit," reminding his English audience that it is composed in "our speech: ironical, self-deprecating, and quite tough-minded." "In my mind," he suggests, "it's our nation's greatest gift to the world" and "will be remembered as long as there's poetry in these islands. Until the dragon comes! [an echo of Tolkien's conclusion to his famous British Academy lecture of 1936]." (Sincere thanks to Diana Briscoe for providing the reviewer with a copy of this program.)

In "Popularizing High Culture: Zemeckis's *Beowulf*," *Studies in Popular Culture* 31.2: 45–59, Kathleen Forni finds suspect the promotion of this 2007 film version of the poem as a serious interpretation of the timeless classic. While allowing for the legitimacy of such re-interpretations, she still deplores this particular film's distance from the dignity and thematic depth of the original poem, finding that it panders to the tastes of immature movie-goers with its "disquieting fusion of graphic violence and moral conservatism" (46). In particular, the hero's fathering of the dragon upon Grendel's seductive mother is in Forni's view a cheap trick to titillate a teenage audience while putatively warning them that "a single pre- or extramarital liaison can ruin your life" (46).

Christopher W. White discusses "Needing the Dragon: Physical EXperience vs. Cerebral Analysis in Banana Bag and Bodice's *Beowulf: A Thousand Years of Baggage*," with photos by Jessica Palopali, *TheatreForum* 34: 84–91. White describes this "song-play" which ran at the Abrons Art Center in New York City from 1–19 April, after its 2008 premier in Berkeley, California.

Just as the martial philosophy and principles of military strategy described in works like Sun Tzu's *Art of War* (fifth century BC) and Miyamoto Musashi's

Book of the Five Rings (ca. AD 1645) have been adapted to business school curricula, so E. L. Ridsen wishes to offer *Beowulf for Business: The Modern Warrior's Guide to Career Building* (Albany: Whitson Publishing, 2007), organized into twenty-five lessons comprising five parts each: (1) an idea, (2) the passage from the poem in which it is expressed, (3) its application in the contemporary business world, (4) a “manager’s spotlight,” emphasizing its implications for company leaders and CEOs, and (5) further “points to ponder,” often a list of questions to ask oneself and recommendations about how to go about answering them. For instance, the first chapter is entitled, “Mortality and Learning from the Past,” followed by an epigraph from the poem, “By generous deeds one may prosper in any nation” (lines 24a–25), which is paraphrased “Your own generosity will help you succeed” (13). Ridsen reminds us that the “poem is unabashedly instructive” (246) and “serves up a particularly large number of quality nuggets of wisdom” (248), stressing especially that leaders “need compassion and magnanimity if their work is to produce any lasting results of value” (251). He concludes with the exhortation: “Go get ‘em.”

Teaching Beowulf

Jacob Hughes suggests including *Beowulf* in a first-year college writing course devoted to “A Monstrous Pedagogy,” *Rocky Mountain Review* 63.1: 96–104, in which students are encouraged to explore how human groups define themselves not by who they are, but by how they project their own ethnocentric fears into racial and other “monstrous” stereotypes.

(With thanks to Emily Coda for help with the studies in German.)

CD/EC

Works Not Seen

Micillo, Valeria, “Grendel: *ellor-gâst* ‘essere dell-altrove [a being from elsewhere]” *Annali: Sezione Germanica* ns 18 (2008): 45–72 [abstract in English, pp. 249–50].
 O’Brien, Eugene, “The Ethics of Translation: Seamus Heaney’s *Cure at Troy* and *Beowulf*,” in “*Kicking Bishop Brennan up the Arse*”: *Negotiating Texts and Contexts in Contemporary Irish Studies*, Reimagining Ireland 1 (Oxford/New York: Peter Lang, 2009), pp. 31–48.

4D. PROSE

Old English Martyrology

Christine Rauer makes her “Old English Martyrology: An Annotated Bibliography” freely available online at <http://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/~cr30/martyrology/>. The site is divided into sections: Introduction; Manuscripts; Editions and Translations; Reference; Bibliographies; Studies (subdivided into Hagiography, Liturgy, Function; Date, Historical Background; Language, Style; and Sources, Composition); Reviews; Miscellaneous; Other Martyrologies; Essential Reading; An Index of Reference Nos., Saints, Feasts, and Manuscript Contents; An Alphabetical Index of Persons Named in the Old English Martyrology; Links to Other Sites; and Contacts. Most of these sections have self-explanatory titles, although a few are not obvious. “Essential Reading” lists good introductions and crucial studies and should not be overlooked, although it appears late in the contents; indeed, readers new to the study of the *Martyrology* should begin here. “Reference” sketches out the three major systems of reference for sections of the *Martyrology*: the *DOE*, *Kotzor*, and *Scragg*. “Other Martyrologies” is still “under construction” but lists both general studies of the field and editions of other late antique and early medieval martyrologies. Annotations are brief, ranging from a few words to a couple of lines in square brackets at the end of a citation. Most of Rauer’s comments simply summarize concisely, but a few note that an item has been superseded or is unreliable. Despite their brevity, some of the annotations are quite useful. Items are generally listed chronologically from earliest to most recent.

Christine Rauer also studies the “Usage of the Old English Martyrology” in *Foundations of Learning: The Transfer of Encyclopaedic Knowledge in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Bremmer and Dekker, 125–46 (see sect. 5). Scholars have generally believed that the *OE Martyrology* was not used in the monastic office; extant copies are fragmentary and usually were not copied alongside other texts for regular monastic use. Instead, its tone is literary, and it covers mostly universal and early saints with little evidence for local interest or updating. Yet, Rauer notes, books used regularly tend to wear out, so we may have lost copies more appropriate for the divine office or entries for new saints. *The OE Martyrology* stands out for its range of details, employment of direct discourse, and encyclopedic function. It contains more entries on cosmology and astronomy than other

martyrologies. Later authors bear traces of influence from its non-hagiographic material: Bazire and Cross Homily 6 borrows from the *Martyrology* on processions for relics, and the miscellany Harley 3271 includes the *Martyrology's* entries on the Beginning of Summer and the Beginning of Winter. Other possible cosmological borrowings appear in Irvine Homily 6, the *Meters of Boethius*, and Ælfric's *De falsis diis*. Twelfth-century marginalia in one copy provide the only evidence for interest in the *Martyrology's* hagiographic entries. Rauer suggests that the authors who drew upon the *OE Martyrology* were not poorly educated but learned readers who used both English and Latin sources. The *OE Martyrology* is also "particularly user-friendly to a homilist" with entries in calendar order, each beginning on a new line in every extant manuscript (139). Rauer concludes that the *OE Martyrology* "combines the characteristics of a martyrology, calendar, legendary, homiliary, and encyclopedia" (144) and that later readers appreciated its generic hybridity, so that "the *Old English Martyrology* was a relatively widely known and appreciated text, and . . . its usage may well be even more varied, frequent and intensive than can ever be reconstructed" (145). An appendix lists the contents of each of the surviving manuscripts that contain pieces of the *OE Martyrology*.

■ *Old English Bede*

George Molyneaux asks, "The *Old English Bede*: English Ideology or Christian Instruction?" *EHR* 124: 1289–323, though he never says why the *Bede* could not be both simultaneously. Patrick Wormald argued that Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica* solidified notions of a single English people with whom God had a special relationship and that Alfred then used the *Old English Bede* to foster the unification of England. Both the Latin *HE* and the *OE Bede* were relatively well-copied texts, but in different centuries; as Molyneaux observes, "[i]t is unlikely that more than a small proportion of people in late Anglo-Saxon England knew the *OEB*, but . . . the proportion who knew the *HE* was probably even smaller" (1295). Molyneaux argues that Wormald's is a possible but not the most likely reading of the *HE*, since "Bede is not consistent in presenting a single *gens Anglorum*" and only twice seems to indicate that God has special ties to the English (1297). Though he used Gildas as a source, Bede did not adopt most of Gildas's numerous references to Israel. Nor did his translator identify the English consistently as a unified people favored by God. He replaces the title's *Gentis Anglorum* with *Angelþeode* ⁊ *Seaxum*, gives Gregory the Great less prominence, and

omits both of the Latin passages that seem to grant the English a special place in God's providence (1302). Texts that accompany the *OE Bede* in two manuscripts indicate dynastic interest, but Molyneaux writes that these texts were probably added later. Instead, Molyneaux argues that the *HE* and the *OE Bede* both emphasize the conversion of all gentiles. The translator's reworking of the preface downplays the role of reading but adds references to teaching and to hearing, envisioning a didactic purpose and a listening audience. Many of his omissions simplify the text, while additions are few but clarify very basic points: What is Genesis and who is the chief apostle? Exemplary narratives of good deeds, bad deeds, visions, and miracles remain largely intact in the translation; documents are omitted except where they reflect directly on questions of Christian living. One exception is the translator's rendering of the canons of Hertford and Hatfield, which rebut R.D. Fulk's charges that England did not have or honor its own canons. Marginal notes suggest that multiple readers found the text's didacticism useful. Molyneaux then argues that the terms *Angelcynn* and *gens Anglorum* lack political overtones in other texts and elsewhere in Bede. The *Bede* instructs much as the *Old English Dialogues* does, and the latter translation has traditionally been linked to Alfred. Molyneaux finds similarities in style, language, method, and even the prefaces of the two works "suggestive of a common purpose . . . and therefore Alfredian initiative," though the evidence remains "inconclusive" (1322). As he ends this significant contribution to the field, Molyneaux concludes that historians need to reconsider how the West Saxons pursued unification and whether the English saw themselves as a chosen people at all.

In "La 'vita' di Gregorio Magno nella versione antico-inglese della 'Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum' di Beda" in *Testi agiografici e omiletici del Medioevo germanico: XXXII Convegno dell'Associazione italiana di filologia germanica: Verona, 8–10 giugno 2005*, ed. Adele Cipolla and Mosè Nicoli (Verona: Fiorini, 2006), 1–24, Domenico Pezzini reads the Latin and Old English texts against each other with a focus on Gregory the Great. Pezzini argues that Gregory is the hero of Bede's text; despite Gregory's own protests about earthly distractions, he is Bede's ideal bishop, balancing active and contemplative life. Bede is so intent on Gregory's role in the conversion of the English that he ignores any contributions from Frankish or British churches. The *OE Bede* has often been denigrated, but—while he heavily abridges Bede's account of Gregory—the translator maintains the three crucial parts that Pezzini identifies: Gregory's chronology, his epitaph, and

the story of Gregory seeing the English slave boy—complete with puns. Pezzini argues that the translator shows intelligence and creativity in rendering the epitaph in English verse, simplifying the grammar and lexicon but preserving the sense. Likewise, the story of Gregory and the English boy exemplifies key qualities of the translation: the use of doublets to reinforce sense for a hearing rather than a reading audience, the simplification of grammar and lexicon for clarity, and the addition of explanatory words and phrases. The translator demonstrates his sophistication in word choice and parallelisms, leading Ælfric to borrow not only from Bede's Latin text but also from the Old English for his homily on Gregory. Pezzini concludes that the translator has made a translation appropriate to a variety of hearers with good structure, balance, and style.

In a similar vein, Paul E. Szarmach reads “Æðeldreda in the *Old English Bede*” in *Poetry, Place, and Gender: Studies in Medieval Culture in Honor of Helen Damico*, ed. Catherine Karkov, 132–50 [see sect. 2] to shed light on both Latin and OE texts. Bede devotes two chapters to Ætheldreda in his *Historia ecclesiastica*: “a prose *vita*” and “an astonishing 54-line poem,” the longest in the work, which devalues “[t]he foundation myth of the West” by rejecting Vergil and his ilk (134). Both content and form elevate this poem, a series of serpentine elegiac couplets that combine alphabetic and acrostic openings. The OE translator omits all poems except for Gregory the Great's epitaph. Szarmach argues that Ætheldreda's two chapters form “a ‘poor man's *opus geminatum*,” and the OE translator adds details and ornaments to the *vita* portion to compensate for the lost poem (139). The translator retains Bede's order and emphasis, including a final topographical description of Ely that provides a visual image for Ætheldreda's enclosure and chastity. Ambiguity in the OE regarding her second husband may make him seem more virtuous and thus a better match for her. The OE also uses alliteration—much as Bede plays on *maximum* and *maxilla* when describing the tumor on the abbess's jaw. An interjection of *hwæt* calls attention to the story, while doublets ornament it, and a few details are highlighted or added in translation. Szarmach then turns to the story of Hild, which he also reads as an *opus geminatum*: a *vita* followed by a miracle that produces a poem. Scholarship has overemphasized Cædmon, whom Bede treats as part of his story of Hild. Both the Latin and OE versions emphasize the role of Ætheldreda and Hild as mothers: “Æðeldreda is a mother of the body, whereas Hild is a mother of learning” (149). Szarmach rejects as presentist readings of Bede as diminishing these women's accomplishments.

He concludes that the translator's treatment of the story of Ætheldreda gives the first *English* interpretation of Bede's Latin and helps us to understand the structures and perspectives of both the Latin and the OE.

Carmen Guarddon Anelo scrutinizes “The Locative Uses of the Preposition ‘at’ in the Old English Version of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History of the English People: A Cognitive Approach*” *SELIM* 11 (2004): 117–45. She outlines developments in cognitive linguistics—especially the semantics of prepositions and the meaning of “at” in Modern English. Its core sense is “a point that coincides with another” (quoting Herskovits at 120). A space that is conceived of as larger than a point or as internally differentiated requires “in” or “on” instead. “At” also concerns being close to an object in order to use it (e.g. I am at my computer). Guarddon Anelo writes that “the object follows the preposition” (120, contra Mitchell's *Syntax* 1062), and she asserts that Latin *ad* does not condition OE *æt*. Guarddon Anelo hypothesizes that *æt* should not appear “with large geographic entities” but does identify three occurrences with *burg* and two with Rome (127); she explains that the *burg* in question, Coldingham, is small and came to be collocated with “at,” while Rome appears as a point because the author imagined it from “a remote perspective” (128). *Land*, *stow*, and *mor* are general and unbounded, allowing a remote perspective because “there is no information about them” (129). Buildings, surprisingly, take not *æt* but only *in* and *on*; *cirice* and *mynster* cannot be the subject of a distant viewpoint because the translator is a cleric, she concludes. *Æt* also does not appear before containers or with ships. It is used with body parts, usually literally: something that is “at hand” can be picked up. *Æt* for being near and using something appears with *fyr*. Finally, heaven and paradise do not take *æt* because their location is too uncertain—and yet knowledge of them too detailed. Guarddon Anelo concludes that “the category *at* has to be defined in relation to one basic modality in conceptualising space: map images” (137). She has no references to medieval maps or scholarship on them and appears to be thinking more of modern maps than early medieval ones. Guarddon identifies two areas for further work: extending the study of *æt* beyond literal space, and examining the preposition in Middle English.

■ *Wulfstan's Voyage in the OE Orosius*

Anton Englert and Athena Trakadas edited *Wulfstan's Voyage: The Baltic Sea Region in the Early Viking Age as Seen from Shipboard* (Roskilde: Viking Ship Museum), a complementary volume to the 2007 *Ohthere's Voyages*,

ed. Janet Bately and Anton Englert. The "Foreword" by Ole Crumlin-Pedersen and Friedrich Lüth describes the seminar that produced the book (7–8). Chapters are organized into four major sections. Each chapter contains its own notes, figures, and references. Because chapters stand on their own and have different authors, they sometimes duplicate or contradict parts of other chapters.

Part One, "Wulfstan's Account," begins with black-and-white plates of "Wulfstan's report" from Cotton Tib.B.i, ff. 11v–13r (10–13 in the book, Figs. 1–4). In "Wulfstan's Voyage and His Description of Estland: The Text and the Language of the Text" (14–28), Janet Bately gives her edition and translation of the text with extensive notes and commentary on names and language. In "Who Was Wulfstan?" (29–36), Judith Jesch finds that Wulfstan was likely an Anglo-Saxon well-traveled in both Scandinavia and the Baltic and that his account conflates a specific trip with his broader geographical knowledge and an ethnographic description of *Estland*. Rudolf Simek sets "Wulfstan's Account in the Context of Early Medieval Travel Literature" (37–42), offering very brief introductions to several such texts, which are generally hagiographical in mode and context. He treats *Wulfstan sæde* as equivalent to *Orosius cwæð*, arguing that neither phrase presupposes oral transmission. Wulfstan's report differs from other travel works in that it is not hagiographical but informational—the kind of piece that historical or encyclopedic works sometimes incorporated. Simek suggests that Wulfstan's account was included in the Tiberius manuscript to support and extend Orosius's own brief description of the north. The reasons behind Wulfstan's journey are now unrecoverable, but Simek speculates that he—like most early medieval travel writers—was a cleric and therefore set out to convert the Slavic and Baltic tribes. If so, he probably did not make his journey until the Ottonian era. Przemysław Urbańczyk's "On the Reliability of Wulfstan's Report" (43–7) notes the similarities between Ohthere's and Wulfstan's accounts and wonders whether "Wulfstan" might be a fiction binding together pieces of conventional wisdom about the Northeast. Urbańczyk finds that some of the text's onomastic material had been well-known since antiquity, while a few names had become outdated by the time of Alfred, and some might even have been invented. Two genuine Old Prussian names in the text were not widely known, however: Truso (Družno Lake, German Drausen) and Ilfing (Elbląg, German Elbing). The route connecting these two places seems incompatible with modern geography, but a reconstruction of the region's tenth-century hydrography demonstrates that Wulfstan could

have made the voyage described. Urbańczyk concludes that the the whole account is not necessarily true, but at least one portion reveals a real person who made a voyage to Truso.

Part Two explores "The Western and Central Baltic Sea Region in the 9th and 10th Centuries," and some chapters focus very much on Scandinavian and Baltic routes and peoples rather than Old English prose. These chapters include "Ests, Slavs and Saxons: Ethnic Groups and Political Structures" by Christian Lübke (50–55), with a note on "Changing Societies on the Southern Baltic Shores" by Przemysław Urbańczyk (56–7); "Danes and Swedes in Written and Archaeological Sources at the End of the 9th Century" by Władysław Duczko (58–71); "Harbours and Trading Centres on Bornholm, Öland and Gotland in the Late 9th Century" by Anne Nørgård Jørgensen (145–59); "Ports and *Emporia* of the Southern Coast: From Hedeby to Usedom and Wolin" by Hauke Jöns (160–81); "The Settlement of Truso" by Marek F. Jagodziński (182–97); and "Handelsplätze zwischen Danziger und Rigaer Bucht zur Zeit Wulfstans" by Vladas Žulkus and Mindaugas Bertašius (198–204). Part Two also includes "Wulfstan and the Coast of Southern Scandinavia: Sailing Routes from Langeland to Möre" by Johan Callmer (114–134) and "Viking-Age Sailing Routes of the Western Baltic Sea—A Matter of Safety," a response to Callmer's paper by Jens Ulriksen (135–44); these two papers discuss factors in choosing routes that hug the coast versus ones that cut across more open waters with stops at major ports.

Two items in this section may be of greater interest to Anglo-Saxonists: Søren M. Sindbæk's "Routes and Long-distance Traffic—The Nodal Points of Wulfstan's Voyage" (72–8), which explores why Wulfstan names so few ports, and Volker Hilberg's "Hedeby in Wulfstan's Days: A Danish Emporium of the Viking Age between East and West" (79–113). Sindbæk argues that there are two kinds of nodal points for trade: regional centers where raw materials and local crafts are exchanged, and "true nodal points directly engaged in routinized long-distance transport" (74). Wulfstan names Hedeby and Truso because they were such central nodal points in the ninth century, and probably the only such. Hilberg gives greater detail on ninth-century Hedeby, using primarily archaeological evidence. Anglo-Saxon items found in Denmark—and particularly in Hedeby and Truso—are too ordinary to be booty, so their presence indicates trading relations. He concludes that Hedeby was the chief trading emporium not only for Scandinavians but for many peoples and that it had extensive contact with both Anglo-Saxon England and the Danelaw around 900.

Part Three focuses on “Navigating the Baltic Sea.” Christer Westerdahl’s “Transport Zones in Wulfstan’s Days” (206–19) introduces the concepts of transport zones and transit points (or nodes) and then compares what we know from archaeology to routes conjectured for Wulfstan—such as the itinerary proposed by Ole Crumlin-Pedersen. Westerdahl finds that what we know of southern Baltic transit zones and the few details we get from Wulfstan allow for the construction of possible routes that Wulfstan might have taken—sometimes hugging the coast and sometimes venturing into open sea to avoid dangerous shallows, attack, or both. Ian Wood and George Indruszewski’s “An 8th-century Written Source on Ships and Navigation: The *Cosmography* of Aethicus Ister” (220–34) argues that the *Cosmography* should be studied as seriously as Wulfstan; despite its parodic elements and made-up names, it contains some sound information and indications of real eighth-century concerns. It provides the earliest written source for shipbuilding and maritime practices as well as Baltic culture more generally, for a non-Baltic audience. The authors also suggest that Anglo-Saxons, possibly including Alcuin, may have read the *Cosmography* and taken it seriously. In “Boats and Ships of the Baltic Sea in the 9th and 10th Centuries: The Archaeological and Iconographic Evidence” (235–56), Ole Crumlin-Pedersen surveys ship types roughly contemporary with Wulfstan as known from archaeology, trade routes, and visual representations (particularly on coins). He concludes that Wulfstan most likely found a knörr, an oared sailing ship with a relatively shallow draft, at Hedeby to take him east.

“Sailing in Wulfstan’s Wake: The 2004 Trial Voyage Hedeby-Gdansk with the *Skuldelev 1* reconstruction, *Ottar*” (257–70) vividly recounts a recreation of Wulfstan’s voyage; its authors, Anton Englert and Waldemar Ossowski, were among the eight who made the trip. Original conditions could not be fully duplicated: The Viking ship was a reconstruction of *Skuldelev I*, ca. 1030—a type probably not available to Wulfstan—and modern conditions included bridges and a road. The sailors had to use some modern navigation techniques and equipment to compensate for their lack of lived experience with medieval navigation and to proceed safely in shipping lanes with much larger ships. The *Ottar* made its voyage from the Danish coast, near Hedeby, to Danzig in four days and nights rather than Wulfstan’s seven; Wulfstan may have been in a slower ship or may have followed a different course. The participants did find that much of the voyage kept land in sight, and they concluded that Wulfstan’s account represents a realistic voyage. Seán McGrail’s “Seafaring

Then and Now” (271–4) points out that Wulfstan lists locations to dock that could not have been seen from the ship. The locations of these ports would, however, have been known to mariners from the area. Wulfstan probably recounted his trip to a non-mariner, so technical details are limited. McGrail also writes that seamen would want to maintain a safe distance from the coast to avoid shoals and pirates and to have room to maneuver in an adverse wind. Navigation may have included visual sightings of land, sun, and stars; indications of land from waves and clouds; and possibly even basic instrument use. George Indruszewski and Jon Godal elaborate on these techniques in “The Art of Sailing like Wulfstan,” with contributions from Max Vinner (275–92). After a review of existing literature, they identify vital points from Wulfstan’s account: He uses the ship as his reference point, unlike the *Orosius*; the ship sailed the whole way, night and day; and key sites along the way are identified with ethnic groups. Wulfstan used the four cardinal points of the compass in his account, but his navigator might have used a different number of points; Scandinavians had eight and southern Europeans twelve. Time and distance also present problems, since they may be combined in a statement like “seven days and nights,” as we might speak of “a day’s walk.” Thus, we cannot know whether Wulfstan offers an account of time, distance, or both. The authors review the eleventh-century Wolin disc, which may have been a portable sundial, and recount methods of reckoning still used in the area. They offer far more detail than this brief summary can include.

Part Four is titled “Exchange and Control,” and the first three chapters provide some context for Wulfstan’s voyage but do not have direct relevance to Anglo-Saxon studies: Heiko Steuer’s “Principles of Trade and Exchange: Trade Goods and Merchants” (294–308), which describes changes in the monetary systems, trading routes, and emporia in the Baltic and environs around the time of Wulfstan’s journey; Jörn Staecker, “The 9th-century Christian Mission to the North” (309–29); and Felix Biermann, “The Christian Mission in the Northwestern Slavic Territories” (330–42). “Piracy and Naval Organisation in the Baltic Sea in the 9th Century: Some Security Considerations Concerning Wulfstan’s Voyage” by Jan Bill (343–53) relates more directly to Wulfstan’s account. Bill finds that piracy was so common—and passing unseen so difficult—that ships generally traveled in convoys. Wulfstan probably traveled in a convoy, which would move at the speed of its slowest ship, perhaps accounting for his trip taking longer than *Ottar*’s. Night travel and indirect routes may have helped to avoid attacks.

A “Summary” by Michael Müller-Wille (356–63) follows the last section and, among other things, calls attention to some recurring themes that I have not covered, such as the relevance of Rimbert’s *Vita Anskarii* for understanding ninth-century Baltic travel and the importance of reading Wulfstan’s voyage in conjunction with Ohthere’s. The book concludes with a list of authors with contact information (365–7), and a “Select Index” that includes “Persons,” “Tribes and Peoples,” “Places,” “Ships and Seafaring,” and “Miscellaneous.”

■ *Gregory the Great’s Dialogues*

David F. Johnson pursues “Divine Justice in Gregory the Great’s *Dialogues*” in *Early Medieval Studies in Memory of Patrick Wormald*, ed. Stephen David Baxter *et al.*, 115–28 (see section 2). Rather than viewing the *Dialogues* as Gregory’s weakest work, Johnson examines its appeal to the early English and finds some of its attractiveness rooted in its view of divine justice. He classifies three kinds of retributive agents in the *Dialogues*: demons, saintly mediators, and God himself. These didactic tales seem to have been particularly well-received in Worcester, with which three of the four extant manuscripts of the OE *Dialogues* are connected. British Library MS Cotton Otho C.i contains the text in two parts written roughly forty years apart, suggesting a strong desire to try to complete an imperfect text. Alfred may have commissioned a translation to further Christianize his own people much as Gregory sought to win over his contemporaries, and certain passages may have had particular resonances for Alfred. In the thirteenth century, the Tremulous Hand of Worcester added punctuation that would aid in oral delivery to some of the anecdotes, which Johnson identifies. Both the Alfredian translation and the later glossing “unambiguously demonstrate the vitality of Gregory’s *Dialogues* centuries after their initial composition” (124). An appendix exhibits each of the three kinds of divine justice in the *Dialogues*.

■ *Alfredian Program*

Michael Treschow, Paramjit Gill, and Tim B. Swartz investigate “King Alfred’s Scholarly Writings and the Authorship of the First Fifty Prose Psalms,” *Heroic Age* 12. Prefaces and explicit name Alfred as the author of the OE *Pastoral Care*, *Boethius*, and *Soliloquies*. The authors find a “distinctive Alfredian voice” in each of each of those three texts, and they argue that all three have been shaped to serve Alfred’s agenda. The Prose Psalms, however, have no internal attribution to Alfred. William of Malmesbury refers vaguely to “explication”

of Psalms by Alfred, and he lists as Alfred’s other translations that the king did not do. The authors find no Alfredian voice and little match to his agenda in the Psalms, though they suggest further study be done on Alfred’s voice—with no mention of David Pratt’s extensive work on the topic. They then argue that both recent editions of the Prose Psalms “cast doubt on the weight of Bately’s conclusion” that Alfred authored the Prose Psalms. Richard Stracke’s online edition never suggests an author nor mentions Bately, but Stracke cites almost no secondary sources—and none from after 1964, so omission may not indicate disagreement. They then claim that “[O’Neill] makes no mention of [Bately’s lexical study] at all.” Their note counts two citations of Bately in O’Neill’s chapter on authorship, missing two other citations in the same chapter and ignoring the reference to the previous chapter on language, where Bately is cited more than twenty times. They review O’Neill’s own lexical arguments, finding some similarities in usage between Alfred’s known works and the Psalms “not particularly distinctive” and others more significant for differences than similarities. They conclude that analysis of content words cannot settle the issue and turn to stylometric analysis, “the use of statistical models to compare the relative frequencies of function words in different texts . . . A writer uses function words . . . regardless of context.” Both their traditional Cluster Analysis and Bayesian analysis find that the three texts that name Alfred as translator resemble each other in language usage but leave the Prose Psalms as an outlier, sharing more with parts of the *Bede* and the *Orosius* than with the *PC*, *Bo*, and *Sol*. See also Bately’s response below.

In “Did King Alfred Actually Translate Anything? The Integrity of the Alfredian Canon Revisited,” *Medium Ævum* 7: 189–215, Janet Bately responds to earlier work by Malcolm Godden—most immediately his 2007 *Medium Ævum* article—and the piece by Treschow, Gill, and Swartz treated above. She notes that Alfred’s four older brothers each ruled before him, giving him a courtier’s experience as well as a king’s, before commencing her linguistic arguments. The seventeen “function words” of Treschow *et al.* combine headwords and inflectional forms, and they include homographs. The authors assume “unreflective” use of words, but Bately argues that these words are not free from context and reflection. The choice of an OE verb often determines the OE preposition, and the Latin source text often conditions OE word choice. Bately analyzes several specific key words in detail, showing usage in context. She concludes that “for the use of function words . . . to be of any value in stylometric

analysis, a major overhaul of the key words and the extent of their cover would need to be undertaken, and . . . frequency figures adjusted, to set apart all instances of occurrences that are either direct translations of the Latin or immediately dependent on it” (196). She then turns to other lexical evidence from both Treschow *et al.* and Godden, examining several sets of words. In each case, she finds more similarities among Alfred’s texts than differences. Usually she interprets the data differently, but occasionally she corrects word counts by others. Finally, she finds that word choices sometimes cluster: one synonym will be used for a while, then another, within the same text (possibly indicating that a translation was set aside and later resumed). Bately concludes that the lexical evidence still supports a single main author for the *Pastoral Care*, *Boethius*, *Soliloquies*, and *Psalms*, and that “given the existence in ninth-century manuscripts of a first-person prefatory letter by the king himself,” that author can be named Alfred (209). In the same year, Malcolm Godden posted a brief “Note on King Alfred’s Authorship” online to respond to one specific point in Bately’s article: <http://users.ox.ac.uk/~pembo138/KingAlfredsAuthorship.pdf>.

Malcolm Godden’s Sir Israel Gollancz Memorial Lecture, “The Alfredian Project and its Aftermath: Rethinking the Literary History of the Ninth and Tenth Centuries,” *PBA* 162: 93–122, argues for a very limited Alfredian project. Godden identifies the Preface to the *Pastoral Care* not as a royal letter, which would, he argues, be straightforward documentary evidence, but as a literary preface relying on conventions. Prefaces to the OE *Dialogues* assert that Wærferth translated the text for King Alfred because Alfred had insufficient Latin; prefaces to the *Pastoral Care* say that Alfred did likewise for Wærferth and other bishops, contradicting the *Dialogues’* prefaces. Claims that translation was done for lay readers reappear in Ælfric’s saints’ lives and Æthelwold’s Benedictine Rule in English to avoid acknowledging that members of the clergy have poor Latin. The *Dialogues* and *Pastoral Care* were close translations done for bishops, Godden argues. They use Alfred’s name just as Continental texts used Charlemagne’s: to assert authority. Godden finds the OE *Boethius* and *Soliloquies* far more like each other than like the two known works of Alfred’s program. Both engage in speculative philosophy to the point of heterodoxy, even suggesting the pre-existence of souls. Godden argues that these works are too ambitious, and the *Boethius* too negative towards kings, to have come from Alfred’s court. Other translations may have preceded the *Pastoral Care*, possibly including the *Orosius* and *Martyrology*. He concludes that Alfred’s project “may

have been much less novel than Alfred claims” and might only include the *Dialogues* and *PC* (120). If we disengage the other translations associated with Alfred from the king and court, we have “a narrative that looks rather like the story we already have for Old English poetry: a variety of prose works, written by various people at different times over the ninth and early tenth centuries and in different contexts . . . for readers who were often themselves intelligent and educated” (121–2); we are freer to see them “as intellectually ambitious and learned enterprises,” and even “the first English works of philosophy” (122).

■ *Boethius’s Consolation of Philosophy and the Old English Boethius*

The Old English Boethius: An Edition of the Old English Versions of Boethius’s “De consolatione philosophiae,” ed. Malcolm Godden, Susan Irvine, et al. (Oxford: Oxford UP), improves vastly on Walter J. Sedgefield’s 1899 edition. The first volume contains a full scholarly introduction that treats the manuscripts and Junius transcript, language, sources (including unedited early commentaries on the Latin *Consolation*), and problems ranging from date and authorship to specific readings of the text. The editors challenge the traditional attribution of the text to Alfred the Great and his court, arguing that disagreements between texts produced by Alfred’s program such as the *Orosius*, and the use of commentaries that may not have been available in the 890s, support a later date and different author. They also argue that the Meters had a different translator than the prose text. The team re-edits both texts of the *Boethius* and presents them separately: the B text in 42 prose chapters, then the C text as thirty-one meters alternating with thirty-three prose sections. Each page of text contains one apparatus of textual notes and one of differences between B and C. Notes in the margin key each text to the other OE text, the Latin source text, manuscript pages, and the pagination in Sedgefield’s edition. The second volume contains translations of the entirety of each text into Modern English; these translations are both accurate and smooth, a difficult balance to maintain, although the meters are translated as prose. There follows a detailed commentary (keyed to lines in the B and C texts) that engages a wide range of scholarship and frequently quotes from the Latin commentary manuscripts. *The Old English Boethius* deservedly won the 2011 ISAS Prize for an edition or translation.

In “The Transmission of Boethius’ *De consolatione philosophiae* in the Carolingian Age,” *Medium Ævum* 78: 1–15, Adrian Papahagi argues that Theodulf of Orléans,

not Alcuin, revived and disseminated *The Consolation of Philosophy* to the medieval West. The only significant argument for knowledge of the *Consolation* in England before 900 lies in attributing the OE *Boethius* to King Alfred. Papahagi accepts Godden's arguments in favor of later, non-Alfredian authorship of the translation—perhaps by Dunstan or a contemporary—and notes that all extant Insular manuscripts of either OE or the Latin are tenth-century or later. One of the most significant and earliest copies of the Latin is Vatican, Vat. Lat. MS 3363, which has glosses in a Celtic hand and one in a language identified by Patrick Sims-Williams as “late ninth-century Cornish” (quoted p. 5). Dunstan himself later glossed the manuscript. Vat. Lat. 3363 thus demonstrates Insular interest by the late ninth century in a *Consolation* manuscript that had been copied in the early ninth-century Loire, probably at Fleury. Fleury had everything necessary to transmit the *Consolation*: books from sixth- and seventh-century Italy, likely brought from Monte Cassino with St. Benedict's relics, ca. 700; one of the top Latin libraries in early medieval Europe; and a fine scriptorium. It also had Theodulf of Orléans, who made frequent use of Boethius. Of the fifteen extant pre-eleventh-century manuscripts of the *Consolation*, four hail from Fleury, including the oldest extant manuscript, which also contains all of Boethius's *Opuscula theologica*. Papahagi suggests that Theodulf began quoting the *Consolation* about 790, the same time as Alcuin, sparking intensive study and glossing of the text at Fleury before the *Consolation* spread to other Carolingian centers of learning and to England.

Adrian Papahagi traces a progression “From Boethius's *Orbes* Simile to the Wheel of Fate Metaphor in the Old English Version of the *Consolatio Philosophiae* (IV, prose 6.15)” *Scriptorium* 63: 3–29. In 4p6.15, Philosophy depicts God's providence as the center of a series of concentric circles; the closer one is to that center, the less fate affects one. The Old English transforms the circles into a cart wheel with the hub as center. Of the one hundred thirty-five extant manuscripts of the *Consolation* from the ninth through the twelfth centuries, twenty-seven have drawings of circles or wheels. Papahagi groups the illustrations according to whether they include inscriptions, concentric circles, concentric circles traversed by crosses, cart wheels, or a single circle with radii but no rim. He discusses possible relationships among some of the manuscripts and drawings. He notes that scribes often treated the diagram as part of the text; sometimes they incorporated it into the text area, and it appears in manuscripts that have little or no glossing. Concentric circles dominate among the early drawings. Cart wheels appear in few manuscripts, but those

few include Vatican, Vat. Lat. 3363, a ninth-century manuscript with late ninth-century glosses in a Celtic hand (see previous item). Papahagi concludes, “This drawing, so peculiar in the context of ninth-century representations of the *orbes*, may thus have triggered the radical transformation of Boethius's passage in the Old English version, suggesting the intricate metaphor of the wheel” (29).

Soliloquies

Rossella Tinaburri explores the meaning of “*Gesceadwisnes* ‘ragione’ nella versione anglosassone dei *Soliloquia*,” *Testo a Fronte* 41: 58–77 with some references to the OE *Boethius* as well. The OE translator did not have an existing philosophical lexicon in English, so he had to make his own. *Gesceadwisnes* renders Latin *ratio*, a faculty of the mind connected with human cognizance and truth. Augustine pronounces reason the highest of the faculties, one shared with angels but not lower beings, and the Old English develops the sense of *gesceadwisnes* along similar lines. The stem *gescead* means ‘discernment’, and *wis* is related to ‘wisdom’. This faculty of discernment, Tinaburri writes, is simultaneously intellectual and ethical. Its proper use is the highest virtue and leads to other virtues. The translator completes the word's sense by linking it with other terms: *racu*, ‘logical argument’ and *smeaung*, ‘contemplation’. The narrator expresses discontent with the evidence of his senses and wants to approach pure cognition through *gesceadwisnes*. The translator makes Augustine's ambiguous, implied internal dialogue into an explicitly internal conversation. At the same time, he makes the interlocutors more equal, whereas Augustine's *ratio* was more clearly a guide. The *ic* or ‘I’ of the *Soliloquies* wants to know God better than he can know anything through his senses, which leads the translator to elaborate upon metaphors that Augustine suggested. The *Soliloquies* keeps returning to the image of the mind's eye, which cannot be misled like physical eyes. *Soliloquies* also imagines the senses as a ship that brings the mind to shore; once there, the mind can abandon it to go further than the ship could take it. Tinaburri concludes that the translator's fidelity to his source leads him to conceptual innovations, emphasizing the jointly intellectual and ethical nature of reason as the foundation of all virtue and perfection.

■ *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*

The Anglo Saxon Chronicle: A History of England from Roman Times to the Norman Conquest, translated by James Ingram (St. Petersburg, FL: Red and Black),

reprints Ingram's translation from his 1823 *Saxon Chronicle with an English Translation and Notes, Critical and Explanatory*. The verso of the title page explains that "in cases where the [J. A.] Giles translation [1847] adds more information, or where a different version of the manuscript contains different information for the same year, these have been inserted into the text and marked with parentheses." The result is a trade paperback with narrow margins but readable font and lacking introduction, footnotes, endnotes, and commentary. Nowhere does the book indicate which version Ingram or Giles follows for any entry. Fortunately, Ingram's original text is available at many libraries, on Google Books, and from on-demand publishers—complete with Preface, introduction to Old English, edition and translation in facing columns, footnotes, endnotes and corrections, and multiple indexes. A number of more recent translations and editions are also still in print. This reprint will not satisfy scholars or even eager students.

In "Sentence to Story: Reading the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle as Formulary," in *Reading the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: Language, Literature, History*, ed. Jorgensen, 91–111 [see sect. 7], Jacqueline Stodnick rejects the notion that annals are rhetorically unsophisticated, simple representations of fact. Just as repetition and formulas yield effects and meaning in poetry, they create "a generic identity for the Chronicle as an annals text" and "a subtle register for drawing connections or differences" among peoples and incidents (95). Formulas in poetry must fit metrical conditions; in prose, they must fit conditions of grammar and syntax while containing at least one key word. Thus *personal pronoun/proper noun* + *forðferde* describes death after death in the Chronicle. Other verbs for 'die' are sometimes used, particularly for martyrs or for violent deaths, but the recurring use of the *forðferde* formula helps to equate those who suffer it, since the formula does not distinguish religious from secular. Individuals in both groups also succeed to power formulaically; usually one "(on)feng to rice/bisceopdome/arcebisceopdome" (102). Such similarities make differences stand out: when the formulation of Æthelstan's death adds references to the date of Alfred's, the connection helps legitimate Æthelstan's succession. As that example shows, later chroniclers could use formulas from the common stock to forge links with earlier entries. Ninth-century Viking attacks are described by *ahton wælstowe gewald* and *wæs/wearð micel/ungemetlic wæl geslægen* (105), but only in the *Chronicle*; the text has its own idioms. When the 905 entry repeats this language for Æthelwold and his armies, the chronicler aligns them with invading Danes and Edward with his father Alfred. Similarly, the use of

this formula for the Norman Conquest in some annals casts it as a Scandinavian invasion. Cnut's accession in the C, D, and E texts with "feng . . . to . . . ryce" (110) demonstrates that "formulas can be used to contain the disruption of invasion" (111). Chroniclers thus connect events spread over centuries by using a set of formulas that allow them to group certain kinds of events together and distinguish others.

In the same volume, Alice Jorgensen utilizes Nicholas Howe's understanding of style as "human noise" to study "Rewriting the Æthelredian Chronicle: Narrative Style and Identity in Anglo-Saxon Chronicle MS F" (113–38). She begins with the Æthelredian Chronicle, 983–1016, where "the construction of English identity . . . is characterized by a tension between unity and fragmentation" (115). This portion has a distinctive style with longer, more rhetorically complex entries than those preceding it. It conveys an "authorial personality" (117). The *Chronicle* usually focuses on specific events and people, but this portion uses its particulars to characterize broader English trends. Jorgensen finds the narrator "both profoundly identified with the triumphs, sufferings, and failures of the English and strongly disaffected with the way their affairs are conducted" (118). Jorgensen then moves to the bilingual F Chronicle, which is based on a now-lost version of the E-text. F tends to abridge its source. It retains the openings of entries and other key information but omits parts, including those that express a personal voice. Thus the F-text recalls the early style of the Chronicle. English and Latin do not always match in F; sometimes the Latin adds information for readers who may be less familiar with England and need more help. Changes in leadership, both secular and religious, receive more attention than battles, reflecting the Chronicle's ongoing interests in death and succession. Jorgensen likens the narrative style to the notion of the meme in modern culture: The F Chronicle replicates Englishness across the divide of the Conquest, but that replication comes with variation. Where the Æthelredian chronicler emphasized general patterns and trends on a national scale, the F-chronicler limits those patterns to individuals, highlighting specific traitors, both in Æthelred's time and the twelfth century. The 995 annal contains an exceptionally detailed insertion in which Ælfric and Æthelred consult wise men and the examples of Augustine and Æthelbert to replace secular canons with monks at Canterbury. Authority derives from the king and archbishop working together; English identity depends upon continuity and hierarchy. The style here "move[s] away from the troubling immediacy of the Æthelredian Chronicle, in which the personal narration

presents the (recent) past as a source not of authority but of shame and anger, not as a ground of identity but as its testing ground" (137). Jorgensen concludes that "human noise" in this exploration is "something warmer, less precise, and more multilayered than either an individual author or ethnicity."

Lastly in that collection, Sara M. Pons-Sanz examines "Norse-Derived Vocabulary in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle" (275–304), for the Chronicle offers linguistic samples from the ninth through the twelfth centuries. Pons-Sanz sets aside the Peterborough Chronicle because its Norse words have been well-studied. She investigates when each term was used and what it reveals about cultural and dialectal exchange. Her earliest set of annals extends to the end of the tenth century; its Norse borrowings are technical terms related to war and seafaring, reflecting the impact of Scandinavians on those areas prior to extensive linguistic contact. The Chronicle of Æthelred and Cnut (983–1022) brings more borrowings, mostly legal and one nautical—a result of Scandinavian rule in the Danelaw. In the Abingdon Chronicle (ca. 1040–70), Pons-Sanz finds greater likelihood of direct linguistic contact between OE writers and Old Norse speakers. Most words in these entries were either adopted by OE before the entries were written or reflect shifts in conditions about the time entries were composed. The latter terms all refer to law, seafaring, or governance. A few words and shifted usages of native OE words do not belong to either group, and this vocabulary appears more frequently later, suggesting that the usages were new to OE when the Chronicle recorded them. Finally, the E and especially D annals for 1064–80 show borrowings not common until later, indicating significant linguistic contact with Old Norse speakers. Pons-Sanz concludes that while the Chronicle is orthographically conservative, it is lexically progressive. She recommends further work on the relations between Norse-derived vocabulary and OE synonyms, especially with regards to semantics and style.

■ Wonders of the East, Letter of Alexander to Aristotle, and Related Texts

Patrizia Lendinara draws attention to a lesser-known text in "The Letter of Fermes: Not Only Marvels," in *The World of Travellers*, ed. Dekker, Olsen, and Hofstra, 31–60 [see sect. 4a]. The Latin *Letter of Fermes* is part of a complex set of texts including *Wonders of the East* and *Letter of Alexander*. One group of manuscripts, the F-group, styles the writer "Fermes" or some variant; the other, the P-group, calls him "Premonis"

or a variant. Emperor Hadrian or Trajan is addressed. The narrator should probably be identified with Pharasmanes IV, a king in what is now Georgia who knew Hadrian. A Greek original was probably composed in the late second century AD and rendered in Latin between the fourth and early seventh centuries, when Isidore of Seville used it. Lendinara describes extant manuscripts of the letter, what we know of lost manuscripts, and their relations. Generically, Lendinara identifies the letter as an epistolary account of travel; it is neither fictional nor metaphorical but an itinerary that "strives for geographical versimilitude" (36). Place-names and distances have been corrupted in transmission, and the account "might indeed be derived from someone's actual travels" (38). The itinerary partly follows the Royal Road of Cyrus the Persian (built ca. 540 BC). Marvels increase as the writer nears Egypt. There are some confusions in geographical ordering, but most of the letter takes place in the Fertile Crescent. Though about a third of the topics in it have clear literary analogues, about two-fifths have no known sources or analogues whatsoever. While scholars have considered the works connected with Alexander the Great as the source of the *Letter*, Lendinara argues that each set of texts influenced the other, with one set being consulted to elaborate or restore losses in the other. The *Letter* had particular influence in England, where it sometimes had different chapter divisions and orderings than on the Continent, and particular errors in the text were mirrored in the illustrations. The Insular texts belong to the P-group. The *Liber monstrorum* drew heavily on a P-group text of the *Letter* no later than the ninth century; Lendinara locates the composition of *LM* "in the British Isles before or during Aldhelm's lifetime (640?–709)" (50). Thomas of Cantimpré (thirteenth century) seemed to think that Aldhelm wrote *LM* as well as his *Enigmata*. A number of later works show the *Letter's* continuing influence, including both literary texts and *mappae mundi*, and it began to travel with the letter of Prester John. The writings of John Mandeville and Marco Polo eclipsed the *Letter* near the end of the Middle Ages.

Patrizia Lendinara turns to the *Wonders of the East* in "I donestri, pericolosi indovini delle Meraviglie dell'Oriente," in . . . *un tuo serto di fiori in man recando: Scritti in onore di Maria Amalia D'Aronco*, ed. Silvana Serafin and Patrizia Lendinara (Udine: Forum, 2008), 259–73. The Donestre appear in both the Latin and the OE *Wonders* as hybrid creatures who call unwary visitors in their own languages with the voices of relatives, luring them close, so that the Donestre can catch and eat them. They save and weep over the heads of their victims. Whence did this odd complex of characteristics derive? English texts describe the Donestre as half-human, half

soothsayer. *The Letter of Fermes* features oracles, as do Pindar and the *Odyssey*. The use of voice to attract victims can be found in a group of legendary animals: the hyena, the leucrocota, and the corocotta, which became identified with the crocodile. The hyena is said to eat humans and dogs lured by its voice. Parts of its body were supposed to have curative powers and could even help users see the future. The leucrocota and corocotta similarly imitated human voices and had immense jaws. The crocodile was said to cry over its victims because it has tear ducts like humans. Lendinara suggests that Anglo-Saxon depictions of the Donestre, including manuscript illustrations, in which the Donestre and sometimes others are depicted eating a human leg, influenced later representations into the Middle English era. The Latin word *divini* describes prophets or those with extraordinary knowledge, such as these hybrids. Lendinara proposes that a corrupt form of *divini*, with the suffix *-estre* added for a person, resulted in the mysterious name *donestre*.

■ *Finding of the Holy Cross*

In “Traveller and Mediator: St Helena in the Old English Invention Homily” in *The World of Travellers*, ed. Dekker, Olsen, and Hofstra, 103–16 [see sect. 4a], Karin Olsen examines the figure of Helena in the vernacular homily *Finding of the Holy Cross*. The anonymous homilist downplays Helena’s intellectual accomplishments and personal piety—evident in the Latin source, the *Acta Cyriaci*—and emphasizes her role as Constantine’s loyal subordinate. In the Latin, Helena reads and meditates upon Scripture, and the Holy Spirit inspires her. Though the OE homily makes one reference to Helena reading the New Testament more explicit, it otherwise downplays her spiritual life and emphasizes Constantine’s initiative and his mother’s role as good subject carrying out his will. The more subtle inspiration of the *Acta Cyriaci* becomes a direct command from God, which also supports her son’s claims to power. Ælfric’s homily shows similar emphases, and Mary-Catherine Bodden demonstrated that particular sentences in the anonymous homily come nearly verbatim from Ælfric. Both the anonymous homilist and Ælfric, Olsen concludes, believe that social order results from pious rulers who are well-served by their pious subjects. They reimagine Helena not as the autonomous and learned woman of the Latin but as mediator and servant to the emperor, answering “a concern that only arose in the late tenth century” (115), although Olsen does not explain why earlier English kings and churchmen could

not have shared such concerns. [Also reviewed in sect. 4a.]

■ *Blickling Homilies*

Robert R. Getz edits “Four Blickling Homilies” in his 2008 Ph.D. dissertation from the University of Toronto (Proquest NR44796): from Princeton, Scheide Library MS 71: I (Annunciation), XIV (Nativity of John the Baptist), XV (Sts. Peter and Paul), and XVI (St. Michael). His introduction treats codicology, language, dating, and origins for the homilies; the origins of the manuscript itself; and his editing principles. Each homily has its own introduction as well. The edited texts are accompanied by the Latin sources in an apparatus at the bottom of the page, textual apparatus, translation into Modern English after each edited text, and extensive textual notes after the translation for each text.

NGD

Richard J. Kelly’s *The Blickling Concordance: A Lexicon to the Blickling Homilies* (New York: Contium) provides a convenient and well-organized companion to the same author’s earlier edition and translation of the Blickling Homilies, *The Blickling Homilies: Edition and Translation* (London: Contium Academii, 2003). This work will be of use primarily to students (as is made clear, for example, by the author’s short discussion of Old English word formation in his introduction and his decision to include several basic Old English paradigms in an appendix). The entries are both grammatical and lexicographical, providing detailed information about each headword’s attested morphological forms, dialectal variants, certain scribal errors, etc., besides a full list of each occurrence of the word in the Blickling corpus. After the concordance, the author includes—without discussion—the opening portion of the Old English *Vita Andreas* from Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 198 (fol. 386r–94v) and the portion from the Blickling MS that completes the text (fols. 136r–139v). Only thorough use of his concordance will reveal the quality and utility of Kelly’s volume. Awaiting that judgment, some skepticism is necessarily raised by the uncomfortable number of typographical errors in Kelly’s introduction, e.g., his reference to the 1977 edition of the Old English grammar by “Wrenn & Quike [sic]” (17). In my cursory examination, however, I discovered no such mistakes in the body of the concordance proper. Certainly, Kelly’s volume will have great value for students of Old English who wish to work through these important and often neglected texts.

■ Composite Homilies

In *Language and Style in Old English Composite Homilies* (Tempe, AZ: ACMRS, 2010), Hiroshi Ogawa breaks important new ground by conducting a thorough, if limited, study into the linguistic and stylistic development of Old English composite homilies, defined as those homilies that borrowed and adapted their contents from previous vernacular material (usually homiletic). Rejecting the “scissors and paste” hypothesis for the composition of these works (in concert with most recent scholarship), Ogawa rightly considers them to be valuable in their own right, not merely as “targets of source studies but for what they are—historical records of the way in which earlier homiletic works are understood and accepted by later writers of the period who transmit them in their own ways” (6). His volume, thus, ably champions an important revisionist trend in recent scholarship on these documents.

Ogawa's study builds on previous work by a number of scholars who likewise see value in taking a synchronic approach to these texts, emphasizing how Anglo-Saxon homilists adapted the material they had on hand, rather than hunting for their ultimate sources. What distinguishes Ogawa's method is his narrow focus on the linguistic and stylistic features that accompanied these later homilists' borrowings. In Ogawa's own words, the volume is intended to make a contribution “by examining the compilers' language, syntax and style in particular, in comparison with the source texts” (7). Specifically, Ogawa's approach focuses on later redactors' adaptations, ranging from syntactic concerns—including word order, word choice, and pronominal and verbal morphology—to stylistic considerations such as clause type and length, word pairing, and the use of devices such as enumeration, poetic rhythm, etc.

Ultimately, his conclusions are somewhat constrained by the fact that Ogawa closely examines only eight primary witnesses: Chapter Two considers Napier XXX; chapter Three considers Napier XL and LVIII; Chapter Four considers several late Old English Judgment Day homilies, including Vercelli XXI, Fadda X, and, again, Napier XL; Chapter Five considers Napier XXIX; and finally, Chapter Six considers two Easter homilies, *In Die Sancto Pasce* and *De Descensu Christi Ad Inferos*. Perhaps because of the relative smallness of his sample size, Ogawa's conclusions are most convincing when he focuses on specific instances of borrowing between particular texts. His general conclusions—that most composite homilies can be classified as *sermones* (as opposed *homiliae*), that there seems to have been a

“range or stock of passages” that composite homilists would borrow from (176), and that composite homilists tended to adapt their sources for their own distinctive styles while modernizing them both linguistically and syntactically—seem somewhat less earthshattering. While Ogawa's work provides an important step forward in our understanding of the ways in which later Anglo-Saxon homilists drew from earlier vernacular material, it leaves as a significant desideratum a close, comparative study of the same procedures used by Anglo-Saxon homilists dealing in a similar way with Latin homiletic texts. Since this question lies outside the parameters of Ogawa's thesis, however, this gap only underscores the importance of his contribution and the need for further research in this area.

■ Taunton Fragment

In a well-written and well-argued article, “The Taunton Fragment and the Homiliary of Angers: Context for New Old English,” *RES* 60: 1–33, Aidan Conti sets out to examine, for the first time, the recently discovered bilingual Old English/Latin Taunton Fragment in relation to its newly-identified source, the so-called Homiliary of Angers. Most importantly, Conti challenges the claim by the fragment's editor, Mechthild Gretsch (“The Taunton Fragment: a New Text from Anglo-Saxon England,” *ASE* 33 [2004]: 145–93), that this text constitutes the sole example of an Old English text composed by a non-Anglo-Saxon author, albeit mediated by an Old English scribe who preserved the linguistic and syntactic idiosyncrasies of his exemplar. By thoroughly examining discrepancies in the Latin source text of the Taunton Fragment when compared with the Old English, Conti convincingly argues that the text evinces a far more complicated transmission history than previously recognized and that the author's sometimes unusual Old English syntax likely derived not from his unfamiliarity with the vernacular language—as might be expected of a foreign author writing in an acquired language—but rather from infelicities in his source and his own carelessness.

BC

■ Vercelli Book

2009 was an *annus mirabilis* for the Vercelli Book, especially for the Vercelli homilies. Samantha Zacher and Andy Orchard edited a collection of eleven essays, *New Readings in the Vercelli Book* (Toronto: U of Toronto P). Their co-authored “Introduction” (3–11) clearly summarizes the book's contents and urges more work on the

codex. *New Readings* examines both the prose and verse of the Vercelli Book (each reviewed in the relevant sections of YWOES): six of the book's essays concern the Vercelli homilies, four examine Vercelli poems, and one final contribution is a bibliographic essay covering the entire codex. The book closes with an index of manuscripts cited and a general index. *New Readings* is an excellent, high-quality collection with a useful unifying focus and learned essays.

Paul E. Szarmach starts off the book with a very welcome analysis of "The Vercelli Prose and Anglo-Saxon Literary History" (12–40). He argues that if we view the Vercelli Book as an "anthology" of early Old English prose, the various homilies collectively demonstrate a variety of stylistic paths, "a set of potential directions and paths for later prose writers" (13). This generous essay is both a summary of literary critical scholarship on the Vercelli homilies and a guide to possible further research in this vein. After discussing various models of literary history and their applicability to Anglo-Saxon studies, Szarmach notes that the field has avoided "narrative" (or diachronic) literary histories due to problems such as uncertain dating and attribution of texts and the field's excessive attention to poetry. As an antidote, he sketches out a literary history of Old English prose "that begins with the Vercelli homilies and carries through in a lively fashion for about a half-century on either side of the millennium" (19). Szarmach shows how the rhetorical tactics of various Vercelli homilies provided "options for style" for later authors (19); the homilists "show freedom and the flexibility in selecting and adapting the many aspects of the Latin tradition" (30), including "rejection of certain aspects of that tradition (e.g. the florid style of hermeneutic Latin). In summary: "The response to the Latin tradition in Vercelli shows a certain suppleness that runs from closer word-to-word rendering through broader imitative composition" (32) and thus "the Vercelli prose offers a baseline for the development of Anglo-Saxon prose in the ecclesiastical genres" (40). Some Vercelli homilies are strict translations; some texts are not quite translations (in our sense of the term), but rather "imitations" displaying a "comparatively free response" to the Latin sources (24). For example, Vercelli Homily I is "a rewriting of the biblical narrative that at its root constitutes exegesis as well as the tendency of all biblical interpretation or presentation to 'fill in' the biblical record" acting with a "daring or confidence" similar to biblical apocrypha (27). When he turns to selected *Kompilationspredigten* (i.e., composite sermons: Homilies II-IV, VIII-X, and XIX-XXI) Szarmach shows another sort of working method, in which each homilist

takes up a central idea and then applies a collection of relevant sermon themes and motifs from various sources. Some homilies seem to take vernacular poetry as their inspiration in an "attempt to elevate expository prose with poetic effects" (34); in this stylistic mode, "vernacular sermons with marked rhythms became a tradition" (35). Szarmach suggests perhaps reviving the categories of "Asiatic" and "Attic" prose to help better describe the complex literary history: "The homilies featuring marked rhythm are most definitely 'Asiatic' in their self-conscious use of rhythmical adornment; those that avoid such rhythmical adornment are, by contrast, 'Attic.' The citation of this classical typology, well developed in classical rhetoric, is analogical here, representing the potential of any language system to go 'fancy' or 'plain'" (38). His conclusion briefly examines how Ælfric and Wulfstan might fit into this vision of literary history.

Donald Scragg revisits his authoritative work on the Vercelli Book in "Studies in the Language of the Copyists of the Vercelli Homilies" (41–61), examining the language of later copies of the Vercelli Homilies by means of his ongoing project on spelling in eleventh-century vernacular manuscripts. Scragg's essay includes a concise description of this Manchester database project (43–4), found at <http://www.arts.manchester.ac.uk/mancass/C11database/>. The temporal span of the database (980–1099) post-dates the Vercelli book (ca. 975) but does allow for investigation into the language used by later copyists of the same homilies in Vercelli. Scragg uses the database "to show some features of the language of copies of the Vercelli homilies recorded in manuscripts other than the Vercelli Book, and by that means . . . attempt to distinguish features of the language of the originals from that of later copyists" (43). By looking at later copies of the Vercelli homilies we can see how later scribes wrestled with the different linguistic forms of the Vercelli originals. Some scribes seem to update the language of their sources; others seem to go to lengths to preserve "linguistic archaisms" such as *nænig* and *o* rather than *a* before a nasal consonant (54); other scribes seem to use a mix of both strategies. As Scragg explains: "By comparing eleventh-century copies of tenth-century texts, we can see which older linguistic forms were acceptable (and acceptable to which scribes, or even—if the evidence is sufficiently full—in which scriptoria), and which were uniformly modernized" (60). Scragg notes that his essay is "exploratory rather than definitive" (58) as he makes a number of observations and suggestions, ever pointing the way for further linguistic research in which "we may discover more about the education and training of

eleventh-century scribes, and of their attitudes to their copy-texts" (59). One general final suggestion is "that late Old English, often now called 'Standard Old English,' is not quite the uniform language that is implied in that designation" (59). The Manchester database can reveal much about variation in late Old English, and even open the way for regional studies of textual culture in the eleventh century.

Tom Hall delivers his usual well-researched and clearly written work in "The Portents at Christ's Birth in Vercelli Homilies V and VI: Some Analogues from Medieval Sermons and Biblical Commentaries" (62–97). Hall examines the sources and analogues for Vercelli V and VI, both Christmas homilies that share a striking motif: an enumeration of various wondrous events or portents that presaged Christ's birth during the reign of Augustus. Hall provides an excellent summary of the work done to-date on the relationship between these two homilies and their possible common source for the portents: the Pseudo-Alcuin *De divinis officiis*, "the Hiberno-Latin compilation known as the Catechesis Celtica" (66), the Old English *Martyrology*, and behind all of this Orosius's *Historia adversum paganos*. Building upon this previous work, Hall expands the reach of source study by "drawing attention to several additional sets of nativity portents that provide close parallels for the passages in Vercelli V and VI, all taken from medieval sermons and biblical commentaries" (69). He introduces ten possible source texts: "the seventh-century pseudo-Jerome *Expositio quatuor evangeliorum*; the eighth-century commentary on Matthew known as the *Liber quaestionum in evangeliis*; the eighth-century Vienna *Commentary on Luke*; the eighth-century Irish *Reference Bible*; a Christmas sermon from the late-eighth- or early-ninth-century Verona homiliary; a sermon on the seven signs of Christ's nativity attributed (by Migne) to Hrabanus Maurus; a text on the same topic in a ninth-century manuscript, Munich Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 5257; a Christmas sermon from the eleventh-century Pembroke 25 homiliary; a Christmas sermon in Salisbury Cathedral Library 9, from the first quarter of the twelfth century" (70); and the Old Icelandic Homily Book (ca. 1200), a collection of Icelandic translations of Latin texts that include items "that go back to exemplars that were introduced into Scandinavia by English missionaries in the tenth and eleventh centuries" (90). Hall introduces and discusses each of these texts in turn and provides a clear table that plots out the relationships among these texts (94–5). He concludes that "the essential outlines of the tradition [i.e., of Christ's birth portents] were already beginning to come together by the late

seventh century . . . and that several competing sub-traditions were in circulation during the eighth and ninth centuries" (93). He argues that "the Christmas portents tradition reflected in Vercelli V and VI was essentially formulated and popularized by Irish exegetes and their students working in the seventh, eighth, and ninth centuries based ultimately on a reading of Orosius" (96). By the time the portents find their way into the Vercelli Homilies, the original Irish context is lost, but the portents "retain the unmistakable echoes of the exegetical methods, stylistic mannerisms, and rhetorical tropes . . . that are most fully realized in Irish and Hiberno-Latin literature of the early Middle Ages" (96–7). But Hall also warns that "the situation must be more complicated" than the scenario he has advanced and advocates more work on Irish texts such as the *Catechesis Celtica* and the Irish Reference Bible as well as on Old Norse homily collections.

In his standard edition of the Vercelli homilies, Donald Scragg notes of Vercelli VII that the text "has many of the hallmarks of a literal translation from Latin but no source has yet been found" (*Vercelli Homilies*, 133). Samantha Zacher has discovered that source in "The Source of Vercelli VII: An Address to Women" (98–149). As she summarizes: "Vercelli VII proves to be a close rendering of exactly half of a Latin translation of John Chrysostom's Homily XXIX on the Epistle to the Hebrews"; the sixth-century Latin version of this homily was "produced by one Mutianus Scholasticus (also known as Mutianus of Vivarium)," an associate of Cassiodorus at Vivarium whose translation of Chrysostom's homilies circulated widely in the early Middle Ages (99). Zacher gives background as to the knowledge of both Chrysostom and Mutianus in Anglo-Saxon England and argues for the dependence of Vercelli VII on this source "by investigating three main areas of concentration: corruptions in the Old English text that may be elucidated or corrected by comparison with Mutianus's text; textual omissions, additions, and changes that especially highlight the Old English homilist's method of adaptation; and finally, a consideration of the 'anti-feminist' portions of the text, as a means of raising some probing questions about both the target audience of the homily, and ostensibly that of the Vercelli Book at large" (104). A detailed and convincing comparison of text and source follows, also laid out in an appendix that sets out the complete Old English and Latin texts in parallel, with translations (128–49). Zacher analyzes textual corruptions in the Old English text and the Old English homilist's stylistic and rhetorical changes as he translated the Latin text. She also focuses on the homilist's translation of the source

text's bizarre attention to women's bodies, suggesting briefly at the end of the essay that women were possibly an intended audience of this particular homily, and, by extension, the audience of the Vercelli Book as a whole.

The late-antique *Apocalypse of Thomas* survives in several versions: Latin, Old English, and Middle Irish. Charles D. Wright's "Vercelli Homily XV and *The Apocalypse of Thomas*" (150–184) examines "the Old English version of the apocryphon in Vercelli XV, focusing on what appear to be the homilist's alterations and additions to his source" (151). The changes to the Latin source "reflect the homilist's efforts to pre-empt skeptical reactions to the revelation and to link apocalyptic expectation to the spread of clerical corruption" (151). The essay first surveys the Latin manuscript transmission of the apocryphon then analyzes the relationship of Vercelli XV to the Latin versions, reconstructing as best as possible the lost Latin manuscript source. Wright argues that the deviations from the source in Vercelli XV were not due to an intermediary's influence but the product of the homilist himself. He surveys in minute detail the homilist's alterations and additions, sorting them into seven categories: "(1) deletion of anachronisms; (2) explanatory and summary statements; (3) rhetorical embellishments; (4) biblical additions and doctrinal emendations; (5) moralizing asides; (6) authenticating devices; (7) politically motivated and possibly topical revisions" (160). On the basis of this final category, Wright argues for a particular historical context. The Old English text blames widespread pre-apocalyptic corruption on "young kings, young popes, young bishops and young ealdormen"; Wright argues that this is a "topical allusion to the Benedictine Reform, and specifically to the expulsions of the clerks by King Edgar, Pope John XI, Archbishop Dunstan, and Edgar's ealdormen" (178). The homilist thus was a pre-reform secular priest or canon cleric complaining about the strong-arm tactics of the Benedictine Reform and its establishment backing.

Michael Fox provides another source-based analysis in "Vercelli Homilies XIX–XXI, the Ascension Day Homily in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 162, and the Catechetical Tradition from Augustine to Wulfstan" (254–279). These four homilies for Rogationtide and Ascension Day are the work of a single author, and Fox argues that the "author's aim is at once to convince listeners and readers of the spiritual importance of the season and to rehearse as many of the most significant events of Christian history and foundations of the faith as possible" (254–5). Fox argues that in doing so, the author was guided in all four of these homilies

by the catechetical tradition whose ultimate source is Augustine's *De catechizandis rudibus*: i.e., a *narratio* of Christian sacred history designed specifically for neophyte instruction in the faith. There is not much evidence that Augustine's text was directly known in Anglo-Saxon England, but Fox argues that intermediary texts such as Martin of Braga's *De correctione rusticorum* (ca. 573) and Pirmin's *Scarapsus* (early eighth century) transmitted Augustine's idea of a catechetical *narratio* to Anglo-Saxon England. Fox surveys the varying influences of these authors and the catechetical tradition on Ælfric and Wulfstan (primarily *De initio creaturae* and Bethurum VI, respectively) before then finding a similar influence on the Vercelli homilies. In all of these examples, Fox shows that "authors also clearly felt free to adapt the basic guidelines of Augustine's model *narratio* to their own immediate needs" (278). In the four Vercelli homilies, "we see an author who, given the opportunity to compile a series of sermons for Rogationtide and Ascension Day, decided to combine material appropriate to the occasion with the sort of general outline of scriptural history which Augustine recommends" (278).

Capping off this excellent collection is Paul Remley's "The Vercelli Book and Its Texts: A Guide to Scholarship" (318–415). This ninety-seven-page lightly annotated bibliography is extracted from Remley and Andy Orchard's ongoing revision and update of Greenfield and Robinson's *A Bibliography of Publications on Old English Literature to the End of 1972* (Toronto: UTP, 1980). Remley's contribution is a near-comprehensive bibliography of work done on the Vercelli Book from the beginnings of modern scholarship. The bibliography does not cover absolutely everything: e.g., the scholarship on Cynewulf is not exhaustively treated here. Rather, as Remley states, he has "sought to cover certain types of print materials exhaustively, most notably those that refer to the Vercelli Book, its verse, or its prose at the level of the wording of their title. Moreover, I have tried to seek out and to record significant scholarly treatments of the manuscript and its texts, regardless of length or larger context, whenever they have entered my purview" (319). The result is a ready-made research guide perfect for a graduate class on the Vercelli Book, among other uses.

In addition to her work in *New Readings in the Vercelli Book*, Samantha Zacher published the first monograph-length study of the Vercelli Homilies as literary texts: *Preaching the Converted: The Style and Rhetoric of the Vercelli Book Homilies*, (Toronto: U of Toronto P). Chapter One, "Locating the Vercelli Homilies: Their Place in the Book, and the Book in Its Place" (3–29),

provides an excellent summary of scholarship on several introductory matters: the physical aspects of the codex, date and origin of the manuscript, and the mystery of the book's location in Italy. This chapter is generally a lucid conspectus of received views of the poem; Zacher tends to favor Rochester as a place of origin (*contra* Scragg), but acknowledges that, given the evidence, absolutely firm conclusions are unlikely. Chapter Two, "Reinventing the Past: Originality and the Vercelli Homilies" (30–62), is also an introductory chapter in which Zacher provides a well-informed summary of the contents of the codex, its audience, and its purpose. Favoring the idea that the codex was produced by and for secular clergy rather than for a monastic audience, she also suggests that part of the audience might have included women. She argues against the traditional view of the Vercelli homilists as poor stylists and Latinists (in comparison to Ælfric, for example), noting that such a prejudice "has hindered consideration of the sources of the collection as a whole" (46). Instead, Zacher finds the Vercelli Book quite wide-reaching and learned; likewise, in her focus on style and rhetoric, her goal is to "highlight the individual artistry of [the Vercelli homilies'] authors, as well as the sensitivity of the compiler of the collection as a whole" (61) and examine "the Vercelli collection's close connections with prevailing literary trends in both Latin and the vernacular" (62).

Chapter Three, "Seeing Double: The Repetition of Themes and Text in the Vercelli Book" (63–105), argues that the repetition of elements within the Vercelli Book (e.g. the overlap in Vercelli Homilies II and XXI) does not indicate a haphazard or careless assembly of elements in the codex, but rather that "the use of verbal and structural repetition [is] an effective rhetorical device" both within homilies and in the structure of the codex as a whole (65). She argues that the compiler was "discerning and critical" and that textual repetitions in the codex have an artistic or aesthetic purpose behind them (70). Chapter Four, "'Where Are They Now?': The Sources and Techniques of Adaptation and Compilation in the Vercelli Book" (106–139), concentrates on Vercelli X and explores the connection between this homily "and a compendium of known Latin sources . . . as well as a rather less easily containable nexus of associations with vernacular poetic styles" (108). The chapter explores the sources of Vercelli X in-depth: "not only the extent to which the author remained more or less faithful to the content and rhetoric of Latin texts on which he so evidently draws, but also the degree to which he embellished his prose with ornamental devices more frequently associated (in current critical debates) with

Old English verse" (108). She argues that the homilist "shows considerable mastery, both at improvisation and in employing what is sometimes referred to as the 'cut and paste' style of cobbling together disparate sources so that key themes and ideas recur throughout" (112). The "author of Vercelli X emerges as a talented writer of Old English prose working under the twin influences of the imported Latin and inherited vernacular rhetorical traditions" (113). Zacher examines various rhetorical effects, such as embedded poetry, paronomasia, and rhyme—all evidence for the Vercelli X homilist's "proficiency as a rhetorician" (135) and complex "integration of Latin and vernacular influences" (139).

Chapter Five, "The 'Body and Soul' of the Vercelli Book: The Heart of the Corpus" (140–178), focuses on Vercelli XXII and its representation of the soul/body motif—specifically, the soul's address to the body, a pervasive theme throughout the Vercelli Book. In Zacher's words, "[a] study of this homily in relation to the eleven extant vernacular Anglo-Saxon texts containing the soul's address (in addition to their Latin influences) demonstrates not only the extent of the author's incorporation of individual themes from this relatively well-defined corpus of materials, but also his familiarity with a broad range of Latin and vernacular sources that treat the theme of body and soul outside of this group" (141). In a fashion similar to the last chapter, she shows how the homilist "is able to combine his translation of a Latin source with artful invention drawn in part from a host of intermediary vernacular influences" (142). Zacher thoroughly surveys this motif's history and use in Anglo-Saxon literature, discovering relationships between this homily and expressions of the same motif in other texts. She argues for "the intermediary influence of a vernacular tradition between Vercelli XXII and its main source in Isidore's *Synonyma*" and indeed argues that the soul/body motif is one of the thematic organizing principles of the codex (177). In Chapter Six, "'For the Sake of Beauty and Utility': The Place of Figurative Language in the Vercelli Homilies" (179–224), Zacher turns to an interesting analysis of figurative language across all of the homilies of the Vercelli Book, particularly metaphors and similes connected to depictions of "miracles and Doomsday events" (184). She suggests that "figurative tropes are not merely ornamental to homiletic discourse, but rather provide a basis for homilists to test and explore perceived boundaries between the literal and figurative levels of meaning" (184). The first part of the chapter "offers a broad overview of the occurrence and frequency of figurative tropes in the Vercelli Book, pointing out gaps and clusters in the arrangement of this particular

feature within the manuscript as a whole” (184–5); the second part of the chapter turns to a detailed analysis of Vercelli VII and IX and their “elaborate conceits” (185). A useful chart tabulates “Metaphors and similes in the Vercelli homilies” (186–191). In conclusion, Zacher finds a certain “transgressive” character in the homilies’ treatment of literal and figurative levels of meaning.

Chapter Seven, “At a Crossroads: Generic Ambiguity in the Guthlac Narrative of the Vercelli Book” (225–268), argues for the aesthetic achievement of the Vercelli Guthlac narrative—Homily XXII, the final text in the manuscript—and for its suitability as a final selection by the compiler. Zacher argues that the prose life, like the *vita* of Martin comprising Vercelli XVIII, fits uneasily into generic categories: A translated excerpt of a Latin life of Guthlac, the Vercelli narrative has homiletic generic markers as well as stylistic and rhetorical features deriving from poetry (e.g., “echo words,” paronomasia, and so forth)—hence the “generic ambiguity” of the text. The homily has a “much more complex intermixture of hybrid features than perhaps has been previously allowed” in the scholarship, which has seen the text as a rather shoddy translation, included in the codex only as an awkward afterthought (229). Zacher sees a unity of aesthetic conception in the homily’s treatment of the tension between movement and stasis; she also finds that the themes of the Guthlac narrative resonate nicely with concerns she has traced in the rest of the manuscript, and thus the text serves as an appropriate conclusion to the codex. Chapter Eight, “Conclusion: Rhetorical Models and Modes of Style” (269–278), suggests further directions for research, including the study of the influence of poetic style on homilies and the homiletic style on poetry, and ends with a brief analysis of the *First Worcester Fragment*. Two appendices follow: Appendix 1: “The Contents of the Vercelli Homilies and Relevant Variant Texts (as Identified by Scragg)” (280–86) and Appendix 2: “Divisions in the Vercelli Book According to Scragg (by Exemplar) and Sisam (by Quire)” (287–293). The book concludes with two excellent detailed indices: a “General Index” (325–343) and an “Index of Passages Cited” (345–348). *Preaching the Converted* is first-rate scholarship and nuanced, sensitive literary criticism.

AS

■ *Lives of St. Edmund*

Anthony Bale provides an “Introduction: St. Edmund’s Medieval Lives” in *St. Edmund, King and Martyr: Changing Images of a Medieval Saint*, edited by Anthony Bale and A.S.G. Edwards (Woodbridge: York Medieval Press

in association with Boydell), 1–25. The earliest mentions of Edmund’s death, in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* and Asser, do not make him a martyr; Abbo of Fleury did that in his Latin life, which Ælfric of Eynsham adapted for his English collection of lives (see below, under Ælfric). The cult seems to have begun early, and Bale traces the simultaneous development of the cult; the abbey at Bury, with its unusual level of control over a large area of land; the town; the shrine itself (which was wood until it burned in 1198 and was rebuilt with marble and metal); and art and literary works associated with Bury and with Edmund and his cult. Bale describes how later English kings associated themselves with Edmund and the effects of doing so. He provides a survey of recent scholarship on hagiography before giving an overview of the volume. This introduction moves smoothly back and forth between Anglo-Saxon and later medieval times (and sometimes beyond).

NGD

In “King, Martyr and Virgin: Imitatio Christi in Ælfric’s *Life of St. Edmund*” (*St. Edmund*, 27–44), Carl Phelpstead discusses the earliest vernacular life of St. Edmund, written by Ælfric in the tenth century and preserved in his *Lives of Saints*. Phelpstead argues that Ælfric’s hagiographical account is designed to emphasize Edmund’s relation to Christ in the various roles of king, martyr, and virgin, although the role of martyr receives greater attention and analysis in this essay. Phelpstead briefly reviews the context in which Ælfric writes, noting in particular the influence of the tenth-century Benedictine Reform in England. Previous scholarship on Ælfric’s intended audience is also reviewed: the dedicatory Prefaces for the *Lives of Saints* are addressed to Ælfric’s two lay patrons, Æthelweard and his son Æthelmær, and, as Malcolm Godden has observed, “Ælfric wrote his saints’ lives for bishops and monks and for highly educated laymen like Æthelweard and Æthelmær, not just (if at all) for the ordinary laity” (quoted at 29). Phelpstead concludes that Ælfric’s intended audience, though not entirely clear, would seem to be both ecclesiastical and political elites; Phelpstead further speculates that Ælfric’s *Life of St. Edmund* seems designed, to some extent, to speak particularly to those elites about pressing political and ethical issues during turbulent times marked by renewed Viking hostility.

Phelpstead also examines the relationship between Ælfric’s version and his source, Abbo of Fleury’s *Passio Sancti Eadmundi*. Ælfric’s version is significantly shorter than Abbo’s account, about a third of the length, but both texts share common features and both are informed by traditions of royal hagiography such as those found in

Merovingian Francia. In Ælfric's text, Edmund seems to place himself within those same hagiographical traditions by invoking Christ's example: *forþan-þe ic Criste folgie þe us swa gebysnode* (34, "because I follow Christ who set us such an example"). Phelpstead cites the ample scholarship that demonstrates the potential political advantages of royal cults, useful both to the monarchy and to the church. The monastic renewal of Ælfric's own day was taken up not only by church leaders but also by the monarchy, with benefits for both parties. A ruler who could lay claim to ancestral royal saints might, in some instances, be able to invoke a stronger claim to the throne and, perhaps, find himself in a stronger position to rule. Similarly, church leaders who forged ecclesiastical ties to the nobility might find greater support for the monastic mission and associated building programs.

Saint Edmund's life, then, may point to a growing interdependence between church and monarchy in the tenth century; as Phelpstead notes, Edmund imitates Christ—and shows his devotion to the church—in his three roles of king, martyr, and virgin. Phelpstead begins his essay with a quotation from the Gospel of John that underscores a type of royalty claimed for Christ—admittedly by his persecutors—namely, the Crucifixion titulus INRI: *Iesus Nazarenus, Rex Iudaeorum* ("Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews"). Phelpstead focuses less attention on the role of king and more attention on the role of martyr, a role more centrally tied to his article's central theme of hagiography. Like Christ, Edmund was a martyr, one who throws down his weapons in a fight against the Vikings, despite having earlier expressed a willingness to die in battle against Hinguar and his troops. As Phelpstead observes, Ælfric departs from his source to explain that Edmund *wolde geæfenlæcan Cristes gebysnungum þe forbead Petre mid wæpnum to winnenne wið þa wælhreowan Judeiscan* (38, "wanted to imitate Christ's example when he forbade Peter to fight with weapons against the bloodthirsty Jews"). Like Christ, Edmund is tortured prior to his death; he is bound, mocked, and beaten with staffs and then, in an oft-quoted passage, we are told: *Hi scuton þa mid gafelucum swilce him to gamenes to oðþæt he eall wæs besæt mid heora scotungum swilce igles byrsta, swa swa Sebastianus wæs* (38, "They shot at him then with missiles, as if it were a game to them, until he was completely covered with their missiles just like the bristles of a hedgehog, as Sebastian was"). Phelpstead suggests that here Ælfric follows the conventions of hagiographic typology and, according to that logic, Edmund must be a saint in the minds of those reading

or listening to Ælfric's narrative because his death is like that of another saint.

Phelpstead concludes his essay by considering the implications of some of the posthumous miracles associated with Edmund—his decapitated head calling out to those searching for it, the head then miraculously restored to the neck of his body, and, finally, the formerly wounded body being made whole and incorrupt. Phelpstead also gives brief consideration to the topic of virginity, which is explored more fully in Abbo, perhaps because his monastic audience would have had greater interest in Edmund's claims to virginity. Phelpstead suggests that "Ælfric recognized the disadvantages of a virgin king incapable of producing an heir and chose not to emphasize this aspect of Abbo's portrait both for pragmatic political reasons and also out of consideration for his non-monastic audience," and so, Phelpstead argues, Ælfric's version of Edmund's life draws our attention to "tensions inherent in a Christocentric ideology of kingship: Christ was believed to be a virgin, but the king who models his life on Christ in that particular respect risks the stability of his kingdom after his death" (43).

■ Ælfric

Petra Hofmann's "*þam Gecyrredum Mannum* in Ælfric's Homily 'Natale Sancte Pauli' (ÆCHom I.27)," *N&Q* 56: 14–16, argues that the word *gecyrrred* in the phrase *þam gecyrredum mannum* denotes 'monastic' rather than the more common translation 'converted'. The translation 'converted men' is accepted by the editors Benjamin Thorpe, in his early edition of the text, and Malcolm Godden, in his more recent glossary for the text. The appropriate translation depends on how the context for this phrase is construed; Hofmann argues that the context here suggests that monks are specifically being addressed and that the word *gecyrrred* also denotes, though with far less frequency, 'monastic' in other contexts. Hofmann reports that Ælfric uses *gecyrran*, *gecyrrred*, and *gecyrrredness* (and their spelling variants) to define three things: some kind of physical motion (more than eighty times), the mending of one's ways (more than fifty times), and conversion (more than twenty-five times). Infrequently for Ælfric (in just seven other instances), the word signifies entrance into the monastic life. The question of interpreting this particular occurrence of the word hinges upon Ælfric's intended reference at this juncture in the homily: is he referring more narrowly to monks, as Hofmann argues, or to the larger body of converted Christians? Hofmann advances a very good argument for the former position,

but because the sentence occupies a transition point in the homily, where Ælfric turns his attention from a more general consideration of the converted to a more narrow consideration of monks, the use of *gecyrredum* in this sentence may be the subject of further discussion.

Rebecca I. Starr's "Ælfric's Gendered Theology in the *Catholic Homilies*, the First Series" (Proquest 3422863), is a dissertation from the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign that focuses on how Ælfric's First Series of *Catholic Homilies* intervenes, in the words of the author, "to erase the significance of the feminine from Christian faith and practice." She concludes that while "Ælfric claims that his selections ensure orthodox teaching, nevertheless, the result is an increased centrality for men, and marginalization for women."

Damian Fleming, in "A Demilitarized Saint: Ælfric's *Life of St. Sebastian*," *Anglia* 127.1: 1–21, views Ælfric's text as "typical of the saints' lives in his whole collection concerning a male, secular, military saint" (1). The story of Sebastian is found in Ælfric's *Lives of Saints* collection, and Fleming rightly observes that Ælfric's text minimizes key aspects of Sebastian's military role, with the result that the narrative seems to be about the life of a soldier whose military trappings, somewhat incongruently, have been largely removed. Fleming notes the popularity of the story of Sebastian's martyrdom in Anglo-Saxon England and reviews relevant scholarship on the Latin version of the *Passio*, which is preserved in a number of manuscripts, perhaps most notably in the "Cotton-Corpus Legendary" and in the *Old English Martyrology*. Fleming details Ælfric's rather significant changes to this "stable" Latin text, which, interestingly enough, records the fact that Sebastian, a Roman soldier, keeps his Christian faith secret—not to protect his own life but in order to maintain proximity to persecuted Christians so that he might "embolden them to martyrdom should their spirits flag" (3). And, as Fleming notes, this seems particularly problematic, since Sebastian apparently also participates in the killing of Christians. Ælfric reduces and alters the story in ways that are more in keeping with his goal to present Christian instruction in a positive and less problematic light, and Fleming cites the pattern of Ælfrician intervention with his sources in ways that have been previously studied by Dorothy Bethurum, Cecily Clark, Anne Middleton, and E. Gordon Whatley. Building upon their work, Fleming correctly argues that Sebastian's life seems a particularly good fit for the *Lives* since the preface to Ælfric's work states that he hopes his passions of the martyrs will revive, by their exhortations, his listeners who are inactive in the faith and "greatly encourage a weakening faith" (*fidem erigant languentem*); similarly, Ælfric

explains, Sebastian's only motive for continuing to serve an emperor notorious for persecuting Christians was because he saw that some Christians would grow weak because of punishments, and Sebastian then "exhorted their minds to faith" (*gehyrte heora mod to þæs hælendes geleafan*, 5). Fleming surveys recent scholarship on the group of secular saints found in the *Lives* and then, building on those studies, he provides a detailed analysis of the changes Ælfric makes to the militaristic language of his Latin source text. Fleming concludes that Ælfric minimizes three major themes found in the Latin *Passio*, namely, themes about "*miles Christi*, the arrows of the devil, and the acceptability of hiding one's religion" (20). In minimizing these themes, Ælfric avoids some of the inherently difficult and sometimes contradictory ideas and situations found in his Latin source, a source that contains passages that portray Sebastian both as "a Roman soldier and a Christian; he encourages others not to avoid martyrdom while avoiding it himself; some Christians choose to live while others are praised for their dying" (20). In conclusion, Fleming writes: "Ælfric's translation avoids the contradictions and instead stresses the simple virtues of the Christians and the errors of the pagans" (20).

John Halbrooks, in his article, "Ælfric, the *Maccabees*, and the Problem of Christian Heroism," *SP* 106: 263–84, analyzes Ælfric's version of the biblical story of Judas Machabeus as it is presented in the *Lives of Saints*. Halbrooks suggests that the story, with its emphasis on heroism and with little in the way of what Auerbach calls "figural interpretation," would have challenged Ælfric because a text that tends to "valorize martial prowess and pride over the Christian virtues" would not be a text that Ælfric would be inclined to promote or disseminate (264). The answer to the challenge of dealing with this biblical text, Halbrooks argues, comes in the form of Ælfric's methods of translation. Ælfric reshapes the narrative through a range of stylistic and rhetorical strategies. His use of *abbreviatio*, for example, allows him to elide much of the martial material. Ælfric also invokes, says Halbrooks, a "native sense of heroism in order to redefine it according to Christian ethics" (264). Ælfric also adds a Christian sense of the classical virtue *pietas*, and, finally, Ælfric emphasizes the difference between old Judaic law and new Christian law, differences that allow Ælfric to claim a "figural interpretation" for physical warfare that "prefigures the spiritual war that Christians must now fight" (264). Halbrooks cites Dorothy Bethurum's claim—made as long ago as 1932—that in his *Lives of Saints*, Ælfric creates "a connection between the saints and the early Germanic

heroes, with the idea of replacing the latter by the former, but clothing the story of the saints in a form familiar to his hearers" (266). Halbrooks then summarizes some of the subsequent scholarly disagreement, made in the decades after Bethurum wrote, over the concept of the hero in saints' lives; Halbrooks also examines Ælfric's use of sources, especially texts with Anglo-Saxon connections, such as the "Cotton-Corpus Legendary" and the *Old English Martyrology*. He then explores the topic of heroic virtue in the Maccabees and argues that perhaps the emphasis on *pietas* in the story "seemed to Ælfric to transform the heroic ethos into something nobler than that which he found in the native English tradition of heroism" (278). Halbrooks concludes his essay by noting that since heroic virtue poses a potentially difficult concept theologically, Ælfric "must redefine it in a way that transfers the most true form of virtue from the *bellatores* to the *oratores*, from the worldly warriors to the spiritual warriors" (284).

Emily V. Thornbury's helpful note, "Strange Hybrids: Ælfric, Vergil and the Lynx in Anglo-Saxon England," *N&Q* 56: 163–66, offers an explanation for a rather odd definition in Ælfric's bilingual *Glossary*: "Linx. Gemenged hund and wulf" (164). In an earlier article, Thornbury had suggested that the confusion may have come from the traditional understanding of a leopard as a hybrid born of a lion and a *pard*, and that this might explain Ælfric's gloss for the lynx as a wolf-dog hybrid. After discovering, however, that the definition that Ælfric gives for a lynx in fact occurs in the Corpus glossary as "Lycisca. canis. ex lupa. et cane natus," Thornbury now takes the Corpus glossary tradition to be the source for Ælfric's error. As an interesting aside, Thornbury notes that Michael Lapidge has observed that these Corpus definitions "are derived from scholia on line 18 of Vergil's third *Eclogue*" (165); hence, one may infer that Ælfric's tenth-century glossary is connected to "Vergilian scholia recorded in Canterbury centuries before his time" (166).

Mary Clayton's fascinating survey, "Suicide in the Works of Ælfric," *RES* 60: 339–70, adds an important footnote to the monumental two-volume study by Alexander Murray, *Suicide in the Middle Ages* (1998). Murray's study deals primarily with the period from around the millennium to ca. 1500. Since his study does not deal in any detail with the period before 1000, Clayton seeks to "remedy this deficit for one late Anglo-Saxon author" (339) through a survey of references to suicides in three areas in the writings of Ælfric: biblical characters (both those treated and those omitted by Ælfric), suicides of characters in texts concerned with saints, and a suggestive passage in which Ælfric links

fasting and suicide. Clayton also examines Ælfric's sources and shows how his thinking on suicide can sometimes be at variance with his chosen source, as happens to be the case, for example, in his rendering of the Life of Saint Martin. Clayton correctly argues that Ælfric takes a firm stance against suicide and seems opposed to any concessions that would mitigate the guilt attached to suicide. With regard to fasting and suicide, Ælfric seems to have in mind the suicidal delusions associated with excessive fasting found in Cassian's *Collationes*. Clayton concludes her article by considering Ælfric's word choice for a suicide, where Ælfric prefers the term *agenslaga*, which is recorded only in his writings; elsewhere, the more common word *sylfcwala* is found in Anglo-Saxon texts.

Helmut Gneuss offers a brief but magisterial introduction to the life of Ælfric in his book, *Ælfric of Eynsham: His Life, Times, and Writings* (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications). The book began life as a lecture at a session of the Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, delivered and later published in German. Michael Lapidge volunteered to translate the text, ably assisted by Mechtild Gretsch, and the volume appeared in the OEN Subsidia series as a concise yet indispensable introduction to Ælfric. Gneuss covers topics such as "Ælfric's Name and Career," "Ælfric's Writings and Their Circulation," "Ælfric's Language and Style," "Ælfric as Language Teacher," and "The Royal House and the Scandinavian Wars." With impeccable scholarship, Gneuss gives his readers both the broad context and the nuanced detail necessary to explain Ælfric's particular set of contributions to the ecclesiastical, cultural, and pedagogical life of England during the fervent years of Benedictine reform. His book begins with the statement that he will "attempt to introduce an Anglo-Saxon author, one who does not, perhaps, shine as a star in the firmament as viewed by today's medievalists, but one who was the first, and for a long time the only, master of prose written in English" (1). We learn in the first section of his book, "Ælfric's Name and Career," that in the early Anglo-Saxon period, up to the tenth century, the name *Ælfric* seems to have been relatively uncommon, but in the tenth and eleventh centuries we find (with the help of works such as Searle's *Onomasticon* and the recently produced *Prosopography of Anglo-Saxon England*) more than one hundred persons by that name, which partially explains the long history of scholarly misidentification of Ælfric of Eynsham with others bearing the same name. In the next section, "Ælfric's Writings and Their Circulation," Gneuss provides a convenient and clear overview of Ælfric's corpus:

Of writings in English pride of place belongs to more than 160 homilies (mostly exegetical in nature) and saints' Lives; it is above all from these writings that Ælfric derives his reputation as a master of Old English prose. To these are to be added translations and homiletic versions of parts of the Old Testament, a summary of the entire Bible (the *Letter to Sigeward*), an abbreviated version of Alcuin's *Interrogationes Sigewulfi in Genesin*, and a scientific handbook (*De temporibus anni*) on the creation, the sun, moon, stars and planets, the year and the seasons, the wind and the weather, derived principally from works by Bede.

Ælfric's so-called "Pastoral Letters" were composed both in English and in Latin versions, as also are the informative prefaces to his more important writings (*Catholic homilies, Lives of Saints, Grammar*). Latin and Old English are combined—as necessitated by the subject matter—in his pioneering *Grammar* and the *Glossary*, a class glossary appended to the *Grammar*. Works composed entirely in Latin include a scholastic colloquy for educational purposes (known as the *Colloquium*), his "Letter" to the monks of Eynsham, and a Life of his master Æthelwold, which is an abbreviated version of the *Vita S. Æthelwoldi* by his fellow monk Wulfstan. A few further treatises in Old English and some excerpts in Latin must be passed over here (8–9).

Gneuss concludes his book with particularly helpful sections on "Art and Culture in Winchester" and "The Survival of Ælfric's Writings." All students of Ælfric will welcome this helpful guide to his life and writings.

Brita Wårvik's "Teaching by Stories: Ælfric's Instructive Narratives" in *Instructional Writing in English: Studies in Honour of Risto Hiltunen*, edited by Matti Peikola, Janne Skaffari, and Sanna-Kaisa Tanskanen (Philadelphia: Benjamins), 13–34, opens with an assertion that seems very nearly self-evident: although Ælfric "tells many stories in his works, his primary purpose is not narration, but instruction" (13). This idea is, of course, reinforced by Ælfric himself, who states in the preface to his *Catholic Homilies* that *menn behofiað godre lare swiðost on þisum timan þe is geendung þyssere worulde* (14–5, "people need good instruction, especially at this time, which is the ending of this world"). Wårvik writes that her "view-point is that of linguist studying texts whose purpose has been explicitly identified as instructive by their author" (14). She discusses different types of sermons, both ancient and modern; the ancient sermon cites a passage and then comments on it, while the latter, modern kind—or a university, school, or scholastic sermon—follows

a more elaborate structure making use of distinctions and themes. Wårvik says that Ælfric's sermons follow the ancient pattern but that "they definitely do not lack organization" (18). She notes that Ælfric's stories sometimes have ancillary material that precedes them, and that he sometimes draws attention to their sources. She summarizes (and concludes) her essay in this way: "Ælfric's urge to teach is made very explicit by his use of metatextual, interactive and evaluative elements and by his references to his sources. He uses these signals to welcome the audience to the homily and to guide them between narrative and instructive passages inside the texts" (30).

Elizabeth Sklar, in "Ælfric's *Life of Saint Edmund*: Constructing National Identity," *Medieval Perspectives* 17.2 (2003): 129–42, writes that what she wants to address "is not Ælfric's celebrated stylistic and narrational finesse, which I take to be a given, nor his equally vaunted and well-documented doctrinal manoeuvres, but rather what I perceive to be the potent ideological subtext of this *vita*, a metanarrative, as it were, designed to restore self-esteem to a demoralized and bewildered populace in the throes of devastating cultural crisis" (130). The article summarizes Ælfric's account of Edmund and concludes with the idea that just as Edmund will be resurrected on Judgment Day, so too "might the Angelcynn aspire to resurrection of the body politic." Sklar notes that in "Apocalypse and Invasion in Late Anglo-Saxon England," Malcolm Godden argues that from the mid-990s on, "Ælfric's writings show an increasing concern with political and national issues," and that "by the end of his life he had become strikingly outspoken on such matters" (131–132). The *Life of Saint Edmund* speaks out eloquently on just "such matters." It is no arbitrary gesture of authorial prerogative that prompts Ælfric to rewrite Abbo's conclusion; where the *Passio Sancti Eadmundi* culminates in a peroration on the power of chastity and virginity, Ælfric offers his narrative as affirmation of the Resurrection to come. (139) Sklar perceives a possible analogy between the hope of redemption for Edmund and the hope of redemption for Edmund's people.

Hugh Magennis and Mary Swan have edited *A Companion to Ælfric*, Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition 18 (Leiden: Brill). After an introduction, Magennis provides "Ælfric Scholarship," a concise, accurate, and informative overview of the history of scholarship on Ælfric (5–34). He begins by noting that to non-specialists Ælfric has been "of little interest as a literary and intellectual figure," with the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* according Ælfric just two pages compared to Chaucer's twelve and

King Alfred's eight (5). Furthermore, Ælfric finds "no place in 'canonical' anthologies of literature such as the *Norton*" (5). Nevertheless, for Anglo-Saxonists, Ælfric is a figure of pivotal importance, and Magennis draws attention to more than one thousand publications on Ælfric, beginning with a printed version of an admiring reference by William of Malmesbury and extending to the present day. Most of these references can be found in Reinsma's bibliography, which covers the years 1548–1982 and cites eight hundred eighty-two publications, with a further one hundred sixty-two references added by Kleist, who covers the years 1983–1996 in his bibliography. His section on "Early Scholarship: Foundational" mentions antiquarians such as John Leland, Robert Recorde, and Robert Talbot. More detail is given to the publications of Archbishop Parker—especially Ælfric's controversial Easter homily, which Theodore Leinbaugh has shown was edited and annotated in a way that made it useful to the cause of Protestant reform. Reprinted and used in subsequent decades in support of Protestant teachings, Ælfric's Easter homily played a vital role not only in shaping Early Modern religious debates but also in advancing the study of Old English: By studying Old English texts, religious reformers could, they believed, find ancient precedent and support for their beliefs.

In his section, "The Nineteenth Century and the Beginning of the Twentieth: Ælfric in the Age of Philology," Magennis traces the impact of continental scholarship, with its philological principles, on various editors in England, particularly the influence of the Danish scholar Rasmus Christian Rask on Benjamin Thorpe and the influence of German scholars—especially Jacob Grimm, with whom he corresponded for twenty years—on the work of John Mitchell Kemble. Magennis also comments on the key study by Dietrich, as well as on the work by Gerould and Förster. In his section on "The Twentieth-Century Heritage," Magennis rightly pays homage to the important editorial work of Peter Clemoes, John C. Pope, and Malcolm Godden, together with the work of many others whose work is discussed not only in this essay but also throughout the pages of this very helpful and informative volume. *A Companion to Ælfric*, so ably edited by Magennis and Swan, is, in itself, a fitting tribute to the many new directions of Ælfrician scholarship. With its review of current work and a nod towards future work in "Ælfric Studies Today, and Tomorrow," Magennis comments on the particular importance of scholarly projects that focus not only on Ælfric's vernacular writings but also on his Latin. Magennis does an excellent job delineating the various directions of current research projects, whether

on Ælfric's historical context, the larger ecclesiastical background, transmission, performance, reception, or the general topic of translation. Magennis also mentions various electronic projects that will, no doubt, keep scholars in the field busy now and for many years to come: *Fontes Anglo-Saxonici*, SASLC, the *Dictionary of Old English*, the MANCASS eleventh-century database, the Leicester-Leeds project, and the Electronic Ælfric Project. Magennis rightly concludes his essay by noting that the value of these electronic projects "will be measured by the scholarship they stimulate" (34).

Joyce Hill, in "Ælfric: His Life and Works" (*A Companion to Ælfric*, 35–65), provides a summary of the best scholarly work on Ælfric's life and writings. Drawing on her long and distinguished scholarly career, Hill's summary is helpful and accurate, as she surveys Ælfric's journey from Winchester to Cerne, and from Cerne to Eynsham. She begins with Dietrich's biographical work (published in 1855 and 1856) that first properly identified Ælfric, and she reviews current scholarship on the dates of Ælfric's life and writings. Traditionally, his birth has been fixed to the years ca. 955–957, but some recent scholarship points to a possible date of ca. 940–945; Hill holds to the former. She notes that Ælfric's homily *In Natale Unius Confessoris*, which has a dedication to Æthelwold II, Bishop of Winchester from 1006 to 1012, is his last securely datable work, and she suggests that this text may well mark not only the end of his literary output but also the approximate end of his life. Central to her survey is a review of the excellent scholarship on Ælfric by Clemoes and Pope, as well as more recent scholarly studies by Godden, Gneuss, and Lapidge. She devotes a section of her essay to Ælfric at Winchester, with a helpful commentary on the city and its building program: "The Winchester in which Ælfric lived was a planned town, with the Old Minster, New Minster, Nunnaminster and the Royal Palace cheek by jowl in the south-east quadrant" (49). In a section on Ælfric at Cerne Abbas, Hill gives a particularly good account of Ælfric's call to service from Æthelmær, who "was a member of one of the most powerful and well-connected families in Wessex: his father, Æthelweard, was Ealdorman of the Western Provinces (presumably Devon, Somerset and Dorset) from 983 until his death in ca. 998" (51). She concludes her essay with a section on Ælfric at Eynsham, which traces Æthelmær's retirement to the monastery there during a time of factional in-fighting at the court of King Æthelred: Æthelmær apparently acquired the estate through an exchange of land-holdings with his son-in-law and then "refounded the ecclesiastical community there as a monastery (perhaps before he

retired there himself), improved its endowment, in part with the transfer of an estate previously given to Cerne, and arranged for Ælfric to be transferred from Cerne to take up the position of abbot” (61). Hill comments on several texts Ælfric wrote at Eynsham and concludes by noting the poignancy of the fact that this great upholder of the Benedictine Reform died as abbot of the last refoundation before the Norman Conquest.

In “Ælfric and the Limits of ‘Benedictine Reform’” (*A Companion*, 67–108), Christopher A. Jones hearkens back to both the title and the cautionary words of J. Leclercq’s “Mérites d’un réformateur et limites d’une réforme” in order to examine the diversity of the Benedictine reform movement, particularly within the second generation that produced not only Ælfric but also writers as varied as Ælfric Bata, Byrhtferth of Ramsey, Wulfstan Cantor of Winchester, and, perhaps, Wulfstan of York. Jones notes that, tellingly, Ælfric himself refrains from using Old English equivalents for the Latin *reformatio* or *reformare* to capture the catch-all ‘reform’; rather, Ælfric seems to stress the correction of doctrine or morals or institutions, which, Jones argues, represents “only a symptom, not the substance, of an ideology broadly concerned with redefining essential categories” (68). Jones reviews varied topics in his sections on “Monastic History,” “Monastic and Clerical Orders,” and “Ælfric Among the Reformers.” He rightly suggests that to associate Ælfric with Benedictine reform can and does, in fact, mean many different things. It is a label that signals both his ties to Winchester and Æthelwold and his sincere concern for individual and institutional *correctio*, as well as a nostalgic vision of a former golden age of monastic history and, finally, a strong commitment to the traditions of Benedictinism that he inherited from his teachers. Jones carefully addresses each of these topics and concludes his argument by suggesting that our use of the phrase “Benedictine reform” has grown “too fungible if it can present both Ælfric and Wulfstan Cantor (for example) as its mainstream. Ælfric’s identification with monasticism does not stand in doubt, but the character of that monasticism resists generalizations; simply calling it ‘reformed’ and ‘Benedictine’ only defers what we do not know” (104).

In “Ælfric, Language and Winchester” (*A Companion*, 109–37), Mechthild Gretsch characterizes Ælfric as the “most prominent proponent of two outstanding linguistic phenomena in the late tenth and the eleventh century: Standard Old English and the Winchester vocabulary” (109). Gretsch defines Standard Old English as a form of the West Saxon dialect with regularized orthography of inflectional endings and stressed phonemes, a

feature found in many eleventh-century manuscripts regardless of their geographical origin. Winchester vocabulary refers to particular synonyms preferred in texts from the late tenth and eleventh century that have Winchester connections. Gretsch observes that although Ælfric promotes both practices, he never overtly discusses them, and if we wish to understand them we must “extrapolate the principles and rules by which they were governed, as well as the intellectual ambiance in which they originated, from the surviving texts” (109). Ælfric’s various *Prefaces* provide some limited information about his educational experience at Winchester with its “stress on competence in grammar and metric and in translating from Latin into the vernacular”; these were deemed “decisive skills for future abbots, bishops and archbishops” (113). The rigorous teaching of these skills is lauded by both Wulfstan in his *Vita Æthelwoldi* and Ælfric in in his abbreviated version of the same *Vita*. Gretsch argues that this philological training at Winchester engendered the confident expertise that helped Ælfric select appropriate translation methods for his Latin texts. That Winchester confidence permeates Ælfric’s prefaces and is reflected in his “nonchalant dismissal of possible criticism and of alternative renderings” (115). In the preface to his *Grammar*, Ælfric claims that his “simple translations” render nearly irrelevant other translation methods, though he concedes that alternative methods do exist. Gretsch discusses four ways of translating a Latin word into Old English: 1) “the adoption of the foreign word as a loanword,” 2) “the creation of a semantic loan,” 3) “the invention of a loan formation,” and 4) “a free rendering of the Latin term” (115). Of these four methods, Ælfric favors the use of loan formations, which are, for the most part, “straightforward translations of the individual parts of a given lemma, and they thus put the English students of grammar on a par with Latin-speaking students in providing them with a grammatical terminology in their native language” (117).

Next, Gretsch considers “Ælfric’s metalinguistic reflections on the relationship between Latin and English, which accompanied his sustained striving after grammatical regularity, lexical precision and stylistic elegance” (119). Gretsch applauds Ælfric’s *Grammar* and notes that in his “quiet, matter-of-fact tone” (120), Ælfric “creates a grammar of English which aims to imitate the grammar of Latin, but which—with regard to grammatical categories—is several centuries in advance of the state of the language” (120). Gretsch makes the case that Ælfric strives for nothing less than putting English on par with Latin and that he meticulously

sets out the parallel grammatical structures of both languages in order to do so. Returning to the topic of her introduction, the Winchester vocabulary and Standard Old English, Gretsich argues that “measuring English against the Latin model is also a dominant rationale behind these phenomena” (122). She notes that the phenomenon of Winchester vocabulary precedes by about thirty years the implementation of Standard Old English and that Winchester vocabulary was therefore several decades old by the time that Ælfric began to settle into his studies under Æthelwold in Winchester. Standard Old English seems to develop in the beginning of the 970s, towards the end of Edgar’s rule, and Gretsich notes that Ælfric left Winchester for his later stint at Cerne Abbey with a “clear notion of what a standardized form of English should look like” (127), as evinced in his *Catholic Homilies*—even if his detailed revisions of these texts complicate the realization of the ideal. Gretsich concludes her informative article with a discussion of Æthelweard and Æthelmær, laymen apparently literate in Latin, who commissioned works in English from Ælfric. Crucially, neither sponsor would have needed these texts simply for the translation, a consideration that leads Gretsich to call for “a new understanding of the active involvement of two important players on the political stage of the 990s in the scope of Ælfric’s translation programme” (131).

Malcolm Godden’s “Ælfric and the Alfredian Precedents” (*A Companion*, 139–63) explores Ælfric’s knowledge and use of Alfredian translations. Godden begins by asking which texts Ælfric regarded as Alfredian; the answer is, as Godden suggests, not entirely clear. The modern consensus holds that Alfred translated the *Pastoral Care*, Boethius, the psalms, and Augustine’s *Soliloquies*, “as well as instigating versions of Gregory’s *Dialogues*, Orosius, and perhaps Bede by others” (140). Godden himself believes that King Alfred personally translated nothing, and so his article works from the assumption of King Alfred as the putative author of these texts. The only work that Ælfric explicitly attributes to Alfred is the Old English translation of Bede’s *Historia Ecclesiastica*, but no one now regards this as the work of King Alfred. After reviewing other evidence, Godden finds that Ælfric knew, or knew of, five works now called Alfredian, of which only two are now attributed to the king himself: Ælfric quotes from Gregory’s *Pastoral Care* and makes heavy use of the Old English *Boethius*, but there is, says Godden, no evidence that Ælfric “knew of the *Soliloquies* or the translation of the psalms or the *Orosius*” (141). Worse still, says Godden, is the fact that none of the texts associated with Alfred “seem particularly relevant to the context”

in which Ælfric alludes to them (141). Ælfric’s preface to the *Catholic Homilies* states that he “saw and heard much folly in many English books” and that he regretted the poor availability of the Gospel except to “those people who knew Latin and apart from the books which King Alfred wisely translated” (139). As Godden points out, Ælfric was providing sermons and lamented the absence of *godspellican lare*; although some texts associated with Alfred might be considered religious, Godden does not believe that Ælfric’s primary concerns about unmediated biblical translations actually come into play with regard to the Alfredian texts, which are not sermons. Godden also argues that the “battery of dangers” (144) in using vernacular texts seems much more obvious to Ælfric than to Alfred, who seems relatively unconcerned about the hazards of offering translations that might be inaccurate or that might contain heretical material.

Godden offers a close reading of Ælfric’s use of the Old English *Boethius*, which serves as a source in Ælfric’s items one and seventeen of his *Lives of Saints*. In the first Life, Ælfric borrows, first, a portion from the Old English *Boethius* that consists of “essentially independent writing . . . owing little to the Latin text, though reflecting its general concerns with the distinction between God and his creation, eternity and perpetuity”; another borrowing comes from a passage in the Old English *Boethius* that is “a free adaptation of Book 5 Metre 5 on the different orders of creation” (149). Why, Godden asks, did Ælfric use the Old English *Boethius* as a source? Perhaps because the largely independent passages “provide[d] ideas, or at least formulations of traditional thought, that were not readily available in other sources” and the Latin Metre passage “is a section of unusual eloquence in the Old English *Boethius*” (150). In fact, Ælfric seems so enamored of the latter section that he translated it back into Latin, Godden argues, and later translated his own Latin back into his new and quite distinct rhythmical style of Old English. Godden also points out that Ælfric does not borrow from the Old English *Boethius* word for word: he ignores its “fascination with hierarchies of knowledge and what is known by different orders of creation” and is instead “concerned with a different distinction, that men had souls but animals and lesser creatures did not”—a distinction not made in Ælfric’s source (151). Godden then examines Ælfric’s use of other borrowings from the Old English *Boethius*, including a passage on free will about which he writes that “despite the apparent agreement over free will here, there does seem to be a real difference between the two writers over the question of fate or *wyrd/gewyrd*” (155); for

Ælfric, fate is nothing but a false belief: *gewyrd nis nan þing buton leas wena* (156). Ælfric also takes a different view on marriage than his Boethian source.

Godden's excellent discussion of these sources leads him to a paradoxical conclusion: Ælfric apparently condones Alfred's translations despite the fact that the king's vernacular project "created a dangerous situation in which heretical doctrines and misleading narratives were being circulated among, and read by, the laity and the less learned circles" (160). Ælfric seems, nevertheless, to depend on Alfred's precedent in order to authorize his own vernacular project, even though these same sources of authority found in Alfredian works were highly problematic. Godden sums up his analysis of Ælfric's use of Alfred, particularly the Old English *Boethius*, in this way: "The fact that the one [source] he himself used most heavily as a model for both style and thought, the *Boethius*, was one which he never actually acknowledged or recommended, while the ones which he specified and invited his listeners to consult, the *Bede* and the *Dialogues*, were the least competent as translations, stylistically most impoverished and had little or no influence on his own writing, reflects the fact that, to his mind, the latter two texts were at least safe" (163).

In "Identity and Ideology in Ælfric's Prefaces" (*A Companion*, 247–69), Mary Swan writes that Ælfric's prefaces are "unlike any other surviving Old English texts" with respect to "their setting out of a context and their construction of a literary voice for Ælfric" (247). Swan draws upon the work of Jonathan Wilcox, whose book on the subject serves a starting point for analyzing how Ælfric makes use of his various prefaces. Wilcox writes that "Ælfric uses his identity in order to validate the following work"; Swan terms this an "external-facing" reference, where Ælfric validates his authority by "references to status, institutional and individual affiliations and networks of tradition" (248). Her essay examines a "contrasting self-presentational tendency of Ælfric's," one that she terms "internal-facing," through which Ælfric "articulates the position of the first-person (often speaking) voice of the prefaces to his works in terms of its relationship to the other persons invoked" (248). Swan examines Ælfric's various Old English and Latin prefaces and summarizes her findings in this way:

Ælfric's authorial self-positioning in his prefaces is meticulous and deft. He deploys the external-facing factors of rank, institution and tradition to create a first-person voice which draws on a carefully-delineated Winchester reformed authority and weaves this with the internal-facing web of positional rhetoric to position his addressees relative to this

first-person voice. In doing so, he is shaping an identity for himself relevant to the function of the text in question and at the same time is defining the identity of his addressee relative to the external- and internal-facing coordinates he sets out. (268)

Thomas Hall's "Ælfric as Pedagogue" (*A Companion*, 193–216) explores Ælfric's role as a teacher by considering his skills in the monastic classroom and his efforts to provide instruction on the Christian calendar. Hall notes that we have "no record of what actually took place in any Anglo-Saxon classroom" (194) and so his approach is, necessarily, indirect and based upon an examination of three textbooks that were "unambiguously designed for use in monastic schools" (194), namely, Ælfric's *Grammar*, *Glossary*, and *Colloquy*. These three texts have been the focus of a good deal of recent scholarly scrutiny, and Hall, in analyzing these texts, draws upon the findings of Clemons, Law, Lapidge, Gneuss, Gretsch, Wilcox, Porter, Gwara, et al. Hall also looks, briefly, at Ælfric's *De Temporibus Anni* and concludes that this text together with Ælfric's *Grammar*, *Glossary*, and *Colloquy*, all possess "a strong traditional element coupled with a drive for innovation. All are modeled squarely on texts that had been used for teaching grammar and chronology for centuries, and all embody the educational methods that Ælfric had learned at the hands of Bishop Æthelwold, but all are modified in a fundamental way to make them best suit Ælfric's own students." (215).

TL

Drawing on various documentary records, Catherine Cubitt helpfully consolidates and gives perspective on what is known of "Ælfric's Lay Patrons" (*A Companion*, 165–92). She discusses the influential blood-relations, property, and responsibilities of Æthelweard and Æthelmær and recounts their changing status at court through decades of shifting royal policy. She contextualizes their monastic patronage within the ongoing debate over the extent to which honoring the church affected national prosperity—particularly after Æthelred's public penitence and restitution of ecclesiastical land in 993 in response to a Viking attack. She shows how writings by Ælfric may have spoken directly to current affairs: one tale of punishment befalling secular powers who seek to appropriate church possessions, another condemning evil counselors who lead their sovereign astray, still others praising kings who publically repented as models of godly humility. Moving down the ranks to thanes or "local gentry"—in whose ranks "Ælfric's friends Sigeward, Sigefyrth and Wulfgeat may have belonged" (186)—Cubitt traces the

movement over the tenth and eleventh centuries from the supremacy of minster churches “responsible for . . . pastoral care over wide areas” to the burgeoning growth of local churches on the estates of thegns who promoted, defended, and received status from them (184 and 187). Ælfric’s teachings, Cubitt notes, had direct relevance for such individuals’ lives: In his exhortations for judges to act impartially, teaching on sexual abstinence, warning against selling lay lordship over monasteries, and so on, his work “was aimed at those with real power over the parish communities” (188). Nor were Ælfric’s patrons tame listeners; they demanded explanations, pressed for further compositions, and showed knowledge of subjects ranging from biblical narratives to saints of the past. As Ælfric moved from monk to abbot, his contacts with such individuals “would have increased and intensified, and his understanding of the religious sensibilities and needs of such men may have changed” (191). Such figures played a key role in shaping the course and content of Ælfric’s works.

In “Boredom, Brevity and Last Things: Ælfric’s Style and the Politics of Time” (*A Companion*, 321–44), Kathleen Davis considers and connects Ælfric’s “spatial” strategy for filling the minds of the unlearned with his “temporal” strategy for emphasizing the pressing importance of good deeds, compressing both text and time. As regards the first, Davis notes that in distilling his sources to meet the putative capacities of his audience, Ælfric defines both tradition—that which is appropriate for them to hear—and the nature of the “unlearned”—the limits of what they are able to understand. Moreover, even as Ælfric condenses authoritative material for transmission, he situates his compositional approach “in an already established, authoritative rhetorical system,” carefully indicating the orthodoxy of *how* he speaks as well as what he says (322). Furthermore, Davis suggests, one reason behind Ælfric’s compression of material is his concern to fill minds otherwise characterized by *idelnisse* (here, ‘emptiness’) and *bilewitnes* (here, ‘open vulnerability to suggestion’)—traits that lead individuals away from good deeds and thus salvation. For Ælfric, only material trimmed to fit what unlearned minds can hold will prompt them to act righteously, meaning that “[l]ong and complex texts, which allow for and even require interpretation, are as dangerous as the bad teaching he wishes to counteract” (331). As regards Davis’s second main consideration, Ælfric’s “contracting” of time through an emphasis on eschatological imminence, she notes that he fuses chronological and biblical time through the immediacy of the liturgy, as when he speaks on December 25 of Christ’s birth happening “today.”

Moreover, seeing in Christ’s crucifixion his triumph to be realized fully at the parousia, Ælfric inculcates in his audience a dual salvific sense of “already and not yet.” Furthermore, Davis observes, in urging believers to “achieve” their salvation by viewing their own existence as the ending of time—death bringing them as swiftly to Judgment as Christ’s future coming—Ælfric works to achieve his own. In the process, he “cultivate[s] a temporality of style that merge[s] with the temporality of his eschatology, and the result is a delicately balanced politics of time” (321).

In “Ælfric’s Schemes and Tropes: *Amplificatio* and the Portrayal of Persecutors” (*A Companion*, 297–320), Gabriella Corona examines one area in which Ælfric consistently augments his sources: his use of negative epithets to describe opponents of the faith. Such qualifiers as *reþe* ‘cruel’, *deoflic* ‘devilish’, and *wælhreow* ‘bloodthirsty’ are not randomly placed but aurally emphasized by inter- and intralinear homophones and alliteration. Corona shows that the technique is not simply a product of Ælfric’s idiosyncratic style; rather, it stems from a long rhetorical tradition of stimulating an audience’s emotions and intellect through *amplificatio*, a device which by Aldhelm’s time was understood not simply as an addition but an ornamental expansion that facilitated comprehension while leaving the sense of a text unchanged. According to Donatus’s *Ars maior*, which drew on Quintilian and which “exerted an overwhelming influence on early medieval schooling and, as a consequence, on medieval literary production,” two tropes by which *amplificatio* might be applied were *epitheton*, the use of an epithet to characterize a person or object, and *antonomasia*, the substitution of an epithet for a proper name. While direct quotations of Aldhelm by Ælfric are “disappointingly absent,” Corona makes a strong case for Ælfric’s debt to Aldhelm’s *De virginitate* for his use of *epitheton* and *antonomasia*: “It is tempting . . . to view Aldhelm’s lavish use of classical rhetoric in combination with native alliterative schemes as one of Ælfric’s main sources of stylistic inspiration” (314). Corona suggests that Ælfric’s use of such devices to characterize aristocratic opponents of Christianity may reflect his concern for repeated attempts by the nobility in the late 970s and 980s to seize church land. If so, the “preoccupation with inadequate secular leadership” in Ælfric’s earlier works “may be prompted by his familiarity with those [like Æthelweard and Æthelmær] who were in contact with the aristocracy, the king and his closest advisors” (316 and 319). The demonized rulers in Ælfric’s writings might thus “constitute the projected enemies not only of his spiritual leaders but also of his contemporary community” (319).

Examining “Catechetical Homiletics: Ælfric’s Preaching and Teaching During Lent” (*A Companion*, 217–46), Robert K. Upchurch suggests that Ælfric’s Lenten writings offer “a prime opportunity to discern Ælfric’s core ideals,” as he sought to convey fundamentals of the faith with a lay audience in mind (219). On the one hand, his sermons complement the catechesis or basic moral instruction that was to accompany Lenten confession: comparing works in the *Catholic Homilies* to a vernacular penitential, Upchurch concludes that “like the confessor, [Ælfric] touches upon the nature of the Trinity, the body and soul, deadly sins, and lists of Lenten ‘dos,’ albeit in a fuller, more sophisticated format” (223). On the other hand, the fact that nearly all of Ælfric’s Lenten homilies are exegetical in nature, systematically expounding over three hundred biblical verses, enables him to redefine what “basic doctrine” all Christians should know; as Upchurch states, “by employing scriptural exegesis as his chief educational vehicle, Ælfric vastly extends the array of texts and topics presented as fundamental to the faith and thereby creates an implied audience of Christians whose moral practice is grounded in sophisticated intellectual arguments based on the word of God” (226). To demonstrate how Ælfric’s work is more theologically rigorous and intellectually demanding than his anonymous homiletic contemporaries, Upchurch compares *CH* I.11 with Blickling 3 and Irvine 5—three sermons written for the First Sunday in Lent that circulated around the same time, draw on the same source material, and are similar in structure (227–28). Where the anonymous sermons connect Christ’s fast and struggle against Satan in the desert with believers’ fasting and resisting temptation during Lent, Ælfric seizes the occasion to discuss divine sovereignty and free will, reassuring believers of God’s delimitation of Satan’s power and underscoring their role and responsibility in sanctification. Here and elsewhere, Upchurch says, Ælfric “concerns himself more than the anonymous homilists with the theological *why* that motivates the performative *how* of Lent” (228). One major image that Ælfric uses to depict Christian discipline and its goal is that of spiritual warfare: believers wage war against deadly sins just as the Israelites strove against pagan nations to gain the Promised Land. Comparing Ælfric’s Lenten sermons with their sources, moreover, Upchurch shows how Ælfric nuances his material to prod his audience to action and to emphasize the necessity of “the proper use of human agency, the purposeful exercise of free will and the performance of good works,” even as he acknowledges human dependence on divine grace (238). Ælfric believes that “earning the salvation

already accomplished by Christ requires a knowledge of Scripture and scriptural truths that, once internalized, will produce the action that merits God’s saving grace”; it is for this reason, Upchurch concludes, that “Ælfric chooses to catechize Christians by means of exegetical homilies” (246).

In her study of *CH* II.9, “In Ælfric’s Words: Conversion, Vigilance and the Nation in Ælfric’s Life of Gregory the Great” (*A Companion*, 271–96), Clare A. Lees urges us to look beyond the short episode so often studied by modern scholars: Gregory’s encounter with the Angle slave-boys that prompts him to send missionaries to England. First, Lees considers the contemporary “geo-politics of conversion,” suggesting that Gregory’s “own wider interests in converting a people” may partly reflect a competitive reaction to the Visigothic king Reccared, whose conversion brought his people from Arianism to Catholicism (274). Quoting Peter Brown, she comments that Gregory “was not a man to be outdone by a Visigothic king” (275). Next, she surveys the extant Latin and vernacular versions of Gregory’s *Life*, noting how the pope’s potent influence on the medieval understanding and practice of pastoral care would have been “especially appealing to a reforming monk, priest, and preacher such as Ælfric” (227). Turning to the episode of Gregory’s encounter with the Angles, Lees reviews modern studies that have to various extents situated Gregory’s gaze “within postcolonial theories of nationhood, sexuality, race and place” (281), before offering observations of her own—particularly regarding the way in which “peoples and places . . . in this *Life* are as much constructs as they are places” (286). Ælfric not only speaks fluidly (and anachronistically) of the Angles or Deirans as “English,” she states, but presents Rome in at least three ways: as the “old Rome . . . of Gregory’s senatorial and aristocratic relatives,” as the papal home “of Gregory’s particularly monastic expression of the apostolic life,” and as a home to both trade (the slave market) and death (the subsequent plague)—three interrelated faces of Rome which are “mobilized at a key points in [Ælfric’s] narrative” to make a particular point (288). The plague, for example, brings Gregory (and thereby Ælfric) to preach a sermon “on the need of the Romans for repentance as they come into the sight of God as judge” (293)—a divine gaze that Lees connects back to the gaze of Gregory, God’s representative, as he sees in the slave-boys the need for repentance and conversion. Examining Ælfric’s *Life* as a whole in its wider historical and literary context, therefore, Lees concludes that “Gregory’s looking is directed by God’s desires, as

understood by a transnational discourse of pastoral care" (295).

Jonathan Wilcox brings his ability to extrapolate history from manuscript data with "The Use of Ælfric's Homilies: MSS Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 85 and 86 in the Field" (*A Companion*, 345–68). Noting that Ælfric's work—in contrast to much extant Old English—was written for a non-elite audience and arguing that Ælfric's homilies were distributed to English churches in massive numbers, Wilcox points out the irony that these homilies survive primarily in high-status manuscripts at major ecclesiastical centers. In the two-part Junius 85 and 86, however, he sees a "scruffy low-status" witness to how Ælfric's sermons may have circulated and how they may have been used in the field (368). Reviewing the "explosion in pastoral models" in late Anglo-Saxon England, where minster churches serving broad regions began to give way both to reformed Benedictine houses and to smaller local churches, Wilcox points out the timeliness of Ælfric's material given the pressing need for "an extended program of pastoral care" (347). To serve such far-flung communities, Wilcox argues, priests would have used not tomes produced for a lectern but portable, unbound booklets instead. While few examples of such booklets survive, he discusses two "clearcut" cases of once-independent anonymous homilies preserved in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 115 and Auctarium F. 4. 32. Might "LXXIII," written at the beginning of the latter booklet, point to an "extensive stock" of at least seventy-two other such texts at a centralized ecclesiastical resource center? Turning then to Junius 85 and 86 itself, he determines through careful analysis that the quire containing Ælfric's *CH* II.7 was initially copied for independent circulation before soon being incorporated into the larger, if still modest, manuscript. The homily's new neighbors—including charms and a translation of the *Visio Sancti Pauli*, both items Ælfric elsewhere condemns—combined with the collection's overall focus on the uncertain "mechanics of death and judgement and the fate of the soul" would have given our monk apoplexy (361). The result, however, may give insight into the actual rather than idealized use of Ælfric's works. The contents reflect parishioners' concern with "big broad questions of eschatology," suggest a priest incanting Latin prayers over those in need of healing, reveal a scribe inserting Latin versions to reinforce the authority of Ælfric's vernacular biblical quotations, and indicate a speaker clarifying word division to save himself from verbal embarrassment. The compilation and changes to it "provide something quite rare in Old English: a hint

of the real-world use of an Old English text at the most humble level of reception" (368).

Elaine Treharne offers another insightful study of post-Conquest uses of Old English in "Making their Presence Felt: Readers of Ælfric, c. 1050–1350" (*A Companion*, 399–422). Examining various types of annotations in vernacular homiliaries, Treharne demonstrates both the extensive and detailed degree to which Old English texts were actively read in the centuries after Ælfric and the lasting usefulness of Ælfrician material in particular. Not only did the Tremulous Hand of Worcester know Ælfric's reputation and seek out his work, but others who may not even have recognized the monk's authorship "made a beeline for Ælfric material in the manuscripts at their disposal" (404 and 401). Focusing specifically on Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 162, Treharne draws attention to data often overlooked by scholars: "lexical substitutions, orthographic variation, annotations, marginalia, visible corrections, additions, clarifications, expansions, excisions, interlinear glosses, rearrangement of syntax or of narrative, *signes de renvoi* and deliberate reconfiguration of textual items within the manuscript, altering the immediate context of the individual pieces"—all these suggest "dynamic and meaningful engagements" by readers with the material at hand (406 and 405). One reader consistently clarifies nouns and pronouns, as if for "the understanding of a specifically listening audience" (412). Another reader clusters his comments around Ælfric's treatment of Martha and Mary—"symbolic of the contemplative and active lives, a choice of life under such intense scrutiny in the twelfth century" (416). A third, recognizing the source of some Ælfrician material, supplements it with quotations from that source in a way that makes Ælfric's injunctions "explicit and more practical," "seems absolutely to reconfirm the intention of delivery to an actual, present audience," and "represents a time-consuming, deliberate involvement with the text in a way that indicates the gradual evolution of writing and authorship of accretive texts in this period" (410). In general, Treharne concludes, such active engagement with Ælfric's work seems either aimed at "enlivening the text for certain public delivery" or culling material for preaching or personal edification related to sin, basic Christian practice, and the miraculous display of divine power (419 and 420). Far from being the work of a few antiquarian scribes, these textual interventions testify to "multiple and vibrant vernacular textual cultures" whose annotations provide "critical clues to later readers' understanding of the texts' interpretations for their own historically situated audience" (414 and 404).

In “Assembling Ælfric: Reconstructing the Rationale behind Eleventh- and Twelfth-Century Compilations” (*A Companion*, 369–98), Aaron J. Kleist gives particular attention to *De duodecim abusivis*, *De falsis diis*, and the *Interrogationes Sigeuulfi in Genesin*, which tend to travel together: of the twelve manuscripts that have any of these texts, at least four originally contained all three, and another two hold two. The texts do not share much subject matter, so what unites them? Time may have been a factor: Ælfric probably wrote them all ca. 993 to 998, yet he wrote several other texts during those years. Kleist notes that works still extant in at least five copies—“oft-copied” works—tended to be from certain groups (such as *Catholic Homilies*) or to travel with *Abusivis*, *De falsis diis*, and *Interrogationes Sigeuulfi*. Most of these oft-copied works had themes in common with one or more from Kleist’s focus group, but then again, Ælfric returned to many of his favorite issues in work after work. Mary Clayton has argued that Ælfric himself joined *Abusivis* and *De auguriis*. Wulfstan’s compilations of texts have been explored by scholars, but Ælfric’s have received less attention. Kleist examines Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 178 + 162 as a collection of texts by and of interest to Ælfric. Other manuscripts seem to collect Ælfric’s sources, and Kleist suggests that he had them made for his use, though Wulfstan may later have used one (CCCC 190). John C. Pope identified eleven pieces in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 116 and CCCC 178 + 162 as elements of an Ælfrician commonplace book; Kleist looks at six pieces in particular that may help connect his focus texts. He offers two detailed tables: the first shows oft-copied works that travel with *Abusivis*, *De falsis diis*, and *Interrogationes Sigeuulfi*; the second expands to include commonplace book works that appear with these oft-copied and focus texts. Kleist examines several individual manuscripts and suggests that they may help to date Ælfric’s revision and dissemination of the *Catholic Homilies*. Kleist conjectures that someone took charge of Ælfric’s materials after his death—perhaps Wulfstan—but cautions that further research is needed. He concludes that Ælfric himself played a role in how his texts were transmitted after his death and that he may have compiled Commonplace Books that outlived him, too. Kleist’s chapter offers valuable data and analysis.

Alison Gulley’s “Suffering and Salvation: Birthing Pains in Ælfric’s *Life of Agatha*,” *Medieval Perspectives* 17 (2003): 105–20, contrasts Agatha’s pain with the tortures of Ælfric’s four other virgin martyrs, who did not feel sensations of torment. While Gulley sees the emphasis on the female body and its suffering as somewhat

pornographic, she argues that pornography was not the work’s sole function—particularly not for female audiences. Instead, the Lives highlight willingness to suffer, whether one actually feels pain or not. Agatha’s torture and pain center on her breasts, which are torn off after a prostitute tells the prefect that stone and iron would soften before Agatha’s breasts would. Her breasts represent her faith, her ability to nurture, and even her ability to give birth: Gulley concludes that Agatha’s pains are labor pains that lead to her rebirth into heaven. The article needed better editing: the journal prints ð for ð consistently and sometimes confuses *p* and *b*, and Gulley has copied Skeat’s translation “feed my understanding” (*LS* 1.8.203) as “feed misunderstanding,” undermining her treatment of the symbolism of the breast.

In “Sumum menn wile þincan syllic þis to gehyrenne”: Ælfric on Animals—His Sources and their Application” in *Transmission and Transformation in the Middle Ages: Texts and Contexts*, ed. Kathy Cawsey and Jason Harris (Dublin: Four Courts, 2007), 65–76, Letty Nijhuis writes that Ælfric referred to over four hundred animals in his *Catholic Homilies* and *Lives of Saints*. He drew on a variety of sources, including the Bible, Bede, Isidore, and collections by Paul the Deacon and Haymo of Auxerre; Ambrose and Augustine also inform Ælfric’s treatments of animals. Ælfric writes that even pagans can observe nature and conclude that God exists, so animals offer useful clues about humanity and God. Animals have incomplete souls or are soulless: They can experience desire and anger but lack reason, which humans and angels share. Animals face the earth while humans walk upright because we have a higher purpose, which is also reflected in our better food, but some animals retain prelapsarian virtues such as asexual procreation or procreating only at set times. Though most of Ælfric’s sources are literary, he occasionally draws from his own experience. For instance, he comments that birds’ bodies and food fit their own niches and that no one country has all kinds of birds. Even where he could not know an animal personally (such as the elephant), he does not reduce it to a mere metaphor for morality as other writers do. Finally, where Bede says that otters dried the feet of St. Cuthbert, Ælfric makes the animals seals. The Irish believed that otters had magical powers, which probably influenced the original story. Ælfric, however, might have visited the seas around Lindisfarne, and he would have found there not otters but seals. Nijhuis concludes that Ælfric includes animals in his homilies in traditional ways, but he adds information from experience and additional sources to increase audience knowledge.

In "Translating the Texts Where 'et verborum ordo mysterium est': Late Old English Idiom vs. *ablativus absolutus*," *Journal of Medieval Latin* 18 (2008): 217–29, Olga Timofeeva investigates the various ways in which Anglo-Saxon translators rendered the Latin ablative absolute in the vernacular. In fact, however, her thesis is much more narrowly focused. In her conclusion, she compares the treatment of this Latin construction in the Alfredian translations against the Ælfrician ones, though the focus of her discussion centers exclusively on the latter. Her comparison of Ælfric's and Alfred's translation practices is, therefore, unfortunately made without the support of evidence (in the latter case). Her data come almost exclusively from the Gospel of St. Matthew in Ælfric's *West-Saxon Gospels* and his translation of the book of Genesis. Despite her narrow focus, her conclusion is significant, and may be summarized in the following quotation:

[A] careful translator like Ælfric was no longer happy with the Latinized style of contemporary translations. What seemed elegant to Asser in the late ninth century became unsatisfactory in the early eleventh, when a more conscious attitude towards the vernacular had changed writers' feelings towards foreign elements in the target text. Instead of mechanically glossing every tiny item in the original, these writers were gradually growing accustomed to building complex, extended thoughts in their mother tongue, transforming their prose from an imitative tool into an independent genre. (228–229)

While these conclusions are compelling in the form Timofeeva presents them, a far more extensive data set would be necessary to secure her case. For example, her offhand claim that a close syntactic parallel—such as a dative absolute, or even a calque, functioning outside the grammar of Old English *per se*—would have "seemed elegant" to Asser, stands in need of definitive proof (228). Likewise, a more up-to-date discussion, taking into account recent scholarship on both the Alfredian and Ælfrician translations, would contribute to her overall argument. These infelicities notwithstanding, Timofeeva marshals some important evidence for the development of Old English translation style from the ninth to the eleventh century that is certainly worthy of—and in need of—deeper, more thorough investigation.

BC

Martin Blake provides a welcome edition of Ælfric's "*De Temporibus Anni*" (Cambridge: D. S. Brewer) that updates Heinrich Henel's 1942 work for the EETS—taking into account, for example, London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius C. viii, which Henel had omitted. Blake

discusses the contents, authorship, and title of *De temporibus anni*; provides a quick overview of Ælfric's life and career; and reviews previous editions of and manuscript witnesses to the text. Exploring the relationship of *De temporibus* to the rest of Ælfric's canon, Blake suggests that Ælfric composed a first recension of the work between 990–992, not long after completing the First Series of *Catholic Homilies*, and a revised form (appearing idiosyncratically in Cambridge, University Library, Gg. 3. 28) no later than 995 (36–37). Regarding the purpose of the text, Blake describes it as a practical, selective handbook answering specific questions regarding natural phenomena. He observes that while more educated readers might have turned to Bede, Isidore, or Pliny for "a comprehensive treatment of chronology and the nature of the physical world," the handbook might nonetheless have "proved its worth amongst those who, whilst in theory having an adequate training in Latin, still found it easier to consult a vernacular reference book where one was available" (46). Blake briefly treats the sources behind *De temporibus*, the basics of medieval cosmology and calendrical computation, Ælfric's translation of biblical passages, parallels between Ælfric's work and Byrhtferth's *Enchiridion*, and the lack of direct descendants of *De temporibus*—a fact which, ironically, "may help to explain the enduring appeal of a vernacular work like *DTA*, which continued to be copied into the second half of the twelfth century" (67). As to the edition itself, Blake bases his text on CUL Gg. 3. 28, the earliest witness and one with "few obvious copying errors," though it preserves a revised rather than original form of *De temporibus* (68). His facing-page translation, the first for some one hundred forty years (i), attempts "to reflect the syntax of Ælfric's prose sufficiently to enable those not fluent in the language to follow the Old English text" (72). Textual commentary then follows, as do appendices containing side-by-side comparison of Ælfric's biblical quotations to the Vulgate, parallels between *De temporibus* and other Ælfrician works, orthographic variants, definitions of astronomical and calendrical terms, and a glossary to aid linguistic study.

Larry J. Swain's University of Illinois at Chicago doctoral dissertation, "Ælfric of Eynsham's *Letter to Sigeward*: An Edition, Translation and Commentary," while having the misfortune to be published subsequent to Richard Marsden's authoritative edition of the same (EETS 330, London: Oxford UP, 2008), nonetheless constitutes a valuable supplement to scholars' understanding of Ælfric's epistolary review of Christian doctrine and the books of the Bible. Arguing that the *Letter* reflects Ælfric's concern for catechetical

teaching, instruction about biblical history, and the implications of Viking invasion, Swain begins by reviewing the contemporary political situation, the Benedictine Reform, and the history of catechesis in Old English and Anglo-Latin (Chapter One). Thereafter, he addresses such issues as authorship, recipient, date, structure, and Ælfric's working method (Chapter Two); manuscripts, audience reception, and editorial history (Chapter Three); and Latin and Old English sources (Chapters Four and Five), concluding as regards the last that *Genesis A and B*, *Exodus*, *Daniel*, *Christ and Satan*, and the *Fates of the Apostles* were "as important sources for Ælfric as patristic writers such as Jerome, Augustine, and Bede" (x). Next, Swain considers Ælfric's seemingly unique ordering of the books of the Bible (Chapter Six), before using details in the *Letter* to posit a new reconstruction of Ælfric's career. Swain suggests that Ælfric was born in the early 940s ("at least a decade earlier than usually thought"); grew up in Glastonbury, studying under Dunstan and Æthelwold; perhaps travelled through northern England and Italy; came to Winchester in the early or mid 970s, and was "perhaps even a dean of Winchester before being sent to Cerne Abbas in the late 980s" (Chapter Seven, 185 and 218). Swain then presents his edition proper, using Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud Misc. 509 as his base text. Variants and notes on the manuscripts appear in the footnotes, while commentary on "textual, semantic, grammatical, source-critical, exegetical, and interpretive issues" follows thereafter (x). Finally, Swain concludes with a translation (the first part of which was originally based on Crawford's edition rather than Swain's own completed work), which is more literal than not, "often . . . favoring early modern English grammatical choices" (345), and which supplements previous translations by Hugh Magennis ("Ælfric of Eynsham's *Letter to Sigeward*," in *Metaphrastes* [Belfast: Belfast Byzantine Enterprises, 2004], 210–35) and S. J. Crawford (*The Old English Version of the Heptateuch*, EETS os 160. [London: Oxford UP, 1969], 15–75).

A study of "Biblical Translations in Homily VII in the Second Series of Ælfric's 'Catholic Homilies'" by Naotoshi Furuta appears somewhat unexpectedly in the *Toho Gakuen School of Music Faculty Bulletin* 30 (2004): 67–78. Here, Furuta distinguishes between the "extremely literal" translations of Scripture, which Ælfric makes "only" in the Old English *Heptateuch*, and his "faithful but not literal" biblical translations in the *Catholic Homilies* (67). Focusing specifically on CH II.7, Furuta provides examples of different ways in which Ælfric translates—expanding or supplementing,

omitting, loosely paraphrasing, and employing alternate vocabulary—using the word-for-word *West-Saxon Gospels* as a control, showing to what extent Ælfric departs from literal rendering. Furuta suggests that by turning unfamiliar Latin constructions into simpler or more normative English, Ælfric's changes "make the renderings more intelligible and smooth to the general reader and the message more acute and vivid" (73). In short, he concludes (quoting Stuart Lee): "Ælfric approached the Vulgate with respect, but also with a recognition of the needs of his audience" (77).

Another linguistic study is found in Kiriko Sato's "The Absolute Participle Construction in Old English: Ælfric's Exploitation of the Latinate Syntax in His Vernacular Prose," *ES* 90: 2–16. For the most part, Sato suggests, scholars have viewed absolute particles in Old English—such as *astrehtum handum* 'with outstretched hands'—not as original constructions but as literal translations of Latin ablative absolutes (such as *expansis manibus*). Examining Ælfric's *Lives of Saints* and *Catholic Homilies*, however, Sato shows not only that Ælfric uses absolute particles vastly more than Wulfstan or the Blickling and Vercelli homilists, but often employs such constructions without any counterpart in his Latin sources. Indeed, says Sato, sometimes these inclusions produce "more sophisticated" rhetoric than his sources (4). On the one hand, they facilitate "logical subordination," relegating certain information to the background while drawing attention to the main verb (8). On the other, they convey information more succinctly, likewise pointing readers to what Ælfric considers the central point(s) of the story. Such linguistic techniques distinguish Ælfric from other Old English translators, who employed absolute constructions in literal, word-for-word translations (9). Even Ælfric, however, appears to have developed his facility over the course of his career, adding prepositions to his constructions and using them periphrastically—in other words, moving "from a synthetic to an analytic language" (14). In short, Sato concludes, "Ælfric mastered the absolute participle as his own syntax, exploiting it for stylistic felicity in writing vernacular prose" (4).

■ OE Translations from the Desert Fathers

The three narratives addressed by Peter J. Dendle in his two-part study of "The Old English 'Life of Malchus' and Two Vernacular Tales from the *Vitas Patrum* in MS Cotton Otho C.i: A Translation," *ES* 90: 505–17 and 631–52, are Old English translations of two excerpts from the *Verba seniorum*—sixth-century Latin

accounts of the Desert Fathers—and of Jerome's fourth-century account of the Syrian monk Malchus. Dendle describes the movement of desert monasticism in the fourth and fifth centuries; discusses competing Anglo-Saxon responses to such accounts, such as the tension between solitary and communal life; and reviews what is known of mid-eleventh-century Worcester, where the manuscript was copied. In addition, he posits ways in which the texts might have been valuable to that audience: The excerpts warn against sexual temptation and worldly involvement; the example of Malchus, who defiantly leaves his monastery only to encounter hardships in the world, commends the communal over the solitary life and emphasizes the importance of obedience; and translation strategies within the manuscript as a whole "seem intended to render the story as clear as possible for a vernacular audience" (508). While scant attention has been paid to the possible literary value of the texts, Dendle suggests that in fact they may offer significant insights into Anglo-Saxon understandings of such issues as chastity, gender, identity, history, and geography (509). Dendle then discusses the various hands in the manuscript and the process of its compilation; ultimate sources for the texts, since no immediate exemplars have been identified; and his principles for editing and translating. His edition, intended simply to accompany the translation rather than being a critical work in its own right, silently expands abbreviations and missing letters, but generally follows Bruno Assmann's work of 1889; his translation, which supplies missing words "where the general sense can be plausibly inferred," "reflects a sense of what a reader of the Old English text would find, even where it is reasonably clear that an error or misreading of [the] original has occurred at some stage of transmission" (514). Both edition and translation are found in Part Two of the study, printed in the second issue, along with textual commentary in the footnotes.

Legend of the Seven Sleepers

In "As the Lawbook Teaches': Reeves, Lawbooks and Urban Life in the Anonymous Old English Legend of the Seven Sleepers," *EHR* 124: 1021–49, Catherine Cubitt challenges Patrick Wormald's contention that Anglo-Saxons did not use written lawcodes in routine legal transactions but relied on customary law—the oral transmission of royal legislation (1021 and 1031). She focuses on a reference in the Old English Legend to a *portgerefa*, a high-ranking reeve or city officer, calling for a putative malefactor to be punished *eall swa seo domboc . . . tæcð* 'as the lawbook teaches'. Beginning

with the historical development and textual transmission of the Legend, Cubitt then discusses ways in which the vernacular version embellishes the Latin original to include not only "human psychology and emotion" but "details of everyday life quite specific to tenth- and eleventh-century England" (1025). As Dorothy Whitelock had observed, additions in the Old English reflect contemporary practices of monetary coinage, capital punishment, and public trial. In addition, Cubitt suggests that the reeve's reference to the *domboc*—the only literary reference to such a tome—mirrors both royal requirements and reeves' responsibilities. Not only did lawcodes such as that of Edward the Elder command reeves to judge "as it stands in the lawbook," but "the documented activities of . . . actual portreeves in overseeing financial transactions and acting with this community at large as witness resemble those of the portreeve in the Old English Legend" (1033 and 1036). Given both the high status of royal, shire, and city reeves, moreover, and the quality and quantity of extant vernacular records, Cubitt argues that reeves should have had knowledge of written law, either through personal literacy or clerical assistance. Even if the *domboc* was not physically present, the Anglo-Saxon community would have been "permeated by the written word" which was "directly accessed only by a few individuals who [could] interpret it for others" (1046). In contrast to Wormald's view, therefore, this Old English Legend testifies to an "environment of pragmatic literacy," in which "Anglo-Saxon town dwellers may have expected their local reeves to act according to the book, even if such texts were only known to them from oral report" (1048).

AK

Though Maria Elena Ruggerini's study is titled "Le figure di paragone nel tessuto stilistico e narrativo della *Passio Septem Dormientium* inglese antica" in *Studi anglo-norreni in onore di John S. McKinnell: he hafað sundorgecynd*, ed. Ruggerini, 85–131 (see section 2), the first half ranges widely around the texts. Ruggerini begins with brief discussions of both of the Latin text likely to be the source and of the Old English text in its two manuscripts. In the narrative, the cave functions as a sacred space, a place of initiation into spiritual life. The Latin ascribes the emperor's plan to punish the seven brothers by walling them into a cave to divine providence. The OE text retains these elements and uses *faran into* to emphasize that entering the cave is coming closer to heaven. Ruggerini then gives an overview of the OE style and elaborations. Some amplifications are theological, while others remove potential

ambiguities. Where the narrative seems least believable, the narrator asserts his authority and co-opts readers with the first-person plural pronoun. Following poetic tradition and the example of Ælfric, the translator adds alliteration, rhyme, and parallelism. He uses *copia verborum*, as does the Latin; indeed, the Latin has forty word pairs, of which the OE only reproduces five as simple word pairs, while others are transformed. The second half shows more focus, concentrating on comparison. Ruggerini distinguishes similes, which are symmetrical and reversible, from similitudes, which are neither. The Latin has only seven total comparisons, including one in a passage for which the OE equivalent has been lost; the English has a dozen. Both simile and similitude amplify the Latin. The Latin's comparison of tortured bodies with dust is expanded in OE into dust blown by the wind, an image found in Psalm 18 and the OE Prose Psalms; the elaboration stresses the severity of torture. The Latin image of faces like roses changes in OE to both roses and lilies, with debts to the Song of Songs, and the two flowers are joined in Ecclesiasticus, the church Fathers, and Carolingian and Anglo-Saxon writers. In Vercelli Homily IV, the flowers illustrate the transformation of resurrected bodies. Martyrs and paradise are described in terms of roses and lilies; the simile shows the sleepers' progress from faith (white) into martyrdom (red) and towards heaven. Five similitudes are original to the OE. Two compare the treatment of the bodies of the tortured: in one case to thieves' bodies, in the other to pigs. Both add realism despite the negative comparison. In another similitude, Decius makes himself like God, a case of infernal pride. A more positive comparison likens God to a mother, as in Isaiah, Hosea, the Psalms, and Matthew, and commentaries by Jerome and Augustine. Finally, persecutors are compared to locusts, recalling Exodus, Job, Psalm 109, and exegesis on these texts. Ruggerini concludes that the OE version of the Seven Sleepers makes most frequent use of comparison in its opening, to bring home the scene of persecutions in a realistic and emotional way to later readers.

NGD

■ *Prose Life of St. Guthlac*

In "The Blindness Curse and Nonmiracles in the Old English Prose Life of Saint Guthlac," *MP* 106: 399–426, Robin Waugh takes a primarily reader-response approach to the Old English *Prose Life of Saint Guthlac* that focuses on the miraculous elements and how they might have affected contemporary interpretation of the narrative. Beginning with a discussion of the curse in

the texts' prefaces (i.e., in both the Latin and Old English versions), which threatens blindness on anyone who mocks or disparages the work, Waugh observes: "The curse in the prologue directly parallels material in the vitae, which use the theme of blindness and the discomfort that a blindness curse is likely to cause in a reader to put that reader's critical habits at odds with one another: to stir up conflict between an allegorical mode of interpretation and a more 'realistic' mode" (401). Taking these modes of interpretation head on by examining the juxtaposition of miracles in the narrative, Waugh sets out to show how "[t]hese dualities . . . develop into a questioning of the very ideas and means of interpretation; they force the reader into an impossible interpretive dilemma" (401). Insightfully anticipating objections to his method, Waugh concedes that his approach may seem anachronistic: "I realize that I am suggesting that an early medieval work partakes in remarkably modern attitudes toward interpretation, such as aporia, but recent critics have observed that medieval writers were often self-consciously concerned with interpretive acts and the tensions and problems thereof" (426). In the end, Waugh's interpretation of the miracles in the Old English *Prose Life of St. Guthlac* and his theories about putative responses to the text by a contemporary audience raises some perplexing questions that later critics may or may not choose to investigate further.

■ *Apollonius of Tyre*

In "*Ʒoðer and Top in the Old English Apollonius of Tyre*," *N&Q* 56: 12–14, William Sayers proposes a new explanation for a difficult passage in the Old English *Apollonius of Tyre*, where the use of the words *Ʒoðer* 'ball, sphere' and *top*, usually meaning 'summit, lock of hair, a top to play with'—both used to describe the same, apparently ball-like object—presents something of a crux. In the passage in question, these two terms appear to describe a ball with which Apollonius and the king engaged in mutual play. As seems most likely, both words were attempts to render the difficult Latin word *ceroma*, an irregular ablative of *ceromate*, 'a waxy ointment used by athletes'. The Anglo-Saxon translator clearly misunderstood *ceroma*, taking it to signify a ball used in some kind of game. Given the translator's apparent misinterpretation of the passage, *Ʒoðer* makes sense. In what way, though, Sayers asks, can one explain its apparent equation with *top*, which carried no attested meaning associated, however vaguely, with a ball-like object? Sayers's explanation is intriguing: he concludes that *top*, in this context, describes the ball (*Ʒoðer*) after Apollonius spun it for the king's amusement, as one would

spin a toy top. In his own words: "I suggest that what the translator envisaged was that Apollonius, like an ostentatious modern basketball player, went up to the king and twirled the relatively large ball on one finger in a manner reminiscent of a spinning top" (14). Sayers's interpretation of this troublesome passage provides a novel and satisfying solution to this small, but long-standing problem with the Old English translation of *Apollonius of Tyre*.

■ Concerning the Coming of the Anti-Christ

In "The *Revelationes* of Pseudo-Methodius and 'Concerning the Coming of Antichrist' in British Library MS Cotton Vespasian D. XIV," *N&Q* 56: 324–30, Stephen Pelle clarifies received opinion about the source of a brief apocalyptic text contained in London, British Library, MS Cotton Vespasian D.xiv titled "Concerning the Coming of the Anti-Christ" and assesses the implications of his findings. While it has long been known that the *Revelationes* of Pseudo-Methodius provided a source for this text, Pelle is able to show, more specifically, that the Anglo-Saxon author relied on Recension 1 of Pseudo-Methodius's work, a version not previously thought to have been widely known in Anglo-Saxon England. In fact, Recension 1 survives in only one English manuscript (Salisbury, Cathedral Library, MS 165). Since "Concerning the Coming of the Anti-Christ" is undeniably apocalyptic, this identification leads Pelle to argue that it provides an example in contradiction to Michael Twomey's claim that the *Revelationes* was used primarily as a source of biblical—not specifically apocalyptic—lore in Anglo-Saxon England. Finally, based on a quotation from Gregory the Great's *Homilia* I in "Concerning the Coming of the Anti-Christ" wherein Gregory refers to contemporary invasions by pagans, Pelle concludes that the author of the Old English text wished to invite comparison between Gregory's personal familiarity with foreign invaders and similar experiences shared by his contemporary audience. For this reason, Pelle suggests, the Old English text may have been composed during the Viking, or alternatively, the Norman invasions. Either case, Pelle notes, would indicate that the *Revelationes* were known in England earlier than previously thought.

■ Legal Texts

In "Anglo-Saxon Women before the Law: A Student Edition of Five Old English Lawsuits," *OEN* 41.3 (2008): 33–56, Andrew Rabin provides fresh editions of five tenth- and early eleventh-century charters that focus on

issues related to women in Anglo-Saxon England. His text is aimed at students and, for that reason, includes both a complete glossary and generously thorough footnotes. Besides the texts he edits, Rabin's introduction should be required reading for all new students of Anglo-Saxon law. On the one hand, Rabin crafts his introduction so that it familiarizes students and other neophytes with the nature of Old English charters and Anglo-Saxon legal procedures generally. On the other hand, it invites students and scholars to think subtly about the underlying issues that may have motivated the rhetoric and the complexities of these often murky documents. By focusing on texts that address the question of gender and, in particular, female agency, Rabin succeeds at presenting students and scholars of Old English with a neglected set of texts, amply contextualized, glossed, footnoted, and ripe for their engagement.

See also Catherine Cubitt, "As the Lawbook Teaches': Reeves, Lawbooks and Urban Life in the Anonymous Old English Legend of the Seven Sleepers," under "Legend of the Seven Sleepers," above.

■ Medical Terminology

In "*Dweorg* in Old English: Aspects of Disease Terminology," *Quaestio Insularis* 9: 99–117, Conan Doyle sets out to examine the relationship between two different—and apparently conflated—senses of Old English *dweorg/dweorh*, which curiously signified both 'dwarf' and 'fever'. In particular, Doyle argues that the latter meaning of the word, i.e., 'fever', developed from its more basic meaning, i.e., 'dwarf', presumably an earlier folk diagnosis of the disease's cause, though no causal connection between "dwarves" and "fevers" survived in the Anglo-Saxon collective consciousness. Doyle argues that *dweorg* meaning 'fever' (derived ultimately from *dweorg* meaning 'dwarf') followed a semantic trajectory parallel to that of Modern English *influenza*, itself derived from an Italian etymon attributing its symptoms to the effects of the stars, or Modern English *hysteria*, which derives from a diagnosis that attributed female madness to uterine obstructions. The problem Doyle addresses has attracted periodic interest since at least the late nineteenth century, with editors, critics, and lexicographers proposing various emendations to and interpretations of the five texts that contain attestations of *dweorg*. All of these former proposals warrant varying degrees of skepticism. While Doyle's study leaves some questions unanswered, it is admirable for taking the textual problems head on. In the end, his conclusion is plausible and convincing, if a bit cautious: "It is . . . apparent that the word *dweorh* seems to have had a

specific medical meaning probably associated with disturbed sleep and fever" (116), and that, in the context of medical literature, the word had lost any contemporary association with earlier folkloric causes attributing such ailments to supernatural creatures.

BC

■ Works Not Seen

- McGuire, Brian Patrick. *Da himmelen kom naermere: Fortaellinger om Danma Anglo-Saxon Women befo. Fredericksberg: Alfa*. [esp. ch. 2, "Beowulf og Grendel: helten og uhyret," and ch. 3, "Alcuin og Willibrord: laereren og missionaeren."]
- Moffatt, John. "The Sparrow and the Shaking Tent: Containing the Convert in Two Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Ojibwe Conversion Narratives." *RHETOR* 3: 1–21 (see section 5).
- Rowley, Sharon M. "The Role and Function of Otherworldly Visions in Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum*." *The World of Travellers: Exploration and Imagination*. Eds. Kees Dekker, Karin E. Olsen and Tette Hofstra. Leuven: Peeters, 2009, 163–82 (see section 4a).
- Sgarbi, Romano. "Implicazioni culturali di alcune parentimologie." *Aevum* 83: 425–30 (see section 5).
- Sharma, Manish. "The Reburial of the Cross in the Old English *Elene*." *New Readings in the Vercelli Book*. Eds. Zacher and Orchard, 280–97 (see section 4b; on *Elene*).

5. Anglo-Latin, Ecclesiastical Works

■ Bede

Michael Lapidge, "Author's Variants in the Textual Transmission of Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica*," *Filologia Mediolatina* 16: 1–16, considers the standing belief among scholars that both the C- and M-recensions of the *Historia Ecclesiastica* are authorial. He concludes that while the M-text (herein designated μ) represents a Northumbrian family of manuscripts, and therefore the version closest to Bede's own, the C-text (herein designated κ) is possibly a Canterbury redaction made in the 730s either by Abbot Albinus or one of his Canterbury contemporaries. Each recension contains three manuscripts, and there are four major differences between the recensions: the location of the prayer *Praeterea omnes . . . inueniam*; the St. Oswald miracle (at IIII.xiii), missing in κ ; a cross-reference to a mention of Benedict Biscop, missing in κ along with any mention of Biscop at all; and the absence of Archbishop Tatwine's 731 consecration in κ . Explaining these alterations and lacunae also affects belief as to which recension is earlier, with both Charles-Edwards and Wormald believing that κ is earlier. Their reasoning is to a great extent based on an apparent omission in μ (owing to eyeskip) of a passage drawn from Gregory the Great in *Historia Ecclesiastica* I.xxvii. Against this, Lapidge first argues that corrections made in the κ -recension instead suggest that a knowledgeable Canterbury redactor was at work, silently correcting apparent small factual oversights and errors of Latin syntax. Each of the four major variants can be explained through such a hypothetical redactor, who made alterations to improve the narrative (ex. 1), to correct a textual oversight (ex. 3), to supply local astronomical information unavailable in Northumbria (ex. 4, where mention of two eclipses has been inserted), and, in the case of the St. Oswald miracle (ex. 2), through the loss in transmission of a single folio (amounting to eighty-four lines of text, almost exactly the length of the miracle in μ). Assuming this is an accurate hypothesis, Lapidge provides a new stemma for the *Historia Ecclesiastica* and goes on to consider how recent work by Paul Meyvaert on the transmission of Gregory's *Libellus responsionum* suggests that Bede's own copy of this text was corrupt, which would explain Bede's omission of the passage mentioned above. If this is the case, then earlier

arguments for the primacy of κ disappear. Lapidge at last turns to a serious weakness in his hypothesis, the presence of numerous "stupid" errors found in the existing manuscripts in the κ -recension, and thus were ostensibly present in κ itself. Here, Lapidge uses the relative soundness of the *Historia Ecclesiastica* transmission found in the Old English translation of the text to posit two lost hyparchetypes of κ , which he designates ϵ and ζ , and that it was this ζ hyparchetype that served as the exemplar for the extant CKO manuscripts of the κ -recension, not the sounder ϵ . K derived directly from ζ , while γ represents the Southumbrian exemplar of C and O. Lapidge concludes by suggesting that once Bede had sent copies of *Historia Ecclesiastica* to Albinus and King Ceolwulf in 731, he did not again revise the text before his death.

The series of "Translated Texts for Historians" from Liverpool University Press has for some years now provided sound translations and commentaries of an eclectic assortment of early texts that benefit from a prosaic and cautious approach, of which Calvin Kendall's edition of Bede's exegetical text *On Genesis* (2008) is exemplary. Bede began his commentary in the first decade of the eighth century and it took him approximately twenty years to complete. In his prefatory letter to Bishop Acca, Bede claims his approach has been to collect the wisdom of others who have pondered Genesis and to arrange it carefully, augmenting and clarifying when he has deemed it appropriate in order to make the narrative accessible to inexperienced readers who wish to ascend to greater wisdom. Following this letter, there are four books, which conclude with an extended consideration of Gen 21:9–10, although Bede gives the last words of his text to the Gospel of John. Although Bede's commentary was never as popular as Augustine's or Ambrose's, it did survive in twenty-two manuscripts and remains an important text for understanding Bede's exegetical method. Kendall's introduction is erudite and straightforward, and provides an excellent liaison to Bede's approach to Genesis and to his exegesis more generally. We learn that Bede had a predilection for numbers, including the precise age of Noah when Shem was born (502 years), the exact duration of the flood (365 days), and the significance of the seventy times

seven vengeance for Lamech. Kendall explains Bede's approach to explaining the Biblical text, his concern for clarifying potential confusions, his desire to impart an understanding of the literal and allegorical nature of Scripture, and also his recurrent themes, including the omnipresence of exile and the need to privilege youth. Kendall is also forthright and thoughtful on the anti-Semitism and anti-Islamic (here, Saracen) sentiments that Bede inherited from his sources, but which remains an unfortunate stain on a noble spirit. Kendall's translation is accurate and readable, and his commentary is filled with Patristic cross-references and informative guideposts, especially for the novice (who will be grateful to learn that Bede believed that Moses wrote the Pentateuch himself, and the significance of Greek in the *nomen sacrum* for Jesus); yet there are many gems herein for experts as well, for Kendall brings much learning and many years of expertise with Bede's texts and Biblical commentaries. But the real treasure here is Bede's own language, which nearly always combines the best qualities of the scholar and the teacher, as he expounds one of the most crucial texts of any Christian's education.

Vicky Gunn, *Bede's Historiae: Genre, Rhetoric, and the Construction of Anglo-Saxon Church History* (Woodbridge: Boydell), offers a new intervention into the scholarly discussion concerning how Anglo-Saxons read and wrote history. This debate, which arguably peaked in the late 1990s, featured Roger Ray, Gabriel Knappe, and others (including Malcolm Parkes), and centered on exactly how a writer such as Bede was affected, if at all, by the tenets of Classical rhetorical teaching, especially the work of Cicero. Gunn suggests that giving greater attention to intertextuality displayed by Bede in the *Historia Ecclesiastica* would complicate the question helpfully, and proceeds to outline an approach that attempts to do just that. Although not exactly Classical in nature, Bede's form of *inventio* was one developed from late Patristic texts and included appeals to authority, dependence upon convention, and the value of direct observation. Bede uses direct quotations, variations on generic themes and conventions (such as those from hagiography), and eyewitness accounts filtered through Late Antique "frameworks" of thinking and writing. Moreover, she posits Bede as a "talented manipulator" of his sources, who might also have adopted certain rhetorical techniques in spite of himself. To this end, Gunn examines the extent to which "generic placing" and textual allusion had an impact on Bede's historicity and argues that signs both subliminal and overt are present in his narratives for the prepared or initiated reader. Monastic rivalry also

played a role in spurring a writer such as Bede to tweak his accounts. Generally speaking, Gunn's approach is admittedly comparative, and includes readings of Irish and Merovingian Latin sources in addition to the expected Anglo-Saxon and Patristic, which makes for a welcome and broad-ranging appraisal. After examining Bede's audience and regional predilections, she elaborates on these issues in a chapter devoted to Bede's Northumbrian "self-promotion" in the *Historia Ecclesiastica*. Chapter four features an examination of genre as featured in the *Historia Ecclesiastica* and Gunn then devotes several chapters to analyzing Bede's innovations in his martyrology, in *Historia Abbatum*, and in his compositional techniques in the *Historia Ecclesiastica*. Although longtime readers of Bede will find many familiar ideas in the book and may find some assertions questionable, it offers some valuable new intertextual and reception-based approaches to his writing.

George Hardin Brown, "Quotation from Isidore in Bede's Commentary on Genesis 4:25-26," *N&Q* 56: 163, corrects a solecism in Carmela Viricillo Franklin's article on Bede's exegesis ("Bilingual Philology in Bede's Exegesis," in *Medieval Cultures in Contact*, ed. Richard Gyug [New York: Fordham UP, 2003], 3-18), pointing out that certain onomastic comments made by Bede about Enos and Seth are not original, but are most likely drawn from his knowledge of Isidore's *Eymologiae* and possibly the same author's *Quaestiones*, the former of which was certainly known to Bede. Both Isidore and Bede etymologize the name Seth as 'resurrection' and Enos as 'man'.

Francisca del Mar Plaza Picón and José Antonio González Marrero. "El *De schematibus et tropis* de Beda y la cristianización de la retórica," *Pectora Mulcet'*: *Estudios de retórica y oratoria Latinas*, Vol. I, ed. Trinidad Arcos Pereira, Jorge Fernández López, and Francisca Moya del Baño (Logroño: Instituto de Estudios Riojanos), offer an analysis of Bede's systematic and deliberate efforts to demonstrate how the literary tropes and rhetorical figures admired in Classical authors such as Virgil could be found already present in the Scriptures. In this, Bede stands in a long line of Christian writers, including Ambrose and Augustine, who sought to defend Christian writings from the charge that they lacked art. Bede's own contributions lie in developing this argument from the apologetic to a programmatic tool for teaching, as he demonstrates in his *De schematibus et tropis*. Moreover, the authors demonstrate, through an examination of Bede's use of writers such as Donatus, that Bede did not choose to "turn his back" on pagan learning, but rather sought

to use it wisely in the dissemination of the greater Christian knowledge and wisdom.

■ *Insular and Early Anglo-Latin*

Gildas's use of scriptural authority and outright quotations to afford his polemic against the dissolute Briton kings of his own day has been well-studied, but Nicholas Perkins manages to tread new ground in this careful study of the writer's use of the Book of Isaiah, "Biblical Allusion and Prophetic Authority in Gildas's *De excidio Britanniae*," *Journal of Medieval Latin* 20 (2010): 78–112. Specifically, he reads *De excidio* 27–65. Perkins suggests that Gildas manages to marshal quotations, more subtle scriptural allusions, and thematic echoes both to demonstrate his knowledge of scripture, to castigate and encourage reform in British leaders, and also to lay claim to prophetic power of his own. Gildas chose to quote so heavily from Isaiah because the Old Testament prophet manages to express lamentation and enraged judgment, yet also hope for a renewed and reborn future. As well as being the most-quoted Old Testament prophet in the New Testament, Jerome calls him an "evangelist," linking him closely to the new Christian tradition that stresses rebirth as well as judgment. While some of this material will be familiar to readers of Gildas, Perkins provides illuminating close descriptions of precise echoes and quotations from Isaiah. Gildas's approach towards citation is to follow the sequence of the Biblical text, which Perkins suggests adds a sense of Isaian narrative strength to Gildas's own text. Developing Robert Alter's notion of "pervasive allusiveness" in Hebrew scriptures, and indebted to Neil Wright's useful treatment of the varieties of literary allusion in Christian Latin literature, Perkins offers a study of thematic allusions in Gildas, which take the form of stressing God's overwhelming power as well as the sense of a nation being the chosen remnant. While Gildas seems to shy away from using certain verses that had become closely associated with the Incarnation, perhaps because he wished to avoid the appearance of foretelling a specific British savior, he does link the notion of the Israelites' sense of their own status as God's chosen people and the British themselves. Perkins closely reads Gildas's rhetorical structures and devices and his historical and moral exegesis, the latter taking the form of frequent exhortations in the second person, which excoriate the current leadership.

Christopher Cain, "Sacred Words, Anglo-Saxon Piety, and the Origins of the *Epistola salvatoris* in London, British Library, Royal 2.A.xx," *JEGP* 108: 168–89, discusses the manuscript and cultural context

of the apocryphal *Epistola salvatoris* found in Royal 2.A.xx, concluding that the letter did indeed possess an apotropaic purpose in the Royal collection. After surveying the history of the legend, including its important adaptation through Rufinus's translation of Eusebius's version, Cain considers the versions of the legend known in the west. By the ninth century, Christ's remarks had been divorced from the letter as a whole, and Cain notes that the version found in Royal 2.A.xx includes no part of Apgar's words, but an expanded version of Jesus's reply—language which promises that enemies will not have dominion over believers, the devil need not be feared, and neither hail, nor thunder, nor sea or land, nor day or night, will cause harm to the bearer of the letter. He concludes that Rufinus was not the only source of the knowledge of the letter in Anglo-Saxon England (contra Dobschütz and Lutz). Cain argues that Bede does not reproduce or mention the correspondence of Jesus and Apgar, not because he did not believe in its authenticity, but because of a reluctance to encourage the further spread of the controversial practice of apotropaic textual amulets, of which the *Epistola* was a very popular example. Cain goes on to examine two potential lines of transmission for the letter to England and concludes that Theodore is the most likely, not an Irish source. His evidence for this is very detailed, and Cain follows Lapidge's suggestion that Theodore was responsible for introducing the devotional practice of litanies of saints to England. This practice, which involved much private reading, and which did itself take on an apotropaic role, could easily have been responsible for the use of such textual excerpts as the *Epistola salvatoris* in amulet forms, as well as in collections of such texts as suggested by the Royal manuscript.

■ *Alcuin*

Ruben Florio attempts a rather daunting task, that of finding an unbroken link between the educational strategies of the Classical and Late Antique world with the Carolingian renaissance, and the associated teachings of Alcuin in "*Discere-Docere: Tertuliano y Alcuino frente a la Paideia oficial*," *Traditio* 64: 105–38. He discusses the difficulty faced by Charlemagne in creating a "network" of teachers who would be able both to develop and transmit the cultural heritage of the past. One-time barbarians became linked by their new Christian culture, and took it upon themselves to convert other barbarous peoples. Above all, the connection between teaching and learning, *docere-discere*, was among the most vital survivals from the ancient world into the new

world of Carolingian culture. Florio cautiously uses the term *paideia* to describe the idea of a school at this time as a place which not only transmitted learning to the young, but which also introduced to society the “hegemony” of intellectuals, who would orchestrate “the process of spiritual formation and transformation” in the rest of the people.

Michael Murray Gorman, “Rewriting Augustine: Alcuin’s Commentary on the Gospel of John,” *Revue Bénédictine* 119: 36–85, considers how Alcuin planned and executed his commentary on John, freely modifying his source authors in order to promote correct comprehension as Alcuin saw it. Gorman briefly traces the origins of the commentary, from Bede’s inchoate deathbed translation through Alcuin’s lengthy preparation for the task, up to Alcuin’s own visionary experience during a reading of the Gospel, before he received a request for such from Charlemagne’s sister Gisla. Gorman offers a careful analysis of the various letters associated with Alcuin’s commentary which provide some insight into Alcuin’s thought process for copying and preserving the document. An important goal in his writing was to produce a document that was less daunting than Augustine’s own commentary, to which Alcuin owed a great deal. Understanding this helps make clear several of his choices during the process, including the decision to eliminate explicit citation of his sources and the willingness to adapt the words of his sources for clarity. This was a method of exegesis that Alcuin used for other texts as well, such as in his commentary on Ecclesiastes, and Gorman stresses the uniqueness of Alcuin in “deliberately [making] the texts he chose from patristic literature say what he wanted them to say” (46). Substantial examples of this revision process are provided, from Jerome’s commentary on Ecclesiastes, and Ambrose’s *De fide*, the latter of which became important to Alcuin in his crusade against Adoptianism. Gorman also considers Alcuin’s debt to Gregory (whose words he changed little), Augustine, and Bede, and also considers Alcuin’s original contributions. Appendices detail Alcuin’s textual debts in a helpful graphic format, offer a complete source analysis, and survey the manuscript evidence for the commentary.

Vinko Grubišić, “Albin Flak Alcuin u karolinskoj renesansi,” *Književna Smotra* 41.4: 93–101, offers a discussion (in Croatian) of the importance of Alcuin to the Carolingian renaissance, including a sensitive, albeit cursory, reading of some of Alcuin’s poetry, discussing his influences and styles.

Francesca Sara D’Imperio, ed., *Explanatio super Ecclesiasten* (CLM 14614): *Un’èpitome carolingia*

del Commentario all’Ecclesiaste di Alcuino di York (Firenze: SISMELE, 2008), offers an edition of Alcuin’s variously named commentary on Ecclesiastes (called here *Explanatio super Ecclesiasten*). Alcuin dedicated this work to Candidus, Frigidus, and Onias, and its most comprehensive recent commentator has been Raffaele Savigni (*Augustinianum* 37 [1992]), which makes the appearance of this book both welcome and timely. Alcuin saw Ecclesiastes as particularly salient intellectual fare for his students who were departing from the relative safety of his own walls to enter the wider world, for the book reminds its readers of the transient nature of earthly things, and recalls to the mind the greater glories of God. For his own commentary, Alcuin borrowed extensively from Jerome’s commentary, but it is clear from reading Alcuin’s letters that he possessed a fondness for elements of this book that were personal in nature. D’Imperio provides a detailed summary of the codicological and palaeographical details of the manuscript, which is Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 14614, saec. ix 3/4, of probable French origin (Tours?) and St. Emmeram provenance. The contents of the manuscript in addition to Alcuin’s text are exhaustively described and include several other texts of Alcuin’s pen, including several poems, *De ratione anima*, and his writings on the Trinity. D’Imperio also provides an extensive analysis of the structure and textual debts of Alcuin’s work. The edition itself is free from error, as is the App. Crit. All in all, this is an exemplary edition of a minor work.

Florence Close, “L’Itinéraire de Candide Wizo: un élément de datations des œuvres anti-adoptianistes d’Alcuin? Note sur les lettres 41 et 204 de la correspondance d’Alcuin,” *Revue d’histoire ecclésiastique* 103 (1998): 5–26, argues for a slight redating of letters 41 and 204 written by Alcuin, based upon the itinerary of Wizo, an intermediary with the Frankish court, and upon a reading of one of Alcuin’s treatises against Adoptianism, the *Contra Felicem*. The MGH edition of Alcuin’s letters, by Dümmler, gives 794/5 as the date for letter 41, but given its anti-Adoptianist subject matter it is most likely to have been written during the years 797–799. Cross-referencing Wizo’s travels during this period, during which time he delivered Alcuin’s letter to the court, provides a putative date of autumn in the year 798. Close argues as well that there is no firm evidence to link Wizo with *Contra Felicem* and suggests another of Alcuin’s disciples might have delivered that particular work. Letter 204 contains in itself a dialogue that Alcuin intended to serve as ammunition against Adoptianism. Close also announces that she will be delivering a new edition of the Alcuinian corpus, a volume that has not,

to my knowledge, yet been published. The essay closes with a French translation of letter 41.

■ Carolingian

Rainer Jakobi, "Beiträge zu mittellateinischen Dichtern (VII–X)," *Filologia Mediolatina* 16: 115–20, offers students of Carolingian Latin a series of four meditations on textual and metrical problems. The first concerns Gregory of Ely's use of sources, particularly the relationship between Bede and the *Liber Eliensis*, for his *Vita Ætheldridi*, written after 1116. The second offers two emendations of the 1987 Assmann MGH edition of Gunther's *Solimarius* (a comma adjusted in line 87, *paci* to *paci<s>* in line 137). The third offers thoughts on a corrupted Plautus citation in John of Garland, and the fourth a revised stemma for the *De naturis animalium* attributed to Konrad von Mure.

The bibliography of items devoted to understanding the complicated origin, influence, and inheritance of the collection of Canon Law owned by Archbishop Lanfranc of Canterbury grows every year, yet an edition of the work remains out of sight. A new monograph by Nicolás Álvarez de las Asturias, *La 'Collectio Lanfranci': Origine e influenza di una collezione della chiesa anglo-normanna* (Milan: Giuffrè, 2008), does not supply this edition, but it does offer a careful textual study of the relationship between the *Collectio Lanfranci* and other Pseudo-Isidorian materials in England. He offers a counterargument to the 1931 argument of Zachary Brooke, who had claimed the *Collectio* as the sole source for the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals. Rather, Álvarez de las Asturias argues for a more complex and varied line of transmission.

The *Dicta Albini* had once been believed quite strongly to be the work of Alcuin of York, until Donald Bullough successfully argued that such an attribution is unsupported after his study of Alcuin's lexical usage; instead Bullough proposed a fifth/sixth-century composition, perhaps in southern Gaul. Nevertheless, Mette Lebech, John McEvoy, and John Flood, "*De Dignitate Conditionis Humanae*: Translation, Commentary, and Reception History of the *Dicta Albini* (Ps.-Alcuin) and the *Dicta Candidi*," *Viator* 40.2: 1–34, agree, as John Marenbon has argued more extensively, the work should still be seen as having experienced a revival in the Carolingian intellectual milieu. Alcuin, it would seem, re-popularized the work to such a degree that the authors suggest it may even have been considered his own during his lifetime. The authorship of the *Dicta Candidi* has also been contested, but current wisdom attributes it to Alcuin's student and friend,

Candidus Wizo. The authors offer a translation of and commentary on the late medieval amalgamation of these two texts, known as *De Dignitate conditionis humanae*, in hopes of tracing the development of the concept of human dignity through time. They carefully argue for reading the title as a clear allusion to the theological and philosophical problem of human dignity and also point out a previously unnoticed liturgical source for the *Dicta Albini* in a Christmas prayer found in the Leonine Sacramentary (concerning which the authors have an article forthcoming). They trace the transmission of the texts and offer a supplementary discussion of the influences that the *Dicta Albini* seems to have had during the Carolingian period and after, including apparent echoes of the *Dicta Albini* in the "sentences" associated with the School of Laon (from Douai MS Bibl. Municipale 371), echoes of both texts in the pseudo-Augustinian text *De spiritu et anima*, and the extended reach the *Dicta Albini* may have had on Grosseteste, who made use of *De spiritu et anima* in his own writings, predominantly the *Hexaëmeron*. The article is rather dense, and specialized, yet contributes significantly to the earlier work of Marenbon and Bullough, and will be of interest to scholars of Carolingian intellectual history.

■ Late Anglo-Latin

Too much pain, too suddenly, shocks the system and the memory; but gradually and systematically introduced, it can play an aid in learning and memory, since we gladly remember what hurts us. Such is the world that Irina A. Dumitrescu, "The Grammar of Pain in Ælfric Bata's *Colloquies*," *Forum for Modern Language Studies* 45: 239–53, returns us to in her treatment of the connection between pain and language in the oft-derided yet perennially-fascinating juvenile antics of the eleventh-century writer Ælfric Bata. His schoolroom exercises in Latin have long-seemed one of the great curiosities, if not embarrassments, of late Anglo-Saxon literary practice, but Dumitrescu, as has Drew Jones previously (see last year's review), instead sees the *Colloquies* as providing some fascinating evidence for eleventh-century pedagogical procedure. She explores the possible connection between pain and language (or learning), as mirrored in the terrors of the Anglo-Saxon classroom displayed in Ælfric's writings. The notion that learning was painful, and images of Lady *Grammatica* as a flagellant, steadfastly striping the backs of her students, is an ancient one, and has remained popular through many years of schoolroom experience. Dumitrescu thus expands upon ground already mapped by scholars of Latin mnemonic practice such as Mary Carruthers, and

readers of a theoretical bent will have no problem hearing echoes of Derridean and De Manian language in her discussion about the entanglement of violence and texts. Dumitrescu points out that prior to the eccentric writings of Ælfric Bata, Ælfric of Eynsham clarified the explicit connection between language and violence in his *Grammar*; verbs, in particular, were “understood as violent, and understanding comes by imagining one’s own pain when learning them.” She notes that Ælfric chooses (perhaps coyly) *flagellare* (and not, for example, *amare*) to illustrate first conjugation verbs, and more tellingly defines a verb as “an action or suffering or consent,” continuing the explication of doing, suffering, and consenting with *aro* (‘I plough’), *uerberor* (‘I am flogged’), *ligor* (‘I am bound’), and *doceor* (‘I am taught’). Ælfric follows Donatus, Pompeius, and other grammarians in his choice of *uerbero*, but Dumitrescu goes on to argue that, for Ælfric, focusing on violence is an essential part of understanding how verbs are different from nouns. In fact, it reveals a vital dichotomy for Ælfric: an assiduous learner of Latin must learn active and passive roles as he is loved and taught in turn, disciplined and flogged. In this world of pedagogical practice, Ælfric Bata represents the “second step in the learning process,” and serves to flesh out with comical, satirical, or even shocking examples the more abstract principles laid down in the *Grammar*. Dumitrescu analyzes a portion of the *Colloquies* and reveals a more subtle humor and keener intelligence than their author had been previously credited with. This is a most clever and welcome essay.

Michael Lapidge, ed., *Byrhtferth of Ramsey: The Lives of St. Oswald and St. Ecgwine* (Oxford: Clarendon Press), offers us a magisterial edition of a pair of Anglo-Saxon saints’ lives, as well as a comprehensive overview of the Latin style of Byrhtferth of Ramsey, one of the more prolific and intriguing writers of tenth- and eleventh-century England. The more important of the two lives edited here is the *Vita S. Oswaldi*, being one of three sources of information on the life and career of the learned bishop, whose fondness for the more difficult and esoteric forms of Latin expression (sometimes known as the “hermeneutic style,” such as practiced by Abbo of St. Germain-des-Prés) added a continental flair to tenth-century English prose. The arrival at Ramsey of Abbo of Fleury in 985 further enhanced both the library and the educational curriculum. It was in such an environment that Byrhtferth was trained and in which he produced his *Enchiridion*, his saints’ lives, and his other works. The most interesting qualities of the author arguably stem from his Latinity, one best-known perhaps for its elevated vocabulary, which

Lapidge categorizes under four characteristic headings: archaism, polysyllabicity, Grecism, and poeticism. But Byrhtferth’s peculiar art is not limited to lexicon alone, and Lapidge also covers the author’s syntax and his grammatical solecisms. The examples of each of these are highly useful and it is hoped that further studies into Byrhtferth’s language will be possible with the arrival of this edition. In addition to this introduction, I would mention the useful studies in *Aspects of the Language of Latin Prose*, ed. by T. Reinhardt, M. Lapidge, and J. N. Adams, and its “companion” book *Aspects of the Language in Latin Poetry*, ed. J. N. Adams and R. G. Mayer, particularly Lapidge’s essay in the former and Mayer’s essay on Grecism in the latter. J. H. W. Penney’s essay on archaism in this volume is also important. Lapidge helpfully summarizes the lengthy *Vita S. Oswaldi*, and offers a discussion of its hagiographic conventions and transmission. The briefer *Vita S. Ecgwini*, despite its idiosyncratic nature, certainly had a significant influence on his *cultus*, as Lapidge explains. A description of the manuscript follows (London, BL, Cotton Nero E. I, pt. 1), and he surveys previous editions of the texts and gives an account of the editorial procedures taken in this volume. Appendix I contains the glosses to the *vitae*, and Appendix II contains the Abbonian acrostics as found in the manuscripts themselves. This is a model edition, one whose insights should prove stimulating to Anglo-Saxonists and medieval Latinists alike.

Mary Cheney, with the aid and assistance of David Smith, Christopher Brooke, and Philippa M. Hoskin, has completed the first volume of a planned two-volume edition of *English Episcopal Acta* from Worcester (*English Episcopal Acta, XXXIII: Worcester 1062–1185* [Oxford: Oxford UP, 2007]), a useful contribution to late Anglo-Saxon and early Norman English diplomatics. Brief biographies of the bishops of Worcester during this period are most welcome, including most notably St. Wulfstan (d. 1095), but also Samson, a close confidante of William I, William II, Theulf, the controversial Simon of Lotharingia, and John of Pagham. There are 223 *acta* edited herein, including forty-five originals. Helpful facsimiles of four later *acta* are included, as well as photographs of the seals and counterseals of Bishops John and Roger. The volume also includes discussion of the diplomatics of the *acta* and the ten certain forgeries (most attributed to Bishop Simon). Spelling has been retained, but modern punctuation has been added. Of special interest to Anglo-Saxonists will be Wulfstan’s *acta*, which include one (no. 10, inc. “Ego Wlstanus Dei gratia Wigorn(ensis) episcopus . . .”) which Julia Barrow has argued is a forgery, albeit “skillfully done,”

of the mid-twelfth century, and another (no. 7) that is uniquely in Old English, a confraternity agreement with Evesham, Chertsey, and Bath; the text is found on a single leaf removed from CCCC 140, a mid-eleventh-century copy of the Old English Gospels.

Katherine O'Brien O'Keefe offers a learned essay on the provenance of the *Liber Confortatorius*, written by Goscelin in the years 1080–1082 in "Goscelin, the *Liber Confortatorius*, and the Library of Peterborough," *Poetry, Place, and Gender*, ed. Karkov [see sec. 2]. This text was composed following what was the personal loss of his former student Eve of Wilton, who was sent into seclusion shortly after Goscelin himself was sent away by his new bishop to unnamed locations for an unspecified period of time. Its purpose was to comfort himself and, ostensibly, Eve. While the location of Goscelin during his peregrinations may be forever unknown, scholars have been more certain about where he wrote the book afterwards, suggesting either Bury St. Edmunds or Peterborough as the *Burgis* where Goscelin tells Eve his is still a guest while he writes. O'Brien O'Keefe argues that the place of the *Liber's* composition at least can be more firmly identified as Peterborough and she makes this case by reconstructing, through the literary citations detected within Book 2 of his letter, the library he was likely to have had access to during its composition. Starting with various scholars' attribution of the eleventh/twelfth-century booklist found in Bodley 163 (ff 250–1, edited by Lapidge in "Surviving Booklists from Anglo-Saxon England," in the Clemoes *festschrift*) to Peterborough, she examines Book 2, which elaborates at some length the theme of spiritual battle. To buttress his theme, Goscelin cites extensively from a dizzying array of authorities, including the *Aeneid* and Horace, Gregory's Homily 37, Eusebius's account of an unnamed captive, and Origen's homilies on Joshua. His inclusion of Rufinus's translation of Eusebius's tale of the *mulier quaedam captiva* is both long and extraordinarily faithful, suggesting that Goscelin had the text before him as he wrote. Most telling, however, is Goscelin's inclusion of excerpts of Origen's fifteenth and twentieth homilies on Joshua, which Goscelin believed to have been written by Jerome. This misattribution occurs in the D-transmission of the text, and item 10 on the Peterborough booklist mentions a similar text. While such evidence is not definitive, it does further strengthen the connection of Goscelin with the library of Peterborough as he wrote the *Liber Confortatorius*.

■ *Anselm and Post-Conquest*

Richard Sharpe and Teresa Webber, "Four Early Booklets of Anselm's Works from Salisbury Cathedral," *Scriptorium* 63: 58–72, offer us a magisterial, albeit narrow, palaeographical and codicological examination of four short compilations of St. Anselm's writing that came into existence very shortly after he wrote them, allowing us to glimpse the strategies and techniques of twelfth-century publishing, as it were. The booklets are extant as a portion of Cambridge, Trinity College, MS. B.1.37. F. S. Schmitt printed six letters from this manuscript, all from Anselm. This manuscript has since been assigned a Salisbury provenance by Teresa Webber, who identified the copyist as Scribe ii, a Salisbury scribe active between ca. 1086–1100. The letters are from Booklet 3 of the manuscript, which also contains one of the earliest extant copies of Anselm's *Proslogion*. It is clear from a study of the hands that the Anselm corpus of this booklet is presented as a single work, with uninterrupted connections (in contrast, a copy of Prosper's *Responsiones* was written by Scribe ii, but is set off significantly from the rest on its own page).

Roland J. Teske, "Henry of Ghent on Anselm's *Proslogion* Argument," *Traditio* 64: 213–28, begins by considering an apparent contradiction in the writings of thirteenth-century scholastic Henry of Ghent, who would seem to agree with Anselm that God cannot be thought not to exist and yet argues in his *Summa quaestionum ordinariam* (SQO) that the proposition that God exists is not naturally self-evident to his creatures. Teske explores Henry's arguments in SQO 30.3, concluding that Henry did accept the arguments for the existence of God as set out by Anselm in the *Proslogion* and he also examines the qualifications Henry introduces in his own argument. Teske then goes on to explore Henry's argument for the proposition that the existence of God is not naturally self-evident (SQO 22.2), which sees Henry wrestling with arguments by St. John Damascene and Hugh of St. Victor, as well as Aristotle's *Prior Analytics*. Teske calls Henry's version a "quidditative knowledge of God," which stresses that a concept of God is not immediate, but gained only through philosophical reflection and careful study. It is this important argumentative distinction that connects both Anselm and Henry of Ghent, as Henry emphasizes the notion of a developing intellect.

M. B. Pranger, "The Authenticity of the Devil in Gregory the Great, Anselm of Canterbury, and Heinrich von Kleist," *Mind Matters: Studies of Medieval and Early Modern Intellectual History*, ed. Marcia L. Colish, Cary J. Nederman, Nancy E. Van Deusen, and E. Ann Matter

(Turnhout: Brepols), 117–32, considers the philosophical problems encountered when trying to navigate the differing portrayals of evil in Augustine and Anselm, on one hand, and Gregory the Great on the other. Augustine and Anselm present and polish the powerful Christian idea of the self divided from God in the presence of evil and sin, which cause the chain of events within a person that leads to a cruel metamorphosis, which is the loss of identity. Augustine claims evil is nonexistence in Creation, and Ambrose, in *De casu diaboli*, continues the argument when he claims that by sinning, the devil has willed nothing: by “giving up perseverance before anything was given to him the devil has failed to will to the end” (119). Thus, he receives nothing. Pranger traces the implication of this philosophical move, noting that one consequence is that the model does not allow for bipolarity, despite the fact that metaphorically, pastoral Christian concerns are frequently framed as conflicts between good and evil, between the Christian soul and the enemy. Moreover, how can his manifestations be explained if he really is nothing? Pranger returns to Late Antiquity and the intellectual figure of Gregory the Great as found in the *Dialogi*. Following Carole Straw, Pranger agrees that Gregory offers a more visceral view of sin than Augustine had done, moving from the more purely theological to the humbler pastoral realms. In the language of the *Dialogi*, the devil, with his moths, worms, and fires, torments and batters very real and tangible Christian bodies and minds, and is a tyrant, a hunter, a deceiver, not the pale ghost of Augustine’s philosophy. Pranger goes on to compare Gregory’s imagery to a short story by Kleist, “Die heilige Cäcilie,” written in 1819 but set in the iconoclastic conflicts of the sixteenth century.

A new edition by Michael Winterbottom is a happy event indeed in Medieval Latin studies, and the new two-volume edition of William of Malmesbury’s *Gesta Pontificum Anglorum*, with commentary by Rodney Thomson, is a delight to contemplate (*William of Malmesbury: Gesta pontificum anglorum: The History of the English Bishops*, 2 Vols. [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2007]). This edition of this vital text is the first since the Hamilton’s Rolls Series edition (1870) and is thus overdue. As Winterbottom notes in his introduction, we are fortunate to have an autograph of William’s text, although the manuscript in question (Oxford, Magdalen College MS lat. 172, the “A” manuscript) is a “working copy” of the text, not a rough draft, and yet this autograph itself lacks certain later revisions of William’s own. Winterbottom adjusts the grouping of the manuscripts, and argues for two other manuscripts, B and C, being descended from a lost copy of A, which

he terms β . This new discovery is vital to our text, for whereas Hamilton had relegated all passages found only in β to the App. Crit., Winterbottom has chosen to include them, or at least all such additions beyond a few words in length, in a slightly-offset left column within the main text. The rather inaccurate state of much of β has encouraged Winterbottom to make editorial alterations to sections of the text that do not correspond to what he believes the author intended. Of even greater interest is the opportunity, with Winterbottom as our guide, to view William’s editorial decisions in action, even watching him catch his own scribal errors as he composes (see iv.172 I, for an example). The translation is, as expected, elegant, accurate, and delightful throughout. William’s Latin, while always clear, can at times be rather compact, and Winterbottom unpacks his terse prose into a most readable and idiomatic English. A few examples: upon the arrival of a usurping stranger in his bishopric, Angilbert “went off in a huff” (*abscessit infensus*); an old woman with eggs is vexed by the “licentious jostling” (*petulanti excussu*) of laggard workmen; and Eriugena’s neglected corpse is translated to a finer resting place only after a luminescent miracle occurs and the recalcitrant local “monks took the hint” (*ammoniti monachi*). The second volume, which features the commentary to the text, opens with introductory material offering the reader information on the structure and purpose of the *Gesta Pontificum Anglorum*, its date and William’s sources, and its later influence, from William’s contemporaries on down to readers in the sixteenth century; Winterbottom also contributes a short but important discussion of certain terms of William’s that are problematic to a translator. In his commentary, Rodney Thomson details useful background information where appropriate, offers extensive cross-references to necessary *loci* within William’s text and to his sources, and also refers the reader to more extensive scholarship on numerous occasions. It is deeply learned and informed, and is a most-fitting companion volume to the edition proper.

■ General

Antonio Alberte González, “Del arte retórica al arte predicatoria,” *“Pectora Mulcet”*: *Estudios de retórica y oratoira Latinas* [see above], 103–28, argues, in a learned survey article, for the important dual role of both preaching and learning for the *homo novus* of the Pauline creed. Alberte González traces the various arguments made both for and against the use of rhetoric by Christian Latin writers, providing a short but useful survey of the concerns and techniques of the Latin

writers themselves, including St. Paul, Augustine, Cassiodorus, and Gregory the Great, down to Bede, Alcuin, and Hrabanus Maurus. Alberte González continues on far past the Anglo-Saxon and Carolingian eras, to consider Guibert, Alan of Lille, Alexander of Ashby, Thomas of Chobham, William of Paris, and John of Wales, among others. The essay is a font of quotations in both Latin and Spanish, and would be very useful for students seeking excerpts from the Fathers on rhetoric and Christian learning.

Raymond Clemens and Timothy Graham have provided, with their *Introduction to Manuscript Studies* (Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2007), a fitting companion to Bernhard Bischoff's classic volume *Latin Palaeography*. The field has long wanted a comprehensive and student-friendly text that would cover the creation of manuscripts and the finer points of codicology, and the authors have succeeded brilliantly in filling such a gap, as well as revealing how a book can be both essential for students and professional scholars alike. Unlike Bischoff's volume, and indeed unlike almost every other book on the subject save for those of Michelle Brown, Clemens and Graham combine a scholar's erudition with the thoughtful approach of a *magister*, as they guide the reader through the numerous stages of familiarity with the tools of a medievalist's trade, from the raw production of a manuscript to the tools of reading and writing. The study also includes a discussion of medieval literary (and non-literary) genres, an introduction to palaeography (including transcriptions of the given facsimiles with translations alongside), and a survey of compendia and punctuation marks. Although students will still need to become familiar with the standard tools for manuscript research such as Capelli, Derolez, Lowe, Kristeller, and Parkes, *Introduction to Manuscript Studies* provides an incomparable *vade mecum*. The authors have taken full advantage of modern digital technology and printing advances, and the result is a book that is a delight to peruse, with manuscript images drawn from the Newberry Library (primarily), the Parker Library at Corpus Christi College, and the British Library. This is a volume that all students of manuscripts and the Middle Ages will wish to have on their shelves.

Francis X. Gumerlock has published *The Seven Seals of the Apocalypse: Medieval Texts in Translation* (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications, Western Michigan UP), a translation of an assortment of late antique and medieval commentaries concerning the proper interpretation of the seven seals mentioned in the Book of Revelation (Rev 5–8). Authors include Cassiodorus and Joachim de Fiore, Caesarius of Arles

and Peter Auriol, Vital du Four and Giovanni Nanni, Hugh of St. Cher, Nicholas of Gorran, and Apringius of Beja. Two texts on Revelation have been attributed to Alcuin over the years. One is found in Vatican, BAV Vaticanus latinus 651, and was first edited by Cardinal Mai in an 1837 edition, and was also released as *Patrologia Latina* 100: 1085–1156. This text relies most heavily on Ambrosius Autpert (as studied by Thomas W. Mackay), and Alcuin's authorship has been questioned by Ann Matter (in "The Pseudo-Alcuinian 'De Septem Sigillis': An Early Latin Apocalypse Exegesis," *Traditio* 36 [1980]: 111–37), who has argued that the text dates from the late sixth or early seventh century and is Spanish in origin (others have suggested Irish, although this seems less likely). Anglo-Saxonists will be most interested in the (very) short excerpt from Alcuin's *Explanatio Apocalypsis*, an exegetical text found in Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 13581 (this manuscript is discussed at greater length by Mackay in "Apocalypse Comments by Primasius, Bede, and Alcuin: Interrelationship, Dependency, and Individuality," *Studia Patristica* [Louvain] 36 [2001]: 28–34). Given the lack of a more complete edition of this text, which (to my knowledge) remains unedited, it might be regretted that we do not have more in this book, although Gumerlock can hardly be blamed for not doing what was never his purpose. Bede's own commentary on the Book of Revelation is not included in this book, but Gumerlock has cross-referenced the relevant passages by Bede in his notes to Alcuin's text. Aside from the Anglo-Saxon angle, this book is a highly useful introduction and overview of a fascinating element in medieval prophecy, and the chosen texts, while brief, are wide-ranging and comprehensive. Gumerlock's book will be very useful to teachers of Apocalyptic or prophetic writings in numerous contexts.

Carine van Rhijn, author of several studies on Carolingian pastoral concerns (including *Shepherds of the Lord: Priests and Episcopal Statutes in the Carolingian Period*), has now turned her attention to the *Paenitentiale Pseudo-Theodori* (Turnhout: Brepols), a ninth-century penitential text comprised of fifty-two books in total: thirty-nine books of penitential prescriptions and thirteen more discursive texts, the first nine borrowed from Gregory's *Dialogues*. Despite a growing interest in penitentials in recent decades, the *Paenitentiale Pseudo-Theodori* has remained peculiarly unexamined: the last article devoted to the text was written by Walther von Hörmann in 1908. Anglo-Saxonists will be aware that Wulfstan of York seems to have owned a complete copy of the text (CCCC 190), and thus will be thankful that, thanks to van Rhijn and CCSL, a new edition has been

completed. The introduction covers matters of thematic organization, sources, techniques of compilation, and the presence of the classic penitential prescriptive style. Despite its attribution, the text is Frankish in origin, its earliest date of composition being 820/2, while its *terminus ante quem*, a more difficult matter, is probably the second third of the ninth century. Van Rhijn traces its provenance to the area between Rheims and Mainz. One distinctive attribute of the *Paenitentiale Pseudo-Theodori* is the choice of its compiler to avoid explicit references to authorities; these are rare, and a comparison with the source materials reveals that in many cases they have been removed. References to specific conciliar decrees are also rare, the *Collectio Dionysio-Hadriana* being the only canon so-cited, and not the *Collectio Vetus Gallica*, as might be expected, given the close connection between it and the *Excarpsis Cummeani*. The compiler of the text is a far more extensive borrower from earlier works than related penitentials, although he prefers substantial revision and energetic selection to mere paraphrase or quotation. The *Paenitentiale Pseudo-Theodori* clearly belongs to the tradition of “tariffed” penitentials, differing from those of Hrabanus Maurus and Halitgar, which are frequently concerned with more abstract concerns. The six manuscripts and one substantial excerpt are discussed and described, and van Rhijn admits to a conservative (or “faithful”) editorial approach. The base manuscript is the Berlin, MS Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, Phillipps 1750 (saec. ix 2/3, France), 16r–47v, which breaks off in Book XLIX (see Bischoff, *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften des neunten Jahrhunderts* I, 422). Helpfully, a concordance with Friedrich Wasserschleben’s 1851 edition is also provided.

Thomas O’Loughlin has written a very wonderful albeit unusual book (*Adomnán and the Holy Places: The Perceptions of an Insular Monk on the Locations of the Biblical Drama* [London: T & T Clark, 2007]). Its wonder is owing to the fact that the volume is, as the author acknowledges, the result of nearly twenty years of study and reflection upon a sole, relatively single-minded early medieval text, years which have enabled O’Loughlin to uncover previously unnoticed profundities in the *De locis sanctis* of Adomnán of Iona (d. 704). It is unusual because, in addition to the attention lavished upon what remains a rather obscure text, the volume is also a record of a historical theologian’s intellectual adventure. Readers are able, as we follow O’Loughlin’s arguments and insights, to see the pleasures and pitfalls of such pursuits. The work itself purports to be the records of the travels of a certain Arculf of Gaul, who wandered through various lands including Sicily, Syria, Egypt,

and most crucially Palestine and Jerusalem, before returning to northern Europe to give an accounting of his journeys. O’Loughlin is at pains to correct several long-standing but erroneous approaches to Adomnán’s text, ones that have read it as a mere traveler’s account of the Holy Land or as a fairly transparent locus for Late Antique geographical knowledge. He argues that the *De locis sanctis* is rather part of a specifically theological genre of writing known as topographical exegesis, whose tradition stretches back to St. Jerome, and which requires readers to take on a different mindset. The figure of Arculf shifts from a primary eyewitness to Palestine, whose travels Adomnán merely records as a scribe, to a necessary sort of compositor’s construct, whose perhaps real-life travels serve as inspiration for Adomnán’s more intellectually ambitious task of creating a “sacred topography.” This form of exegetical literature seeks to make clear the connections between the present and the sacred past, through close attention to the scriptural and historical significance of sacred places, one that includes onomastic, hagiographic, textual, and historical analysis. Having established the concerns of this genre, and having firmly placed *De locis sanctis* within it, O’Loughlin proceeds to unpack certain questions that have not previously been asked of the text, such as how it reveals the theological concerns of Adomnán and what we can learn about a seventh-century theologian’s understanding of the cosmos. He proceeds to set before the reader certain examples and show how previous (too-literal) readings offered a facile (phenomenological) interpretation, rather than the more-nuanced theological reading that Adomnán was (probably) intending. While the arguments are convincing, one sometimes gets the feeling that the O’Loughlin is fighting old conflicts. One drawback of the book, as noted by another reviewer (Roy Flechner, *Irish Theological Quarterly* 73: 404) is the rather myopic focus upon Adomnán and his patristic heritage, to the near-exclusion of references to any contemporaneous Irish tradition. The author admits to this narrowness (113), but it is clear that his purpose is to show Adomnán’s connection to a patristic exegetical tradition rather than to situate him comparatively within an insular milieu. As a result, it is difficult to know for sure how much of such “sacred topography” would have been familiar to an insular audience, and how much would have been considered novel. Nevertheless, the book remains rich with insight, and although much of it has appeared previously in journals (O’Loughlin cites forty-seven of his own essays and chapters), its appearance in monograph form should prove stimulating to anyone with an interest in the seventh century.

Richard William Pfaff's *The Liturgy in Medieval England: A History* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP) deserves both praise and awe for the volume of material presented and the mastery of its handling. The greatest strength of this book, Pfaff's probably unrivalled familiarity with and expertise in liturgical manuscripts, massbooks, and other essential primary sources, is lessened somewhat in the chapters on Anglo-Saxon liturgy, partly because, as Pfaff himself admits, these chapters are more dependent than later ones upon the interpretations of other scholars and hindered by a scarcity of resources, especially for the earliest period of the Anglo-Saxon church. He is selective with his citations, noting the work of Lapidge, Keynes, Bischoff, Cubitt, Marsden, Blair, Bullough, Foot, Nicholas Orchard, Drew Jones, Kornexl, and others, and offering some cautious suppositions of his own. Chapters two and three deal with the history of the Anglo-Saxon liturgy and consider the Northumbrian evidence and the tenth- and eleventh-century evidence respectively, prior to the Conquest. The evidence prior to 670 is scant indeed, and Pfaff notes the numerous questions that remain unanswered. The importance of the liturgical materials brought to England on the Augustinian mission is well-established, but we cannot know how long they were used or how widely they were disseminated. Similarly, the narrative offered by Bede is likewise essential, but Pfaff reserves the possibility that Bede could have been guilty of projecting liturgical conditions of his own day, with which he was most familiar, upon preceding generations. Pfaff surveys the evidence offered by the council at *Clofesho*, and the York of Ecgbert and Alcuin. In chapter three, Pfaff gives due attention to the work of John Blair, who has set the study of minster churches on secure footing, and clarifies the slender evidence offered us by the Durham Collectar and the liturgical marginalia found in the Old English Bede (CCCC 41, saec. xi). Other topics include the A and B strands of the Leofric missal, the manuscripts associated with Athelstan, the writings of Wulfstan and Ælfric, and the significant contributions of Æthelwold, especially the *Regularis Concordia*. Fitting space is given as well to Ælfric's instructions to the monks at Eynsham, a discussion notably dependent upon Jones's edition and commentary. Pfaff notes the lack of evidence during this period for observance of the secular office. Chapter four discusses the advent of the Norman period and the "cross fertilizations" that occurred as a result, with primary discussions of Lanfranc's *Constitutions*, St. Augustine's sacramentary (CCCC 270, dated 1093), and the so-called Giso sacramentary. Pfaff then turns again to Leofric and

the continuing development of the liturgy during the eleventh century. While the specifically Anglo-Saxon era ends here, there are fifteen chapters altogether, and although extant evidence related to liturgical practice becomes more prevalent, Pfaff never loses control of his technical material, or of the numerous strands that make up his complex and magnificent history. This is a demanding book, one that makes clear to its readers the considerable knowledge they should possess before they start (pp. 5–8), and that extensive familiarity with one or more liturgical texts will also be necessary in order to follow the arguments in many places; nevertheless, the text will prove fundamental in any study of church practice and liturgical convention, and all scholars of medieval England should consult it.

AA

Works Not Seen

- Alcamesi, Filippa. "The *Sibylline Acrostic* in Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: The Augustinian Text and Other Versions." *Foundations of Learning: The Transfer of Encyclopaedic Knowledge in the Early Middle Ages*. Eds. Bremmer and Dekker. pp. 147-73.
- Baxter, Philip. *Sarum Use: The Ancient Customs of Salisbury*. Reading: Spire Books, 2008. 118 pp.
- Beitia, Philippe. "Les personnages des Évangiles dans les Martyrologes Latins." *Bulletin du Cange* 67 (2009), 129-59.
- Biedermann-Pasques, Liselotte. "Matérialité des caractères, règles d'orthographe, théories de l'écrit dans le Tractatus orthographie gallicane (XIIIe et XIVE-XVe siècle)." *Latin écrit—roman oral?: de la dichotomisation à la continuité*. Corpus Christianorum: Lingua patrum 5. Eds. Marieke Van Acker, Rika Van Deyck and Marc Van Uytfanghe. Turnhout: Brepols, 2008. pp. 105-14. [Alcuin's *De orthographia*]
- Bremmer, "The Reception of Defensor's *Liber scintillarum* in Anglo-Saxon England." ...*un tuo serto di fiori in man recando. Scritti in onore di Maria Amalia D'Aronco*. 2 vols. Eds. Silvana Serafin and Patrizia Lendinara. 2 vols. Undine: Forum, 2008. pp. 75-89.
- Brown, George Hardin. "The St. Petersburg Bede: Sankt-Peterburg, Publichnaja Biblioteka, MS. lat. Q.v.I.18." *Anglo-Saxons and the North*. Eds. Kilpiö, Kahlas-Tarkka, Roberts, and Timofeeva. [see sect. 2] pp. 121-29.
- Casiday, Augustine M. C. "Royal Virgins: Aldhelm of Malmesbury's Use of the *Passio Sancti Thomae*." *Studia Patristica* 39 (2006), 301-06.
- Chardonnens, László Sándor. "Context, Language, Date, and Origin of Anglo-Saxon Prognostics." *Foundations*

- of Learning: *The Transfer of Encyclopaedic Knowledge in the Early Middle Ages*. Eds. Bremmer and Dekker. pp. 317-40.
- Darby, Peter Nicholas. "Bede's Eschatological Thought." Ph.D. Diss. Univ. of Birmingham, 2009. [uk.bl.ethos.512431]
- DeGregorio, Scott. "Bede and Benedict of Nursia." *Early Medieval Studies in Memory of Patrick Wormald*. Eds. Baxter, et al. [see sect. 2] pp. 149-63.
- Dekker, Kees. "Anglo-Saxon Encyclopaedic Notes: Tradition and Function." *Foundations of Learning: The Transfer of Encyclopaedic Knowledge in the Early Middle Ages*. Eds. Bremmer and Dekker. pp. 279-316.
- Di Sciacca, Claudia. "The Manuscript Tradition, Presentation and Glossing of Isidore's *Synonyma* in Anglo-Saxon England: The Case of CCCC 448, Harley 110 and Cotton Tiberius A.iii." *Foundations of Learning: The Transfer of Encyclopaedic Knowledge in the Early Middle Ages*. Eds. Bremmer and Dekker. pp. 95-124.
- Dräger, Paul. *Alcuini Vita sancti Willibrordi: Das Leben des heiligen Willibrord*. Trier: Kliomedia, 2008. 219 pp. ill. map.
- . "St. Willibrord als ambulanter Wunderheiler in Trier: Alkuin und Thiofrid, *Vita Sancti Willibrordi*." *Kurtrierisches Jahrbuch* 48 (2008), 219 pp. ill. map.
- Dumitrescu, Irina A. "The Grammar of Pain in Ælfric Bata's Colloquies." *Forum for Modern Language Studies* 45 (2009), 239-53.
- Ferrand, Lin. "The Hydrologic Cycle in Bede's *De natura rerum*." *The Nature and Function of Water, Baths, Bathing, and Hygiene from Antiquity through the Renaissance*. Technology and Change in History 11. Eds. Cynthia Kosso and Anne Scott. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2009. 361-80.
- Fisher, Verity. "Muscular Sanctity? Masculine Christian Ideals in Anglo-Saxon Latin Texts." *Jnl of the Australian Medieval Association* 5 (2009), 21-34.
- Foot, Sarah. "Anglo-Saxon 'Purgatory.'" *Studies in Church History* 45 (2009), 87-96.
- Gallagher, Robert. "Aediluulf's *De abbatibus*: A Soteriological Reading." *Quaestio Insularis* 9 (2009), 129-43.
- Guglielmetti, Rossana Eugenia. "Il commento al Cantico dei Cantici Alcuino nel ms. Barcelona, Arixiu Capitular de la Catedral 64." *Rendiconti dell'Istituto lombardo di scienze e lettere: Classe di lettere, scienze morali e storiche* 139 (2008 for 2005), 395-416.
- Hewish, Juliet. "Sulpicius Severus and the Medieval Vita Martini." *Peritia* 20 (2008), 28-58.
- Holopainen, Toivo J. "The *Proslogion* in Relation to the *Monologion*." *Heythrop Journal* 50 (2009), 590-602.
- Howlett, David. "Two Latin Epitaphs." *Bulletin du Cange* 67 (2009), 235-47.
- Judic, Bruno. "Grégoire le Grand, Alcuin et l'idéologie carolingienne." *Le monde carolingien: bilan, perspectives, champs de recherches: actes du colloque international de Poitiers, Centre d'Études supérieures de Civilisation médiévale, 18-20 novembre 2004*. Eds. Wojciech Falkowski and Yves Sassier. Turnhout: Brepols, 2009. pp. 105-20.
- Lauletta, Mario. "Alcuino, il cuculo e l'amicizia: Lettera e interpretazione del carme 57 di Alcuino di York." *Vichiana* 9 (2007), 68-89.
- Lendinara, Patrizia. "The *Versus de die iudicii*: Its Circulation and Use as a School Text in Late Anglo-Saxon England." *Foundations of Learning: The Transfer of Encyclopaedic Knowledge in the Early Middle Ages*. Eds. Bremmer and Dekker. pp. 175-212.
- Lenz, Karmen. "Liturgical Readings of the Cathedral Office for Saint Cuthbert." *Heroic Age* 12 (May 2009), online.
- Livljanic, Katarina. "Abbo Abbas: polyphonies françaises et anglaise de l'an mil." Ambronay: Ambronay Editions (distributed by Harmonia Mundi), 2009. [sound recording]
- Martín Rodríguez, Antonia María. "Lenguas en contacto y problemas interlingüísticos en la 'Historia ecclesiastica' de Beda." *Latin vulgaire—latin tardif VIII: actes du VIIIe Colloque international sur le latin vulgaire et tardif, Oxford, 6-9 septembre 2006*. Ed. Roger Wright. Hildesheim: Olms-Weidmann, 2008. pp. 445-52.
- McKitterick, Rosamond. "The Migration of Ideas in the Early Middle Ages: Ways and Means." *Foundations of Learning: The Transfer of Encyclopaedic Knowledge in the Early Middle Ages*. Eds. Bremmer and Dekker. pp. 1-17.
- Montefusco, Lucia Calboli. "Alcuino: un maestro di retorica dell'alto medioevo." *Retorica ed educazione delle élites nell'antica Roma: atti della VI Giornata ghisleriana di filologia classica, Pavia, 4-5 aprile 2006*. Studia ghisleriana. Pavia: Collegio Ghislieri, 2008. pp. 237-50.
- Muñoz García de Iturrospe, María Teresa. "El uso de la Biblia en el tratado 'De schematibus et tropis' de Beda." *Helmántica* 57 (2006), 331-50.
- Murray, Alexander. "Bede and the Unchosen Race." *Power and Identity in the Middle Ages: Essays in Memory of Rees Davies*. Eds. Huw Pryce, John Watts, and John Davies. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2007. pp. 52-67.
- Ricciardi, Alberto. "Dal 'palatium' di Aquisgrana al cenobio di Saint-Martin: Le nozioni di 'ordo' e 'correctio' in Alcuino di York tra l'esperienze della 'renovatio' carolingia e i primi anni del soggiorno a Tours."

- Bulletino dell'Istituto storico italiano per Medio Evo* (Rome) 110 (2008), 3-55.
- Savigni, Raffaele. "Israele, la chiesa e le genti nei due commenti di Beda agli Atti degli apostoli." *Studi di storia del Cristianesimo*. Le tessere 16. Eds. Luigi Canetti and Alba Maria Orselli. Ravenna: Longo, 2008. pp. 153-80.
- Schipper, William. "Hrabanus Maurus in Anglo-Saxon England: *In honorem sanctae crucis*." *Early Medieval Studies in Memory of Patrick Wormald*. Eds. Baxter, et al. [see sect. 2] pp. 283-98.
- Sharpe, Richard. "Anselm as Author: Publishing in the Late Eleventh Century." *Journal of Medieval Latin* 19 (2009), 1-87.
- Spurrell, Mark. "Children in the Monastic Liturgy of the Earlier Middle Ages." *Downside Review* 127 (2009), 127-38.
- Stephenson, Rebecca. "Aelfric of Eynsham and Hermeneutic Latin: 'Meatim Sed et Rustica' Reconsidered." *Jnl of Medieval Latin* 16 (2006), 111-41.
- Szerwiniack, Olivier. "Quel manuscrit James Ware a-t-il transcrit dans son édition princeps de la lettre de Bède le Vénérable à Egbert?" *Parva pro magnis munera: études de littérature tardo-antique et médiévale offertes à François Dolbeau par ses élèves*. Instrumenta patristica et mediaevalia 51. Ed. Monique Goullet. Turnhout: Brepols, 2009. pp. 345-54.
- Taviani-Carozzi, Huguette. "Exemplarité de l'histoire: Bède le Vénérable, Adémar de Chabannes et Raoul Glaber." *Histoire, fiction, représentation*. 21st Century COE Program International Conference Series 8. Eds. Claude Carozzi and Shoichi Sato. Nagoya: Nagoya Univ., Graduate School of Letters, 2007. pp. 39-48.
- Thacker, Alan. "Bede, the Britons and the Book of Samuel." *Early Medieval Studies in Memory of Patrick Wormald*. Eds. Baxter, et al. [see sect. 2] pp. 129-47.

6. Manuscripts, Illuminations Charters

■ General Considerations

Two major works this year are the long-awaited Lyell Lectures of 1999 by Malcolm Parkes, and the collection of essays edited by Gale Owen-Crocker that addresses Anglo-Saxon manuscripts from the point of view of pedagogy. The new book by Parkes, *Their Hands Before Our Eyes: A Closer Look at Scribes: The Lyell Lectures Delivered in the University of Oxford, 1999* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), is a treasure-chest of information, of stunning ideas, of clarifications and details. About half of each page offers detailed footnotes, often pursuing their own argument and offering incidental insights, riches in and of themselves. The book also has over forty pages of arcana, including a glossary of technical terms applied to handwriting, indexes of scribes and manuscripts, and sixty-nine full-page black and white plates (yes, it is best always to start a book at the back). At the front of this one, Parkes adds three sections on scribes in their environments before getting to the meat of his analysis of individual movements of the scribe's pen and how that enables the identification of the handwriting of individual scribes. Sadly, there is not a lot for Anglo-Saxonists here, save perhaps as detailed background information. The first thirty-three plates are Latin, the next seventeen largely in late medieval vernaculars (English and French), and the last eighteen are a largely Latin sequence starting with late Antique inscriptions—only plate 56 offers an Old English example, from Oxford, Corpus Christi College MS 197, although several Latin texts copied in Anglo-Saxon England also figure in the plates. While only two chapters are directly relevant to Anglo-Saxonists, the very first chapter is among the blessed as it considers scribes and their environment before 1100 (3–13). It starts with Cicero, delineating the late Roman methods of copying and disseminating texts, moves on to booksellers and monastic communities, carefully considers scriptoria as opposed to work-places for scribes, and links the scriptorium as an historical phenomenon to its palaeographical symptoms (9). Issues of house style are relevant in the south of Italy, differently in Wearmouth-Jarrow, and differently again in a bishop's household, among cathedral clergy, or in the work of a parish priest. Over this

period the work of copying books, originally a menial task, became respected work.

The next two chapters consider religious and secular scribes in England after the Conquest; having established the sociocultural and historical conditions in which scribes worked, Parkes turned, in the second part of the book, to scribes at work, beginning with a study of the scribe at work copying Caroline Minuscule, then considering cursive handwriting focusing on New Roman Cursive. Chapter 6 addresses set hands from 800 to 1200 (87–100), analyzing first the manuscripts produced for Hincmar of Rheims between 845 and 882 and, drawing from them detailed conclusions about how each scribe developed an individual interpretation of the set hand, established a personal equilibrium between style and function. Parkes performs a similar analysis for twelfth-century Canterbury, before looking at Rochester at the turn of the twelfth century (notably the scribe of the *Textus Roffensis*), and then considering the “native” tradition of Caroline Minuscule as used at Cirencester in the same century. Chapter 7 considers the changing fashions of script from 1200 to 1500 and in the last chapter Parkes exhaustively surveys the history of handwriting, the hierarchy of scripts as used by Anglo-Saxon and Carolingian scribes, as well as the use of different scripts for the design of the page—Parkes terms this “handwriting as image” in order to emphasize the appearance of the script and the page, another balance of style and function (127–45).

As her brief introduction indicates, Gale Owen-Crocker put together her edited collection, *Working with Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts* (Exeter: U of Exeter P), as a practical guide for senior students and young or inexperienced scholars to manuscripts produced or owned in Anglo-Saxon England (“Introduction,” 1–5). In the first of eight chapters, Owen-Crocker and Maria Cesario address “Handling Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts” (7–27). There are numerous anecdotes and comments about the joys of turning the pages of a manuscript, along with advice about what to take to look at a manuscript and how to obtain permission to examine the original. Many examples clarify the need to see the codex; footnotes are kept to a bare minimum, perhaps too bare and out of date in some respects (and the idea that manuscripts are generally kept climate-controlled

at 80° Celsius seems improbable [p. 1]). The authors seem perhaps unduly unhappy with editors, charging them with all manner of misdemeanors and felonies in the representation of the text; sometimes even the greatest desire to look at a manuscript could and should be curbed by the custodians of the manuscript: the authors seem sometimes unhappy with these overworked and underpaid individuals as well. Though it may well be preferable to look at a manuscript before publishing an argument based on a manuscript reading, we do also have a responsibility as scholars to curtail our access, to recognize that our desire to check a detail has to be weighed by manuscript librarians against the effects on the manuscript; it is a point that the authors make, but very briefly indeed, which makes some sense given the context of this handbook. In the second chapter, Alexander R. Rumble considers “The Construction and Writing of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts” (29–59), briefly explaining dating conventions, bindings, the construction of pages and quires, scripts (with many useful examples for practice transcription), punctuation, and other elements of the manuscript page. His concluding remarks offer some pointers on the identification of scribes and comments on glosses, decoration, and matters relevant to provenance. Many useful examples get brief mention in this chapter.

The next three chapters enact a classic division of Anglo-Saxon manuscripts: Old English prose, Old English poetry, and Latin manuscripts; in many ways these chapters overlap with the first two chapters. Donald Scragg assesses “Manuscript Sources of Old English Prose” (61–87) with many useful examples, including a section on scribal care and scribal error and sections on scriptoria and scribes, as well as decoration and marginalia. Elaine Treharne addresses “Manuscript Sources of Old English Poetry” (89–111), beginning with the presentation of poetry in the manuscript as against the edited texts and continuing with issues of punctuation, details of the four libraries which hold the four major poetic codices and their attitudes to scholars requesting these manuscripts, the chances of survival, and the beginnings and ends of texts. She discusses each of the major codices and ends with a brief analysis of Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 201, and the presentation of the poetic texts there. In chapter five, Gernot Wieland has perhaps a more promising topic, “A Survey of Latin Manuscripts” (113–57), and takes full advantage of his opportunity, with many illustrations not previously seen and some very useful lists of materials relevant for scholars of the Latinity of Anglo-Saxon England. Working from Gneuss’s *Handlist*, Wieland considers the Latin manuscripts, including

those from the eighth century that are occasionally thought to be Continental productions and only those from after the Conquest that replicate material already copied and available earlier in Anglo-Saxon England. He divides them into Biblical manuscripts (with a nice analysis of gospel book production by century); liturgical manuscripts of the Mass including homilies, saints’ lives, and exegetical or theological works, then of the Office (psalters rightly appear under both the Office and the Bible); manuscripts containing monastic rules and related texts; historical manuscripts; classroom manuscripts first of the *trivium* and then of the *quadrivium*; and practical works including geographical and medical texts. Wieland offers both survey and analysis of the material, with precise short statements about what texts are found where, along with any unusual features, and carves a new path through his field. This chapter alone is worth the price of admission to the book.

Timothy Graham follows Wieland with another massive assignment, in his case “Glosses and Notes in Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts” (159–203). Graham’s approach is slightly different, as he introduces a category of manuscript, such as the manuscripts with full interlinear gloss, passes under review the full range of such texts, and discusses a few manuscripts in greater detail—for this group, the Vespasian, Cambridge, and Eadwine Psalters, and the Lindisfarne Gospels in some detail. The rest of the manuscripts glossed during the Anglo-Saxon period are presented by way of the types of texts that attracted glossing, the range of kinds of glosses including “paving letters,” glosses copied from an exemplar or otherwise planned, and the manner of production of the gloss (such as drypoint or scratched glosses with a stylus, and methods of discovering them). Graham then turns more briefly to collections of glosses and glossaries, medieval glosses post-dating the Anglo-Saxon period (especially those in Worcester Cathedral graced by the Tremulous Hand, who garners several pages of commentary), early modern glosses and annotations by Robert Talbot, Lawrence Nowell, John Joscelyn, William L’Isle, and Abraham Wheelock. As Graham points out, in the Anglo-Saxon period the general approach was to gloss Latin manuscripts with Old English, while afterwards the general approach was to gloss Anglo-Saxon manuscripts with Latin.

Catherine E. Karkov wrestles with the topic of “Manuscript Art” (205–51), a job made more difficult by the fact that, as Karkov points out, “there is no norm when it comes to Anglo-Saxon manuscript illumination” (201). Nonetheless, she soldiers on, beginning with a general consideration of periodicity and style, then

some of the various interactions of image and text. She continues with some examples of illuminated scriptural and liturgical books; non-liturgical illuminated manuscripts including the New Minster Charter, calendars, and texts such as the “Wonders of the East” under the rubric of the unknown world; and, briefly, literary texts. Finally, Stuart D. Lee and Daniel Paul O’Donnell together tackle the modern era of Anglo-Saxon manuscript studies in “From Manuscript to Computer” (253–84). The images at the beginning of their chapter are very useful diagrams demonstrating how to hold a camera for good image capture and, by the end, showing good examples from various websites—but they are at a severe disadvantage by comparison with the other authors in the handbook. Nonetheless, Lee and O’Donnell admirably explain the way in which digitization can help to resolve “the great weakness of manuscript culture: each object is unique and (literally) irreplaceable” (253). They explain the process, elucidate the benefits and drawbacks of digitization, and then explain methods of using and presenting the material: the simulation model in which the user accesses all the image files of a particular manuscript in sequence, with zoom, or the edition model with images linked to a full edition of the text. They cogently note the continuing problem that the image can be separated from its metadata, especially on the internet, and offer the emerging solutions of adding either visible or hidden information (or both) to it. In the final pages they discuss Optical Character Recognition software, mark-up languages—particularly the case against WYSIWYG and structural mark-up languages (HTML, XML)—and the Text Encoding Initiative. Creating a digital text involves choosing a mark-up language, capturing the textual information of the manuscript in some detail, adding collations, and establishing other editorial materials in order to produce a fully-coded and customized text in the TEI model. Circling back to their original point, however, Lee and O’Donnell note that the quality of the final product depends on the quality of the initial capture.

This book is a handbook, really almost a textbook, and provides many relevant elements of the textbook, including brief introductions before each chapter, a series of manuscript illustrations with extended description of the significant features of the page and the manuscript, and highlighted sections with practical information for the young reader: for example, a table about obtaining manuscript images, what not to do in a manuscript library, a list of exegetical and theological texts available in England before 1066, and a list of early Christian and late Antique authors in Anglo-Saxon

manuscripts. These are perforce simplified lists and sets of instructions, but they are helpful and useful. A great strength of the book is the remarkably high quality of the production, in that 114 images are placed, often in color, precisely where they are needed on the page to aid in the exposition (Wieland and Karkov garner the most color, including quite a few full-page and unusual illustrations)—and yet the price is reasonable. The volume is highly professional, with excellent proofreading and very useful ancillary materials: a list of further reading, glossary, general index, and an index of manuscripts. This is an impressive summary of current knowledge and teaching text, doing precisely what it aims to do. Here and there, it also does more.

This year’s bibliography also offers two excellent summary studies relevant to the field in *The Cambridge History of Libraries in Britain and Ireland: Volume 1 to 1640*, ed. Elisabeth Leedham-Green and Teresa Webber (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2006). Richard Gameson considers the physical settings, the outer fabric and structure, in “The Medieval Library (to c. 1450),” (13–50) and David Ganz addresses the materials within the library in “Anglo-Saxon England” (91–108). Gameson picks his way through the dribs and drabs of evidence for the *armarium* and *librarium*, for booklists and finding-lists, for the shifting needs of collections insufficiently reflected in a list marking but one moment in time, and for the books to be found in the cloister as opposed to a library room or the Spendement (store-room) or other cache. He adduces the evidence for the centrality of the cloister as the place for books, with its *almaria* (aumbrie), then the development of store-rooms first in Cistercian houses. The organization of the books on the bookshelves as they developed is also considered, with the occasional development, from the fourteenth century on, of location marks. Library rooms evolved at the colleges in Oxford and Cambridge, in imitation of the Sorbonne, taking into account issues of lighting, convenience of access to the room, lecterns and desks, and questions of security, including the chaining of individual books or their disposition in chests with two separate locks held by two different authorities. Chains were also in use in cathedrals and religious houses from the fourteenth century, before the library rooms of the fifteenth century and later. Decoration of these rooms could be impressive, often commemorating benefactors—since reconfiguring a library room was a costly, and highly infrequent, undertaking. Gameson closes by pointing out that continuity is the most significant element in the treatment of books and libraries, and that libraries at all times depended on donations. The chapter benefits from many plans

of medieval monasteries, cathedrals, and colleges, highlighting the book-rooms of these institutions, and from numerous diagrams and photos.

In his chapter, David Ganz also begins with the physical certainties of the *armarium* or *boccist*, noting that “for the five centuries before 1066 neither archaeology, history nor literary investigation can supply many certainties about what libraries may have been” (91). He then analyzes in sequence the surviving manuscripts, their creation and migration, especially by comparison with continental material; the booklists that are available; and the literary evidence and sources used by authors in Anglo-Saxon England. In effect, Ganz offers a conspectus of learning and libraries throughout the Anglo-Saxon period, moving from the texts mentioned or quoted in Alcuin’s poems on the bishops, kings, and saints of York in the eighth century to the texts used by the grammarian Æthelstan in the tenth century, as recorded in a list at St. Augustine, Canterbury. Individuals whose use can be gleaned (Ælfric, Byrhtferth) from their own writings and individuals who assembled book collections (Sæwold, Leofric) for themselves or for their institutions are canvassed in detail. The chapter is the best short introduction to learning and bookishness in Anglo-Saxon England, and should be much read and reprinted.

■ *Manuscript Linkages and Provenances*

Attempting to tease out the “hubs of interconnecting networks of operation” that produced manuscripts concerns Elaine Treharne in “Scribal Connections in Late Anglo-Saxon England,” *Texts and Traditions of Medieval Pastoral Care: Essays in Honour of Bella Millett*, ed. Cate Gunn and Catherine Innes-Parker (Woodbridge: York Medieval P), 29–46. Treharne discusses the production of manuscripts in English in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, focusing first on Worcester as one of her hubs and as the Anglo-Saxon scriptorium which has achieved the most scholarly consideration in the modern era. Possibly, Worcester and other houses in the west of England might have collaborated on issues such as the training of scribes and lending of manuscripts to copy—and even perhaps in the development of a regional script in play at many writing locations. According to Ker’s *Catalogue* some seventy-five scriptoria existed, places at which at least one manuscript was written. Moreover, clerics including Wulfstan and Leofric owned manuscripts individually and carried them about, and Leofric certainly set up his own scriptorium or writing office at Exeter and borrowed or acquired model books and other texts to copy in the 1050s and

1060s. This article could serve many purposes: it is a fine review of medieval scriptoria onward from the woe-laden comments of John Leland in the sixteenth century at their destruction, its footnotes admirably summarize and coordinate current scholarship in the field correcting many errors (including one by Treharne herself) and assessing current research, and she offers a useful caveat against the tendency to move from hints about localization to a specific center to certainty of that localization simply through the process of scholarly repetition (her principal example for this is the assignment of Cambridge, Corpus Christ College MS 322 to Worcester).

Rebecca Rushforth digs into the complicated issues of Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 272 in “The Script and Text of the Achadeus Psalter Gloss: Reusing Continental Materials in Eleventh-century England,” *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 14.2: 89–114. Written in the outer, inner, upper, and lower margins, the Latin gloss added freehand to the Achadeus Psalter dates, following a suggestion of David Dumville, to the two middle quarters of the eleventh century. Rushforth distinguishes the hands of four glossators, defines their individual characteristics and their stints, and determines that the script is English. The gloss appears to come from a single exemplar, much of it a version of Cassiodorus’s *Expositio Psalmorum* which most closely corresponds to what Rushforth terms the St. Gall psalter gloss; the closest parallel to the gloss in Corpus 272 is St. Gall 27. Where necessary Cassiodorus’s Roman readings are altered to the Gallican psalter, and about one-third of the glossing material derives from Jerome or pseudo-Jerome. Finally, the manuscript appears to have been disbound when the gloss was added, so that up to four scribes could work at the same time; Rushforth identifies other manuscripts disbound during the Anglo-Saxon period, and posits that the exemplar was only briefly available as an explanation for the haste in copying. She considers possible locations for the copying of the gloss and while she slightly favors Canterbury, with Winchester and Abingdon also in the running, there is no definitive evidence. This exegetical gloss on the psalms, rare evidence of higher-level study of the psalter in Anglo-Saxon England, demonstrates English copying of a gloss developed in southern Germany into a manuscript produced at Rheims—work both cosmopolitan and intelligent.

■ *Details, Numbers, Letters in Various Manuscripts*

“The Irish Role in the Origins of the Old English Alphabet: A Re-assessment,” by Patrick P. O’Neill,

Anglo-Saxon/Irish Relationships Before the Vikings, ed. Graham-Campbell and Ryan [see sec. 7], 3–22, reconsiders the controversial claim of Marjorie Daunt, as partially accepted by Alistair Campbell, for an Old Irish origin of Old English orthography. O'Neill carves through the evidence, the faults, and the fissures in the arguments, determining what evidence has come to light since Campbell did his assessment (the Leiden Glossary, the Grimm Fragments, and other glosses from Canterbury between 670 and 695) and clarifying the errors made in Campbell's assumptions about the Épinal, Erfurt, and Corpus glossaries. The Latin alphabet of the late grammarian Donatus matches well with the Old English alphabet generated by the earliest texts, but for details O'Neill compares the Frankish, Welsh, and Irish alphabets. The closest connections are to the Irish as a result of processes of fronting, in the use of the digraphs <ch, th> to represent spirants, in the use of bivalent symbols, and in the doubling of a vowel to indicate length in both languages. Working out the details is difficult as both languages were to some extent in flux in the seventh century, although the Old English alphabet appears to have solidified before the third quarter of that century—perhaps, O'Neill suggests, in Ireland where Anglo-Saxons were studying at that time. The openings of History of the English Language texts will have to be revised, as will bibliographies for papers on English orthography and phonetics, even if the authors consider Northumbria or Canterbury as more likely sites for the development of the Old English alphabet than Ireland.

Rebecca Rushforth toils in a different field, focusing on two sets of flyleaves representing texts not otherwise known in Anglo-Saxon England and in “Two Fragmentary Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts at St. John's College, Cambridge,” *Scriptorium* 63: 73–78. The six flyleaves (three before and three after the main text, a collection of fifteenth-century grammatical tracts) in Cambridge, St John's College, MS F.10 (147) are sections from Alcuin's *In evangelium Iohannis*, commenting on chapters 13 and 18 from the gospel; they are all written by a single scribe in Anglo-Caroline minuscule Style II in a large-format book with two columns per page. These sections do not correspond with those apparently available to Ælfric, but they do demonstrate that this text was available in Anglo-Saxon England. The single folded folio which produces a bifolium at the beginning of Cambridge, St John's College MS F. 27 (164) is another large page, this one somewhat later of the mid-eleventh century, written according to Rushforth at St. Augustine's Canterbury. The main manuscript is a compilation of texts about St. Benedict, from the

tenth or early eleventh century; the fragment is “from a commentary on Donatus's *Ars grammatica*” (77), previously edited in *Commentum Einsidlense* after the Einsiedeln manuscript from Rheims used as the base text. Grammatical teaching continued in eleventh-century England.

Also interested in what some small details reveal is Daniel Anlezark in “Understanding Numbers in London, British Library, Harley 3271,” *ASE* 38: 137–55. Harley 3271 is a schoolbook which includes a series of notes on numerical issues that have complex relationships to other Anglo-Saxon notes and sets of notes. Fourteen different hands of the same scriptorium worked on the manuscript; Anlezark focuses on Scribe C (based on the characterization of hands by Chardonnens), a scribe whose added notes demonstrate some consistency of focus and intent. Anlezark presents transcriptions and translations of Chardonnens's notes on *De triginta argenteus*, *Noes arc*, on Solomon's gold in question and answer format, and three texts at the end of the manuscript, two of them excerpts from Ælfric's *Libellus* (on an extended conversion story from the acts of John as told by Jerome which is really an account of divine mercy for schoolboys who refuse to submit to their teachers and learn properly and on the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus), and lastly, possibly an “autograph composition” (151). The date of Easter (not the reckoning given in the piece) suggests a date for this text of 1032, which may be a date for the manuscript as well. Anlezark notes in several of these pieces focus on the Jews and on calculation; in the last piece the building of Solomon's Temple is highly prominent. Anlezark concludes that Scribe C was involved in the compilation of the manuscript, had an interest in pedagogy, and a particular interest in Jerusalem and the Jewish people's place in history.

Offering a vastly-improved version of the text of the thirteenth-century Northumberland Bestiary over the poor manuscript facsimile produced by the Roxburghe Club is Cynthia White's *From the Ark to the Pulpit: An Edition and Translation of the “Transitional” Northumberland Bestiary (13th Century)* (Louvain-la-Neuve: Université Catholique de Louvain). The Old English bestiary materials and Latin *Physiologus* tradition in England appear only as scholarly references in the notes to the whale and the phoenix, however. The introduction is brief but solid in its careful explication of the complicated bestiary tradition. The Latin text has a facing page translation and each section of the bestiary has its own immediately following section of notes. The appendices cover material missed in this bestiary, there are several indices, and the edition concludes with

twenty-nine pages of black and white illustrations from this beautiful manuscript. In the introduction, White notes that the miniatures demonstrate the tinted line and tinted wash technique used in England from the tenth to the thirteenth centuries.

Another work which includes Anglo-Saxon texts for the light they cast on other materials is Kenny Louwen, "Zur Lesart und Hybridität der altniederländischen Federprobe," *Amsterdamer Beiträge zur älteren Germanistik* 65: 61–86. The paper is an extended and detailed consideration of *probatio pennae* in which appear to be Old Dutch or possibly Old English. The focus is the famous bit beginning *Hebban olla vogala* found in MS Bodley 342, first published by Kenneth Sisam in 1933; Louwen considers other editions and discussions, variant versions of the clause, and then analyzes the forms and variants of each word in it for possible hybridity of Old English and Old Netherlandish. Kwakkel's 2005 article on the historical perspective of the scribble offers Louwen a connection to Rochester (as previously noted by Sisam) and the possibility of there having been a Fleming there to make a series of later additions, mostly in Latin, on the final flyleaf to Bodley 342. After a detailed linguistic analysis, Louwen considers whether the *probatio pennae* might be an attempt to play with the language, or imitate it. The forms of the words are sometimes Anglo-Saxon, sometimes hybrid, and sometimes Old Dutch, and they suggest a kind of bilingualism.

Finally, Jennifer O'Reilly tackles the immense presence that is the Codex Amiatinus in "All that Peter Stands For: The *Romanitas* of the *Codex Amiatinus* Reconsidered," *Anglo-Saxon/Irish Relationships Before the Vikings*, ed. Graham-Campbell and Ryan [see sec. 7], 367–95. Her focus is the theory that the manuscript was made as a gift for Rome, so she works through the relevant elements of the codex: the patristic themes of the dedication to the body of St. Peter as *caput ecclesiae* and its careful use of the topos of the ends of the earth, the text itself and the antique images used with it, the frontispiece with its scribe dressed as an Old Testament priest—complete with head-dress and breastplate—and *armarium*, the association with Ezra as a former editor of the Old Testament (as discussed at some length by Isidore and Bede), the building up of the pandect as itself a kind of hypertextual edition of the divine scriptures, and the ecclesial and orthodox context of all the pandects produced at Wearmouth-Jarrow. O'Reilly argues that the frontispiece can be understood best as an Ark, that it contains the whole library of scripture, appearing at the front of a pandect which itself reveals the whole library of Christianity, the divine Word.

She argues that the codex contains "the Hebrew truth" (387), including as it does Jerome's prefaces, Jerome's Hebrew titles for various Old Testament books, the Hebrew Psalter, and its diagrams of the Pentateuch and the Tabernacle/Temple. She closely connects the volume to Bede, to patristic exegesis, and to current issues in scriptural interpretation as reflected in papal councils and synods, offering a detailed exposition of the planning and purpose of this important manuscript.

■ Charters

The indefatigable S. E. Kelly produced in 2009 her ninth edition of Anglo-Saxon Charters (the entire set of publications totals fourteen, which puts her contribution into focus): *Charters of Peterborough Abbey* (Oxford: Oxford UP). Nicholas Brooks notes in the introduction that this is the first volume moving into the Danelaw and also an area significant for the tenth-century monastic reform and for having a major monastery. Issues of religious continuity are important to historians; literary scholars will be interested in linguistic continuity in the boundary clauses as well. Even the introduction to this set of twenty-eight charters and three sets of memoranda is substantial. Perhaps the best way to introduce the riches of this volume is to follow a couple of texts through the treatment Kelly accords them: charters 3, surviving in a single copy with no descendants, and 16, with its six further developments. The introduction frames the entire history of Peterborough Abbey, using the charters and memoranda, sifting through the historical and material evidence from before and after the Conquest (Hugh Candidus is useful), and drawing careful conclusions. Item 3, for example, is one of a very few extant pre-Viking diplomatic records from a Danelaw minster, all of which survive only from Peterborough. This makes determining the history of the estates and the agriculture extremely difficult; even the ecclesiastical history is hard to follow. Kelly suggests that the Peterborough evidence offers a model for studying issues of continuity in the period. Item 16, a spurious diploma of Edgar, is carefully assessed and discounted as a fabrication, along with all its descendants. Its twelfth-century forger chose 972 as a date by which to ratify Æthelwold's activities and claims, an appropriate date for Edgar to confirm the refoundation—perhaps because of local knowledge. In the introduction, Kelly thus works through the history of Peterborough, then through that of the *Medeshamstede* colonies, and finally through the history of the archive. Separate sections then address the twelve relevant manuscripts, the authenticity of the charters, the landed endowment, and the abbots from Seaxwulf

of Medeshamstede to the enthusiastic pluralist Leofric who perhaps died of wounds incurred at Hastings and Brand, just after the Conquest. Each section is admirably self-consistent and coherent. The first text is a grant by Wulfhere, king of the Mercians, to St. Peter's, Medeshamstede, in 664, and the thirty-first is a list of benefactors of Peterborough whose first copy was from the early twelfth century.

Item 3, one of the few pre-Viking documents, is a grant of thirty hides to the minster at Medeshamstede from Æthelred, king of the Mercians. The memorandum, surviving in two Peterborough cartularies, confirms a grant in front of witnesses with a ceremony in the king's own room involving the placement of a sod of earth from the estate on a copy of the gospels. Kelly clarifies the arguments made by Frank Stenton with respect to this charter, offers in some detail the evidence that an earlier record underlies the document, discusses the symbolic use of a sod of earth in early English diplomas and on the Continent, discusses some problems with the wording that suggest it might be either a paraphrase or a construct, and discusses the place-name that marks the location of the grant (sadly, possibly not a "hill where lettuce grew" for *Leugttricum*). The spurious item 16 is the grant of what was formerly *Medeshamstede* but not called *Burch* (Peterborough) by Edgar, listing associated appurtenances, estates, lands, market control, toll-privileges, half of Whittlesey Mere, and a moneyer. This grant is confirmed in later charters by Edward, Æthelred, Cnut, Edward the Confessor, and William I, each with variations on the original. Unfortunately, as Kelly points out, the entire sequence is a forgery of the first two decades of the twelfth century. She nonetheless teases out the evidence, establishing where and how this charter and its confirmations were copied, discussing the earliest mention of the material in 1285 in Pro Warranto proceedings, the version of Hugh Candidus in his history, details of the manuscript copies and their relationships, the controversial *Historia Croylandensis* and its interesting variants, and the separate travels of the William I confirmation. The forger uses the existing Peterborough archive, especially charter 15, the grant by Edgar to Æthelwold of land at Barrow-upon-Humber for Peterborough Abbey (itself with some uncertainties), and perhaps other models. Kelly indicates the forger's care in choosing valuable appurtenances, and considers how these might have been picked or recognized; she then works through the details of all the estates mentioned, Whittlesey Mere and the perhaps ancient claim to half that the Peterborough community may have believed in, the market and toll monopoly (not listed in Domesday, nor in any pre-Conquest documentation),

and the confirmations, which added estates the Abbey acquired in the middle and late eleventh century—thereby adding verisimilitude to the claim. As item 16A, Kelly discusses the Old English paraphrase of the charter which appears in the manuscript of the Peterborough Chronicle, added in as part of the annal for 963, clarifying the changes made by the chronicler to the text. For example, instead of listing the right to free election of an abbot, the chronicler demonstrates it by discussing the careers of three abbots, all chosen from the monastery itself in a way that encapsulates the tradition. The work is meticulous, its implications substantial and wide-ranging in the field.

MJT

Those interested in a broad overview of the Anglo-Saxon manuscript production will welcome Richard Gameson's *The Earliest Books of Canterbury Cathedral: Manuscripts and Fragments to c. 1200* (London: The Bibliographical Society and The British Library, 2008). It provides the first catalogue and detailed descriptions of pre-thirteenth century manuscripts, leaves, and fragments currently housed in Canterbury Cathedral. The catalogue contains a useful and thorough introduction to the collection, divided into three parts. The first focuses on what can be gleaned from the surviving evidence about the interests and practices of book production during the roughly four centuries that the items catalogued were made. Though presently housed in Christ Church, many of the items catalogued here originated not in the Cathedral scriptoria but in other Kentish houses (St. Augustine's and Rochester in particular) and from various locations in England and on the continent. Gameson's overview surveys book production both before and after the Conquest, though the broad picture he provides will be most useful for general audiences (though professional historians and paleographers will certainly benefit). The second part of the Introduction examines the conditions that affected the survival of the evidence, that is the annotation, revision, scrapping, and recycling of earlier books in the later Middle Ages. Here, Gameson's discussions are particularly interesting, because of the very nature of the fragments, paste-downs, etc. in the Canterbury collection. This relatively unknown material provides a wealth of detail as Gameson applies his years of study and insight. The last section considers the impact of the Reformation, "a period of holocaust for manuscripts" (38), on the libraries of Canterbury and their collections. For those interested in the "lives" of manuscripts, Gameson's account of "the traumas of dismemberment and the rigours of life as paste-downs and wrappers,"

is informative, yet strangely affective, reminding one of how a medieval audience must have reacted to an account of the martyrdoms of the saints.

Another useful and informative survey can be found in Melanie Holcomb's *Pen and Parchment: Drawing in the Middle Ages* (New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art), which catalogues the exhibition of the same name held at the Metropolitan Museum from June 2–August 23, 2009. (Readers will want to note that the online material supporting this exhibition is still accessible on the Met's website.) Holcomb's introductory essay, "Strokes of Genius: The Draftsman's Art in the Middle Ages," provides a "history of drawing that focuses on its status as a distinctive and meaningful artistic choice" (4) beginning with the Carolingian era and running through approximately 1250. Holcomb frames her essay with the observation that "Drawing is at once the most basic form of visual expression and invention of a specific time and place" (3). By this she refers to the particularly human and "timeless compulsion to make pictures" (3) but noting that it is one particular period, the Renaissance, that has largely defined how we understand drawings to function as a "visible traces of the mind at work . . . revered remnants of a new kind of saint: the artist-genius" (3). In this sense Holcomb has to work against an understanding that is widely held in our culture and one that still guides production today and thus an understanding that defines and is used as a foil for the artistic processes of the Middle Ages. It is a signal of the thoughtfulness of her approach that several themes emerge from this study. In Holcomb's formulation, drawing emerges not only as a "foundation for projects intended to be completed in other media" but also as "a distinctive mode of representation, particularly favored by turns for its symbiotic relationship with the written word, for its evocation of the antique, for its didactic clarity, and for its seeming attestation of direct observation" (4).

Holcomb tells us that a history of drawing in the Middle Ages could start from several points of origin. She briefly considers such starting points as the reconstruction of the meager evidence surviving from late Antiquity or the history of trial pieces, preliminary sketches, or even "rudimentary figural drawings of the eighth century" found in the Durham Cassiodorus (Durham Cath. Lib. Ms. B.II.30, f 169v). She, however, chooses as her starting point two Carolingian manuscripts, the Corbie and the Utrecht Psalters. The drawn images of the Utrecht and Corbie Psalters "were eminently suited to the particular kind of partnership espoused by the book . . . the fruitful blurring of the boundaries of activities that we moderns perceive as

distinct: writing and illustrating, reading and seeing" (10). In the Corbie Psalter (made at Corbie in Picardy, France in the early ninth century), the incomplete state of its 156 images contributes to our appreciation of drawing. Up until folio 107, the initials are adorned with various combinations of green, yellow, pink and blue paint, "were it not for the considerable diminution of color that begins on that page . . . we might be less attuned to the significance of the role of drawing in the creation and conceptualization of the initials" (6). The initials are drawn in two different types, zoomorphs, shape-shifters and elegant interlace while others utilize human forms to define and fill in the figures. The latter are particularly affecting in that they "embody an exceptionally intimate relationship among words, pictures, and the evocation of sound" that, in the words of Lisa Bessette, "represent the monastic reader's engagement with the psalms, providing a model of reading, prayer, recitation, and meditation" (6).

The Utrecht Psalter presents a different approach, its 166 narrative ink drawings "assigns a picture to every psalm and canticle, with each illustration encapsulating in visual form the wide ranging verbal imagery of the psalm it precedes" (7). What is interesting about the Utrecht Psalter is its different and deliberate relationship of word and drawn image, i.e. the "literal illustration" of the Psalms in a characteristic, dynamic style. Holcomb emphasizes that there is no real precedent for the numerous drawn images; indeed, Van der Horst had proposed in an earlier study that the Utrecht Psalter's drawings were meant to have been painted, noting that paint signaled the completeness and finish appropriate to luxury manuscripts. Holcomb argues that at some point, "the decision to 'finish' the book as a series of drawings had to be grounded in a medieval sense of what was acceptable and appropriate" (9). Drawings within the Utrecht Psalter may have been meant to reference works such as the illustrated texts of Terence or Prudentius in such a way that many motifs (buildings, sprawling landscapes) are used as a deliberate antiquarianism (9).

Anglo-Saxonists will be most interested in Holcomb's discussion of the impact of the Utrecht Psalter, which was brought to England at least by the year 1000, on Anglo-Saxon artists and audiences. She reminds us that the intense and positive reception of the Utrecht Psalter's distinctive style and literal approach likely was based on an existing predilection for outline drawing. This is evident in the illustration added to the "Classbook" that once belonged to St. Dunstan's (Bod. Lib. MS Auct. F.4.32). Perhaps accomplished at the direction of Dunstan himself in the mid-ninth century,

the addition of this drawing to an earlier collection of texts is a “highly personal endeavor: a way to insert [Dunstan] himself in the book as well as a way to frame his encounter with the text, creating a private reminder of how to approach the act of reading” (11).

The most direct impact of the Utrecht Psalter on Anglo-Saxon art is, of course, evident in the Harley Psalter (London, BL Harley 603). Holcomb highlights the importance of the Anglo-Saxon simultaneous adoption of the Utrecht Psalter’s method of literal illustration and transformation of its monochrome drawings into color outline as a way of adding detail and enhancing the legibility of the illustrations. In this she rehearses the widely accepted view that “one of the great contributions of Anglo-Saxon manuscript artist is the successful marriage of line and color” (13). Holcomb adds: “Utrecht’s most important contribution may be that it seemed to grant artists permission to include line drawing in their repertoires for use in the most exalted works . . . Drawings could thus assume a respectable place alongside images made with costly materials such as paint and gold.” The essay illustrates evidence for this point of view using several Anglo-Saxon manuscripts, including the Sherborne Pontifical (BN MS Lat. 943), the Corpus Psychomachia (Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 23), and the Bury St. Edmunds Psalter (Vatican, Biblio. Apost. Reg. Lat. 12). Holcomb stresses how in the hands of Anglo-Saxon draughtsmen, the aesthetic dimension of drawing can rival that of painting. In one opening from the Ramsay Psalter (BL Harley 2904), a Crucifixion scene created from sophisticated colored outline technique stands across from a luxurious full-colored painting of the Beatus initial in the traditional “Winchester Style.” Similarly, the artists of Arenburg Gospels (New York, Morgan Lib. M.869) combine drawing with use of translucent color washes and gold leaf for luxurious effect. The most intriguing part of this discussion is Holcomb’s analysis of the combination of techniques and materials used in the “Dedication” scene found before monastic canticles (fol. 133r) of the Eadui Psalter (BL Arundel 155), the work of the noted scribe and artist Eadui Basan. Previous studies, Holcomb notes, have interpreted the use of the combination of techniques (drawing and painting) as a way to signal the hierarchical relationship between Benedict, revered saint and monastic founder on the right, and the humble monks of Canterbury on the left. Holcomb disagrees, arguing that “to confine the meaning of the combining of techniques to a mere display of hierarchy simplifies the vastly more complicated aesthetic aims of the image” (16). She continues, “The distinction between painting and

drawing seems not so much tied to differences in status as to divergences in time, space, and spiritual experience.” The Hand of God and the monk are drawn in outline, perhaps emphasizing their simultaneous and contemporary presence, while the full color treatment of Benedict perhaps indicates his historical distance; “the humble monk has left the commonplace zone of the monastery to enter the otherworldly and transcendent realm of reverential prayer, a distinct domain encapsulated in a field of opaque paint” (16). As Anglo-Saxonists know, several continental centers sustained contact with leading Anglo-Saxon churchmen and artists. The third section of Holcomb’s introduction, “Drawing beyond Anglo-Saxon England” focuses on the impact of the achievements and innovations of the tenth- and eleventh-century English artists, particularly at the monasteries of Saint-Bertin at Saint-Omer and Saint-Vaast.

The nature, purpose and audience of Anglo-Saxon drawings are also the subject of Herbert R. Broderick’s “Metatextuality, Sexuality and Intervisuality in MS Junius 11,” *Word and Image* 25: 384–401. The rich relationship of text and image in Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Junius 11 has long attracted art historians and literary scholars alike. Prompted by several important recent studies of Junius 11, Broderick reviews and reassesses key questions about the audience, purpose, intent, and origin of the manuscript. Broderick divides these previous studies into two approaches, or broad methodological “schools.” The first, which he labels the “Codicological” school, concentrates on the layout and structure of the book, working from the understanding that the physical relation of poems and drawings is indicative of how well the “illustration” matches the text. He places the work of George Henderson, Barbara Raw, and Richard Gameson in this category. Broderick labels the second approach the “Typological” school. This approach is seen in the work of Thomas Ohlgren, Pamela Blum, Catherine Karkov, and Maidie Hilmo. What unites these scholars is the tendency to see the relationship of text and image “as something more than ‘mere illustration’” in which “the drawing by various means, allude to other concepts and symbolic ideas through the agency of what has been labeled as ‘intervisuality’ and ‘metatextuality.’” (384). While both “schools” are valuable in Broderick’s opinion, the assumptions that underlie them lead their practitioners “to vastly different assessments of the ‘big picture’ in terms of the intentions of Junius 11’s creators as well as the appropriate understanding of the *realia* of the relationship between its drawings and its texts” (384).

An essential point of difference between the two "Schools" is attitudes towards the historical relationship of text and image. The "Codicological" school follows the essential rules of "picture criticism" established by Kurt Weitzmann. Weitzmann's approach applies philological principles to illustrations and picture cycles; to determine what is unique about illustrations in any particular manuscript, it is important to determine to what extent what they borrow and how they diverge from previous work as well as to consider the particular physical features of the specific manuscript that preserves them. Following this approach, scholars such as Henderson and Gameson have emphasized the derivation of the Junius 11 illustrations from previous cycles. They have also emphasized the serious disjunction of the text and illustration, i.e. that the location of several drawings within the text is far from the text they supposedly illustrate. This observation leads to an understanding of a working process for the construction of Junius 11, in which scribes and artists were at odds, or at least not cooperating effectively.

The "Typological" school seeks to understand the illustrations through their interpretive connections to other images or texts that a viewer/reader may have encountered elsewhere. In this approach, the meanings that the drawings add to the manuscript take priority. This may involve linking an illustration to texts other than that found in Junius 11. This can be seen in Pamela Blum's argument that details of certain drawings in Junius 11 draw on and make visible the explication of the creation story found in Ælfric's *Exameron Anglice*. Broderick labels this method "typological" because of its resemblance to well-known medieval exegetical or typological schema. While agreeing that "typology was a pervasive interpretative strategy throughout the Middle Ages," Broderick warns that at times modern practitioners of this approach may go too far or at least often lack "corroborative visual evidence" (389) for their interpretations. In pursuing an interpretive framework that does not adequately take source material into account, the "pursuit of the typological can sometimes blind the contemporary interpreter to other important aspects of an image and its sources and in the end produce a jejune, in not inaccurate understanding of the image" (389).

The bulk of Broderick's article is devoted to an examination of the two most recent lengthy studies of the Junius manuscript, Catherine Karkov's *Text and Picture in Anglo-Saxon England* (2001) and Maidie Hilmo's *Medieval Images, Icons, and Illustrated Literary Texts* (2004). Broderick groups the work of both authors in the "Typological" school because both argue that the

illustrations draw on the viewer's knowledge of other images and texts to add to, explain, or direct the reader/viewer's attention to deeper meanings of the Genesis poems. (Karkov labels this approach "intervisuality" while Hilmo prefers the related term "metatextuality.") For Broderick, who looks carefully at several of the key examples from Karkov and Hilmo's studies, their intervisual or metatextual approaches rely too much on the twenty-first-century reader's ability to read their own interests and desires into the form of the tenth-century images (392). Neither Karkov nor Hilme demonstrate sufficient knowledge of pictorial models for biblical texts much less the types of extra-biblical images (such as the apocrypha) that the Anglo-Saxon scribes and artists would have looked to and borrowed from as they created Junius 11. Instead, both modern scholars depend too much on overly sensitive attention to minute details and the observation of patterns and themes that are more of our world (literacy, gender). He concludes, that "while proleptic symbolism and typology are deeply ingrained aspects of medieval habits of mind, 'free association' is not an appropriate hermeneutic strategy . . . What the Anglo-Saxon artists of MS Junius 11 did with their sources, how they altered them, appropriated them, misunderstood them at times, re-cycled them in quite different contexts, remains the real interpretative challenge" (397).

Laura Cochrane's Ph.D. dissertation "Where There is no Time: The Quadrivium and Images of Eternity in Three Eleventh-Century Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts" (U of Delaware) likely falls into Broderick's "Typological" approach. Cochrane's focus here are the images found in the Royal Bible (London, British Library, Royal I.E.VII, fol. 1), the Tiberius Psalter (London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius C.VI, fol. 7v), and the Bury Psalter (Rome, Vatican, Biblioteca Apostolica, MS Reg. Lat. 12, fol. 68v). The particular images in question depict a figure placed above two or three concentric circles, identified by a cross-nimbus, with two trumpets or torches issuing from its mouth. The presence of a compass or dividers has previously led to this subject being identified with creation imagery and tied to the text of Wisdom 11:21: "Thou hast ordered all things in measure, and number, and weight." Cochrane here offers a new interpretation, one that reads the image as a portrayal of God's immaterial nature, "referencing the quadrivium, the four liberal arts that deal with number (arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music) which was an essential foundation for philosophical and theological studies" (xvi). The first chapter of the dissertation, "Visualizing Eternity," outlines role of images in monastic spirituality and reviews

the iconographic background of the various visual elements of the Anglo-Saxon illustrations. A chapter is devoted specifically to each of the three illustrations individually. The illustrations differ in what aspects of the quadrivium they emphasize, with the Tiberius images associated with music, Bury with arithmetic, and the Royal Bible with geometry and astronomy.

Looking at this Year's Work as a whole, early Insular manuscripts received considerable attention. This includes one of the most well-known images from Northumbrian contexts, the portrait of the scribe Ezra (folio 5) from the Codex Amiatinus (Florence, Bib. Med. Laur. 1). Given the importance of the manuscript and the frequent reproduction of the image, it is surprising that until now, few scholars have attended to the decoration of the *armarium* or book chest that plays such a prominent role in the portrait. Fortunately this oversight has been addressed by Janina Ramirez's "*Sub culmine gazas: The Iconography of the Armarium on the Ezra Page of the Codex Amiatinus*," *Gesta* 48: 1–18. Prompted by the observation of two previously unnoticed peacocks decorating the gable of the book chest, Ramirez describes, catalogues, and locates textual references that may help explain why the artist of the page went to the trouble of selecting and painting what she sees as symbolic forms. Her analysis systematically moves from the base of cupboard to the top gable. The base is painted with a small, round-winged bird that Ramirez identifies as a partridge; turning to Late Antique analogues in the catacombs and to textual sources such as the OE Physiologus, Ramirez suggests that the painted partridge encodes symbolic meaning—that is, that the partridge “represents the Christian on earth. With the free will to choose, believers have the capacity for both good and evil but will receive heavenly rewards if they choose the right path through life” (4). The representation of the cross just to the right of the partridge stands, in Ramirez's view, as a profession of faith; even smaller decorative details on the base may have meaning, “the rows of arrowheads, chevrons, and triangles that point upward and downward could be interpreted to represent the choice of the individual, whether to progress heavenward or not” (4). Ramirez proceeds similarly and systematically from the bottom to the top of the *armarium*. The nine codices contained in the cupboard have long been recognized as a reflection of the *novem codices* compiled by Cassidorus; Ramirez attends to the lozenges and crosses that adorn their covers to suggest that the volumes “represent the entire body of the scriptures and the many important activities associated with understanding and interpreting their teachings,” a complement to the

theme of *lectio divina* expressed through the portrait and equipment of the scribe contained within the page. Similarly, meanings for the lozenge (quaternities of the Christian faith), urn (Eucharistic sacrifice), quadruped (oxen and hence apostolic mission), and star and cross (triumph and majesty) on the lintel of the *armarium* can be found in textual pictorial sources. On the gable, the two peacocks flanking the central cross “can be understood as symbolizing, first, Christ's own death and Resurrection, and, second, the notion that all Christians who receive Christ's body and blood through the Eucharist will give themselves up to death and achieve resurrection” (10). Attending to both what and where the decoration is placed, “it may be possible to discern an overall iconographic scheme centered on the individual soul's journey toward salvation” (10). Seen together with the surrounding nine codices in the cupboard, the symbols “enhance the theme of *lectio divina* and the related notions of reading, copying, and editing sacred texts that are central to other aspects of the composition—namely the seated scribe, his writing equipment, and the eleven pandects” (11). Arguing that the depiction of Ezra was once the frontispiece to the Codex Amiatinus, Ramirez suggests the image was meant to introduce themes developed in the other miniatures in the manuscript, stressing “the harmony of the scriptures, the importance of correctly interpreting the Bible, and the benefit to individuals of dedicating their lives to its study” (12). These themes are “centered on the salvation of the individual, which enhances and contributes to wider iconographic programs throughout the illustrations of the Codex Amiatinus” (3).

Several other contributions to this Year's Work stem from the publication of four papers in *Anglo-Saxon Studies in Archaeology and History* that were first presented at the conference “Form and Order in the Anglo-Saxon World, AD 600–1100” (held at the British Museum in 2002). In her “Framing the Book of Durrow Inside/Outside the Anglo-Saxon World,” *Anglo-Saxon Studies in Archaeology and History* 16: 65–78, Nancy Netzer proposes to “examine how what we think we know—and think we don't know—about the Book of Durrow was configured for our understandings by narratives that construct a form and order for books produced in the Anglo-Saxon world of Northumbria” (65). Much of this “form and order” derives from the belief that an Irish style was eclipsed by a Romanizing one in Northumbria. This widely accepted, yet unexamined construct shapes the perception of chronological and stylistic relationships. This impedes the study of the art of the period by forming a frame that constrains rather than one that focuses understanding.

The first important frame that Netzer describes belongs to the noted paleographer E. A. Lowe who in 1935 suggested that Durrow was the product of an Anglo-Saxon scribe working in Northumbria. This marked an important scholarly shift; in the nineteenth century scholars had largely accepted that the book originated at Durrow, perhaps at the hand of Columba himself. Though some early twentieth-century studies questioned the pure Irish origins of the manuscript by, for example, noting the Anglo-Saxon-style animals found on its last carpet page (f. 192v) it was Lowe's analysis that marked a turning point. "After 1935, it is as if Lowe's initial construct of Durrow's Northumbrian origin by Irish scribes opened the floodgates for a reassessment of the origin of all aspects of the manuscript" (68), Netzer maintains. Lowe's work particularly influenced T. D. Kendrick's highly influential reassessment of early medieval art. Kendrick's 1938 volume, *Anglo-Saxon Art to AD 900*, "frames Durrow as reflecting the established Irish Columban style before the mission to Northumbria where, he believes, Durrow was made in about 650" (68). Kendrick's work establishes two important constructs that continue to influence the study of the manuscript today, Netzer explains. First, Kendrick argues for a complex "back and forth" series of artistic influences between Anglo-Saxon and Irish centers that privilege the Northumbrian origin of Durrow, a construct which, Netzer suggests, may be more the result of "competition of scholarly nationalism in the mid-twentieth century" (68) than logic or consistency. Second, Kendrick constructs a well-known and often cited chronological relationship of Northumbrian manuscripts based on the progressive embellishment and growing size of the initials that form the Chi-Rho monograms found in Insular Gospel books. As a result of Kendrick's intellectual framing, the Book of Durrow occupies a peculiarly important position as a witness to the origin of Northumbrian, Anglo-Saxon styles. Curiously, however, this central witness to the formation of the style is placed "outside a truly Anglo-Saxon inner sanctum" that is defined by the Romanizing, classicizing elements in the "true" Anglo-Saxon product, the Lindisfarne Gospels. "For Kendrick we can only speculate that some combination of historical circumstances in Northumbria—the triumph of the Roman church and the slightest hint of illusionism—is enough to propel a manuscript over the line from the devalued colonial 'Celtic' side to the pure English, Anglo-Saxon, rooted in the highly-prized Roman past" (70). Kendrick's influential work, in turn, provides the scholarly framework for subsequent scholarship. This scholarship is based on four basic

assumptions articulated by Kendrick: that Durrow's decoration is essentially Celtic, that this style was imported prior to the Synod of Whitby in 664, that Durrow pre-dates the beginnings of the formation of a "true Anglo-Saxon style" seen in Lindisfarne, and yet that the creation of Durrow marks the starting point for later Insular deluxe Gospel books (71).

At the root of the issue are the parallel narratives in scholarship that link ornament, script, and text. These narratives rooted in Lowe's analysis of the script and to Kendrick's essentializing assumption of the role of classical influence, as Netzer puts it, show that: "once Mediterranean influence was introduced in Northumbria there was no turning back" (72). The second part of Netzer's article explores evidence for an alternative narrative. First, she explores the script, questioning the position of the Lindisfarne Gospels within the story of how writing developed in Northumbria. Specifically, she asks "what is to prevent us from reframing the Lindisfarne half-uncial a house style variant and viewing what has been termed the Phase I half-uncial script of the Durham fragment and Durrow as both an earlier and contemporaneous style practised at Columban houses in Ireland and/or Dalriada?" (72). To address this possibility, she cites the work of Christopher Very who has linked parts of the Durham fragment to the Irish Ussher Gospels; also key is Dáibhi Ó Cróinin's argument that Phase I half-uncial was written in Ireland well into the 680s. Additional evidence is derived from the Turin Gospel fragments (Turin, Bib. Nazionale F.VI.2). Earlier, William Sullivan and Julian Brown had associated the script of the fragments with the same scriptorium, perhaps even the same hand, as Durrow. Netzer builds on these previous studies and links characteristics of the script of the Turin fragments to that found in the Antiphony of Bangor (Milan, Biblioteca Ambrosiana C.5 Inf), which has been located in Ireland between 680 and 691. She also notes that the text of the Turin fragment shares at least two variants with Durrow's *Novum Opus* text. While differences do exist (ultraviolet light reveals that the Turin fragment was written in two columns, whereas Durrow was written in one), Netzer concludes: "The picture that emerges for the scriptorium that produced these two books is one that may have experimented with different formats and texts. This, in turn, suggests that the unusual arrangement of preliminary texts in Durrow and Kells was less widely disseminated and thus more indicative of a common origin for those two manuscripts outside the Anglo-Saxon world—perhaps at Iona" (74). Bonifatius Fischer's collation of gospel texts tends to support an origin for Durrow in Ireland

or Iona in the late seventh or early eighth century, she adds, as does the comparison of visual evidence, e.g. elements borrowed from metalwork. The ramifications for removing the restrictive scholarly frames for the origin of Durrow from Northumbria would allow us to reconsider aspects of the period. Netzer accepts the identification of an “Irish style” seen in manuscripts like the Cathach of St. Columba and the Durham Fragment, yet suggests that whether these manuscripts were produced in Northumbria is an open question.

The question of the relationship of Celtic and Anglo-Saxon styles is also explored by Susan Youngs in her article “From Metalwork to Manuscript: Some Observations on the Use of Celtic Art in Insular Manuscripts,” *Anglo-Saxon Studies in Archaeology and History* 16: 45–64. Youngs notes that, “From the seventh century onwards Celtic art was to make a spectacular contribution to the developing Insular Christian arts of book illumination, fine metalwork, and stone sculpture” (45). She here refers to the indigenous tradition of curvilinear and abstract motifs (trumpet spirals, peltae) often labeled “Ultimate La Tene” (or more concisely and contentiously as “Celtic”). Her article is concerned with both “the portal through which Celtic art came into the Christian world of non-Celtic cultures” and the “vocabulary of motifs” used (48). As for the portal, Celtic motifs in book illumination originate, she argues, as “simple embellishments to script” (45) and develop in close proximity, indeed, as ancillaries or “extensions to the basic strokes forming a letter” (47). The importance of Irish-trained clergy and missionaries in England and on the continent explain the spread of this system of embellishment, she argues: “the history of Irish involvement in the establishment of Christianity in Britain from the mid-sixth century is, I suggest, the key to how this seemingly archaic ‘iron age’ ornament was introduced to the artistic repertoire of the Anglo-Saxon scriptorium” (46).

Having outlined “a portal through which Celtic art came into the Christian world of non-Celtic cultures” (48), Youngs’s next task is to examine specific models for the motifs adapted by the scribes more closely. She helpfully summarizes what is known about the adoption of metalwork models based on recent finds, offering a concise overview of a diverse array of motifs including pelta, triskele, pointed oval motifs, concave-sided triangles, and a range of stylized heads. Special attention is given to some basic “rules” for the decoration of Insular books, that scrolls are not mixed with interlace, for example. Her discussion of spiral ornament is particularly notable, as she describes the high symbolic value of the trumpet spiral. She reads the

Carpet Page in the Book of Durrow (fol. 3v) as a “covert cross-carpet design, in the Irish tradition of veiled symbolism used in interlace and animal interlace” (55). She finds a continuation of the Christian significance of Celtic designs in ecclesiastical metalwork, in the panels of spirals associated with Christ’s body in the Athlone plaque and the less well-known bronze mount from Hofstad, Norway. Also notable is her examination of “a less well-known debt to fine Celtic metalwork . . . seen in the scribal use of fine dots to outline, decorate and punctuate texts” (57). Noting that this is usually attributed to the influence of Coptic scribal practices, Youngs instead briefly traces the use of dots from third to second century BC Celtic metalwork through discarded pins of the fifth century AD. She argues that the “Revival or survival of fine dotting in all early medieval contexts may owe something to the late Roman precious metalworking tradition of stamping and texturing surfaces” (57). Merovingian scribes were known to have been influenced by Coptic traditions, yet the practice of using dots to decorate texts is not pronounced in their work. As Youngs suggests, “this is not to ignore the ancient use of systems of dots in scribal tradition, but to suggest that the idea of using multiple dots to ornament linear designs and to punctuate panels was peculiarly acceptable to Irish scribes because it was already a familiar and ancient element in the decoration of fine metalwork” (58).

The enlarged and decorated *nomen sacrum* (Chi-Rho) of Matthew 1:18 (*Christ autem generation sic erat*) is one of the most recognizable features of Insular Gospel books and for this reason its origins and significance remain a subject of considerable scholarly interest. Two articles published this year directly take on this subject. In “The Sign at the Cross-Roads: The Matthean *Nomen Sacrum* in Anglo-Saxon Gospel Books before Alfred the Great,” *Anglo-Saxon Studies in Archaeology and History* 16: 79–88, Carol Farr focuses on the reasons for the attention to the *nomen sacrum* in early Insular contexts. She argues that the scribal treatment of this passage, the characteristic enlarged initials and decorated texts, signifies an understanding of the passage as a liminal one, placed at the “crossroads” of potentially ambiguous readings and liturgical performances. Farr frames her examination with semiotic theory, particularly C. S. Peirce’s concept of the sign and the ideas of signs in the classical learning of the Church fathers. Of special interest is Augustine’s formulation of the category of intentional signs which includes signs given by God. In the Augustinian conception, “the signs of scripture read or heard as words are a temporal incarnation of the non-temporal discourse of God” (81). Seen in this

light, the Chi-Rhos in Insular texts serve “as a sign in its textual context: its position between the descent of Christ and the Nativity” (80).

Traditional early medieval practices of dividing Old Latin and Vulgate texts into chapter and sections influenced the decisions to enlarge and emphasize the Chi-Rho, Farr explains. In her view, these practices of text division are inconsistently applied and so do not necessarily fully explain the Insular practices. Reviewing specific textual traditions, Farr shows that some *capitula* fall at the *Christi autem* and other sectional practices emphasize the beginning of the following sentence, the words *Cum esset*. Of greater importance, she argues, is the Insular tradition of placing the *incipit* to Matthew above the *nomen sacrum*. This, in effect, emphasized the words *Christi autem* as the beginning of the Gospel. There were both practical and theological purposes to this division, Farr adds. The description of the ancestors of Christ in Matthew's Gospel is divided into three groups. The Latin text relies on the reader to supply the verb (“*errant*”) correctly so that the meaning “there were fourteen generations” is understood. This reliance on the reader to supply the verb presents some danger of a misleading ambiguity that the tradition of highlighting the *nomen sacra* might have addressed: “In an unarticulated text, the reader could mispunctuate, continuing to include *Christi* in the sentence so it would end by saying, ‘there were fourteen generations of Christ.’ While not incorrect grammatically, this reading would interfere with the unequivocal statement of the Incarnation in the correct reading: ‘*Christi autem generatio sic erat*” (82). The Chi-Rho initials effectively eliminate this potential ambiguity: “dividing the text at the *nomen sacrum* makes the sense units clear and creates graphic emphasis on its statement of the Incarnation” (83).

The *nomen sacrum* is in this sense “at the crossroads,” situated between reading and misreading. It is a liminal text in other ways as well, Farr argues. Evidence suggests that the genealogy of Christ was sung in the Office during the Matins of Christmas, attested by neumes in Carolingian manuscripts of the ninth century. The text following the *nomen sacrum* is known to have been used as a Gospel lection for the Vigil of the Nativity. For Farr this indicates that “the Chi-Rho would have been at a cross-roads between two sections performed—one sung, one read—in connection with one of the most important feasts of the year . . . positioned between two way of hearing the signs of the Incarnation” (84). This liminality is also seen through the lens of medieval sign theory, Farr continues, arguing that the *nomen sacrum*, when written as a graphic sign within the text

of Matthew's Gospel, “was understood as a form of the Incarnation. It was a temporal, physical sign of the non-temporal and incorporeal” (84). Farr buttresses this observation by citing Bede's *Expositio* on the Gospel of Luke which (following an earlier discussion of Augustine's) emphasizes that the number of names in the Matthean genealogy is a “*sacramentum*,” a sign of sacred things. Of particular importance to Bede and Augustine are the number of names in the genealogy; these forty generations relate to the several appearances of this number in the life of Moses, the prophets, and in the life of Christ, not to mention symbolic interpretations of the product of four and ten, each numbers associated with cosmic signs. This emphasis on number four and its multiples, along with interest in how the symbolic structure of genealogical text “signifies a change in direction” or corner, may be visually reproduced in the prominent rhomboids and lozenges that are used to decorate many Chi-Rho initials (84). In Farr's words, “Bede's interpretation, excerpting Augustine's longer one, unifies the themes of Incarnation and Crucifixion, with the cosmic quadripartite shape of the Chi in the context of the gospel of Matthew. Possibly Bede's articulation of the idea coincides with the elaboration of the Chi-Rho in Insular gospel books with visual signs of world or cosmos, such as the rhombus shape at the center of the Chi in the Book of Kells” (85).

“Given the amount of ink that has been spilled on the subject of the decorated Insular Chi-rhos, it is surprising how little consideration has been given to the way in which the tradition came to an end,” observes Richard Gameson in “The Last Chi-rho in the West? From Insular to Anglo-Saxon in the Boulogne 10 Gospels,” *Anglo-Saxon Studies in Archaeology and History* 16: 89–107, at 99. Gameson draws attention to Boulogne Biblio. Mun. 10, a manuscript dated to the early tenth century; it is certainly not as well-known as its earlier Insular forebearers nor has it been widely discussed. Gameson's study, which usefully reproduces several of its folios, examines and poses the question: is the manuscript “the earliest late Anglo-Saxon Gospel book—or should that be: the latest early Anglo-Saxon Gospel book?” (89). The first part of the article is an intensive scrutiny of the manuscript's textual and codicological features. It turns out, Gameson shows, that the manuscript is “something of a hybrid.” The number of folios in the quire recalls Irish and Welsh practices, while the parchment is arranged hair/hair and flesh/flesh according to Continental practices, though the pricking and ruling is Insular. The decoration of the Canon Tables recalls English, pre-Viking art, while the birds, beasts, and interlace of most of the initials are

typical of early tenth-century Type I, with the exception of two large initials (“I”) which display embedded interlace similar to Breton work. Similarly, the writing of the text shows hybridity with the hand of the main scribe showing “the new English script of the tenth century emerging from its Insular roots” (95) while a second hand produces a script based on Carolingian minuscule.

It is the second half of Gameson’s study that provides the promised, revealing examination of the treatment of the *nomen sacrum*. The scribe of the Boulogne Gospels deliberately left a portion of the preceding verse blank so that the words *Christi autem* could start at the top of the following page. There he provided a fully-decorated initial “X” and highlighted the words following with color and display capitals. As is well-known, earlier Insular tradition likewise calls attention to the account of the Incarnation; as Gameson explains, this tradition can be seen to follow two practical ways of proclaiming the prestige and importance of the passage. One, perhaps the best known from the magnificent examples of Lindisfarne and Kells, is to devote an entire page to the *nomen sacrum* and its decoration. The second is to call attention to the Chi-Rho within “an otherwise fairly normal page of text” (96) through color and size. The degree to which the Boulogne Gospels decorate the initial and highlight the entire passage differs from the modest treatment of the vast majority of later Anglo-Saxon Gospel books which, Gameson explains, follow Carolingian precedent and simply enlarge or color the Chi, add a line of capitals, or do almost nothing at all. “What many Insular scribes had seemingly conceived as a mystic and majestic symbol of Christ is, in such cases, presented simply as a notable division of the text” (97).

Gameson covers some of the same ground as Farr, though with different emphasis. He points out that *Christi autem* was not consistently an important textual division. He discusses the liturgical use of the verse, noting that it was not used as a lection (outside of some northern Italian examples); instead, it is the next sentence of the verse (*Cum esset desponsata mater eius Maria Joseph*) that was used in the Vigil of the Nativity. Gameson stresses that the liturgical use affected the visual treatments of the two parts of the verse in Continental manuscripts, where the start of the *Cum esset* passage is signaled and emphasized by initials and capitals. Like Farr, Gameson suggests the visual emphasis impacted how the text was read, though with a slightly different conclusion.

Such contrasting presentations affect the way one reads “*Christi autem generatio sic erat*” and arguably embody different responses to the phrase. When it is

highlighted with an initial and clearly begins a new section, one tends to understand it as “The begetting of Christ was thus . . .” interpreting it as the start of the birth narrative. Unmarked and at the end of the list of Christ’s ancestors, it is more logically understood as a concluding phrase, “The genealogy of Christ was thus” (99).

Reviewing his evidence, Gameson offers several reasons why the Chi-Rho is not often highlighted in gospels written in later tenth-century England. The start of Matthew 1:18 was not always a significant division; the decorated Chi-Rho was not part of the influential Carolingian tradition; the revival of manuscript production in the period after Alfred was primarily a southern phenomenon. Why then was the Chi-Rho emphasized in Boulogne 10? Gameson here points to the importance of imported models from Irish and Breton sources, explaining that Boulogne 10’s closest textual affiliations are the MacRegol Gospels and the MacDurnan Gospels (both Irish imports). Also important is the “heterogeneity and experiment that characterized southern English manuscript art—indeed southern English art as a whole—during the first two-thirds of the tenth century” (102) as seen in the development of Type I and Type II initials and in the variety of figural styles of the period. Gameson observes that

Boulogne 10 with its fully decorated Chi-rho, the last surviving Anglo-Saxon example of such, is a key monument of an earlier and, in some respects, more protean phase of late Anglo-Saxon book production when—contrary to subsequent polemics of the monastic reformers—ecclesiastical culture was clearly alive and well in certain centers . . . In sum, the “last Chi-rho in the West” alerts us to the complexity of the choices that faced Anglo-Saxon scribes in the first half of the tenth century, and brings into focus the range of factors that shaped the products of the undervalued yet formative stage of English book culture (104).

The two final entries this year are more indirectly or peripherally related to Anglo-Saxon interests. One is Deirdre Jackson’s *Marvelous to Behold: Miracles in Medieval Manuscripts* (London: British Library). This well-illustrated book surveys the concept of the miraculous in Christian, Jewish, and Islamic art and literature using primarily the collections of manuscripts in the British Library. As the author states, “This book does not offer a representative sample, charting artistic developments in a chronological fashion, but present an idiosyncratic selection governed by the desire to give readers a glimpse of rarely reproduced miniatures, and to juxtapose pictures of identical subjects drawn from

all three religious traditions" (7). The book is structured thematically, with chapters dedicated to "Natural Wonders," "Healing Powers," "Great Escapes," and "God Provides." Anglo-Saxon material is not illustrated or much discussed, though the author does deal with the post-Conquest Life of St. Cuthbert illustrated at Durham ca. 1200 (Yates Thompson MS 26, f. 24r) (pp. 37–38, 75–6) and Bede's Life of St. Guthlac, which appears in a thirteenth-century manuscript (BL, Harley Roll Y.6) (p. 51).

Finally, John Munns contributes "The Artists of the Eadwine Psalter Leaves," *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 14.2: 115–26. This article closely examines three leaves separated from the twelfth-century Eadwine (or Canterbury) Psalter (Cambridge, Trinity College MS R.17.1). These leaves are now housed in collections in New York (Morgan Library MSS M.724 and M.521) and London (V&A, MS 661 and BL MS Add. 37472). None of them is strictly speaking Anglo-Saxon. Munns's study argues that there were three different artists (instead of the two that are traditionally identified) working on these leaves. He also traces the previous cycles which influenced the work, arguing that the artist of Leaf 3 "favours the Pembroke 120 tradition . . . where his colleagues rely more on the purer St Albans style of the so-called Alexis Master" (116).

BW

7. History and Culture

7A. GENERAL SOURCES AND REFERENCE WORKS

In reviewing Michael Lapidge's *The Anglo-Saxon Library*, in "Review Article: When is a Library not a Library?" *Early Medieval Europe* 17: 444–53, David Ganz describes Lapidge's book as "an essential resource," noting that "on the shelves of scholars it will earn a place beside Humfrey Wanley, Neil Ker's *Catalogue of Manuscripts containing Anglo-Saxon*, and Helmut Gneuss's *Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts*" (445). Nevertheless, Ganz draws attention to what he sees as various difficulties in and omissions from the book, perhaps not least that "Lapidge's libraries have no place for liturgical books and biblical texts, and this book has very little to say about homilies and the transmission of patristic sermons" (446).

John Hostettler's *History of Criminal Justice in England and Wales* (Hook, Hamps.: Waterside Press) is a textbook designed for use in introductory legal history courses. If the two chapters dealing with pre-Conquest law—"Origins of Criminal Justice in Anglo-Saxon England" (11–23) and "Saxon Dooms—Our Early Laws" (24–39)—are any indication of the volume's quality as a whole, one can only hope that it will not be widely adopted. Hostettler displays little knowledge or understanding of pre-Conquest legal practices and no evidence of having familiarized himself with any scholarship on the subject published in the last sixty years. Hostettler adopts the same dismissive, primitivist approach employed by Sir Frederick Pollock more than a century ago and makes no effort to revise old opinions in the light of more recent scholars. He not only ignores the work of modern historians, including Patrick Wormald and Paul Hyams, but he also fails to consult authoritative texts by such early scholars as Felix Liebermann. Anglo-Saxon charters are largely neglected, and the editor A.J. Robertson has been mysteriously renamed "Roberson." One hopes that Anglo-Saxon law will receive more attention in English and American law schools, but not in the manner with which it is treated here.

7B. RELIGION AND THE CHURCH

Alban Gautier's "La chrétienté anglo-saxonne (vii^e-x^e siècle): à propos de quelques publications récentes,"

Médiévales 56: 151–68, is essentially a long review article whose principal focus is upon John Blair's *The Church in Anglo-Saxon Society* (2005), though it surveys as well recent and older work by Catherine Cubitt, Sarah Foot, and Barbara Yorke, among others. In considering the range of scholarship published over the last thirty years on the nature of the Anglo-Saxon piety, Gautier notices a major and somewhat paradoxical shift in methodology: Historians have simultaneously become more attentive to the importance of local circumstances and have come to emphasize the continuities between English and Continental religious life. Both tendencies, as Gautier notes, are exhibited in Blair's work. Decades of tumult in this field mean that a once-standard point of reference such as Henry Mayr-Harting's *The Coming of Christianity to Anglo-Saxon England* (1972) "parait aujourd'hui entièrement dépassé," to be used only with the greatest caution (154). The fixed abstractions on which study in this field once depended are no longer reliable; the "conversion of the Anglo-Saxons" from "paganism," for example, ignores the reality acknowledged by most present-day scholars that forms of Christian practice were already well embedded within the British Isles and known to many of its English speaking peoples upon their first encounters with Roman missionaries. Such abstractions also evade uncomfortable questions about the extent to which the Roman Christianity that would become dominant accommodated pre-Christian culture—or about how "Roman" the Christianity established in Kent through the labors of Augustine really was (157). A detailed review of the *minster* hypothesis and its trajectory through scholarship of the last few decades concludes this article.

In "Gallic or Greek? Archbishops in England from Theodore to Ecgberht" in *Frankland: The Franks and the World of the Early Middle Ages: Essays in Honour of Dame Jinty Nelson*, ed. Paul Fouracre and David Ganz (Manchester: Manchester UP, 2008), 44–69, Alan Thacker considers the unique form of higher episcopacy in seventh-century England. This developed under the influence of Theodore, who brought eastern views of metropolitan bishops to his western see and was the first to adopt the title of archbishop. Thacker argues that Theodore saw the churches of all Britain as being under his authority, just as the churches of Cyprus

were all under the authority of the Cypriot patriarch. Wilfrid's complaints against him were justified from a Gallic point of view but clashed with Theodore's Greek assumptions. By the early eighth century, however, the circumstances that made Theodore's dominant role possible had changed, and the creation of a northern archbishopric became a political necessity.

In her chapter, "The Practicalities of Communication between Northumbrian and Irish Churches, c. 635–735" in *Anglo-Saxon/Irish Relations before the Vikings*, ed. J. Graham-Campbell and M. Ryan (London: Oxford UP), 129–47, Fiona Edmonds discusses the various networks of communication and travel that existed between Ireland and Northumbria in the Anglo-Saxon period. She argues that, while ecclesiastics did travel in the same circles as laymen, "major ecclesiastical establishments developed their own institutions and customs to facilitate the journeys of their personnel" (129). In doing so, Edmonds shows that these networks embraced places such as western Northumbria and Dál Riata in Britain and Ireland, respectively.

In "Alcuin, Charlemagne and the Problem of Sanctions" in *Early Medieval Studies in Memory of Patrick Wormald*, [see sect. 2], 207–218, Henry Mayr-Harting argues both that the Carolingian government did indeed use sanctions and that Charlemagne's understanding of sanctions was in part shaped by Alcuin's understanding of the Bible. In addition to controlling the behavior of the nobles by granting or withholding rewards and by playing rivals off one another, Charlemagne used his own moral standards as a yardstick by which to measure others. The theological background to this derives from God's sanctions in Deuteronomy, and the contemporary political application may be seen in works associated with Alcuin such as the *Admonitio Generalis* of 789 and the *Life of Willibrord*. The question of sanctions leads to the question of the use of force, which Mayr-Harting considers in the case of the conquest and conversion of the Saxons. He suggests that just as Alcuin's exegesis of the New Testament develops a theory of the reprehensible sword of revenge and the worthy sword of teaching the word of God, Charlemagne—having subjugated the Saxons in a most bloody manner—realized that they could only truly become part of his empire if he abandoned conversion by violence in favor of peaceful teaching and persuasion.

Joanna Story's "Bede, St Cuthbert and the Northumbrian *Folc*" in *Northumbria: History and Identity 547–2000*, ed. R. Colls (Chichester: Phillimore), 48–67, provides an overview of some of the most famous characters from early Anglo-Saxon Northumbria: of Bede's works and achievements and of Cuthbert's

life and posthumous miracles. Story shows the great achievement of Bede, a monk and scholar who seems rarely (if at all) to have left the confines of his Jarrow monastery, in writing his numerous exegetical works, his letters, and of course his most famous achievement, the *Historia ecclesiastica*. Story also draws attention to the evidence for Bede's vernacular writing and learning. In discussing Cuthbert, she emphasizes that it was the trio of hagiographical works, an anonymous prose *Life* written at Lindisfarne, followed by a verse *Life* by Bede and then a rewritten prose *Life* again by Bede, that secured Cuthbert's reputation and subsequent cult. Story demonstrates how both the anonymous author and Bede took care to name the witnesses on whose testimony many of the miracles and stories about Cuthbert depend. She makes the interesting point that, whereas the anonymous author was content to include details about local people who had stories about Cuthbert, Bede took care to remove such information, preferring instead to draw on the accounts of established figures like Abbot Herefrith. Story suggests that "by cutting out the local details Bede's version sharpened the focus onto St Cuthbert himself" (66). In the turbulent atmosphere of the early eighth century Northumbrian church, when there was fierce competition between Irish and Roman practices, Cuthbert, a man trained in the Irish form of Christianity but who was willing to accept Roman orthodox, became a symbol of unity championed by Bede.

For want of a better rubric, R.W. Burgess and Michael Kulikowski's "The History and Origins of the Latin Chronicle Tradition" in *The Medieval Chronicle VI*, ed. Erik Kooper (Rodopi), 153–77, may be considered in this section. To view the argument from the perspective of an Anglo-Saxonist, the authors situate Bede's chronicles squarely in a tradition that goes back through Isidore to Jerome and thence back to Eusebius, the Hellenistic Olympiad chronicles, Eratosthenes, Babylonian chronicles, and the Royal Annals of ancient Egypt. After demonstrating the long history of the chronicle, Burgess and Kulikowski then argue that it was the only late Antique form of historiography to survive into the Middle Ages, when it began to ramify into the multitude of forms that could all be referred to as chronicles—much to the confusion of modern scholars.

In "Bede's *Chronica Maiora*: Early Insular History in a Universal Context" in *Anglo-Saxon/Irish Relations before the Vikings*, 47–73, Diarmuid Scully follows recent work by Faith Wallis and others in arguing for the originality and inventiveness of the world chronicle with which Bede concludes his *De temporum ratione*. Scully points out that prior to Bede, no insular historian

had “attempted to integrate archipelagic and universal history in chronicle or historical narrative form” (48). Focusing on Bede’s account of the Roman and Germanic conquests of Britain, Scully argues that the chronicle’s narrative is structured in order to emphasize the orthodoxy of English Christianity as well as the union between the Christian community in the British archipelago and the global community of the faithful.

Gregory K. Jember reviews the old question of “Cefi, Materialism, and the Conversion of King Edwin,” *In Geardagum* 29: 33–44, and argues that Bede is not using the figure of the pagan head-priest to condemn paganism as materialistic. Material reward is equally important for the Christians in the story, as Jember points out: Edwin benefits substantially from his various promises to accept Christianity, and Boniface and Paulinus expect material support from Edwin in their mission to convert Northumbria. Rather, the point of the story is to contrast the conversions of Cefi and Edwin. Cefi accepts Christianity in a matter of minutes and is ready to take action against paganism at once, whereas Edwin is an indecisive and reluctant convert who neither firmly embraces the new faith nor puts an end to the old.

W. Trent Foley and Nicholas J. Higham examine the attitudes of “Bede on the Britons,” *EME* 17: 157–85, of his own day. As is widely recognized, Bede condemns the early Britons as uncharitable and depicts the Christian English as morally superior. For theological as well as political reasons, Bede also holds a largely negative view of his British contemporaries. Foley and Higham find that Bede for the most part portrays the Britons like perfidious Jews, “stubborn stumblers,” adherents of outworn traditions, and hate-filled persecutors of the righteous, who are concerned only for the salvation of their own (160). Nonetheless, he is not uniformly contemptuous of them, as is seen both in his praise of St. Ninian and towards the beginning of the *Historia ecclesiastica* (I.22), when he echoes Romans 11:2 to liken the Britons to those Jews who will belatedly come to Christ’s gospel. Foley and Higham note that to some degree these contradictory attitudes derive from the different scriptural traditions on which Bede was drawing, for the gospels depict the Jews in a negative light, whereas the epistles of Paul are much more positive. In a nuanced discussion of Bede’s ethnic identifications and his use of Gildas as a source, they argue that Bede’s stance towards the Britons seems to have been largely driven by his narrative’s wider purposes and that the inconsistencies are primarily due to the shifting imperatives of each chapter.

On a similar theme, Damian Bracken considers the attitudes of Bede toward the Irish in “Rome and the Isles: Ireland, England and the Rhetoric of Orthodoxy” in *Anglo-Saxon/Irish Relations Before the Vikings*, 75–97. Whereas Columbanus had seen the coming of Christianity to the isolated Irish as the culmination of the mission to spread the faith to all lands, Bede describes the Irish as standing apart, against the unity of the rest of the Church. Bracken traces the former discourse back to the fifth-century competition for power between Rome and Constantinople, in which Palladius’s Roman mission to Ireland in 431 was used by Pope Leo the Great as a sign of the triumph of the Roman Church—an interpretation that is repeated by Columbanus. A similar repetition of earlier rhetoric is employed when the Easter controversy arises, for Cummian, Wilfred, and Bede apply to the Irish the accusation of particularism, intractability, and isolationism that was leveled against the Donatists in the fourth century. Bracken thus argues that the descriptions of the Irish by the Anglo-Saxons recycle old stereotypes of heresy and should not be interpreted literally.

John Moorhead analyzes the attitudes of “Bede on the Papacy,” *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 60: 217–32. On the basis of Bede’s account of the Synod of Whitby, his letter to Nechtan, and his handling of the words of Christ to Peter, Moorhead finds that he did not think that special powers had been given to Peter, and presumably he did not see such powers residing in those who succeeded Peter in the see of Rome. Interestingly, this view contrasts with that of Aldhelm, Stephanus, Boniface, and the author of the *Whitby Life* of Gregory. Moorhead argues that Bede’s attitude to the papacy reflected a response to recent events within the English Church. Whereas Stephanus emphasized papal power because Wilfrid had recourse to it and it was deployed on his behalf, Bede may have resented having the judgments of the English Church overturned by the pope. Bede’s attitude also seems to be Gregorian in its view of bishops—and Peter in particular—as pastors responsible for feeding the flock.

Sally Shockro’s “Bede and the Rewriting of Sanctity,” *Haskins Society Jnl* 21: 1–20, the Denis Bethel prize essay, examines Bede’s attitude towards sanctity in the anonymous *Life of St. Cuthbert*, the source of his own *Life* of that saint. She compares the biblical material that Bede omitted from his adaptation of his source with the biblical material that he adds. Whereas the author of the anonymous *Life* used quotations and allusions to emphasize Cuthbert’s sanctity on a literal level, Shockro shows that Bede treats Cuthbert’s sanctity typologically,

as akin to that of the prophets and warriors of God in the Old Testament.

Although Paul Fouracre does explore the attitude of Bede towards Wilfrid in “Forgetting or Remembering Dagobert II: The English Connection” in *Frankland: The Franks and the World of the Early Middle Ages: Essays in Honour of Dame Jinty Nelson*, ed. Paul Fouracre and David Ganz (Manchester: Manchester UP, 2008), 70–89, his larger purpose is historical detective work. At the heart of the case are the facts of Dagobert's life: exiled to Ireland as a child, returned to Francia by Wilfrid, crowned briefly in Austrasia, and killed by his resentful subjects. This story is preserved in Stephen of Ripon's *Life of St. Wilfrid* and in the veneration of Dagobert the martyr in the Ardennes region. The detective work results from the obscurity of Stephen's *vita*, which did not become widely known until the tenth century. Several accounts of Dagobert were created—generally without any real knowledge of the historical figure, so that confusion became piled upon error. Fouracre untangles the sequence of works, from the post-Carolingian *Vita Dagoberti* to Godfrey Henschen's *De Tribus Dagobertis Francorum Regibus Diatriba* (1655) and *The Holy Blood and the Holy Grail* (1996) and thence to *The DaVinci Code* (2003). In doing so, he shows how very often medieval and modern people try to invent a past but must turn to research and fiction in the absence of memory.

In “Trouble at the White House: Anglo-Irish Relations and the Cult of St Martin” in *Anglo-Saxon/Irish Relations Before the Vikings*, 113–27, Juliet Mullins explores the implications of Whithorn's dedication to St. Martin. After examining the cult of St. Martin as a connection between Gaul and Galloway and the popularity of St. Martin among the Irish, she notes the Irish associations of the Anglo-Saxon houses that produced texts that echo the *Vita Martini*: The *Vita S. Cuthberti* was composed at Lindisfarne, and the *Vita S. Gregorii* was a product of Whitby. Mullins suggests that in the early eighth century, Bede's reference to Whithorn's patron saint would have indicated a commonality between the church in Rome and the Columban *familia*, for Martin at that time was venerated by both.

Thomas Pickles has a go at “Locating ‘Ingelingum’ and ‘Suthgedling’: Gilling West and Gilling East,” *Northern History* 46: 31–325. Ingelingum was the site of the religious community founded by Oswiu to atone for the murder of Oswine of Deira in 651. Bede's account indicates that it was not too far from Wilfaresdun, ten miles north-west of Catterick, and it has often been assumed to be at Gilling West. Suthgedling was a vill granted to St. Cuthbert along with the territory of

Cartmel, according to the *Historia de Sancto Cuthberto*, and an early identification of it with Ingelingum has been tentatively accepted by some scholars. On the basis of Bede's narrative, Pickles establishes that Ingelingum was apparently a royal estate on loan to a royal official, and following the murder, Oswiu revoked the loan and re-granted the estate. On the basis of Bede's usage of place-names of this type, Ingelingum was a fairly wide territorial unit, probably a royal vill with a surrounding territory of obligation known as a *regio* or *provincia*. What can be deduced about the foundation at Gilling West fits this description. The account of Suthgedling, in contrast, suggests that it was a relatively small, compact estate. It could not therefore have been at Gilling West, which in the eleventh century was the focus of a soke estate and the focus of a coterminous mother parish. Pickles instead identifies Suthgedling with Gilling East, which shares the place-name element derived from *Gedling. In the eleventh century, it had two compact estates, and the settlement formed the head of a parish—consistent with the terminology of the *Historia de Sancto Cuthberto*.

In “English History and Irish Readers” in *Frankland*, 126–51, Paul Kershaw explores the reception of Bede's *Historia* among the Irish expatriate scholars of the Carolingian world. The political thought of Sedulius Scottus appears to have been shaped by Bede's emphasis on royal humility and victories given by God, and the Irish schoolmaster in Milan who is thought to have compiled the teaching compendium Bern 363 edits the *Historia* to produce a compressed history of Britain and Ireland rather than England; he also annotates it to indicate points of interest and to add his own information. English adaptors were no less bold: The ninth-century Old English translation of the *Historia* omits references to Rome and papal authority.

James T. Palmer's *Anglo-Saxons in a Frankish World 690–900* (Turnhout: Brepols) has a narrower focus than the title suggests; its real focus is the Anglo-Saxon missions, especially the relationship between their efforts to shape religious life and the hagiographical reinterpretation of those efforts. The central chapters of the book consider the motivations behind the missions, the associations between the missions and various Frankish factions, the representation of paganism, the foundation legends of the mission churches, the promotion of Benedictine monasticism, and the representation of Rome, with a concluding chapter analyzing Hygeburg's *Vita Willibaldi*. In this intriguingly revisionist study, evidence is presented that the reputation of the Anglo-Saxon missionaries is overblown or exaggerated, and that the construction of

their sanctity was dictated by local political concerns. Conversely, Palmer discovers an overarching similarity in hagiographic material intended for different audiences and different functions; when it came to saints' *vitae*, there was significant overlap between the lay and religious worlds. Palmer's nuanced readings of these texts and their contexts are plausible and persuasive and argue that the Anglo-Saxon missionaries did not simply provide the Franks with a useful past but were useful precisely because they came from outside the Frankish world.

Richard Abels's "What Has Weland to Do with Christ? The Franks Casket and the Acculturation of Christianity in Early Anglo-Saxon England," *Speculum* 84: 549–81, considers the odd pairing of the Adoration of the Magi and an episode from the legend of Weland on the front panel of this remarkable example of early Anglo-Saxon sculpture. Abels argues that this juxtaposition of what seem to us profoundly dissimilar narratives would not have perplexed those for whom the casket was made; both embody earlier, perhaps pre-Conversion views concerning the nature and importance of gift-giving, with the story of Weland showing "the deadly 'gift' that a bad lord could expect from the followers whom he has abused" (550). Though Abels's article deals brilliantly with the Franks Casket, its concern is with matters of greater scope than the meaning of the Magi/Weland tableau. Sketching the character of earlier Anglo-Saxon Christianity is the real aim of this article, and Abels finds much in the casket to illuminate such an inquiry. Abels argues that the Casket is enmeshed in the world of early Saxon society in ways unappreciated by other commentators. For the first viewers of the casket, the gifts of the Magi would have been seen as "the archetype for the donations *pro anima* that kings and other secular magnates made to churches" (561). The depiction of Weland's revenge perhaps resonates with "Ealdorman Byrhtnoth's offer in the *Battle of Maldon* to pay the Vikings' tribute in the form of spears and swords" (571). The item itself, whose depictions of pagan legends would have made it a rather odd reliquary, was probably a gift for such a member of the "early Anglo-Saxon elite," and its scenes serve to commemorate dominant views of lordship and its practices while perhaps flattering members of this class "who deemed themselves learned" (564). Ultimately, Abels sees signs in the casket and other evidence that the Christianity of the earlier English church was prone to accommodation: so much so that for Bede's contemporaries, forgiving one's enemies "actually proved a new and more effective spiritual mechanism for obtaining vengeance," and, "to Bede's distress," Abels observes, rival exegetes had

discovered "a means to make the biblical injunction of turning the other cheek compatible with the prevailing ethos of reciprocity and feud" (574).

A similarly skeptical assessment of earlier English Christianity may be found in Alecia Arceo's "Rethinking the Synod of Whitby and Northumbrian Monastic Sites," *Haskins Society Journal* 20: 19–30. Against the view that the appearance in seventh-century Northumbria of "metalwork, manuscripts, and stone sculpture" consistent with "artistic styles current in Rome, Italy, Gaul, or Byzantium" reflects monks' "new-found allegiance to the Roman Church," Arceo summons evidence to the effect that "monastic settlements built in Northumbria during this period" merely perpetuated "a tradition of monumentality long embraced by Anglo-Saxon secular elites, many of whom were also founders and leaders of Northumbrian ecclesiastical communities" (19–20). In the view of some contemporary archaeologists, "contemporary high-status secular sites, not monastic sites, were the important loci of fine metalwork production" (23). This metalwork shows evidence of the "fusion of Anglo-Saxon, Irish, British, Roman, and Frankish artistic elements" well in advance of the production of Northumbrian illuminated manuscripts long associated with this style; thus, it can be assumed that scribes "found inspiration for the artistic elements in their illuminated manuscripts in high-status, secular metalwork" rather than the other way around, as some have maintained (24–5). The long-observed associations between monasteries and monuments of the era before conversion, along with continuities of burial practice for the "special" dead, round out the study (26).

David N. Bell's 1995 study, *What Nuns Read: Books and Libraries in Medieval English Nunneries* (Kalamazoo: Cistercian Publications) provided the most detailed analysis yet published for religious women's literacy in medieval England. In "What Nuns Read: The State of the Question" in *The Culture of Medieval English Monasticism*, ed. James G. Clark (Woodbridge: Boydell P, 2007), 113–33, Bell returns to this topic in order to reconsider his conclusions in the light of a decade's further research. While there's much of interest here—especially the survey of new evidence for women's manuscript production, there is little of direct relevance to the Anglo-Saxonist. As Bell himself concedes, the Old English period was not the focus of his research nor was the surviving evidence from the pre-Conquest period of the sort to be useful for the particular methodology employed in his analysis. Accordingly, though Bell's work is of considerable interest and value to anyone studying the history of religious women's literacy, Anglo-Saxonists will have to turn elsewhere to

find detailed consideration of their period.

In *First Among Abbots: The Career of Abbo of Fleury* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic U of America Press, 2008), Elizabeth Dachowski provides a welcome new assessment of the life and career of one of the most influential Carolingian churchmen. The first modern, English-language biography of Abbo, Dachowski's biography relates the abbot's life in admirably lucid and eminently readable prose. She succeeds in painting a vivid picture of tenth-century monastic life in Carolingian Francia as well as in clearly summarizing the particular theological and doctrinal controversies, which Abbo confronted over the course of his career, culminating in his murder by enraged rioters in 1004. Although Abbo's time in and influence on Anglo-Saxon England comprises a relatively small part of the volume, Anglo-Saxonists will take great pleasure in Dachowski's narrative and find much that sheds light on the broader intellectual contexts of late-tenth-century English culture.

With his characteristic learning and sense of humor, Simon Keynes offers a full consideration of "King Æthelred's charter for Eynsham Abbey (1005)" in *Early Medieval Studies in Memory of Patrick Wormald*, 451–73. After discussing the founder of the abbey—Æthelmær the Stout, son of Æthelweard—the author the *Chronicon Æthelweardi*, the foundation itself, foundation charters in general, and the specific language of this charter, Keynes argues that it is indeed authentic and was the model for the "First Decimation" charters, which Keynes is inclined to think were fabricated later in the eleventh century. The significance of the Eynsham Charter lies in its explicit reference to the recent Viking raids, thus forging a connection with Wulfstan's *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*. Politically, the retirement of Ealdorman Æthelmær to Eynsham—along with the retirement of Ealdorman Ordulf to Tavistock—opened the way for Eadric Streona's rise to power. In conclusion, Keynes shows that Eynsham survived the Vikings and the Normans, with Æthelmær being remembered in prayers as late as 1122.

In "Emma's Greek Shrine" in *Early Medieval Studies in Memory of Patrick Wormald*, 499–507, Lynn Jones makes a plausible case that Emma's donation to the New Minster, Winchester, was a Byzantine triptych reliquary filled with thirty-three relics representing the Holy Land, Byzantium, Italy, France, and England. Given that Emma's first husband, King Æthelred II, had ordered the St. Brice's Day massacre of Danes that led to the rule of England by her second husband, King Cnut, Jones argues that it would have been unthinkable for Emma to deposit a relic of St. Brice in England during Cnut's

lifetime, so the gift of the reliquary was most likely made after Cnut's death in 1035 as part of the effort to reshape her image as a pious queen.

The canonization of Edward the Confessor (d. 1066) was proclaimed on 7 February 1161 in two bulls of Pope Alexander III. In "The Sanctity and Canonisation of Edward the Confessor" in *Edward the Confessor: the Man and the Legend*, ed. R. Mortimer (Woodbridge: the Boydell Press), 173–86, Edina Bozoky demonstrates how it was the colliding interests of Westminster Abbey, of King Henry II, and of Pope Alexander III, which led to Edward's cult. Bozoky begins with an examination of the various hagiographical works produced to glorify Edward, the *Vita Edwardi* and then further *Lives*—first by Osbert of Clare, monk of Westminster, in 1138 and then by Ailred of Rievaulx some twenty years later. In this latest *Life*, the image of Edward is that of "an ideal king who achieves a perfect balance between the management of the temporal and the spiritual, but who also has the monastic attribute of chastity" (175). Bozoky also shows that Ailred, writing during the reign of the Plantagenet King Henry II (1154–89), was trying very deliberately to link Edward with the Plantagenet dynasty. While Ailred depicted Henry as the king who joined the Anglo-Saxon and Norman lines, Edward's sanctity "gave a special brilliance to the Plantagenet dynasty, and might have consolidated its legitimacy by linking it to the ancient Anglo-Saxon lineage" (182). Finally, Bozoky examines the general sequence of papal canonizations at this time, which seem to have been increasing under Pope Alexander III.

In "The Monks of Durham and the Study of Scripture," *The Culture of Medieval English Monasticism*, ed. J.G. Clark (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2007), 86–103, A.J. Piper demonstrates how the monks of Durham kept up with advances in the study of Scripture over hundreds of years, from the end of the eleventh century right up until the mid-sixteenth century. Piper shows, for example, how—in the period between 1096 (the death of Bishop William of St. Calais) and ca. 1160 (when a catalogue was compiled)—the book collection at Durham expanded, not only in terms of the number of books acquired but also in the range and type (some classical texts being notable additions). He also draws attention to the great generosity of Bishop Hugh Le Puiset (1153–95), a man who gave some seventy-five books to the community, including one copy of the Bible that was of sumptuous quality (89). Moving into the thirteenth century, Piper uses inscriptions in books to show how the monastic library was growing and expanding at this time, in particular taking in various gloss-books. It was Prior Bertram of Middleton (1244–58) who made one

of the most significant acquisitions of the thirteenth century, as he brought “a complete set of the postils that run under the name of the Dominican Hugh of St Cher, probably composed c. 1232–36”; as Piper shows, this “put Durham up in the vanguard so far as aids to the study of Scripture was concerned” (91). Piper also explains the move, which saw the creation of a Durham study-house in Oxford, which, in the 1380s, was converted to a college and gave Durham monks university experience. From the information provided by a 1315 book list from this college in Oxford, Piper shows the kind of books that were being studied there by the Durham monks; while this initial list reveals a rather limited collection, a later list of 1395 records a fuller library. Catalogues of books from the Durham monastery itself survive from the fourteenth century and can be used to show both what was available in the Spendement, “the strongroom opening off the western walk of the cloister at the northern end,” and in the main collection in the cloister itself (94). Following some very interesting comments about the use of the Durham books in the fourteenth century—when some little-used books were consigned to the Spendement—and in the management of the collection in general, Piper then describes the creation in the 1420s of a “Libraria” specifically to house the community’s books (98). By the end of the fifteenth century, this room held about 320 volumes, covering the main subject areas of scripture, theology, and law (98). Finally, Piper examines how the availability of printed books from the second half of the fifteenth century affected the numbers and types of books relating to scripture that came to Durham—with some very interesting discussion of those collected by Dr. Thomas Swalwell and the marginalia in some of his volumes.

In “The Embedded Saint: The *Wilton Chronicle*’s Life of St Wulfthryth,” *Revue Bénédictine* 119: 86–120, Wiesje Emons-Nijenhuis contrasts the accounts of the Anglo-Saxon saint Wulfthryth in Goscelin’s *Vita et Translatione Sce Edithae* and in the *Wilton Chronicle*. Emons-Nijenhuis suggests that the *patriis libris* cited as sources by Goscelin are local books—perhaps in Old English, but the main value of this essay for Anglo-Saxonists is the helpful review of the development of the legend of Wulfthryth. Beginning with the *Regularis Concordia*’s hints of Edgar’s possible improper behavior, Emons-Nijenhuis traces the legend from the eleventh through the early seventeenth centuries. An appendix presents the *Wilton Chronicle*’s life of Wulfthryth newly edited from BL MS Cotton Faustina B. III.

Other studies that deal with religion and the Church are Sarah Larratt Keefer’s “*Donne se cirlicsa man ordales weddigeð*: The Anglo-Saxon Lay Ordeal,” Lisi Oliver’s

“Royal and Ecclesiastical Law in Seventh-Century Kent,” and Miri Rubin’s “An Anglo-Saxon Queen’s Consecration,” which are reviewed below in Subsection H.

7C. SOCIETY AND THE FAMILY

Thomas M. Charles-Edwards’s “Social Structure” in *A Companion to the Early Middle Ages, Britain and Ireland, c. 500–c. 1100*, ed. P. Stafford (West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell), 107–25, provides an overview of social structures in early Ireland and Britain. He begins with a discussion of early names and what they can tell us about a person’s identity and social status, extending also to names that were applied to particular dynasties (for example, members of the East Saxon royal dynasty often had names that began with S). However, as Charles-Edwards shows, there were also those people who changed their names—an act which often reflected a change in status. In both Ireland and Britain, sharp distinctions were made between the different stages in the lives of men and women: The age at which a free male engaged in his first military expedition was a turning-point, while for the female such moments were related to sex rather than violence. By using evidence from seventh- and eighth-century Northumbria—particularly work by Bede and Stephanus, Charles-Edwards gives an overview of the life cycle of a noble male, at the same time examining the key characteristics of the early medieval feud (at 113). Charles-Edwards then moves on to discuss the evidence for status and class, focusing especially on the relatively plentiful material from Ireland, where a distinction was drawn between nobles, freemen, the “half-free,” and slaves. In the closing pages, discussing various aspects of lordship, Charles-Edwards highlights the distinction between Ireland—where the relationship between a lord and his client was defined in terms of livestock—and England and Wales, where it centered on land.

To what extent did Old English legislation concerning the potential for social mobility reflect the actual flexibility or lack thereof in the pre-Conquest social hierarchy? This question—the subject of major studies by Liebermann, Maitland, and Stenton, among others—is taken up by James Campbell in “Aspects of Nobility and Mobility in Anglo-Saxon Society” in *Soldiers, Nobles and Gentlemen: Essays in Honour of Maurice Keen*, ed. Peter R. Coss and Christopher Tyerman (Woodbridge: Boydell P), 17–31. Rejecting the possibility that the Old English laws may be merely archaic “with only a tenuous connection to contemporary reality” (18), Campbell suggests that fluctuations in social status must have

been relatively common and that—particularly in the earlier Anglo-Saxon period—the boundaries between different social ranks may have been considerably more fluid than they subsequently became. Though he comes to few tangible conclusions, Campbell's wide-ranging reflections highlight a number of provocative questions about the nature of social status in pre-Conquest England.

In “Containing Virginité: Sex and Society in Early Medieval England,” *Haskins Society Journal* 21: 47–66, Thomas Cramer argues that Aldhelm creatively restructures the writings of Augustine—as filtered through Prosper, Jerome, Ambrose, and Cyprian—to create a workable authority for the abbesses of double monasteries. Cramer sees *De Virginitate* as a theological defense of double monasteries requested by the nuns of Barking in response to the attacks by Theodore of Tarsus. Aldhelm first modifies Jerome's classification of the different statuses of women in order to emphasize spiritual chastity over physical virginity, although accepting that in theory, virgins still take precedence over the chaste. He then shifts the debate by arguing that in practice, chastity surpasses virginity, insofar as virginity itself is not holy unless it is coupled with spiritual purity. The influence of Ambrose's *De Virginitate* and Cyprian's *De habitu virginum* is seen in Aldhelm's treatment of clothing, adornment, and marriage; in addition, Aldhelm follows Ambrose's point that it is preferable to have a virgin mind than a virgin body. As the abbesses whom Aldhelm defends so adroitly were married women of high birth who had retired to a monastic life, *De Virginitate* indirectly attests to the status of these women in Anglo-Saxon society: the Englishman Aldhelm viewed their authority as normal and not to be undermined by a foreigner.

7D. GENDER AND IDENTITY

Kirsten Jarrett explores “*Cives* and *Saxones*: The Expression of Ethnicity in South-West Britain in the Early Middle Ages” in *In Search of the Medieval Voice: Expressions of Identity in the Middle Ages*, ed. Lorna Bleach et al. (Cambridge Scholars Publishing), 180–200. Jarrett observes that—unlike the rest of post-Roman Britain—the Cornish peninsula saw minimal change in settlement patterns from the pre-Roman period to the seventh century. Burial evidence suggests that the Roman and pre-Roman past and the Romano-Christian present provided cultural resources for the construction of new identities, as did the use of pins, penannular brooches, and Roman-style belt buckles. Jarrett sees these regional identities as constructed in

opposition to Anglo-Saxon settlement to the east of the region. During the sixth century, pots began to display Anglo-Saxon forms and decoration. After the mid-sixth century, inscribed stones seem to show a desire to assert links first with Roman culture and then with pre-Roman culture. Similarly, whereas Patrick and Gildas used Roman-style discourse to categorize the peoples they discussed as civilized Christian citizens and their barbarian opposites, Latin terms were abandoned during the seventh century in favor of native ones: for example, *cives* yields to *cyrmy*, although both mean ‘fellow countrymen.’ The earlier discourse was enabled by Germanic incomers' paganism, so it was the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons that prompted ethnicity rather than civilization to become the foundation of the next definition of identity.

In “Anglo-Saxon/Gaelic Interaction in Scotland,” Ewan Campbell proposes a postcolonial interpretation of Anglo-Saxon artifacts found in Scotland and Scottish artifacts influenced by Anglo-Saxon styles (in *Anglo-Saxon/Irish Relations Before the Vikings*, 253–263). Rare Anglo-Saxon glass vessels in Scotland may be diplomatic gifts; their rarity would make a reciprocal gift difficult, and so Campbell sees them as an expression of real or intended hegemony or alliances. Ambivalence, resistance, and hybridity are demonstrated in Scottish metalwork that adapts Anglo-Saxon styles of decoration, copies new dress-objects, and adds Celtic ornament to Anglo-Saxon forms. Campbell sees these adaptations as a colonized people's reaction to a colonial power. They may also signify a new social identity arising from the emerging political units of the seventh and eighth centuries.

In “Reporting Scotland in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle” in *Reading the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: Language, Literature, History*, ed. Alice Jorgensen (Turnhout: Brepols, 2010), 221–39, Alex Woolf infers a remarkable amount from the ethnonyms in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle that refer to the groups north of Wessex. Investigating the use and disuse of the terms *Cumbere*, *Peohtas*, *Stræcledwalas*, and *Scottas*, he explores the implications of the ways in which groups identified themselves and were by identified by others. After considering these issues from a historical perspective, he returns to the Chronicle to explore a linguistic point: the absence of the prosthetic /y/ from the Old English *Stræcledwalas* indicates that the term *Stræcled* ultimately derives from a Welsh written source. The presence of Asser at Alfred's court and the transfer of the Cambro-Latin codex, St. Dunstan's Classbook, to Glastonbury are evidence of the connections between Wales and

Wessex, and Woolf suggests that the chroniclers could have been part of this network as well.

Clare A. Lees and Gillian R. Overing's *Double Agents: Women and Clerical Culture in Anglo-Saxon England* (Cardiff: U of Wales Press) is a reissue of their work of the same name published in 2001 by the University of Pennsylvania Press. The authors have added a new four-page preface with a short bibliography of relevant studies since 2001.

Catherine E. Karkov produces a sophisticated gendered reading of "Emma: Image and Ideology" in *Early Medieval Studies in Memory of Patrick Wormald*, 509–20. Using the references to Emma as a virgin in the *Encomium Emmae* and the Marian iconography of the frontispiece of the *Encomium* and the donation portrait in the New Minster *Liber Vitae*, Karkov makes a significant contribution to the scholarly discussion of medieval virginity as performance and rhetorical strategy. Emma's ability to reclaim virginity as a widow and mother of two sons was by no means unparalleled in the medieval world.

In *Gender, Nation and Conquest in the Works of William of Malmesbury* (Woodbridge: Boydell P, 2008), Kirsten A. Fenton takes a new and productive approach by analyzing areas of activity common to men and women alike such as violent behavior. For Anglo-Saxonists, her book is particularly helpful for source criticism because many of the texts Fenton scrutinizes describe events from our period, including: Dunstan violently dragging King Eadwig from his bed-chamber; Wulfstan hitting the married lady who tries to seduce him; St. Æthelthryth snatching back her clothes from a cleric who wants to see her incorrupt body, which she does so violently that he is knocked backwards and crippled; Queen Ælfthryth beating her son Æthelred with candles; and Aldhelm seeking out the company of women to test his power of chastity. Fenton helpfully discusses how issues of gender affect other writers, as when William criticizes Osbern of Canterbury for asserting that King Edgar took his pleasure with a nun. Even though in the *Gesta Regum Anglorum* William himself presents Edgar as promiscuous, he writes in the *Life of St. Dunstan*: "There is absolutely no evidence for that, and even if it could be shown to be true, it would be better for it to be passed over piously than circulated and publicized with malice" (71). Fenton's analysis of gendered discourse in the works of William of Malmesbury not only illuminates his depictions of Dunstan, Wulfstan, the Danish conquest, and the Norman conquest but also suggests new readings of many Old English texts.

Joan A. Holladay touches on what might be termed the reception of Anglo-Saxon "Women in English Royal Genealogies of the Late Thirteenth and Early Fourteenth Centuries" in *The Four Modes of Seeing: Approaches to Medieval Imagery in Honor of Madeline Harrison Caviness*, ed. Evelyg Staudinger, Elizabeth Carson Pastan, and Ellen M. Shortell (Farnham: Ashgate), 348–64. These particular genealogies combine information about the succession of kings from the Heptarchy onward with portraits representing the kings and their children. The only two women to be given text as well as portraits are King Alfred's daughter Alfred and St. Margaret. Overall, the purpose of these striking diagrams is to show that Henry II and his successors are the descendants not only of the Norman kings but also of the Anglo-Saxon kings and the kings of Scotland, thus legitimizing their claims to the Scottish throne.

7E. THE ECONOMY, SETTLEMENT, AND LANDSCAPE

Brian K. Roberts offers a thematic approach to early Northumbrian history in "Between the Brine and the High Ground': The Roots of Northumbria" in *Northumbria: History and Identity 547–2000*, 12–32. As Roberts demonstrates, depictions of the natural landscape, settlement patterns, the political landscape, and religious settlement interweave to expose various aspects of the Iron Age, Romano-British, and Anglo-Saxon periods in this region. Nine maps provide graphic representations of the data, and the thematic explanations for the data are succeeded by a brief history of the polities of the region between 450 and 600.

As the title suggests, David A.E. Pelteret's "The Role of Rivers and Coastlines in Shaping Early English History," *Haskins Society Journal* 21: 21–46, considers a rather broad range of subjects. Its chief aim is to alert historians to the fact that rivers shaped daily life in the pre-modern era in ways we can imagine now only with difficulty. Not only do modern modes of transportation allow us to avoid travel by water entirely, but England's rivers themselves are not what they used to be, having been in the last few centuries "canalized, diverted, embanked, and, in the case of the River Fleet in London, even sent underground in a sewer" (21). Such feats of engineering, along with the natural tendencies of rivers to change their courses under the right conditions—often somewhat drastically—mean that present-day maps tell us less than we might hope about how persons in early England would have experienced their principal means of transportation and communication. Readers will be impressed at just how profoundly the topography of Anglo-Saxon England must have differed from the

present day, with the culprits often nothing more than natural forces such as erosion and silting. The Wantsum Channel, for example, “a broad strait up to 2 miles wide,” once separated the Isle of Thanet from the tip of Kent and was sufficiently significant to have been protected at either end by Saxon forts—one of which gave rise to a monastery. Now, “[t]he Wantsum has been reduced to a drainage channel flowing from Reculver to the Stour, and its original course is now delineated, if at all, only by marshy areas” (26). Surveying current archaeological opinion, Pelteret concludes that “the eastern seaboard might have been much more indented in the early Middle Ages, with some rivers accessible by boat from the sea and, potentially at least, navigable to a greater degree than today” (27). Such features would have facilitated the *adventus Saxonum*, while the nastier seas and paucity of rivers further west slowed the progress of the tribes that seized the crumbling remains of Roman Britain from its Celtic-speaking inhabitants. The rivers that conveyed Germanic tribesmen into their new home would in time sprout churches and monasteries on their banks, and though their appearance “on a high point above a river” had undoubtedly “practical, structural” advantages, Pelteret wonders whether “the model for such riverine ecclesiastical locations may in fact have lain in the immediate pagan past of Anglo-Saxon England in a site like Sutton Hoo, a burial place looming above a river that proclaimed the power of both the living and the dead” (31). The other articles reviewed in this section show that Pelteret is not alone in such speculations. As is to be expected, Pelteret touches as well upon controversies over the rise of the *wic* and the nature of the *minster* that have agitated scholars for some time now, avoiding any too-pointed conclusions. Ultimately, Pelteret’s article is a pleasing and authoritative survey of current archaeological views concerning demographic shifts in England from the arrival of the Saxons to period after the Conquest.

Richard Holt studies “The Urban Transformation in England, 900–1100,” *Anglo-Norman Studies* 32: 57–78, stressing the process of urbanization rather than the original circumstances that gave rise to urban centers. He argues that Alfred was not planning towns when he had burhs founded; the layout of the interiors—to the extent that the interiors were planned at all—was designed to meet current needs and perhaps to emulate the ancient cities of the Continent. The example of Worcester shows that the plots around the High Street were laid out where the earlier defenses had been—not within them—and that the Alfredian market was not in the fortress but on the river-bank. Holt also points out that widespread archeological evidence for urban

activity only dates to the eleventh century, and he argues that the tenth-century evidence of buying, selling, and minting in burhs should be seen in an administrative not commercial light. This contrasts with the central places of the Danelaw, which show clear evidence of commercial and industrial activity before 1000. Holt sees the tenth-century grants of houses, manors, and burgages within the burh of Worcester as evidence that the grantees’ military and administrative service was to be performed within the burh, with the manors being assigned to support the urban households. He concludes that the aristocracy was based in the burhs—not in the countryside, but that did not make the burhs towns. The earliest layouts of Worcester, Winchester, and Oxford show large plots for a few wealthy households rather than the narrow strips that would allow many houses to line the streets. In Winchester, crowded street frontages and occupational street names develop in the late tenth century. The early development of extramural markets is seen as an indication that larger-scale commercial activity was excluded from the burhs. Holt concludes that the burhs at first had a primarily political relationship with their hinterlands that paved the way for the later economic relationship between them.

Following an analysis of those main roads which cross the site of Warwick, and also of the origins of several of its medieval churches, Steven Bassett, “Anglo-Saxon Warwick,” *Midland History* 34.2: 123–55, concludes that when Æthelflæd built a *burh* there in 914 she would have encountered a settlement that already had proto-urban characteristics. Bassett concludes that “we may therefore justifiably add Warwick to the list of the west midlands boroughs, recorded in Domesday Book, which were already well established settlements prior to their being defended in the late ninth or early tenth century” (152). For Bassett, this forms an important corrective to the idea that the lack of evidence for a Domesday borough’s existence prior to its fortification in the late ninth or early tenth century implies that “it owed its origins as a significant settlement, let alone as a town, to the building of a *burh*” (153). In fact, these origins could have been from much earlier, and Bassett encourages a more rounded appreciation of all available evidence.

In “Geographies of Power in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: The Royal Estates of Anglo-Saxon Wessex” in *Reading the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, 187–219, Ryan Lavelle makes the ingenious assumption that the sites of battles with Vikings were often royal estate centers, valuable targets both for their stockpiled supplies and their political importance. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, although it does not identify royal tuns explicitly, thus

serves as one of Lavelle's sources for analyzing Anglo-Saxon royal power in the landscape. After a detailed review of the terminology of royal estates and residences, he turns to the Viking battles in the Chronicle, where he finds a high level of correspondence between those locations and the locations of royal estates recorded in the Domesday Book. Lavelle then assembles the supporting evidence that Athelney was a royal estate before 878 and that Alfred's subsequent movements place him near royal manors recorded in Domesday. In the reign of Æthelred, Vikings are recorded as staying overnight at Thetford and Cholsey, suggesting that these were "farms of one night"—estates that could host a short royal stay. A table of battle sites forms a helpful supplement to the essay.

7F. MAGIC, MEDICINE, AND SCIENCE

Lordana Teresi offers an illustrated inventory of "Anglo-Saxon and Early Anglo-Norman *Mappamundi*" in *Foundations of Learning: The Transfer of Encyclopaedic Knowledge in the Early Middle Ages*, eds. R. Bremner and K. Dekker [see sect. 5], 341–77. She discusses the categories of schematic tripartite (T-O) maps, non-schematic tripartite maps, Macrobian zonal maps, and maps with the five zones in projection, but the inventory itself includes additional categories: list maps, T-O maps in wind diagrams, T-O maps in computes diagrams, and Jerusalem T-O maps. In Teresi's view, the earliest *mappamundi* copied in England were schematic T-O maps that were contained within the works of Isidore of Seville, dating to no later than the second half of the tenth century. These later developed into list maps. From the eleventh century onwards, computus diagrams with a T-O map in the center began to appear, and towards the end of the eleventh century, schematic maps with Jerusalem at the center were produced, perhaps arising out of the first crusade.

7G. LAW, POLITICS, AND WARFARE

Justin Pollard's "What does the Staffordshire Hoard mean to historians?" *History Today* 59.11: 3–4, is a brief opinion piece lamenting the media's emphasis on the weight of the hoard. Pollard draws attention to the anomalous nature of the collection, which consists of very high-status decorative pieces nearly all apparently stripped from military equipment. He suggests that these might be the trophies of a successful warrior—possibly the gleanings from a single bloody battlefield or perhaps the acquisitions of a lifetime.

In Mattiaus Ammon's "Piercing the *rihthamscyld* – a New Reading of Æthelberht 32," *Quaestio Insularis* 9 (2008): 34–51, the law code of Kent's first Christian king attracts yet another study of one of its many *hapax legomena*. As is so often the case, Æthelberht's code does not give commentators much to work with as far as the meaning of this term is concerned: we are told only the consequence of its being "pierced through"; in this case, payment of its unspecified "worth." Felix Liebermann had translated the term as *echtes Hoftor*, rendered by Ammon as "the right [legal/proper] gate to the homestead" (38). Liebermann's interpretation proves yet another disappointing stew of thirteenth-century Frisian analogues—in this case, two of the compound's three elements appear in a clause of legislative prose—and cloudy etymological conjectures. Liebermann's own apparent dissatisfaction with this gloss was shared by T. Northcote Toller, who drastically emends the clause in his supplement to Bosworth's *Dictionary* in an effort to get some sense out of it, and by Frederick Levi Attenborough, who kept Liebermann's interpretation while acknowledging no real belief in it (41). Ammon finds the beginning of a solution in the etymological relationship noted by Lisi Oliver between *ham* "home, homestead" and *hæmed* "sexual intercourse," which could also mean "marriage" (42). The element *riht* is certainly paired with *hæmed* in the compound *unrihthæmed*, "irregular union," which as Ammon notes (again, following Oliver) appears a century after Æthelberht's laws in the laws of Wihtred (45). Thus, Ammon concludes that the clause in question may refer in some fashion to virginity, with *rihthamscyld* perhaps allowing the gloss "hymen" (50). Some of the considerable obstacles to this interpretation are acknowledged: why *hæmed* should appear here in an unmutated form and without the suffix is impossible to explain (46). And although cap. 32 is preceded by a clause having to do with adultery, which perhaps argues for further associations of *rihthamscyld* with sexual conduct, the clause immediately after it takes up the question of *feaxfang*, "hair-pulling." Ammon's concluding paragraph concedes that arguments of the sort he has undertaken are perhaps "unproveable" (51).

In "Unpicking the Web: The Divorce of Ecgrith and Æthelthryth," *European Review of History* 16: 835–54, Katherine Bullimore examines Bede's account of this event from a political perspective. Bede mentions that the king of Northumbria was reluctant to let his wife go, and Bullimore suggests that the most likely reason Ecgrith would have wanted to stay married to Æthelthryth was that the alliances that the marriage brought him were too valuable to lose. Æthelthryth had

family connections to the royal houses of East Anglia, Essex, Kent, Mercia, and Wessex, and it was only after the divorce had severed Ecgrith's alignment with the south that Wulfhere of Mercia invaded Northumbria. Moreover, if Ecgrith's second wife Iurminburh can be identified with a Kentish princess named Eormenburg, then Ecgrith appears to have tried to replace the kinship alliances to the south lost by his divorce from Æthelthryth. Marrying his sister Osthryth to Æthelred of Mercia was another way to achieve this aim.

In "Donne se cirlicsa man ordales weddigeð: the Anglo-Saxon Lay Ordeal" in *Early Medieval Studies in Memory of Patrick Wormald*, 353–68, Sarah Larratt Keefer launches an effective riposte to those who would condemn the anthropological "small communities" approach to the legal procedure of the ordeal. Keefer brings together the manuscript evidence of Anglo-Saxon laws and liturgy regarding ordeals undergone by laymen and finds a good many liturgical adjurations in Old English, which must have been translated so that they could be understood by the uneducated. Keefer interprets them as a quite plausible manifestation of a preference for inclusivity in which all who were involved in lay ordeal should have a clear understanding of the procedure and its consequences. Significantly, the adjurations present confession of guilt as a way to avoid the ordeal, and Keefer argues that this indicates an attempt to position control of the ordeal in the hands of the Church rather than the secular legal system.

Lisi Oliver's "Royal and ecclesiastical law in seventh-century Kent" in *Early Medieval Studies in Memory of Patrick Wormald*, 97–112, augments the fourth chapter of her *The Beginnings of English Law* (Toronto, 2002) by comparing the penitentials of Theodore with the laws of Wihtred that incorporate ecclesiastical rulings. Oliver finds that none of the clauses in the laws of Wihtred that parallel rulings in Theodore are based on Irish penitential material; this suggests that Wihtred did not draw on Theodore. Another significant observation is that the royal law concerns itself with ecclesiastical issues such as the suspension of priests and harboring fugitives from religious establishments. As Oliver notes, in the early days of Christianity in Kent, the ability of a king to legislate religious matters could strengthen the position of both king and Church—only to set them at loggerheads later on.

Stefan Jurasinski re-examines the relationship between "Madness and Responsibility in Anglo-Saxon England" in *Peace and Protection in the Middle Ages*, ed. T.B. Lambert and David Rollason (Durham: Centre for Medieval and Renaissance Studies), 99–120, and finds that—contrary to earlier arguments—the

English held to the medieval conviction that madness was a consequence of sin, and therefore the insane were not absolved of responsibility for their actions. After showing how certain phrases in the laws have been misinterpreted to lend support to the idea that the Anglo-Saxons treated insane criminals leniently, Jurasinski draws on a wide-ranging set of texts to show that the opposite was the case. Latin and Old English penitentials as well as the Germanic *leges barbarorum* all consider sin to be the preeminent cause of mental affliction, and the *Lives* of Guthlac, Alfred's translation of Gregory's *Regula pastoralis*, and Ælfric's *Lives of the Saints* hold that madness is a kind of rage or even a kind of temptation. Far from advocating leniency for the insane, some of these sources do not even recognize insanity as a valid category (120).

Work by Patrick Wormald continues to appear. "Anglo-Saxon Law and Scots Law," *Scottish Historical Review* 88: 192–206, is essentially a brief paper given to the Colloquium of Medieval and Renaissance Studies in Pitlochry in January of 2001; the version printed here has undergone light editing and has few footnotes. It reviews the author's claim—developed at greater length in his *Making of English Law* (1999) and elsewhere—that the Anglo-Saxon state was more developed than was assumed to be the case in older works of scholarship, reliant as these often were on the "archaizing . . . impression" of pre-Conquest law set forth in texts such as *the Leges Henrici Primi* (194). In the early Scottish collection known as the *Leges Scocie*, Wormald sees evidence that "the Old English monarchy could have offered its smaller but not less hyperactive northern sibling a model of how a judicial regime centering on principles of compensation could evolve into one where the government arrogated to itself as much or more of the rights of revenge or amendment as were traditionally reserved to kins" (195). Fines in this text for "homicidally breaking the peace of the king" are not present in earlier Celtic legal compilations and thus are taken by Wormald to resemble the nascent notions of "crime" evident in Anglo-Saxon royal codes (197).

A note of caution about Wormald's assertions is sounded in Alice Taylor's "Leges Scocie and the Lawcodes of David I, William the Lion and Alexander II," *Scottish Historical Review* 88: 207–88, an article of nearly book length (though over half is taken up by a critical edition of the *Leges Scocie*) that should be read alongside Wormald's short piece. Though Wormald urges us to see the *Leges inter Brettos et Scottos* contained within this compilation within the context of Anglo-Saxon royal law, Taylor feels that the *Leges Scocie* in general offer "little to support the notion of an administratively

precocious Scottish state in the eleventh century in which the public authority and jurisdiction of the king was exercised through the offices of earls in the provinces and thanes in localities"; nor do the *Leges inter Brettos et Scottos* "describe a hierarchy of royal officials, maintaining and protecting public law and order on behalf of the king" (244–5). Taylor attempts throughout this article to situate the *Leges* in the environment of late twelfth-century Scotland (the period, she maintains, in which most of its provisions may be securely dated) and emphasizes the differences between practices contained therein and those typical of Anglo-Saxon legislation.

James Campbell's "Archipelagic Thoughts: Comparing Early Medieval Polities in Britain and Ireland" in *Early Medieval Studies in Memory of Patrick Wormald*, 47–63, comprises learned and plausible speculations about the strength of the Indo-European heritage persisting in Britain and Ireland. The particular aspects of this heritage that he considers are raiding, taxation, client kingship, royal villas, and uniform house sizes. Campbell's arguments are necessarily limited, but in a brief space he sketches out large areas for future scholars to investigate in depth.

In "Celtic Kings: 'Priestly Vegetables?'" in *Early Medieval Studies in Memory of Patrick Wormald*, 65–80, T.M. Charles-Edwards is mostly concerned with modifying Patrick Wormald's suggestion that all early Irish kings were "priestly vegetables" (i.e., passive sacral rulers). On the basis of evidence in the areas of legislation, royal control of land within client kingdoms, and the difference between the political regimes of *cairde* and *cáin*, Charles-Edwards argues that it is client kingship in particular that gave rise to the appearance of passive sacral rule. In the course of these arguments, he contrasts the behaviors of a number of Irish, Welsh, and Anglo-Saxon kings that may be of interest to Anglo-Saxonists.

In her chapter, "Britain, Ireland, and Europe, c. 750–c. 900" in *A Companion to the Early Middle Ages: Britain and Ireland, c. 500–c. 1100*, ed. P. Stafford (West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell), 231–47, Janet Nelson concentrates on connections and contacts between Ireland, Britain, and Europe. Having discussed how Charlemagne's "recharged Frankish empire" had encouraged growing contact with Ireland and Britain through, for example, trade and exchange of churchmen and scholars (232), Nelson makes use of various letters which, because of their contemporaneity, can "put modern readers in contact with some ninth-century people" (233). Through her close readings of Alcuin and Charlemagne's 796 letter to Offa, other letters by Lupus of Ferrières, and finally of the letter of Archbishop Fulk of Rheims

to King Alfred, Nelson reveals the kind of exchanges that took place from the late eighth century to the late ninth century. She shows, for example, how Alcuin, in writing to the brethren of Lindisfarne following the 793 viking attack on the island, could suggest that Charlemagne, king of the Franks, might be able to use his own contacts among the Danes to persuade them to return some of the noble children, oblates, who had been taken captive from Lindisfarne by the vikings. Nelson also demonstrates that close contact between Ireland, Britain, and continental Europe was in a way strengthened—especially by the mid-ninth century—by the Vikings' presence, which created a "sense of common threat and a desire for concerted defense" (239). Her readings of these letters forcefully highlight the close desire for exchange and cultural interaction between these different geographical and political areas; in her own words, "letters reveal men in collaboration and in a shared desire to communicate with, to exchange with, to persuade and negotiate with, each other, across space, time, and death" (242).

Alice Jorgensen's "Introduction: Reading the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle," *Reading the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, 1–28, introduces an interdisciplinary volume of essays from a 2004 conference held at York University. In addition to providing useful overviews of the papers in the volume itself (which is divided into three main sections, concerning "the Chronicle as literature," "the Chronicle as history," and "the language of the Chronicle") and how they fit into wider scholarship on the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, Jorgensen offers an assessment of the various issues at stake in any study of this complicated text. She raises such important questions as whether we are really reading one Anglo-Saxon Chronicle or whether we are confronted by a series of different Chronicles; she shows how different manuscript versions have different interests, some of which are clearly propagandist in tone (the Edwardian annals being a good example of this) and some of which exhibit regional bias (as shown, for example, by the Northern Recension in D and E); and she has some very important reminders that in each version of the Chronicle what we are seeing is one compiler's choice of annals and insertion (or deletion) of extra material, all the time with a new agenda. As a summary of and introduction to this complex subject, this offering has much to recommend it.

Anton Scharer indulges in a brief comparison of "The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and Continental Annal-Writing" in *Reading the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, 161–6. Like the Royal Frankish Annals, the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle is official historiography, in this case documenting the

rise of the Cerdicings and Alfred. Both were written in bursts rather than in yearly updates, both invoke the legitimization of Rome, and both contain an element of fabrication, while glossing over events that do not contribute to the larger agenda. Unlike the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, copies of the Royal Frankish Annals were included in compilations of historical texts, such as a St. Petersburg manuscript that also includes Einhard's *Vita Karoli* and the Astronomer's *Vita Hludowici imperatoris*. Scharer speculates that a similar manuscript might have inspired Asser to compose his biography of Alfred, in yet another Anglo-Saxon emulation of Carolingian court culture.

In his entry, "Northumbria" in *A Companion to the Early Middle Ages*, 303–21, William M. Aird begins with a critique of the notion that England's "pre-existing 'national' unity was already in place, waiting to be rediscovered and given political expression by that national icon Alfred the Great and his immediate successors in the tenth century" (303). Such a nationalist view, of an inevitable drive towards the unification of England, has meant that periods in different kingdoms' histories—such as the arrival and settlement of a Scandinavian population in Northumbria—have inevitably been regarded rather negatively. In this chapter, Aird provides a useful overview of some of the main political developments in Northumbria in the Anglo-Saxon period—primarily from the tenth century onwards and including also the Norman Conquest and its effects, demonstrating how different competing influences, such as the Scots and the Scandinavians as well as the West Saxons, shaped and influenced the Northumbrian political entity. For Aird, "it is difficult to understand the historical development of Northumbria in the tenth and eleventh centuries if one starts with the idea that the region was, and was always going to be, 'English'" (316).

In "Northumbria: A Failed European Kingdom," *Northumbria: History and Identity*, 1–11, David Rollason offers an introductory account of the geographical limits and political characteristics of the kingdom of Northumbria in the Anglo-Saxon period. Having delineated its likely borders at various stages, he sets out the evidence for what can be gleaned about its government and the types of official who would have operated there. Rollason also describes the effect of the ninth-century Scandinavian settlement on the kingdom, suggesting that one result was the creation of so-called "successor states" centered on York and Bamburgh (7–8), which Rollason proposes in fact represented a continuation of the old kingdom of Northumbria—a theme that lies at the core of his 2003 book, *Northumbria*

500–1100: Creation and Destruction of a Kingdom. It was in the tenth century, Rollason suggests, that the Northumbrian kingdom came under threat from English kings in the south and later from the Scots in the north and began to unravel. Nevertheless, northern historians of the late eleventh and early twelfth century tried to keep the Northumbrian past alive.

Barbara Yorke looks for and finds the preoccupations of the scholarly circle around King Alfred in "The Representation of Early West Saxon History in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle" in *Reading the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, 141–59. The annals for the seventh and eighth centuries in the Chronicle seem to her to suggest considerable editorial intervention by the team who produced the version circulating around 890. In particular, she proposes that the extended annal entered under the year 755 was composed by the author of the 855 annal, for both reflect views found in the sources associated with Alfred's clerics: the nature of good and bad leadership, the role of the witan in deciding royal succession, and policies for undermining the reputations of earlier West Saxon rulers. She follows Stenton in thinking that the other annals for the seventh and eighth centuries were crafted from an earlier set of annals rather than being complete fabrications.

In "Marking Boundaries: Charters and the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle" in *Reading the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, 167–85, Scott Thompson Smith reads the Chronicle as a narrative of expanding territory. The inventory of place names increases, and the boundaries are identified by being the sites of military activity. In this sense, Thompson Smith argues that the Chronicle does for England what charters do for estates: represent a grant of property and serve as written evidence of possession. In both cases, the textual representation of boundaries is fused with the representation of power.

David A.E. Pelteret discerns "An Anonymous Historian of Edward the Elder's Reign" in *Early Medieval Studies in Memory of Patrick Wormald*, 319–36, behind the notices for 912 through 920 of the A version of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. These notices contain some significant similarities and shared concerns that are not found in the earlier notices, and Pelteret hypothesizes that their author was Edward's youngest brother Æthelweard.

In "An Anglo-Saxon Queen's Consecration" in *Medieval Christianity in Practice*, ed. Miri Rubin (Princeton: Princeton UP), 327–32, Janet Nelson provides a helpful translation of the Latin *ordo*, which, as she has argued elsewhere, likely served as the ritual through which queens were crowned in the tenth and eleventh centuries. She follows the translation with a very brief

introduction targeted at undergraduate and early-career graduate students in which she lays out some of the *ordo's* liturgical contexts. Like the other contributions to this volume, Nelson's piece is designed as a tool for instruction and thus advances no arguments that haven't been made in more detail elsewhere. Nonetheless, it provides a useful short reading that can easily be incorporated into a wide variety of courses.

In "Making a Difference in Tenth-Century Politics: King Athelstan's Sisters and Frankish Queenship" in *Frankland*, 167–90, Simon MacLean examines the dynastic alliances between the Anglo-Saxons and the Saxons, Franks, and even the Vikings in Northumbria. MacLean usefully contrasts the motives of Charlemagne, who was reluctant to contract dynastic alliances because he feared the inheritance claims of his distant grandsons, and those of Edward the Elder, who prized allies in his own time over the possibility of struggles for the throne later on. Once married across the Channel, the English outsider queens worked to gain control of estates that would bolster their precarious status, namely, those owned by previous queens. Suggestively, MacLean concludes by asking whether the experience of Athelstan's daughters led to the queenly emphasis on dynastic commemoration in the second half of the tenth century—given their lack of resources, their only option was to cultivate the resources of the families into which they married.

Simon Keynes and Rosalind Love have the rare opportunity to make use of a new primary source concerned with "Earl Godwine's Ship," ASE 38: 185–223. This is the Latin poem in the *Vita Ædwardi regis* (written in the late 1060's) describing a ship given to King Edward in 1042 by Earl Godwine. Until 2008, the poem had been only partly preserved, but a complete text of the poem was found that year. In this article, Keynes supplies the political analysis, and Love examines the poem in literary and textual terms. Keynes reminds us that Godwine had been raised to power by Cnut and of Cnut's sons supported first Harthacnut and then Harold Harefoot. Godwine seems to have been closely involved in the death of Edward's brother Alfred, which is one reason why, when Cnut's sons had met their end, he might well have thought it wise to show his new loyalty to Edward with a magnificent and useful ship. Love shows that the complete ship poem is unlike the compositions of Goscelin, ruling him out as a potential author, but it does have several parallels with passages from the *Encomium Emmae*. She also shows that the poem was the ultimate source for John of Worcester and William of Malmesbury's descriptions of the ship that they claim Godwine gave to Harthacnut, which

suggests that this claim was a fabrication on the part of the later historians; Godwine made only one gift of a ship, and that was to Edward.

"Were there structural flaws in the late Anglo-Saxon state which contributed to its demise?" (503). This is the question asked by Stephen Baxter in his essay, "The Limits of the Anglo-Saxon State" in *Der Frühmittelalterliche Staat: Europäische Perspektiven*, eds. Walter Pohl and Veronika Wieser (Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften), 503–15. Baxter advances the counterintuitive argument that "the Conquest was the outcome of a lengthy process, not a single event, to which a variety of causal factors contributed; that structural flaws in the late Anglo-Saxon state were among these factors; but that several of these factors could be, indeed often are, listed among its strengths. A defining paradox of the late Anglo-Saxon state is that its strengths made it vulnerable." (503) Building on the maximalist claims of such scholars as James Campbell and Patrick Wormald, Baxter suggests that the centralized nature of the later Anglo-Saxon government made it more susceptible to the consolidation of Norman power than did the more localized hierarchies of other surrounding communities, such as Wales. As Baxter concludes, the closer Anglo-Saxon England came to formal, centralized statehood, the more vulnerable it became.

Stephen Baxter investigates "The Death of Burgheard Son of Ælfgar and Its Context" in *Frankland*, 266–84 and 322–3, and seeks to identify Burgheard in the Domesday Book and explain why he went to Rome. Little is known of Burgheard's life, but his death in 1061 was commemorated by his parents' gift of an estate to the abbey of Saint-Rémi, where he was buried. Earl Ælfgar and his wife also donated a gospel book in memory of their son; it is still extant, minus its ornate cover (Reims, Bibliothèque Municipale Carnegie, MS 9). Baxter argues that Burgheard does appear in Domesday and is the Burgheard of Mendlesham and of Shenley. Baxter supports Freeman's suggestion that Burgheard went to Rome to escort and support Bishop Wulfwig of Dorchester, for the bishop was an ally of Ælfgar's and papal support of his jurisdictional rights in Lincolnshire would have strengthened the earl as well as himself.

The chapter by Stephen Baxter, "Edward the Confessor and the Succession Question" in *Edward the Confessor: the Man and the Legend*, 77–118, provides a detailed reassessment of one of the most vexed problems of Anglo-Saxon history: the succession following the reign of Edward the Confessor, who himself had none of his own children whom he could designate as heir. Having stressed the difficulties involved in this discussion, since English and Norman sources disagree

so considerably in their views over whether Earl Harold or Duke William was the intended heir, Baxter offers a summary of the abundance of previous scholarship on the debate and situates his own position within this body of literature. What Baxter is most keen to stress is that Edward's own attitude to the succession must have changed according to the ever-evolving political situation—especially in the 1050s and beyond. Baxter shows in particular that the balance of power among the native English earls must have had a great influence on Edward's decision regarding the succession. For example, when Earl Godwine and his sons were exiled in the early 1050s, Baxter shows that Edward was able to pursue his own agenda more freely—perhaps with the result that William was welcomed in England in 1051, but when, by 1059, after having explored various other options, including the claim of Edward the 'Exile' and likewise Edgar Ætheling, the majority of the English earldoms were in the power of the house of Godwine, it became increasingly likely that one of its members would become the new king elect, most likely Harold. In its explanation of these obscure, complicated, and often contradictory political happenings, there is much of use in this chapter by Baxter, including his assessment of Edward's deathbed bequest of the kingdom to Harold. For Baxter, Edward's "handling of the succession issue was dangerously indecisive, and contributed to one of the greatest catastrophes to which the English have ever succumbed" (118).

7H. VIKINGS

The Viking World, edited by Stefan Brink and Neil Price (London: Routledge, 2008), takes a large thematic approach to its subject. Part I, "Viking Age Scandinavia," covers people, society, and social institutions; living space; technology and trade; warfare and weaponry; pre-Christian religion and belief; and language, literature, and art. Part II, "The Viking Expansion," covers the British Isles, Continental Europe, and the Mediterranean; the Baltic, Russia, and the east; and the North Atlantic. Part III, "Scandinavia Enters the European Stage," covers the coming of Christianity and the development of nation states. The work as a whole is geared for a reader already somewhat familiar with the subject, and it is particularly valuable not only for including the most recent analyses (for example, that the Oseberg ship burial of two women was left open for several months before being sealed up) but also for the long technical bibliographies that follow each section. Sections of interest to Anglo-Saxonists include the following. Clare Downham's entry, "The Vikings in England" (341–9),

provides an overview of the major political happenings in England involving Vikings and also of some of the main areas of scholarly debate surrounding these Scandinavian incomers. She shows how Viking raids that began as hit-and-run ventures with the aim of snatching booty in the late eighth century became, by the late ninth century and even more so by the early eleventh century, concerted attempts at settlement of different areas of England. Such settlement led to various areas of the country, for example the north and east, being in Scandinavian hands, the result of which was a distinctive mixture of native and Viking cultures and norms. Downham also describes how modern scholarship has questioned the exact scale of these settlements and the extent to which Scandinavians integrated with native Anglo-Saxons (for example in the realm of religion).

In "Vikings in Insular Chronicling" (350–67), David Dumville discusses the differing ways in which chronicles from different Insular zones recorded Viking activities from the late eighth century onwards, often showing varying interests and preoccupations. As Dumville notes, "the differing cultural traditions within which Insular chroniclers worked ensured varying presentations of information" (351). Dumville also examines the various terms applied to Vikings by Insular chronicles (including, for example, *Nordmanni*, *Nortmanni*, *Normanni*, *piratae*, or *Dani*) and the difficulties involved in any assessment of "ethnicity, geographical origins and religion" on the basis of this terminology alone (354). In the remainder of the chapter, Dumville demonstrates how it is only when Vikings began to settle in various Insular zones that chroniclers began to record the names of their leaders, since they were now forced to deal with these figures as settlers and neighbours. He also provides a brief overview of one major scholarly debate concerning Vikings: the scale of their settlement in the British Isles. In closing his chapter, Dumville hypothesizes that it was in thirteenth-century English historiography that the view of Vikings as bloodthirsty warriors became established while already by the early years of the twelfth century such views were common in Ireland.

As Dawn Hadley points out in "The Creation of the Danelaw" (375–8), the term "Danelaw," used to describe those northern and eastern parts of the country occupied by Scandinavians, first occurs in a series of legal texts compiled by Archbishop Wulfstan II of York (d. 1023). Here, Hadley gives an account of the area that constituted the Danelaw and the extent to which its characteristics were distinctive from the rest of England. She suggests that "the regions known as the Danelaw were accorded special provisions, but were, nonetheless,

regarded as legal provinces within the English kingdom” (376). In “York” (379–84), Richard Hall provides a brief political overview of the town’s Roman founding, Anglo-Saxon reoccupation, Viking conquest, Anglo-Scandinavian control, and resistance to the Norman invasion. The focus of the article is on the excavations of Viking Age Jorvik, with attention to the layout of the town, burials, manufacturing, and trade.

In his “The Norse in Scotland” (411–27), James H. Barrett discusses the various forms of evidence for Scandinavian settlement and influence in Scotland and the problems involved in using such data. He highlights the methodological difficulties in, for example, using twelfth- and thirteenth-century narrative sources in any assessment of conditions in the ninth and tenth centuries. Barrett shows how scholars have attempted to bring together the evidence of archaeology, onomastics, and the scant surviving contemporary record to try to form an impression of the process of Scandinavian settlement and indeed of the principal features of Viking Age Scotland. But scholars have often interpreted this evidence in contrary ways—to the extent that there has been considerable divergence in such fundamental issues as when the Scandinavian settlement even began in Scotland. Here Barrett provides a useful overview of all of the different positions while attempting no definitive resolution himself.

7i. THE NORMAN CONQUEST AND SETTLEMENT

Ad F.J. van Kempen is the latest historian to give his own take on “The Mercian Connection, Harold Godwinson’s Ambitions, Diplomacy and Channel-Crossing, 1056–1066,” *History* 94: 2–19. Linking William of Poitiers’s statements about Harold’s diplomatic activities in France with what could be references in the *Vita Edwardi* to Harold’s dealings with William of Normandy in 1064, van Kempen speculates that Harold’s journey across the Channel was meant as a tour of diplomacy to win support for his candidacy for the throne of England. Harold’s expedition is thus seen as a continuation of his diplomacy in the Midlands earlier in 1064, when he concluded a cunning deal with the rulers of Mercia. Part of the secret arrangement was the acquisition of Northumbria, which, at the time, was ruled by his brother Tostig. Harold’s unintended landfall in Ponthieu and captivity in Normandy led him to lie about his presence on the Continent, and the fabrications about a mission from Edward revived what van Kempen claims was William’s latent interest in the English succession. After his return to England, Harold’s extenuation of his illegitimate promises to William raised suspicion about

the true nature of his journey, and when the full facts of his Mercian connection were revealed, Queen Edith and Tostig took desperate measures to prevent a takeover of Northumbria by Harold.

In “The *Vita Edwardi*: The Politics of Poetry at Wilton Abbey” in *Proceedings of the Battle Conference 2008*, ed. C.P. Lewis (Woodbridge: Boydell P), 135–56, Elizabeth M. Tyler analyzes the use of the “Roman story-world” as a means of negotiating dynastic ambition amidst the politics of conquest (136). Tyler highlights the increasing importance of the court and the royal nunnery as centers of literary innovation, and she shows the importance of Latin for communicating between the different linguistic groups in England. Most interestingly of all, she lays bare the social and political reasons for using verse and fictionality as modes of historiography. Namely, not only was the patron of the *Vita Edwardi* a woman, Edward’s widow Edith, but its audience could have been women as well, for Tyler makes a good case for the Latinity, learning, and fondness for poetry on the part of the aristocratic nuns at Wilton.

Paul Dalton’s “The Outlaw Hereward ‘the Wake’: His Companions and Enemies” in *Outlaws in Medieval and Early Modern England: Crime, Government and Society, c. 1066–c. 1600*, eds. John C. Appleby and Paul Dalton (Farnham: Ashgate), 7–36, reassesses the evidence for the outlaw’s activities in order to ascertain the historicity of his French and English associates. In Dalton’s words, the article “argues that some of the English companions of Hereward in these sources were real historical figures, linked with the outlaw in various ways. It also suggests that the roles of some of Hereward’s French companions and enemies, men whose historical existence is not in doubt, [are] quite plausible and supported by their administrative and military positions in post-Conquest England” (7). Ultimately, Dalton argues that the sources for Hereward’s life—especially the *Gesta Herewardi*—are more credible than hitherto recognized and, therefore, worthy of further consideration as records of the post-Conquest period.

Nicholas Karn undertakes a case study of “Secular Power and Its Rewards in Dorset in the Late Eleventh and Early Twelfth Centuries,” *Historical Research* 82: 2–16, as the many deaths and retirements of the office-holders left a fairly full documentary record and also offered the kings repeated opportunities to reshape the system. Karns quite rightly sees a connection between office-holding and private wealth, for those who served the king were rewarded, and those who were closer to the king received proportionately greater rewards. By this methodology, Karns concludes that in the decades

immediately after the Conquest, the powerful sheriffs of Dorset often found their reward in substantial wealth, whereas by the early twelfth century, sheriffs were lesser figures in authority and prosperity, and the new grade of justices were rewarded in a manner reminiscent of the sheriffs from decades before. Karn attributes this to the new ways in which the Anglo-Norman kings chose to manage the shires, the limitations imposed by limited resources and local customs, and the availability of suitable candidates.

Works Not Seen

- Almond, Michael. "Lost in Translation." *History Today* 59.7 (2009), 69. [A response to Terry Wardle's article "England's First Castle."]
- Anlezark, Daniel. "Medieval: Introduction." *Blackwell Companion to the Bible in English Literature*. Ed. Rebecca Lemon. Chichester, UK: Blackwell, 2009. 41-60.
- Bassett, Steven. "The Landed Endowment of the Anglo-Saxon Minster at Hanbury (Worcs.)." *ASE* 38 (2009), 77-100.
- Baxter, Stephen. "Lordship and Justice in Late Anglo-Saxon England: The Judicial Functions of Soke and Commendation Revisited." *Early Medieval Studies in Memory of Patrick Wormald*. Eds. Baxter, et al. [see sect. 2] pp. 383-419.
- Bhreathnach, Edel. "Ireland, c. 900 - c. 1000." *A Companion to the Early Middle Ages*. Ed. Stafford. pp. 268-84.
- Bingham, Jane. *The Cotswolds: A Cultural History*. New York: Oxford UP, 2009. [esp. ch. 1, "Ancient Echoes: From Prehistory to the Coming of the Anglo-Saxons," pp. 1-14]
- Blair, John. "The Dangerous Dead in Early Medieval England." *Early Medieval Studies in Memory of Patrick Wormald*. Eds. Baxter, et al. [see sect. 2] pp. 539-59.
- Bremmer, Rolf H., Jr. "The Anglo-Saxon Continental Mission and the Transfer of Encyclopaedic Knowledge." *Foundations of Learning: The Transfer of Encyclopaedic Knowledge in the Early Middle Ages*. Eds. Bremmer and Dekker. [see sect. 5] pp. 19-50.
- Brooks, Nicholas P. "The Fonthill Letter, Ealdorman Ordlaaf and Anglo-Saxon Law in Practice." *Early Medieval Studies in Memory of Patrick Wormald*. Eds. Baxter, et al. [see sect. 2] pp. 301-17.
- Brown, George Hardin. "From the Wound in Christ's Side to the Wound in His Heart: Progression from Male Exegesis to Female Mysticism." *Poetry, Place, and Gender: Studies in Medieval Culture in Honor of Helen Damico*. Ed. Karkov. [see sect. 2] pp. 252-74.
- Camp, Cynthia Turner. "Embodying the Anglo-Saxons: Incorrupt Saints and Textual Communities in Late Medieval England." Ph.D. Diss. Cornell Univ., 2008. [Proquest 3330031]
- Clarke, Howard B. "Economy." *A Companion to the Early Middle Ages*. Ed. Stafford. pp. 57-75.
- Collins, Roger. "Review Article: Making Sense of the Early Middle Ages." *EHR* 124 (2009), 641-55.
- Colls, Robert, ed. *Northumbria: History and Identity 547-2000*. Chichester: Phillimore, 2007. xiv + 370 pp. ill. maps.
- Cramer, Thomas. "Containing Virginity: Sex and Society in Early Medieval England." *Haskins Society Journal* 21 (2009), 47-66.
- Crawford, Barbara. *The Churches Dedicated to St Clement in Medieval England: A Hagio-Geography of the Seafarer's Saint in Eleventh-Century Northern Europe*. Scripta Ecclesiastica 1. St. Petersburg: Axioma, 2008. xii + 238 pp.
- Crawford, Sally. "Settlement and Social Differentiation." *A Companion to the Early Middle Ages*. Ed. Stafford. pp. 432-45.
- . *Daily Life in Anglo-Saxon England*. Greenwood Press Daily Life through History Series. Westport, CT: Greenwood P, 2009. xii + 245 pp. maps. ill. plates.
- Crick, Julia. "Nobility." *A Companion to the Early Middle Ages*. Ed. Stafford. pp. 414-31.
- Cubitt, Catherine. "Pastoral Care and Religious Belief." *A Companion to the Early Middle Ages*. Ed. Stafford. pp. 394-413.
- . "The Institutional Church." *A Companion to the Early Middle Ages*. Ed. Stafford. pp. 376-94.
- Drout, Michael D. C. *The Anglo-Saxon World*. Prince Frederic, MD: Recorded Books, 2009, 88 pp. ill + 7 CDs. [sound recording]
- Dunn, Marilyn. *The Christianization of the Anglo-Saxons, c. 597-700: Discourses of Life, Death and Afterlife*. London: Continuum, 2009. 280 pp. map.
- Fernie, Eric. "Edward the Confessor's Westminster Abbey." *Edward the Confessor: The Man and the Legend*. Ed. Mortimer. pp. 139-50.
- Flechner, Roy. "An Insular Tradition of Ecclesiastical Law: Fifth to Eighth Century." *Anglo-Saxon/Irish Relations before the Vikings*. Ed. Graham-Campbell and Ryan. pp. 23-46.
- Frodsham, Paul. *Cuthbert and the Northumbrian Saints: An Introduction to the Saints of the Northumbrian Golden Age from the Baptism of King Edwin to the Death of Bede c.627-735 AD*. Seaton Burn: Northern Heritage in association with The Golden Age of Northumbria Project, 2009. 119 pp. ill. map.

- Gautier, Alban. "Hospitality in Pre-Viking Anglo-Saxon England." *EME* 17 (2009), 23-44.
- Gazzoli, Paul. "Knud the Holy and the Metamorphosis of Danish Kingship." *Quaestio Insularis* 9 (2009), 17-33.
- Gem, Richard. "Craftsmen and Administrators in the Building of the Confessor's Abbey." *Edward the Confessor: The Man and the Legend*. Ed. Mortimer. pp. 168-72.
- Gerchow, Jan, et al. "Early Monasteries and Foundations (500-1200): An Introduction." *Crown and Veil: Female Monasticism from the Fifth to the Fifteenth Centuries*. Eds. Jeffrey Hamburger and Susan Marti. New York: Columbia UP, pp. 13-40.
- Graham-Campbell, James, and Michael Ryan, eds. *Anglo-Saxon/Irish Relations Before the Vikings*. Proc of the British Academy 157. Oxford: Oxford UP for the British Academy, 2009. xx + 462 pp. ill. maps.
- Green, Judith. "Kingship, Lordship, and Community in Eleventh-Century England." *Proceedings of the Battle Conference 2008*. Anglo-Norman Studies 31. Ed. C. P. Lewis. Woodbridge: Boydell P, 2009. pp. 1-16.
- Hadley, Dawn. "Scandinavian Settlement." *A Companion to the Early Middle Ages*. Ed. Stafford. pp. 212-30.
- . "Viking Raids and Conquest." *A Companion to the Early Middle Ages*. Ed. Stafford. pp. 193-211.
- Hagger, Mark. "The Earliest Norman Writs Revisited." *Historical Research* 82 (2009), 181-205.
- Hamilton, Sarah. "*Absoluimus uos uice beati petri apostolorum principis*: Episcopal Authority and the Reconciliation of Excommunicants in England and Francia c.900-c.1150." *Frankland: The Franks and the World of the Early Middle Ages: Essays in Honour of Dame Jinty Nelson*. Eds. Fouracre and Ganz. pp. 209-41.
- Helmholz, R. H. "Marriage Contracts in Medieval England." *To Have and to Hold: Marrying and its Documentation in Western Christendom, 400-1600*. Eds. Philip L. Reynolds and John Witte, Jr. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007. pp. 260-86.
- Hen, Yitzhak. *Roman Barbarians: The Royal Court and Culture in the Early Medieval West*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007. xiii + 213 pp. maps. [esp. ch. 5, "Postcards from the Edges: a Prelude to the Carolingian Renaissance"]; John J. Contreni, *AHR* 114 (2009): 468; Joaquín Martínez Pizarro, *EME* 17 (2009): 100-102.
- . "Review Article: Liturgy and Religious Culture in Late Anglo-Saxon England." *EME* 17 (2009), 329-42. [review of John Blair, *The Church in Anglo-Saxon Society* (Oxford, 2005); *Pastoral Care in Late Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Francesca Tinti (Woodbridge, 2005); *The Liturgy of the Late Anglo-Saxon Church*, ed. Helen Gittos and M. Bradford Bedingfield (London, 2005); *The Sacramentary of Ratoldus*, ed. Nicholas Orchard (London, 2005); and *The Place of the Cross in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Catherine E. Karkov, et al. (Woodbridge, 2006)]
- Higham, N. J. *King Arthur: Myth-Making and History*. London: Routledge, 2009. xi + 303 pp. ill.
- Home, Malasree. "Double-Edged Déjà-Vu: The Complexity of the Peterborough Chronicle." *Reading the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: Language, Literature, History*. Ed. Jorgensen. pp. 67-90.
- Hudson, John. "The Making of English Law and the Varieties of Legal History." *Early Medieval Studies in Memory of Patrick Wormald*. Eds. Baxter, et al. [see sect. 2] pp. 421-32.
- Huscroft, Richard. *The Norman Conquest: A New Introduction*. Harlow, UK: Pearson/Longman, 2009. xxi + 369 pp. maps.
- Insley, Charles. "Southumbria." *A Companion to the Early Middle Ages*. Ed. Stafford. pp. 322-40.
- Irvine, Susan. "The Production of the Peterborough Chronicle." *Reading the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: Language, Literature, History*. Ed. Jorgensen. pp. 49-66.
- Jayakumar, Shashi. "Reform and Retribution: The 'Anti-Monastic Reaction' in the Reign of Edward the Martyr." *Early Medieval Studies in Memory of Patrick Wormald*. Eds. Baxter, et al. [see sect. 2] pp. 81-95.
- Keene, Catherine. "The Dunfermline Vita of St. Margaret of Scotland: Hagiography as an Articulation of Hereditary Rights." *Arthuriana* 19.3 (2009), 43-61.
- Kendall, Calvin B. "Modeling Conversion: Bede's 'Anti-Constantinian' Narrative of the Conversion of King Edwin." *Conversion to Christianity: From Late Antiquity to the Modern Age: Considering the Process in Europe, Asia, and the Americas*. Minneapolis: Center for Early Modern History, Univ. of Minnesota, 2009. pp. 137-60.
- Keynes, Simon. "Edward the Ætheling (c. 1005-16)." *Edward the Confessor: The Man and the Legend*. Ed. Mortimer. pp. 41-62.
- Lambert, T. B. "Spiritual Protection and Secular Power: The Evolution of Sanctuary and Legal Privilege in Ripon and Beverly, 900-1300." *Peace and Protection in the Middle Ages*. Durham Medieval and Renaissance Monographs and Essays 1. Eds. T. B. Lambert and D. W. Rollason. Durham, UK: Centre for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2009. pp. 121-40.
- Lambert, Thomas Benedict. "Protection, Feud and Royal Power: Violence and its Regulation in English Law, c. 850 - c. 1250." Ph.D. Diss. Univ. of Durham, 2009. [uk.bl.ethos.506008]

- Lavelle, Ryan. "The Politics of Rebellion: The Ætheling Æthelwold and West Saxon Royal Succession." *Challenging the Boundaries of Medieval History: The Legacy of Timothy Reuter*. Studies in the Early Middle Ages 22. Ed. Patricia Skinner. Turnhout: Brepols, 2009. pp. 51-80.
- Laycock, Stuart. *Warlords: The Struggle for Power in Post-Roman Britain*. Stroud: History, 2009. 192 pp. plates ill.
- Lemanski, Stanley Jay. "The "Rectitudines singularum personarum": A Pre- and Post-Conquest Text." Ph.D. Diss. Univ. of Akron, 2009. [Proquest 3393054]
- Lewit, Tamara. "Pigs, Presses and Pastoralism: Farming in the Fifth to Sixth Centuries AD." *EME* 17 (2009), 77-91.
- License, Tom. "History and Hagiography in the Late Eleventh Century: The Life and Work of Herman the Archdeacon, Monk of Bury St Edmunds." *EHR* 124 (2009), 516-44.
- Marafioti, Nicole Jeanette. "The Politics of Royal Burial in Late Anglo-Saxon England." Ph.D. Diss. Cornell Univ., 2009. [Proquest 3376624]
- Marren, Peter. *Battles of the Dark Ages: British Battlefields AD 410 to 1065*. Bamsley: Pen & Sword Military, 2006. x + 210 pp.
- Matthews, Stephen. "King Edgar and the Dee: the Ceremony of 973 in Popular History Writing." *Northern History* 46 (2009), 61-74.
- Matzke, Ulrike. *England und das Reich der Ottonen in der ersten Hälfte des 10. Jahrhunderts: Beziehung und Wahrnehmung von Angelsachsen und Sachsen zwischen Eigenständigkeit und Zusammengehörigkeit*. Göttinger Forschungen zur Landesgeschichte 16. Bielefeld: Verlag für Regionalgeschichte, 2009. 184 pp.
- McCarthy, Michael C. "Modalities of Belief in Ancient Christian Debate." *Jnl of Early Christian Studies* 17 (2009), 605-34.
- Meyvaert, Paul. *The Art of Words: Bede and Theodulf*. Variorum Collected Studies Series 913. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008. xviii + 389. [including five reprinted essays on Bede]: Graham Gould, *Jnl of Theological Studies* 60 (2009), 715-16.
- Morris, Christopher D. "Revisiting Anglo-Scandinavian Settlement and Sculpture." *Poetry, Place, and Gender: Studies in Medieval Culture in Honor of Helen Damico*. Ed. Karkov. [see sect. 2] pp. 211-33.
- Morris, Lawrence. *The Middle Ages and Renaissance*. Daily Life through World History in Primary Documents 2. Westport, CT: Greenwood P, 2009. xxi + 367 pp. ill. [esp. "Anglo-Saxon Women" and "Anglo-Saxon Slaves"]
- Mortimer, Richard, ed. *Edward the Confessor: The Man and the Legend*. Woodbridge; Rochester NY: Boydell P, 2009. xi + 203 pp. ill. maps.
- Mould, Alan. *The English Chorister: A History*. London: Hambledon Continuum, 2007. xvii + 366 pp. ill. plates. [esp. ch. 2, "Anglo-Saxon Choir Children," pp. 11-22]
- Nelson, Janet L. "Liturgy or Law: Misconceived Alternatives?" *Early Medieval Studies in Memory of Patrick Wormald*. Eds. Baxter, et al. [see sect. 2] pp. 433-47.
- . "Church Properties and the Propertied Church: Donors, the Clergy and the Church in Medieval Western Europe from the Fourth Century to the Twelfth." *EHR* 124 (2009), 355-74.
- . "West Francia and Wessex in the Ninth Century Compared." *Der frühmittelalterliche Staat: europäische Perspektiven*. Forschungen zur Geschichte des Mittelalters 16. Eds. Walter Pohl and Veronika Wieser. Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2009. pp. 99-112.
- Ní Mhaonaigh, Máire. "Of Saxons, a Viking and Normans: Colmán, Gerald and the Monastery of Mayo." *Anglo-Saxon/Irish Relations before the Vikings*. Ed. Graham-Campbell and Ryan. pp. 411-26.
- . "'Celtic and Anglo-Saxon Kingship' Revisited: Alfred Æthelred II and Brian Bórama Compared." *Dublin in the Medieval World: Studies in Honour of Howard B. Clarke*. Eds. John Bradley and Alan J. Fletcher. Dublin: Four Courts P, 2009. pp. 83-97.
- Niles, John D. "Trial by Ordeal in Anglo-Saxon England: What's the Problem with Barley?" *Early Medieval Studies in Memory of Patrick Wormald*. Eds. Baxter, et al. [see sect. 2] pp. 369-82.
- O'Dell, Daniel Patrick. "Anglo-Saxon Historical Imagination and Preservation." M.A. Thesis. Univ. of Nebraska at Omaha, 2009. [Proquest 1462460]
- Oliver, Lisi. "Protecting the Body in Early Medieval Law." *Peace and Protection in the Middle Ages*. Durham Medieval and Renaissance Monographs and Essays 1. Eds. T. B. Lambert and D. W. Rollason. Durham, UK: Centre for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2009. pp. 60-77.
- Padel, Oliver. *Slavery in Saxon Cornwall: The Bodmin Manumissions*. Kathleen Hughes Memorial Lectures 7. Cambridge: Department of Anglo-Saxon, Norse and Celtic, University of Cambridge, 2009. 33 pp.
- Pelteret, David A. E. "Locating 'Ingelingum' and 'Suthgedling': Gilling West and Gilling East." *Northern History* 46 (2009), 313-25.
- Pryce, Huw. "Conversions to Christianity." *A Companion to the Early Middle Ages*. Ed. Stafford. pp. 143-59.

- Rabin, Andrew. "Bede, Drythelm, and the Witness to the Other World: Testimony and Conversion in the *Historia Ecclesiastica*." *MP* 106 (2009), 376-98.
- . "Female Advocacy and Royal Protection in Tenth-Century England: The Legal Career of Queen Ælfthryth." *Speculum* 84 (2009), 261-88.
- Redknap, Mark. "The Vikings in Wales." *The Viking World*. Eds. Brink and Price. pp. 401-410.
- Reuben Davies, John. "Wales and West Britain." *A Companion to the Early Middle Ages*. Ed. Stafford. pp. 341-57.
- Reynolds, Andrew. *The Emergence of Anglo-Saxon Judicial Practice: The Message of the Gallows*. Agnes Jane Robertson Memorial Lectures on Anglo-Saxon Studies 1. Aberdeen: Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies, Univ. of Aberdeen, 2009. iv + 61 pp. maps ill.
- Richards, Julian D. "Viking Settlement in England." *The Viking World*. Eds. Brink and Price. pp. 368-74.
- Rodwell, Warwick. "New Glimpses of Edward the Confessor's Abbey at Westminster." *Edward the Confessor: The Man and the Legend*. Ed. Mortimer. pp. 151-67.
- Rollason, David. "Kingship, Lordship and Protection: Protection and the Mead-hall." *Peace and Protection in the Middle Ages*. Durham Medieval and Renaissance Monographs and Essays 1. Eds. T. B. Lambert and D. W. Rollason. Durham Medieval and Renaissance Monographs and Essays 1. Durham, UK: Centre for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2009. 19-35.
- Russell, Miles. "Rewriting the Age of Arthur: The Dark Ages Brought to Light." *Current Archaeology* 229 (April 2009), 40-45.
- Ryan, Martin J. "Latin Learning and Christian Art." *A Companion to the Early Middle Ages*. Ed. Stafford. pp. 107-25.
- Saunders, Corinne. "Medieval Warfare." *The Cambridge Companion to War Writing*. Cambridge Companions. Ed. Catherine Mary McLoughlin. 2009. pp. 83-97.
- Sayers, William. "King Alfred's Timbers." *SELIM* 15 (2009), 117-24.
- Scheller, Anne. *Bezeichnungen für die christliche Gottheit im Altenglischen*. Schriftenreihe Schriften zur Mediävistik 17. Hamburg: Kovac, 2009. 481 pp.
- Searing, Maureen Elizabeth. "Alfred of Wessex: A Study of Accidental Greatness." M.A. Thesis. San Jose State Univ., 2009. [Proquest 1484306]
- Singles, Daniel Christopher. "Words are Weapons: Boast and Anti-boast in the Poetic Feuds of *Beowulf*, Alexander Pope, and Twenty-First Century Battle Rap." M.A. Thesis. Villanova Univ., 2009.
- Stafford, Pauline. "Edith, Edward's Wife and Queen." *Edward the Confessor: The Man and the Legend*. Ed. Mortimer. pp. 119-38.
- . "Historiography." *A Companion to the Early Middle Ages*. Ed. Stafford. pp. 9-22.
- . "Introduction." *A Companion to the Early Middle Ages*. Ed. Stafford. pp. 1-8.
- . "Queens and Queenship." *A Companion to the Early Middle Ages*. Ed. Stafford. pp. 459-76.
- . "Sources." *A Companion to the Early Middle Ages*. Ed. Stafford. pp. 23-38.
- , ed. *A Companion to the Early Middle Ages: Britain and Ireland, c.500-c.1100*. Blackwell Companions to British History. Chichester; Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2009. xiv + 554 pp.
- Story, Joanna. "After Bede: Continuing the *Ecclesiastical History*." *Early Medieval Studies in Memory of Patrick Wormald*. Eds. Baxter, et al. [see sect. 2] pp. 165-184.
- Suhamy, Henri. *Guillaume de Conquérant*. Paris: Ellipses, 2008. 426 pp.: Alban Gautier, *Moyen Age* 115 (2009): 150-51.
- Sykes, Katherine. "'*Canoni Albi et Moniales*': Perceptions of the Twelfth-Century Double House." *JEH* 60 (2009), 233-45.
- Szerwiniack, Olivier. "Les relations entre l'Irlande et l'Angleterre dans l'*Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum* de Bède le Vénérable." *Un espace colonial et ses avatars: naissances d'identités nationales: Angleterre, France, Irlande, Ve-XVe siècles*. Cultures et civilisations médiévales 42. Eds. Florence Bourgne, Leo Martin Carruthers and Arlette Sanceray. Paris: PUPS, 2008. pp. 19-39.
- Thorn, F. R. "Kelston in Domesday Book." *Somerset Archaeology and Natural History* 152 (2009), 139-51.
- Thornton, David E. "Localities." *A Companion to the Early Middle Ages*. Ed. Stafford. pp. 446-58.
- . "Communities and Kinship." *A Companion to the Early Middle Ages*. Ed. Stafford. pp. 91-106.
- Tinti, Francesca. "*Si litterali memorie commendatur*: Memory and Cartularies in Eleventh-Century Worcester." *Early Medieval Studies in Memory of Patrick Wormald*. Eds. Baxter, et al. [see sect. 2] pp. 475-97.
- Trehearne, Elaine. "The Bishop's Book: Leofric's Homiliary and Eleventh-Century Exeter." *Early Medieval Studies in Memory of Patrick Wormald*. Eds. Baxter, et al. [see sect. 2] pp. 521-37.
- Turner, Peter. "Identity in Gildas's *De Excidio et Conquestu Britanniae*." *Cambrian Medieval Celtic Studies* 58 (2009), 29-48.
- Vallance, Edward. "A Radical History of Britain: Visionaries, Rebels and Revolutionaries—the Men and Women who Fought for our Freedoms." London: Little, Brown, 2009. 639 pp. ill. [see esp. the Introduction, "The First British Radical, King Alfred," pp. 1-18]

- van Houts, Elisabeth. "Edward and Normandy." *Edward the Confessor: The Man and the Legend*. Ed. Mortimer. pp. 63-76.
- Wardle, Terry. "England's First Castle." *History Today* 59.6 (2009), 4-5.
- West, Charles. "The Significance of the Carolingian." *EME* 17 (2009), 186-206.
- Woolf, Alex. "Scotland." *A Companion to the Early Middle Ages*. Ed. Stafford. pp. 249-67.
- Yeates, Stephen J. *A Dreaming for the Witches: A Recreation of the "Dobunni" Primal Myth*. Oxford: Oxbow, 2009. 256 pp.
- Yorke, Barbara. "The *Bretwaldas* and the Origins of Overlordship in Anglo-Saxon England." *Early Medieval Studies in Memory of Patrick Wormald*. Eds. Baxter, et al. [see sect. 2] pp. 81-95.
- . "Britain and Ireland c. 500." *A Companion to the Early Middle Ages*. Ed. Stafford. pp. 39-56.
- . "Kings and Kingship." *A Companion to the Early Middle Ages*. Ed. Stafford. pp. 76-90.
- . "*Rex doctissimus*": *Bede and King Aldfrith of Northumbria*. Jarrow, Durham: St. Paul's Church, 2009. 36 pp.
- . "The Anglo-Saxon Kingdoms 600-900 and the Beginning of the Old English State." *Der frühmittelalterliche Staat: europäische Perspektiven*. Forschungen zur Geschichte des Mittelalters 16. Eds. Walter Pohl and Veronika Wieser. Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2009. pp. 73-86.

SAJ reviewed: Abels, Arceo, Ammon, Gautier, Pelteret "The Role of Rivers," Taylor, Wormald;

AR reviewed: Baxter "Limits," Bell, J. Campbell "Aspects," Dachowski, Dalton, Green, Hostettler, Nelson "An Anglo-Saxon Queen's," Padel, Scully;

EAR reviewed: Baxter "The Death of Burgheard", Bracken, Brink and Price, Bullimore, Burgess and Kulikowski, E. Campbell, J. Campbell "Archipelagic," Charles-Edwards "Priestly Vegetables," Cramer, Emons-Nijenhuis, Fenton, Foley and Higham, Fouracre, Hall, Holladay, Holt, Jarrett, Jember, Jones, Jurasinski, Karkov, Karn, Keefer, Kershaw, Keynes, Keynes and Love, Lavelle, Lees and Overing, MacLean, Mayr-Harting, Moorhead, Mullins, Oliver, Palmer, Pelteret "An Anonymous Historian," Pickles, Pollard, Roberts, Scharer, Shockro, Teresi, Thacker, Thompson Smith, Tyler, van Kempen, Woolf, Yorke;

DAW reviewed: Aird, Barrett, Bassett, Baxter "Edward the Confessor," Bozoky, Charles-Edwards "Social Structure," Downham, Dumville, Edmonds, Ganz, Hadley, Jorgensen, Nelson "Britain, Ireland, and Europe," Piper, Rollason "Northumbria," Story.

8. Names

Two volumes this year continue the ongoing surveys of place-names by county. *The Place-Names of Leicestershire, Part IV: Gartree Hundred* (Nottingham: English Place-Name Society) by Barrie Cox follows his format of the earlier three volumes to describe the southeastern quarter of the county. Cox begins with a discussion of the hundred-name Gartree, itself from *geretrev* of the *Domesday Book* and similar spellings from an ON *geitré* which refers to a tree associated with a spear, either having the wedge shape of a spear-head or a wedge-shaped scar or a wedge-shaped gash to provide a landmark, or perhaps even an ash tree whose wood was regularly used for the shafts of spears. The rest of the book lists the place-names within the parishes by townships in alphabetical order with etymologies, spellings, dates, and sources. At the end of the discussion of each township, field names are listed in large numbers as well.

The Place-Names of Fife, II: Central Fife between the Rivers Leven and Eden (Donington: Shaun Tyas, 2008) by Simon Taylor with Gilbert Márkus is the second volume in what is now planned as a five-volume work. According to the first volume, there were supposed to be four volumes, but it turns out that there was too much material in the area planned for the coverage of the second volume. Therefore, the proposed second volume now incorporates the second and the forthcoming third volume. This volume follows the same format as the first, which was reviewed last year.

Three articles this year focus on particular place-name elements. In “*Burh* Place-Names in Anglo-Saxon England,” *JEPNS* 41: 103–118, Simon Draper concludes that OE *burh* ‘enclosure’ as a place-name element was not limited to military enclosures or fortifications but was used to identify “significant monastic, seigneurial and urban settlements” such as Congresbury in Somerset, Whittlebury in Northamptonshire, and Canterbury in Kent respectively. Such enclosures to be considered a *burh* had to be “ditched, fenced, hedged, or even walled” regardless of the purpose for the enclosure.

In “OE and ME *cunte* in Place-Names,” *JEPNS* 41: 26–37, Keith Briggs compiles a list of place-names from OE *cunte*, a proposed feminine n-stem noun from the attested *cuntan in cuntan heale* in a charter of King Edgar in 960 A.D., and suggests that two small streams meeting at an elongated field may be a clue to the

meaning of the phrase. There are, however, about twenty places called “Gropecuntlane” beginning in the early thirteenth century in England such as Gropecuntlane in Oxfordshire as well as names like Cuntelowe in Derbyshire which denotes a small hill with a cleft.

In “*Lēah* Names in Anglo-Saxon Charters of Wiltshire,” *Wiltshire Archaeological and National History Magazine* 102: 175–187, Ben Lennon concludes from his examination of seventy-seven *lēah* references in Wiltshire Anglo-Saxon charters that the term which is often interpreted as ‘woodland’ and as ‘clearing’ probably refers to a “wood pasture of variable density subject to varying degrees of exploitation or management.” He reaches this conclusion by noting that grazed woodland might not allow new trees to grow because of overgrazing and that a clearing surrounded by older trees might then develop. He speculates that *lēahs* were grazed in common rather than by individual owners because so few are combined with personal names. He notes also that the *lēah*-names are more common on lands that are clay or clay with flint rather than on the chalk lands that are more likely to be cultivated for crops.

Other articles focus on particular names. In “*Din Guoary*: The Old Welsh Name of Bamburgh,” *Archaeologia Aeliana* 28: 123–27, Andrew Breeze shows that Ifor Williams was very close in his derivation of the name *Din Guoary* for Northumbrian Bamburgh from Welsh *din* ‘fortress, stronghold’ and *gwarwy* ‘play’ because of the probable presence of a grandstand there like the one shown by architectural evidence at nearby Yeavinger. However, Breeze argues that *Din Guoary* was not an earlier name for Bamburgh but an artificial “book-expression” concocted in the not-always-reliable *Historia Brittonum* in ninth-century Wales for the site in Northumbria with a wooden auditorium in the sixth century called Bamburgh by the English.

In “Lowdham, Thurgarton Wapentake, Nottinghamshire,” *JEPNS* 41: 49–55, Jean Cameron with Paul Cavill writes a chatty little piece about the recent history of the Nottinghamshire village of Lowdham which has a population of about 2,200. The most interesting part of the article for name scholars will probably be the field-names that are listed, including Horley hill, which has the OE *lēah* ‘a clearing’ as the second element of

the first word, Hemp Close whose first element is from OE *hænep* 'hemp', Black Sykes whose second element derives from ON *sík* 'a drain, a small stream', and Rotten Hades, where *hades* derives from OE *hēafod* 'head' in this case 'headlands, strips of land for turning the plough'.

In "Two Devonshire Place-Names," *JEPNS* 41: 119–26, O. J. Padel argues that Olchard in Ideford parish in Devonshire derives from a Brittonic place-name **Tolchet* from **Toll-gēd* 'hole-wood' which probably means 'wood in a hollow' or 'wood filling a hollow' or 'wood pierced by a stream' and suggests that three forms: Kingsett, Kingseat, and Kingshead meaning 'king seat'—referring to hills that are suitable to survey the surroundings and look for approaching trouble.

In "Cricklade and the Britons," *Wiltshire Archaeological and National History Magazine* 102: 315–17, Andrew Breeze proposes that the place-name Cricklade is a part translation of a Celtic toponym *Crixariton* 'ford at the rippling river', 'ford at broken water', where the second element has been replaced by OE *gelad* 'river crossing, especially one liable to floods' and the first element was a British personal name borrowed into English as *Crecca*.

Four publications in the year's bibliography deal with personal names. In *The North through its Names: A Phenomenology of Medieval and Early-Modern Northern England* (Oxford: Oxbow, 2007), Dave Postles argues that surnames in the north of England suggest an "upper north" and a "lower north" due to differences in intensity of the patronymic *-son* as well as other elements and suggests a "mosaic pattern" in the personal-names elements and pronunciations reflecting what Pythian-Adams called "cultural providences." In a thoroughly documented but quite readable book, Postles shows the instability of by-names in the north of England until the end of the fifteenth century with the continued use of the patronyms; however, by the sixteenth century, the *-son* surnames stabilized as family names for sons, but not for daughters where names like Henrisdaughter persisted through the sixteenth century. Interestingly, bastard children were registered with their putative fathers' surnames in the sixteenth and first half of the seventeenth centuries. Other district Northern naming characteristics were the use of *-man* in bynames and surnames to indicate a servant such as William Trolloman who was employed by a man named Trollop and the use of /k/ in surnames like Thakker in the north corresponding to the southern Thatcher. Postles points out the mosaic of northern dialect features by noting that topographical *-by* names occurred primarily in one dialect area including north Lincolnshire, the East

Riding of Yorkshire, and the adjacent parts of the North Riding such as Peter Westiby. Tod for 'fox' and Fox were divided primarily by the River Ribble with Tod to the north and Fox to the south of the river.

In "A Note on a Guthlac's Stone," *JEPNS* 41: 130–32, Barrie Cox derives the name of Leicestershire's Guthlaxton Wapentake from the OE personal name *Gūðlāc* and OE *stān* 'stone'. Cox speculates that, since Guthlac's Stone was the moot-site of the Guthlaxton Wapentake, the Guthlac mentioned on the stone may have been more than just a landowner, possible St. Guthlac, a minor prince of Mercia who entered the monastery of Repton and later became a hermit at Crowland in Lincolnshire and that there may have been an unrecorded pre-Conquest estate in Leicestershire belonging to Crowland Abbey.

In "Economic Migrants? Continental Moneyers' Names on the Tenth-Century English Coinage," *Nomina* 32: 113–156, Veronica Smart provides a dictionary of all of the probably Continental Germanic (usually Frankish and Flemish) names of moneyers on English coins in the tenth century and the reasons for considering the names Continental rather than Old English. From several possible hypotheses for explaining the large number of Continental names, she tentatively concludes that the economic activity as the English asserted control over the Danelaw attracted "merchants and craftsmen from abroad" with the encouragement of the English kings.

In "Ye Shall Know Them by Their Names: Names and Identity among the Irish and the English," *Anglo-Saxon/Irish Relations Before the Vikings*, ed. Graham-Campbell and Ryan [see sec. 7], 99–111, Paul Russell examines eighteen Irish personal names in the ninth-century core of the *Liber Vitae* of Durham. He concludes that some were transmitted in written form while others were probably transmitted orally with orthographic modifications consistent with pronunciation spellings, such as Old Irish *d* for /ð/ and the OE *ð* and *þ* for [ð] as an allophone of /θ/. Russell notes two striking features in the eighteen names, however: there are no patronymics, and there is no clear evidence of Anglicization of the Irish names.

A couple of entries in this year's bibliography focus on geographic areas where Scandinavian influence was strong in English place-names. In "Reflections on Some Major Lincolnshire Place-Names Part Two: Ness Wapentake to Yarborough," *JEPNS* 41: 57–102, Richard Coates continues his 2008 commentaries on and corrections of Kenneth Cameron's work on Lincolnshire place-names in *A Dictionary of Lincolnshire Place-Names*, the six-volume *The Place-Names of Lincolnshire*, and his *Nomina* article: "The Scandinavian Element in Minor

Names and Field-Names in North-East Lincolnshire.” An example of Coates’s correction of Cameron is of the place-name Scothern which Cameron derived from OE *Scot* and *Born* but which Coates derived from a Scandinavian personal name *Skot-* rather than the ethnic name and posits an earlier Sc **Skots-Born* as the source. Coates presents a useful summary of “key findings” of new place-name elements or meanings and newly identified names at the end of the essay.

In “Scandinavian Place Names in the British Isles,” *The Viking World*, ed. Brink and Price [see sec. 7], 391–400, Gillian Fellows-Jensen gives a survey of the toponymic evidence provided by place-names for the Scandinavian colonization in parts of the British Isles such as the Northern and Western Isles; the northern, western and northeastern seaboard of Scotland; the Isle of Man; eastern, northern, and northwestern England; the northern and southern seaboard of Wales; and the eastern seaboard of Ireland. They are also identified by a clear map at the end of the essay. The essay focuses on the distribution of place-names in *-by*, *-thorp*, and *-thveit* and their density of concentration in various parts of the British Isles reflecting the Viking conquests there, but it does not provide any new information.

In “The Distribution of Distance of Certain Place-Names Types to Roman Roads,” *Nomina* 32: 43–58, Keith Briggs uses Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests to confirm that Coldharbour names lie “closer to Roman roads than uniform random points” and show “that the strongest association of place-name types and Roman roads is between Roman villas and *wichām* names.”

Two summaries of the activities of the Anglo-Saxon Plant Name Survey are included in this year’s bibliography. In “Anglo-Saxon Plant Name Survey (ASPNS): Tenth Annual Report, January 2008,” *OEN* 41.3 [online], Carole P. Biggam reports on the three publications by ASPNS members at the International Medieval Congress for 2008 at the University of Leeds and lists three plant-related publications by ASPNS members, one of which (Della Hooke’s “Early Medieval Woodland and the Place-Name Term *Lēah*”) was reviewed in last year’s “Names” section of *YWOES* 2008, *OEN*.

In “Anglo-Saxon Plant Name Survey (ASPNS): Eleventh Annual Report 2009,” *OEN* 42.1 [online], Carole P. Biggam reports on an invited lecture she gave at the Centre for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, University of Durham entitled “Prickly Problems: The Naming of Juniper and Other Thorny Bushes in Anglo-Saxon England.” She identifies five plant-related publications by ASPNS members, one of which (Andrew Breeze’s “Britons and Saxons at Chittoe and Minety”)

was reviewed in the “Names” section of *YWOES* 2007, *OEN*, and lists the authors and titles of twelve papers published in *Old Names-New Growth: Proceedings of the 2nd ASPNS Conference, University of Graz, Austria, 6-10 June 2007, and Related Essays*.

Hywel Wyn Owen and Richard Morgan’s *Dictionary of the Place-Names of Wales* (Llandysul: Gomer, 2007) is a “synoptic dictionary” drawing on sources such as county surveys and other published sources but also from the archive of Professor G. Melville Richards which includes over 300,000 slips with onomastic information about place-names in Wales. The dictionary begins with a glossary of elements found in the place-names and then lists place-names from Aber to Ystwyth alphabetically, giving etymologies and earlier recorded forms. As one might expect, the majority of these names are Celtic in origin, but these are also names with Old English and Old Norse elements.

JC

■ Works Not Seen

Biggam, C. P. “Anglo-Saxon Plant Name Survey (ASPNS): Ninth Annual Report, January 2008.” *OEN* 41.3 (2008), [online].

9. Archaeology, Sculpture, Inscriptions, Numismatics

9A. EXCAVATIONS

Some archaeological excavations are the stuff of legend: the Sutton Hoo ship burial, Tutankhamun's tomb, and, it must be said, the work carried out by the late Margaret and Tom Jones at Mucking, Essex. Here, on a gravel terrace overlooking the Thames, they excavated more than forty-five acres of complex multi-period archaeology between 1965 and 1978. This was an epic undertaking, part of which Sue Hirst and Dido Clark bring to fruition in *Excavations at Mucking: Volume 3, The Anglo-Saxon Cemeteries* (London: Museum of London Archaeology). There were two Anglo-Saxon cemeteries at Mucking. Cemetery 1 had been partly lost to the gravel pit, which was the reason for the excavations; it contained sixty-three excavated graves. Close by was Cemetery 2 which contained at least 276 graves and 463 cremations. An Anglo-Saxon settlement, probably related to the cemeteries, has already been discussed by Helena Hamerow in *Excavations at Mucking: Volume 2, The Anglo-Saxon Settlement* (London: English Heritage Archaeological Report, 1993).

One of the most important aspects of these cemeteries was the late Roman/early Anglo-Saxon burials which contained some iconic objects, such as the elaborate, chip-carved belt fittings from Grave 117 which seem to appear in every book of the late Roman/early Anglo-Saxon periods. There are also some important Quoit Brooch Style objects, the significance of which is discussed. Mucking contains some important early graves and was in use over a long period, although it appears to have ended before the "Final Phase" burials of the seventh century. The soil conditions on the site meant that skeletal material failed to survive, being replaced by body-shaped stains (referred to as "silhouettes"). While the absence of bone represents a loss of information, the survival of organic traces resulted in startling evidence for the use of plank coffins, biers, and coffins dug out of logs. Many of the cremation deposits had been damaged by plowing but still present a useful group of material.

This is an important report on a cemetery on the approaches to London. It is coherent and well-written with profuse, excellent illustrations (I would never have guessed that glass beads could look so lovely). The

discussion is detailed and comprehensive, drawing on both English and continental parallels. Included with the publication is a CD which contains some of the specialist reports and, most importantly, the tables in Microsoft Excel format allowing users to analyze the data for themselves. A landmark publication.

KL

Analysis of pre-Viking materials discovered in sand-dunes dominating the coastal areas of the British Isles is examined in David Griffiths's "Evidence for Pre-Viking Trade?" (*Anglo-Saxon/Irish Relations Before the Vikings*, 265–280). As opposed to archaeological and material finds at locations that were once monasteries or fortified secular settlements, sand-dunes lack contextual support. Thus, Griffiths explains that finds at sand-dunes raise "a number of interpretative problems, challenges and has led to many of these discoveries being overlooked in favour of the less unintelligible archaeological record from more straightforward terrestrial sites" (266). The author offers a brief synopsis of the tradition of nineteenth-century antiquarian activity across Ireland and Britain and explains that it is difficult to account for the lack of attention to sand-dunes given the high level of awareness and consideration. An illustration outlining the major areas where discoveries have been made is included. Some fourteen sand sites have been located across the northern coastline of Ireland, from the northwestern tip belonging to the Atlantic façade extending all the way around the north and reaching the mid-eastern side sheltered by the Irish Sea. Two sand-dune sites are located on the western coast of Scotland, one identified on the western coast of England near Liverpool (called Meols), and three dune-sites are situated in the indented coast of south-western Wales. The material finds at the aforementioned locations are listed in a chart identifying the main features (whether they be glass, brooches, buckles, beads, metal work, coinage, pins, etc.) and the period of each artifact (Roman, seventh to ninth century, or Viking). Griffiths queries how the material discoveries might be interpreted and explains that in several instances the remains represent "a series of local or regional hierarchies of sites expressing the social structures of the era" (278), while in other cases we might infer that there was trading

activity occurring in pre-Viking Britain. Meols and Luce Sands on the western shores of England and Scotland, respectively, and also Castlemartin on the southwestern tip of Wales “stand out as particularly complex assemblages which could imply an undefended beach-market function, acting as a central seasonal market in their own localities, and all three are located in places where land and sea routes converge” (278). The extent that pre-Viking activity differed, to any degree, from more tangible settlements such as monasteries and fortified secular sites is also investigated. Upon reviewing the evidence, Griffiths suggests that there was trade and activity on the British Isles before the Vikings arrived, “but throughout the pre-Viking period there is little evidence that its scope extended to encompass both Ireland and Anglo-Saxon England in anything other than a most limited and sporadic way” (279). Griffiths concludes with an interesting argument examining Scandinavians and major economic changes in Ireland and western Britain. He contends that even if activity was vigorous, the change in economic and social behavior cannot be exclusively accredited to the ethnic minority of the Vikings. Rather, upon consideration of the sand-dune sites and the recovered artifacts, “perhaps we can see wider economic forces at work here—the beginnings of a true commercial economy and urbanization in the Irish Sea region may be a knock-on effect of the powerful changes and innovations going on within Anglo-Saxon England, and on the Continent, in both the ecclesiastical and secular spheres, prompting growth of new modes of commercial or semi-commercial trading activity which cut across ethnic lines” (280). Griffiths offers an incisive perspective of pre-Viking activity and trade in Britain and Ireland based on consideration of sand-dune site discoveries, and compels readers to reflect on the idea that economic and social change was a process in which more groups of people besides the Scandinavians participated. However, the ninth-century arrival of the Vikings to Britain “has perhaps deluded us into supposing that their ethnic presence was more than a secondary consideration to the main undercurrents of economic change [already] emanating from southern England and the Continent” (280). This assessment of the dune-sites in pre-Viking Britain brings to light an interesting deviation from traditional understanding of trade, social and economic change and influence in Britain during the Anglo-Saxon period, and encourages readers to consider how England was already changing before Scandinavians settled in Britain, based on evidence of trade before their arrival.

MR-O

Donna E. Y. Young’s report on the “Excavation of an Early Medieval Site at Brent Knoll, Somerset,” *Somerset Archaeology and Natural History* 152: 105–37, is a comprehensive examination of the archaeological finds at an excavated site at the base of Brent Knoll. This site, which underwent archaeological review due to a building project near the village’s vicarage, contained finds from five distinct periods: Romano-British, early medieval (pre-eleventh century), Saxo-Norman, later medieval, and modern. By far the most interesting periods of study were the second and third periods, even though the evidence for early medieval occupation of the site was wholly aceramic. While no pottery shards are datable to this period, there was evidence of ditch-making and agriculture in the excavated site that is consistent with the early medieval period. Additionally, there were animal bone finds from all three major species of husbanded livestock (bovine, ovine, and porcine) as well as domesticated fowl bones radiocarbon dated to the mid-eighth century. These finds, in conjunction with a lack of cereal grains, suggests that the site was in use pastorally. In the eleventh century, the site saw more activity, including the construction of a sunken-floored building whose artifact remains suggest a domestic purpose. As the authors note, Brent was an estate tied to Glastonbury Abbey; they suggest that “the area was continuously exploited in some form from that time [seventh century, the time it was acquired by Glastonbury] in order to provide resources or tithes for the abbey” (133). The authors suggest that the building activity and uptick in agricultural activity at the site might have corresponded to the appointment of Thurstan, a Norman, to the abbacy of Glastonbury as he was well-known for his “more efficient methods of exploitation” of the lands under abbey control. This was a relatively short period of activity; by the twelfth century there was little evidence of settlement and the area seems to have reverted back to agricultural use.

RSA

9B. CEMETERIES, BIOARCHAEOLOGY, FUNERARY ARCHAEOLOGY AND PRACTICES

Christopher Scull and Marion Archibald examine Anglo-Saxon cemeteries in *Early Medieval (Late 5th–Early 8th Centuries AD) Cemeteries at Boss Hall and Buttermarket, Ipswich, Suffolk* (Leeds: Society for Medieval Archaeology). The cemeteries at Boss Hall and Buttermarket are complementary. Burial at Boss Hall started in the late fifth century and flourished in the sixth, but also contained a rich grave coin dated ca. 690–700. The Buttermarket/St. Stephen’s Lane cemetery started

around 600 AD and continued through the seventh century. Finds included continental material, which is discussed in its wider context. High precision radiocarbon dating was carried out and gave useful, if occasionally cautionary, results. A coin of Offa dated to 792–96, found in a grave, was shown to be intrusive, and a late tremissis dated to the 670s was found in a grave with a radiocarbon date of cal. 605–650 at 95% probability. These are discussed in detail and show the care needed in dealing with single finds or dates. The report is comprehensive with specialist sections and a discussion of the cemeteries' contexts. The text is clearly written, the illustrations excellent, and the presentation good.

Martin Carver, Catherine Hills, and Jonathan Schekewitz discuss the excavations at Wasperton in *Wasperton: A Roman, British and Anglo-Saxon Community in Central England* (Woodbridge: Boydell). The excavations at Wasperton, on the Warwickshire Avon, were carried out between 1980 and 1985 in advance of gravel extraction. During the course of this project ten hectares of prehistoric landscape were excavated, within which was found a cemetery of 241 burials. This is a long-awaited report on what is clearly an important site, which remained in use from the fourth to the seventh century and offered the possibility of "continuity" between the Roman and Anglo-Saxon periods. The sequence started with twenty-three fourth-century graves containing bracelets, hob-nailed boots, and neck-rings. These were followed by thirty-seven burials without grave goods, some of which were in plank or stone lined graves. These, the authors argue, occupy a period ending around 480. Around this date the main group of twenty-three cremations was deposited, although radiocarbon dates and the presence of an equal-armed brooch suggest that two of the urns date from the late fourth to the fifth century. With, and following, the cremations were fifty-three inhumations with grave goods.

The graves were placed in sequence using a number of criteria: 1. Stratigraphy (seventeen intercut graves), 2. Alignment (graves in the same area with the same alignment are likely to be of similar date), 3. Clustering (grouped graves of similar date), 4. Radiocarbon dating, 5. The dating of artifacts. Dating by associated artifacts was placed at the end of the list because "using assemblages to date graves more accurately than half a century is rarely possible"—something that we all suspect to be true. This cemetery produced a wide range of grave goods which are discussed in detail with the intelligent use of tables to correlate data including dating and cultural affinities. While material culture in the earlier part of the sixth cemetery looked towards

East Anglia, the objects found in later burials tended to look towards Wessex.

The graves catalogue is usefully integrated, with the grave plans and finds being illustrated together. There are the usual specialist reports including textiles, (suggesting some survival of Romano-British techniques), beads, and metalwork. Metallographic analysis of the spearheads showed them to be of lamentably poor quality with weak, annealed structures leading to the suggestion that they had been purposely heated to destroy them or that they were made merely for funerary use. Stable isotope analysis was carried out in order to determine where individuals had spent their childhoods and it was found that, in addition to the people reared locally, others appear to have come from the West Country and the Mediterranean. While this evidence is exciting, both the excavators and the laboratory carrying out the analyses were cautious about reading too much into them at what is an early stage in this study. (See the review of the Westfield Farm, Ely, graves below.)

The report also includes useful discussions placing the Wasperton cemetery in its regional and historical context and provides a up-to-date résumé of sub-Roman burial practice. It is well presented with a clearly written, readable text, as well including both photographs and drawings of the finds.

Sam Lucy, *et al.*, discuss another grave site in "The Burial of a Princess? The Later Seventh-Century Cemetery at Westfield Farm, Ely," *The Antiquaries Journal* 89: 81–141. In late 2006 excavations carried out in advance of building development to the south-west of Ely, Cambridgeshire led to the discovery of a small seventh-century cemetery. This consisted of fifteen graves, two of which were well furnished. Finds from Grave 1 included a necklace made up of gold and silver pendants, some plain bullae, but there was also a cabochon garnet in a gold setting and what may be a tau-shaped cross. The grave also contained two glass palm cups and an antler comb found within an iron fitted casket with padlock. This burial contained the remains of a 10–12 year old child who appears to have been locally important, with the other graves set around her in a pattern suggesting the original presence of a burial mound. The second well-appointed grave contained the remains of a 15 to 17 year old individual, probably female, buried with a cylindrical copper alloy work-box, five amethyst beads, an antler spindle whorl, and a Roman brooch from the first century. Other graves contained only the modest knives, beads, and buckles usually associated with seventh-century burials.

In short time, a team of specialists produced a good and thorough report that looks at every aspect of the graves including isotopic analysis of the bones. It suggests that the bulk of the individuals came from outside of the area, at least four probably from outside of Britain, with two coming from a hot climate such as North Africa. These results were treated cautiously and the report suggests that the analyses are flawed. The isotopic analysis indicate that freshwater fish formed part of their diet, something that is, it appears, surprisingly uncommon in early Anglo-Saxon populations.

Is this the grave of a “princess”? This claim needs to be treated with some circumspection: the finds in Grave 1 are good, but not outstanding. Glass vessels are not uncommon, their burnt remains are found with otherwise ordinary cremation burials, and we see the graves of young people acting as a nucleus in other cemeteries such as Castledyke South, Barton on Humber, Lincolnshire. The other question posed was the possible relationship between these graves and the foundation of the monastery at Ely in around 673 by St. Etheldreda. While the child and the young woman in Graves 1 and 2 may have known what was happening down the road in Ely, the link is tenuous. These are quibbles over what is a good, scholarly, and well-presented report.

KL

In “Age Estimation of Archaeological Remains Using Amino Acid Racemization in Dental Enamel: A Comparison of Morphological, Biochemical, and Known Ages-At-Death,” *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 140: 244–52, R. C. Griffin, A. T. Chamberlain, G. Holz, K. E. H. Penkman, and M. J. Collins address the issue of determining how old a person was at the time of his or her death. Most methods based on skeletal analysis tend to bias toward the middle—the young tend to be overestimated in terms of age and the older specimens tend to be underestimated. This article examines a dating process involving the subject’s tooth enamel, a skeletal substance that is immune to tissue turnover. Initially, the process involved examining the rate of synthesis of amino acids in the dentine and using this rate of synthesis (fast while alive, slow when dead) to determine age-at-death. The authors note, however, that while this methodology is productive in current forensic work using modern biological remains, it is less so for archaeological remains that have had a significantly longer post-mortem existence. The authors decided to test this process by using the acid soluble fraction of the dental enamel, hypothesizing that it may be more of a “closed system” and thus more resistant to environmental

factors of burial site, etc., influencing the racemization process that is used to determine age-at-death. Their conclusions were mixed: for the two medieval populations that the authors checked, there seemed to be a strong correlation between the dental process and other skeletal analysis processes for determining age-at-death. However, using a control group made up of more modern remains whose age-at-death was known, the process “appeared to be a poor age indicator” (251), and the authors suggest that more work is needed to improve the accuracy of this test before it can be widely used to determine age-at-death of human remains.

RSA

Yarnton in Oxfordshire, near Eynsham, called Erdington, has a long period of continual occupation. Emma Lightfoot, Tamsin C. O’Connell, *et al.*, “An Investigation into Diet at the Site of Yarnton, Oxfordshire, Using Stable Carbon and Nitrogen Isotopes,” *Oxford Jnl of Archaeology* 28: 301–22, examine in particular remains found in a small cemetery covering the Neolithic, Roman, and Saxon periods. The authors studied the isotopes of the remains in order to determine diet. Many of the finds were what one would expect, but there were surprises. For example, although the site is on a river, there was no evidence of a fish diet. Yarnton was low status both before and after the Roman occupation; after the Romans left, the site seems to have been abandoned for a time, though Saxon buildings appear in the fifth century. Crops shift somewhat during this period, not unusually in the transition from Roman to Saxon, from spelt to bread wheat. One unusual crop feature is the presence of emmer wheat. Other crops make their appearances for the first time in the Saxon period: peas, legume, and crops grown for fodder. Saxon and Roman inhabitants had higher levels of delta 13C isotopes, indicating a diet that included animals with a higher proportion of those isotopes (such as pigs) and the consumption of fewer ruminates and horses. An alternative explanation may be that these inhabitants consumed more millet or fat hen (a common plant known by other names such as wild spinach, goosefoot, pigweed, and other names).

The study did not simply examine the diets of the human inhabitants. The porcine bones indicate that the pigs ate an omnivorous diet, possibly more than the humans but certainly more than the ruminants and horses. The canine inhabitants were the most carnivorous of all. In addition to these results, the article contains a large section on the materials and methodology with tables of results for those interested.

LS

9C. SCULPTURE, MONUMENTS, AND ARCHITECTURE

In "Medium and Message in Early Anglo-Saxon Animal Art: Some Observations on the Contexts of Salin's Style I in England," *ASSAH* 16: 1–12, Tania M. Dickinson provides the results of an experiment to establish a framework of analysis for Salin's Style I, because this particular decorative Anglo-Saxon style has never received a comprehensive study despite being a current artistic style in sixth-century England. In a nutshell, Style I depicts "individual body-parts, or elements, which were prioritized over complete or 'natural' body outline[s] and which seem to have had independent iconic significance" (1). Dickinson reinvestigates nineteen communal sixth-century Anglo-Saxon cemeteries and bases her study primarily on reliability and representativity. A map displaying the location of each cemetery is included, along with a thoroughly detailed spreadsheet categorizing each specific artifact that contained Style I within each burial. The report reveals that of the one hundred and thirty burials at least one object was decorated in Style 1 (2), which overall represents close to six per cent of all the artifacts surveyed. Dickinson further explains the various regional differences, for example, as "two Kentish cemeteries display a noticeably higher-than-average incidence of Style I" (7). This evidence supports the claim that there were close and early ties between southern Scandinavia and Kent, and that Kent became a "primary producer and user of Style I." Anomalies and irregularities outside the areas where Style I was primarily discovered is discussed briefly (7–8). Of the artifacts that contain Style I, most were usually brooches and the vast majority of brooches were placed in burials containing female skeletons. Some belt fittings also contained Style I, two of which were associated with feminine assemblages and four were associated with masculine assemblages. Dickinson notes that Style I seemed rarely used on weaponry, although samples captured two instances of its use on a shield (Mill Hill grave 81, Suffolk) and on a spear (Great Chesterford grave 51). Failure to identify an example of Style I on a sword can almost certainly be explained by the rarity of swords in burials as opposed to shields and spears. Dickinson further explains that "since sword-burial is more common in southern counties, the distribution of swords with Style I complements that of the shields" (9). Although detailed discussion of the significance of this artistic style is not discussed, the article does provide a good overview of the locations and gender distribution of the artifacts that contain Style I. Dickinson concludes by arguing that the analysis exploring Style I confirms a number of established patterns and "gives

firm guidance to the relative incidence of Style I in the material record" (10). The data provided has further aided in some understanding of Style I in early Anglo-Saxon England, although the information offered in the article suggests that there is still much more to yield in terms of what Style I can tell us about the people who used it.

Emphasizing victory through Christian imagery in ninth-century Anglo-Saxon England is the focus of Jane Hawkes's "The Church Triumphant: The Figural Columns of Early Ninth-century Anglo-Saxon England," *ASSAH* 16: 31–44. Hawkes examines an early ninth-century column located to the south of the church at Masham in Yorkshire and explores the meaning and purpose of the column by examining its iconography and imagery. Despite a variety of factors that might have damaged the monument beyond any hope of studying its features, its condition is still reasonable; thus, Hawkes manages to undertake a thorough investigation of the figures and carvings on the monument. Clear images of some of the figures are provided, along with an outline of the sequence of carved panels on the Masham column. In the study, Hawkes offers details of a carved figure of Christ flanked by twelve standing apostles, and also a figure of David combating a lion. Hawkes explains that the inclusion on the column of carvings of Christ in conjunction with scenes depicting David's life most likely reflected the idea of "the deliverance of Christians from the power of evil through Christ's death" (34). While one panel includes peacocks, which in Christian art were understood to represent "a general symbol of the Eucharist and the "immortality, resurrection, incorruptibility and eternal beatitude" dependent on that sacrament;" another panel includes Samson with the Gates of Gaza. Hawkes reflects on the iconography included on the monument and suggests that the selected Old Testament themes and figures along with a carving of Christ and the apostles emphasize Christ's saving redemption and the victory found in salvation. An interesting angle discussed in the article involves the question of the monument's form. Hawkes examines the monument in connection with its seeming influence from late imperial Roman monuments such as the "Column of Marcus Aurelius" in Rome, from ca. 180 AD and a "Jupiter column" in Mainz from ca. 60 AD. In the comparative analysis section of the article Hawkes provides an instructive examination of the decoration on the Masham column and concludes "that the physical manifestations of imperial and Christian centres (such as Rome and Jerusalem) were being consciously appropriated and re-dedicated to the service of the new Christian and Papal Rome established

in Anglo-Saxon England” (41). Overall, Hawkes offers a reading of the Masham monument that sheds light on Papal Roman influences on Anglo-Saxon art and further emphasizes how notions of triumph in relation to Christian message of salvation were important in ninth-century England. This essay will be of interest to literary and classical historians, art historians, theologians, archaeologists, and others.

Jane Hawkes makes another contribution to scholarship concerning sculpture, monument and textiles in “Studying Early Christian Sculpture in England and Ireland: The Object of Art History or Archaeology?” in *Anglo-Saxon/Irish Relations Before the Vikings*, ed. Graham-Campbell and Ryan [see sec. 7], 397–408. This essay considers the study of early medieval sculpture in light of how such analysis is perceived within the fields of archaeology and art history. Hawkes explains how style analysis is often met with unease in the academic world. It is deemed unreliable, subjective, and unscientific, and as a result, not appropriate as part of the modern discipline of archaeology. The author notes that the negative perception of style and iconography analysis is also present in Ireland. Yet, the iconography that dominates “modern Irish scholarship is not one that would be immediately recognized in (post-medieval) art-historical circles, for it primarily involved identifying the subjects depicted on the monuments and comparing them with known parallels” (399). Hawkes argues that the data-collecting required in Irish scholarship is an archaeological approach which “seek[s] to explicate the semiotics of images.” She contextualizes her argument by examining the use of style as an analytical tool first popularized by nineteenth-century scholars like John Ruskin and W. G. Collingwood. Hawkes points out that the study of early medieval art was not simply an analytical dating tool; “rather, the early material [was] considered integral to an art theory that privileged a sense of progression and the spiritual: in other words, a Hegelian art theory” (403). The author extends her argument by examining the works and ideas of other nineteenth-century art historians like Romilly Allen and Margaret Stokes and describes how their examinations of the symbols on sculptures marked a departure from mainstream historical discussion. Essentially, their studies exemplified the relationship between archaeology and art history, as an archaeological object “inhabit[s] the world of art history” (407). Hawkes concludes by acknowledging that her brief analysis of early style studies “does not answer the question of whether the current study of the early Christian sculpture of England and Ireland is the object of art history or archaeology” (408). The methodologies discussed in the article reveal that those

early specialists who shaped modern scholarship were proponents of art-historical systems of study in conjunction with other archaeological methods of analysis, and that “forms, materials, and technic, subject-matter, figures, animals and ornament were to be considered together as analytical tools by which to establish a chronology for the sculpture” (408). Although the article does not reach a solution as to whether current scholarship of sculptures should be examined within the fields of art history or archaeology, it does illuminate an existing conflict of interest in terms of how medieval sculptures are or might be examined, while leaving readers to contemplate the matter further.

In “Stylistic Influences in Early Manx Sculpture,” in *Anglo-Saxon/Irish Relations Before the Vikings*, 311–328, David M. Wilson offers insights into the origins of the early medieval stones on the Isle of Man. Written sources from the area are lacking and early records that refer to Man were often confused with the modern Welsh word *Mon*, which is now Anglesey, thus causing problems in establishing much of the Isle of Man’s medieval history. Wilson explains that despite the confusion of names, there are a number of records that probably refer to the Isle of Man, some of which include a record by Bede (*Hist. Eccl.*, 2.9), a reference in Nennius’ *Historia Brittonum* (found in Dumville’s edition, vol. 3, p. 63) and a number of vague references in Irish annals and sagas before the appearance of the Vikings. The essay describes how a small number of inscriptions from the fifth to the ninth centuries offer evidence of the introduction and development of Manx Christianity. Although not much can be said for them as historical sources for specific people, “the inscriptions are useful epigraphically and linguistically in relating the island to the lands round the Irish Sea, while their typology and style-history provide rough chronological yardsticks” (313). One stone slab from Port-y-Vullen, Maughold, bears the inscription “Crux Guriat,” but because “Gwyrriad” is such a common name in Gaelic, it has been difficult to connect the inscription to a specific historical person. Despite not being able to identify any specific person being memorialized in the Manx texts, like the stone slab in Port-y-Vullen, Wilson explains that the artifacts from the entire area are still significant, as “they enable us to recognize the presence of people in Man who are related by script and/or language to communities around the Irish Sea” (314). Wilson goes on to describe several specific examples of inscriptions written in Latin, Welsh, and Old English, all of which were written in the pre-Viking period, and there are many Irish, Pictish, Scottish, Ionian, and Anglian influence present on the stone slabs or crosses. Wilson further

contends that many of the Manx stones that draw on the Anglian tradition have been "rather neglected by students of Manx sculpture" (328). Sharp photo reproductions of some of the items discussed in the essay are also included. To conclude, Wilson argues that the memorial stones on the Isle of Man from the pre-Viking era are mostly located in cemeteries or on sites of *keeills*, and that most of the inscriptions can be identified as Christian because of the presence of a cross or explicit Christian inscriptions. Wilson calls into question the traditional view regarding ornamented sculpture on the Isle of Man during the pre-Viking period and suggests that the claim that "there is much "Celtic" art on the island, must now be seriously qualified" (328).

Salin's Style II is considered in relation to two objects, a gold buckle from the Sutton Hoo burial site and a similarly styled ornament from folio 192v of the *Book of Durrow*. In Egon Wamers's "Behind Animals, Plants and Interlace: Salin's Style II on Christian Objects," (*Anglo-Saxon/Irish Relations Before the Vikings*, 151–204), the confusion over pagan Germanic animal ornaments identified on two eminently Christian objects is discussed. Wamers bases his argument on two assumptions: first that Style II and other non-figurative motifs are not meaningless, and second, that miniature motifs on things such as belt-buckles and brooches "represent abbreviated reproductions of more complex pictures" (156). Throughout the entirety of the paper, each item discussed contains some form of animal decoration in Salin's Style II in association with a Christian ecclesiastical object. Despite the seemingly pagan associations with Style II, Wamers demonstrates that much of it is linked to Christian monuments. The author strengthens his case by comparing late Style II found on three reliquaries including: the "Warnebertus" reliquary in the abbey treasury of Beromünster, the Utrecht reliquary, in Utrecht, Netherlands, and finally a decorated stone from St. Peter's Church, Metz. The examples exemplify a theological concept presented by the early Church fathers in which an image of the cross presented in conjunction with animals was understood to mean "creation was renewed by Christ's crucifixion . . . and this *recapitulatio creationis* became a basic idea of the Christian doctrine of redemption" (160). Further to this connection between the cross and animal imagery is that the animals were interchangeable and could include fish, water birds or reptiles. Still, the basic idea was to represent the three genera of animals, the *tria genera animantium*, which became a permanent Christological motif. Although Scandinavian examples are not included in the chapter, sample pieces from various areas throughout Europe such as modern-day France,

Netherlands, Germany, Italy, Britain, and elsewhere are discussed. After establishing a Christian context for animal imagery found in Style II, Wamers discusses the human head of Style II beasts. The image of Christ's head/mask in combination with an animal contains a fixed meaning in Christian iconography. Whereas an eagle symbolizes the risen Christ, the boar, which is missing from subject matter of Style I and originated from late classical or early medieval Mediterranean art, symbolized chaos invading the cosmos. To this end, in subject matter where Christ is associated with or surrounded by boar heads, the imagery could represent the "notion of Christ victoriously overcoming evil" (176), or alternatively, the imagery could be interpreted as "the wild *bestiae salvae* becom[ing] sympathetic companions under the influence of Christ's work of redemption, as a variant of the paradise-motif in which the beasts are shown at peace with one another." The study continues with the consideration of Style II and interlace, with an exploration of the meaning of interlace in the early Middle Ages. Wamers explains that "since antiquity, knots and interlace, including knitted fabric and the like were considered to be apotropaic motifs intended symbolically to strangle, fasten with a knot and so confuse evil, thus keeping it away" (181). Wamers further expresses that by the late sixth to the end of the seventh century, the style "was not regarded as pagan by the clergy and artists in Italy, Burgundy, Gaul, Alamannia and Francia" (191). Regarding Style II elements on belt-fittings, buckles and brooches, their distribution in places like Gaul, where Germanic paganism had no influence in the seventh century, "shows that Style II animals were plainly in vogue and very much accepted as "Christian" (191). Wamers explains that the Christian objects were intended to protect the wearers and might be considered a "badge of a pilgrim." Wamers comes full circle by returning attention to the Sutton Hoo item and the illustration on the *Book of Durrow* to conclude the chapter. He claims that the pictorial evidence on the objects rule out Arianism, as being a guiding spirit of Style II, and thus, seems to support a link to Catholicism. Wamers offers an in-depth and enlightening study of animal imagery and interlace in connection with Christian symbolism as represented in Style II. The thorough analysis clearly explores how the animal symbols were reinterpreted in a Christian context and how additional symbols like the cross and the image of Christ used in connection with Style II extended the Christian message of redemption. The paper also includes a wonderful array of sharp images of most of the examples discussed throughout the essay,

thus offering readers a clear view of the various artifacts under scrutiny.

MR-O

In “A Figure Sculpture at Upton Bishop, Herefordshire: Continuity and Revival in Early Medieval Sculpture,” *The Antiquaries Journal* 89: 179–214, John Hunt provides a persuasive case for dating a relief carving of a face, hand, and upper torso in an architectural niche to the early ninth century. Previously, this carving, which was discovered in a chancel wall in the Church of St. John the Baptist, Upton Bishop (Herefordshire) in the nineteenth century, was traditionally believed to have been of Roman origin. Later, this estimation was revised and the figure was thought to be of twelfth-century Romanesque origin, and part of the Anglo-Norman Herefordshire School of regional sculpture. Hunt challenges both of these hypotheses and instead argues that the carving is of Anglo-Saxon origin. He asserts that the sculptor of the figure “seemingly draws on local traditions, some of which are classical in origin, while others are consistent with Irish, as well as English, traditions” (211). To support his case, Hunt provides a substantial analysis of the Herefordshire School figural traditions, and shows how the Upton Bishop carving deviates from this group and instead, has more in common with eighth/ninth-century works like the Book of Cerne, the Deerhurst angel panel, and the Newent cross shaft (212). The author concludes by discussing the nature of artistic style and influence, and suggests that this piece of sculpture represents a local stylistic continuity and development between the Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman periods rather than a “conscious revival” (211) of Roman elements during the zenith of the Herefordshire School’s regional sculptural influence in the twelfth century.

The analysis of artistic production often involves an inquiry into the motivations of the artist or artistic community. Why was this piece created? What motivated the artist to make the decisions she or he did? What do those choices mean in a larger social or historical context? These are all key questions; all are, to some extent, unanswerable. Yet as scholars, we have developed ways to approach these questions and suggest reasonable hypotheses of intention and meaning. In his article “Angel Veneration on Anglo-Saxon Stone Sculpture from Dewsbury (West Yorkshire), Otley (West Yorkshire) and Halton (Lancashire): Contemplative Preachers and Pastoral Care,” *Journal of the British Archaeological Association* 162: 1–28, Thomas Pickles employs an interdisciplinary approach to his contextual analysis of three stone sculpture fragments from the late eighth and early

ninth centuries. He suggests that these three works of art, all of which show an angel and an “attendant figure, perhaps a monk or mass-priest” (1), embody “themes ... for members of the communities by whom they were commissioned, carved, encoded and decoded” (8). Specifically, he argues, these figures indicate an attempt to correlate the modes of angel veneration in the Old and New Testaments and to provide a model of a contemplative life for preachers (17). Pickles extensively examines the Biblical commentaries of Gregory the Great and Bede, and their impact on Anglo-Saxon theology to contextualize his reading of these sculptures, and suggests that they were commissioned with an eye towards correcting the decline in the popularity of the monastic life in the eighth and ninth centuries. While this reading is interesting, it is not ultimately convincing, as Pickles seems to see this as a purely theological question entirely divorced from other historical, economic, and political concerns—such as the severity and frequency of Viking invasions throughout the country during this time of “monastic decline.” While I do not doubt that Pickles’s reading of Gregory and Bede is grounded in solid research, his conclusions are a bit far-reaching for the evidence presented.

The church of St. Mary at Deerhurst in Gloucestershire is a remarkable structure with a significant amount of Anglo-Saxon fabric still in existence. Michael Hare’s extensive article “The 9th-century West Porch of St Mary’s Church, Deerhurst, Gloucestershire: Form and Function,” *Medieval Archaeology* 53: 35–93, is a substantial contribution to our understanding of the nature of the building and its function within Anglo-Saxon religious society. Hare’s first contention is that the western wall of the nave and the western porch tower were built congruently in the ninth century, and an upper-level chapel was integral to the building project. By closely examining the stonework, Hare asserts that there is evidence of blocked sockets that would have supported an internal wooden floor for this upper-level chapel as well as a projecting walkway on the three sides of the exterior portion of the tower. This is a rather bold assertion; there is very little contemporary evidence of any similar building patterns, or, as Hare puts it, it would be “the only unambiguous example of such a structure between Late Antiquity and the central Middle Ages” (35). Nevertheless, by putting his thesis into context with the surviving walkway at St. Peter, Beho (Belgium) and manuscript illustration, Hare makes a strong case for his hypothesis. The uses of such a walkway were most likely ceremonial, according to Hare, who also notes that most medieval structural elements had multiple purposes (such as a lookout for defensive purposes). In

this case, he suggests that an external walkway of this sort could be used for public ceremonies of relic veneration. In this way, this article should be of significant interest to hagiologists who are interested in the liturgical and ceremonial function of relics within the Anglo-Saxon church.

David A. Hinton opens "Recent Work at the Chapel of St. Lawrence, Bradford-on-Avon, Wiltshire," *Archaeological Journal* 166: 193–209, with a quotation from the Rev. W. H. Jones, who was one of those responsible for the recognition and preservation of this building. In 1875 he wrote: "To an archaeologist, this unique building must ever be one of the deepest interest" (193). I would remove the limitation; this building is of interest to any scholar of the Anglo-Saxon period. It is a relatively complete church that dates from the early eleventh century; it figures prominently in a 1001 charter (the date is under debate, see Wormald) of King Æthelred II in which he granted lands at Bradford to Shaftesbury Abbey for the construction of a church to house the relics of their primary saint, Æthelred's brother, St. Edward the Martyr, should the nuns desert Shaftesbury because of Viking raiding. Hinton's analysis concerns the now-lost south porticus of the building; he suggests that it was removed as late as the eighteenth century when the building was transformed into and incorporated into a local school, and this south side of the church became one of the walls of the school-master's house. The major question that Hinton explored was whether or not there might have been a lower level to this porticus structure, perhaps a small crypt. His excavation of the building's foundations revealed some lower level ashlar (in contrast to the rubble base along the south wall of the nave's two ends) that would have formed part of a lower-level room. Hinton notes that there is no specific evidence for two internal levels in this porticus (i.e. no internal vaulting) but there is no evidence ruling out a plank floor with north-south joisting. Hinton notes that the identification of such a sub-level room like this as a "crypt" is somewhat problematic, he states that "no Anglo-Saxon church or chapel in England is known to have a crypt that is not below and on the axial line of the main elements of the building" (207). The building's history as a purpose built (or purpose remodeled) building as a relic repository, however, makes the possibility of a crypt of sorts attractive and plausible. In any case, the building is of "deepest interest" to many and well-deserving of scholarly attention and archaeological investigation.

RSA

In this nearly fifty-page article, Nancy Edwards, "Rethinking the Pillar of Eliseg," *Antiquaries Jnl* 89: 143–77, reviews the history of the pillar, the history of interpretation, and then offers a lengthy reconsideration of the pillar's origins. The pillar of Eliseg was a large, round-shafted cross with an inscription probably dating from the ninth century. It is now in pieces, with a still-large section of the upper portion standing in the original base. It was once inscribed, but now the inscription is illegible. It was transcribed by Edward Lhuyd in 1696, but scholars have questioned the accuracy; some even reject the transcription altogether as any kind of useful historical document. Edwards argues that the pillar is a piece of propaganda erected in the mid-ninth century by the rulers of Powys. The multiple messages of the monument include a celebration of victory over the English, a linking of the ruling family of Powys with a legendary and mythical past, and an affirmation of the commitment to Christianity and the saints associated with Wales, and Powys in particular. Edwards also speculates on whether the location of pillar on top of a Bronze Age burial mound might have served as a gathering place for public ceremonies and events, arguing that the royal genealogy and other parts of the inscription were intended for public recitation. In addition to Edwards's extensive reconsideration of the context and history of the pillar, she includes maps, diagrams, and photographs of the object. An appendix contains a reconstruction of the inscription and a proposed translation.

LS

9D. ARTIFACTS AND ICONOGRAPHY

‡‡Scandinavian influence in pre-Viking Age Scotland is the topic of Steven P. Ashby's article "Combs, Contact and Chronology: Reconsidering Hair Combs in Early-Historic and Viking-Age Atlantic Scotland," *Medieval Archaeology* 53: 1–33. This article systematically analyzes combs made of antler and produces a taxonomy of their variations, including the species of antler used in their manufacture, specifically red deer and reindeer. The species is key, he argues, as it has been used as a base from which to argue the possibility of a significant Norse presence in pre-Viking Age Atlantic Scotland; specifically, that the presence of combs made from reindeer must be imported, as reindeer are not native to Scotland, but are plentiful in Scandinavia. As a result of his analysis, Ashby argues that the comb evidence is not a solid basis on which to hypothesize early significant contact; the majority of the combs in the historical record date from the post-Viking age, and

the differences in styles (Scandinavian vs. “Pictish” or “native”—Ashby eschews these terms, for the most part) can be attributable to “differing working traditions” (23). Simply put, the social structure of post-Viking Scotland was complex, and the artisans who made combs did so in manners more related to their traditions and skills rather than fad or fashion. Furthermore, as Ashby notes, “the region’s stylistic repertoire seems to be the result of something of a melting pot, a coming together of stylistic references and traditions with origins in Anglo-Saxon England, Ireland and Scandinavia” (26). In this way, Ashby calls on scholars to resist any hypothesis that rests on significant Scandinavian influence in Scotland prior to 789.

RSA

‡‡In “Combs, Contact and Chronology: Reconsidering Hair Combs in Early-Historic and Viking-Age Atlantic Scotland,” *Medieval Archaeology* 53: 1–33, Stephen P. Ashby shows how detailed analysis and study of an artifact type can cast light on social interactions in a shadowy period of the past. In order to clarify the classification of the combs, Ashby set up his own scheme for British combs based on Correspondence Analysis. The types of immediate interest in this paper are his Types 1c, 5, 11 and 12; Type 5 is Viking and singled sided, as was the English Type 1c “single-sided, high-backed type.” The other two types were doubled sided, Type 11 being seen as typical of western Britain and Type 12 as a form used in Anglo-Saxon England/northern Europe in the later first millennium AD. Ashby’s analysis showed that, not surprisingly, reindeer antler was being used to make Type 5 Viking combs but it was also commonly being used to make Type 12 combs, a doubled sided form unknown in Scandinavia. Reindeer antler, while common in Scandinavia, is unavailable in Scotland. While this might point to the importation of reindeer antler prior to the arrival of the Vikings in Scotland, Ashby recognizes that none of these combs can be securely dated and suggests that the native types remained in production after the arrival of the Vikings with the raw material being imported from Scandinavia, the local tradition continuing under the aegis of the Vikings.

KL

As a result of increased access to an array of medieval manuscript facsimiles ushered in by our digital age, along with a selection of data concerning numerous Anglo-Saxon archaeological finds over the past seventy years, Richard N. Bailey re-examines T. D. Kendrick’s publications from 1938 and 1949, which emphasized

that Anglo-Saxon art was shaped by two opposing aesthetics: the barbaric and classical systems. In “Anglo-Saxon Art: Some Forms, Orderings and their Meanings,” *ASSAH* 16: 18–31, Bailey’s reassessment of Kendrick’s texts recognizes that “Kendrick could not, at [the dates in which he was writing] fully appreciate that ‘classical’ was not a single narrow concept in the seventh and eighth centuries” (19), as early English travelers almost certainly encountered a range of classical influences not only from Rome, but other areas of mainland Europe. The article includes three manuscript images including a depiction of David as psalmist (Durham Cathedral MS B. II. 30, f. 81v), David as warrior (Durham Cathedral B. II. 30, f. 172v) and St. Luke (Rome, Cimiterio di Commodilla). While the first two images were produced in England, the latter image in Rome most likely was viewed by Anglo-Saxon travelers who “scribbled runes on its surface” (21). In presenting the manuscript examples, Bailey argues that the Anglo-Saxon figures have classical origins, and that “much of what Kendrick identified as Anglo-Saxon ‘barbaric’ in the Durham book [had] an impeccable ‘classical’ Italian pedigree” (21). To further strengthen the article’s main point, Bailey examines the Heysham cross-shaft which contains a scene of Lazarus, part of an ivory diptych containing the resurrection scene, the Hornby and Gosforth cross-shafts, various metallic forms on sculptures, Christ on the Rothbury cross-shaft and Hell on the same cross-shaft. Bailey’s re-assessment is not a scathing attack on an early critic’s work; rather, the article provides a balanced overview of Kendrick’s previous work in light of existing archaeological and artistic evidence available to scholars in the first half of the 20th century. Additionally, Bailey credits Kendrick for recognizing an “aesthetic discord and restlessness” (27) in Anglo-Saxon art. Bailey further explores Kendrick’s idea in light of a larger inventory of Anglo-Saxon artifacts and reasserts that “characteristically early medieval art tolerated the co-existence of radically opposed forms” (27), such as interlaced animal tails alongside angels (28). The article shows the benefits of revisiting an older argument and, to that end, Bailey sheds new light on Kendrick’s previous assertions and demonstrates the importance of reevaluating past claims with the aid of new archaeological finds.

Ragnall Ó Floinn revisits the findings of David Longley, whose 1975 essay discussed the presence of Celtic metalwork in Anglo-Saxon graves. In Ó Floinn’s “The Anglo-Saxon Connection: Irish Metalwork, AD 400–800,” (*Anglo-Saxon/Irish Relations Before the Vikings*, 231–251), the metalwork evidence is reviewed in light of a more developed “understanding of interac-

tions across the Irish Sea” (231). Ó Floinn also explains that as a result of excavations in western Britain and Ireland over the past thirty years, an increase in new material from metal-detecting and a better understanding of maritime trading connections between north-western Europe and the Mediterranean, there is much more material and research available to reconsider Longley’s study. Ó Floinn explores the evidence “in the opposite direction to that looked at by Longley—westwards, across the Irish Sea—and look[s] at the evidence (or presumed evidence) for contacts between Ireland and the Continent” (231). Anglo-Saxon imports and interlace is discussed, and a detailed analysis of brooches is included. After discussing the features and locations of such finds, Ó Floinn concludes that many of the artifacts betray Germanic influence (250) and that beginning in the seventh century, Celtic metalworkers were experimenting with metalwork at secular high-status sites in Scotland and Ireland. Ó Floinn provides a thorough overview of some of the metalwork found in pre-Viking Britain as Longley’s work from nearly forty years ago is revisited. This insightful new study reveals the importance of continued archaeological work as it offers us a more complete picture of pre-Viking Britain.

In Mark Redknapp’s “Glitter in the Dragon’s Lair: Irish and Anglo-Saxon Metalwork from Pre-Viking Wales, c. 400–850,” (*Anglo-Saxon/Irish Relations Before the Vikings*, 281–309), known metalwork from Wales is considered in its linguistic, cultural, and historical context. Redknapp divides his study into two sections focusing first on metalwork from c. 450–650 which he describes as Phase I, and metalwork within Phase II, c. 650–850. In assessing the influence of English and Irish metalwork in Wales, Redknapp provides a brief overview of the native styles and fashions in Phase I within Wales. He explains that many brooches were zoomorphic penannular brooches, while offering further support that they were manufactured in Britain. Redknapp’s main focus in Phase I is on brooches, although he does describe a single late seventh- or eighth-century hook-mount enameled hanging-bowl (288). This particular hanging-bowl provides an example of the occurrence of enameled ribbon interlace, which was present on the English border and “represents a “borderland transition type of exchange” (288) between England and Wales. Redknapp queries whether the metalwork found around the Welsh coast is Irish or western British, and concludes that much of the evidence found that dates from the fifth to seventh centuries “could have been in the possession of either Britons or Saxons” (290). Some of the Anglo-Saxon metalwork discoveries that belong to Phase I offer “evidence for the adoption of Christian

The Year’s Work in Old English Studies symbolism” (295) by craftsmen who were also familiar with pagan designs. While the amount of Anglo-Saxon metalwork in Wales in Phase I is small, the number suggests “the conscious acquisition of glittering items to enhance status and prestige among the Welsh elite” (296). Further to this, Redknapp claims that “some objects appear to reflect a different attitude to the symbolism of these objects . . . enabling independent elites in Wales with different beliefs and values to compete socially and politically” (297). In consideration of Anglo-Saxon or local finds from Phase II, Redknapp explains that Anglo-Saxon metalwork between the late seventh to the ninth century is scarce. He goes on to explore the Irish-style metalwork from the period and offers thorough descriptions of finds at specific locations such as Glyn, Llanbedrgoch, Anglesey, and Llan-gors crannog. In summary, Redknapp demonstrates that new archaeological discoveries “are providing further evidence for the exchange of objects between Wales, Ireland and England” (306). It seems clear that the Welsh were not isolated from developments occurring in England and Ireland and that there was hybridization of Welsh-Irish and Welsh-English metalwork traditions transpiring in pre-Viking Wales. Overall, Redknapp demonstrates through the analysis of various metalwork finds that there were “different types and levels of interaction between the Welsh, English and Irish” (309) between the sixth and ninth centuries. A map of Wales identifying the distribution of discovered metalwork is included, and thorough descriptions of specific ornamental metalwork are outlined. Several figures containing images of different metalwork finds are distributed throughout the essay, offering readers a helpful visual guide as they read historical summaries about various metalwork pieces. This article will be of use to metallurgists, archaeologists and medievalists with special interest in the evolving culture of pre-Viking Wales.

As discoveries of hanging-bowls designated to the pre-Viking continues to increase, so too will our understanding of these artifacts within their historical context. In “Anglo-Saxon, Irish and British Relations: Hanging-Bowls Reconsidered” (*Anglo-Saxon/Irish Relations Before the Vikings*, 205–230), Susan Youngs challenges assumptions about contact between the Irish and Anglo-Saxons in the sixth and seventh centuries through an analysis of hanging-bowls. Youngs’s research reveals that there are at least 168 hanging-bowls on record and that 137 of the total are or were enameled. She acknowledges that her tally is not complete, as a result of more recent, unrecorded finds and also the lack of information known about private collections that include hanging-bowls in Belgium and the USA. The essay presents

a distribution map that reveals the general pattern of the distribution in Britain and Ireland of documented finds of hanging-bowls dating before 700. The map identifies the bulk of the finds located in the south eastern region of England, with a small number of discoveries scattered throughout the middle region of Britain and less than a dozen finds dispersed across both Ireland and Scotland. Youngs investigates whether the hanging-bowls were local Anglo-Saxon commissions by analyzing the technology of manufacture, the materials and the styles. The analysis determines that the bowls were “not being commissioned in Lincolnshire, East Anglia or Kent from local British smiths or smiths working in the Romano-British tradition” (208). Youngs further asserts that there is still confusion with regards to the label “Anglo-Saxon hanging-bowl,” especially in relation to the bowls found on the eastern side of the Irish Sea and Scotland. Youngs argues that evidence suggests some bowls were local products of a “north British tradition” (209). She contends that misconceptions concerning the manufacturing locations of seventh-century hanging-bowls in Britain and Ireland is “perhaps due to a natural reluctance to disbelieve the message of distribution maps; partly a failure to see that around 600 Anglo-Saxon ‘England’ did not exist, was not inevitable, and that the relatively new Anglo-Saxon polities were cohabiting with extensive Christian and semi-pagan native powers” (209). The essay provides images and illustrations of specific finds, some of which include hook-mounts, as well as decorated bowls. Details of each image are also included. The selection of examples discussed in the essay assist the author in offering different scenarios surrounding the origins of the hanging-bowls. Youngs offers some “what if” scenarios and examines whether the bowls might have Irish or British origins, but she cautiously stops short of claiming one origin or the other until all the evidence is examined. The author turns attention to dating the objects and the period of manufacture and concludes that some scholarly arguments for fifth-century dating of some of the enameled bowls with glass and millefiori contradicts the actual evidence. She contends that “Irish, Anglo-Saxon and British native finds show that other coloured glasses suitable for inlaying or enameling using existing techniques were re-introduced around or somewhat before 600” (218). After examining the possible dates of production, Youngs makes a case for manufacturing of hanging-bowls in Ireland by discussing and comparing the details of a hoop of a brooch from Ballinderry and the textured frames of the great bowl from Sutton Hoo. Although a workshop location is not determined, the comparative analysis suggests that “we should be

looking at the style of one master or of one workshop, capable of producing the most complex, brilliant castings and enameling in the first decades of the seventh century” (221). Further discussion includes analysis of the earliest bowl tradition in Britain, the manufacture of enameled mounts and style. Upon reflection of all of the evidence, Youngs concedes that although distribution evidence is patchy and misleading, her view remains “that enameled hanging-bowls were originally made in some of the most prosperous centres of British Britain from the mid-sixth century” (228). She leaves open the question of the making and subsequent history of the Sutton Hoo bowl and quips that “the question continues to hang” (230). To Youngs’s credit, she bases her conclusion on the evidence provided, while acknowledging that the evidence itself is limited. With more to examine and with new evidence emerging, there seems to be a tantalizing opportunity for continued research on pre-Viking era hanging bowls.

MR-O

In “Regarding the Spectators of the Bayeux Tapestry: Bishop Odo and His Circle,” *Art History* 16: 31–44, T. A. Heslop treads familiar, but still fertile, ground. By examining the embroidered panel as a text produced within a specific context for a specific audience, he makes a case for the Bayeux Tapestry as a specific commentary on the idea of victory within Bishop Odo’s immediate circle of nobility. Heslop pursues two major avenues of inquiry in this paper: primarily, he examines how Odo, and the men closest to him, are portrayed quite favorably in the embroidered text. Subsequently, he examines how the Norman invasion was depicted in contemporary poetry, especially poetry written by men who benefited from Odo’s enthusiasm for higher education (232). Working from imagery embedded in these poems, Heslop then returns to the Tapestry, and asserts that “There are a few key moments in the narrative depicted in the Bayeux Tapestry at which an educated man or woman . . . might have been reminded of the founding myth of imperial Rome” (237). While Heslop admits that imagining “Harold’s death in terms of the fate of Dido” is a bit of a stretch for a modern audience, he stressed that “people at the time did not” have such a problem (239). He concludes that the Bayeux Tapestry, like Virgil’s *Aeneid*, was concerned with legitimacy of rule, and sought, by association with Roman history and this mythical story of origins, to create a narrative of historical inevitability.

RSA

In a few short pages, Thomas Klein, “Anglo-Saxon Literacy and the Roman Letters on the Franks Casket,”

Studia Neophilologica 81: 17–23, examines the Latin words carved on one panel of the Franks Casket. He examines in detail the various letter forms of the carver, noting the various Roman capitals, the Insular forms, the similarities between the *R* in the Latin segment and the runic *R*, and the alternation between curved and straight craved letters. Whatever else might be said for the Casket carver, Klein notes that he had fluency both in Latin and in English, and used both Roman writing system and scripts as well as runic—even using runes to represent Latin. The one Latin word in runes also suggests to Klein that the carver's community spoke Latin with enough fluency to accommodate it to a different writing system (runic), and also to have developed a localized pronunciation: the Latin word in runes is *afitadores* and in classical pronunciation and orthography should be *habitadores*. Klein concludes that just as the carver has assimilated Germanic, Roman, and Christian images, he assimilated his letter forms in this short Latin line using capitals, book script, display script, and runes.

In “Culture and Gender in the Danelaw: Scandinavian and Anglo-Scandinavian Brooches,” *Viking and Medieval Scandinavia* 5: 295–325, Jane F. Kershaw examines the various types of brooches found in the Danelaw. The Scandinavian style of the brooches indicate that these were not merely trade items, but were items originally brought over by female settlers. Very quickly afterward, however, Anglo-Scandinavian brooches are found demonstrating the fusion of cultures. Danelaw settlers had access to a wide variety of design possibilities—primarily Irish, Anglo-Saxon, Scandinavian, and Carolingian—and are all represented, although the majority of finds are Scandinavian and Anglo-Scandinavian. After reporting these facts, though, Kershaw's argument offers an interpretation based on the longevity and distribution of the artifacts. She suggests that the brooches were used by women to establish Scandinavian identity within eclectic communities. Kershaw seems to overlook, however, the number of Anglo-Scandinavian brooches, which would seem to indicate an eclectic identity in eclectic communities. In any case, the demonstration of Scandinavian identity, in whatever form, is thought to have been beneficial in some way. The author further suggests that through these cultural identities the women—in contrast to the men—were seen as the “bearers of cultural identity and continuity” in the Danelaw. The article contains maps showing artifact distribution as well as drawings of the brooches discussed.

Michael P. Barnes, “The Origins of the Younger *Futhorc*: A Review of Recent and Less Recent

Research,” *NOWELE* 56/57: 123–42, explores one of the most vexed issues in runic studies: the development of the younger *futhorc* (especially since the who, the why, and the how are all issues that remain largely unresolved). Barnes begins by reviewing his own earlier work from 1985 and addressing various explanations of these questions, and then he moves on to consider suggestions made since that paper almost twenty-five years ago. Barnes states his principle that he has come to distrust “quick-fix” explanations by which the origins of the younger version are easily explained and all the questions are answered. Rather, he posits a more difficult approach which considers that the emergence of the differences in the runic system resulted from more than one change, had more than one cause, and occurred in more than one place.

In reexamining the evidence for the reduction of the *futhorc* from twenty-four to sixteen characters, as well as the various scholarly suggestions of the intervening steps, Barnes comes to several conclusions. First, the introduction of the new system and the removal of eight characters are contemporaneous rather than sequential. The older and younger writing systems were used side by side, and sometimes even interchangeably, before the new system become dominant; initial sounds of several rune-names changed while at approximately the same time rune signs became multifunctional, causing rune signs that were not multifunctional to be dropped. This is a fascinating article based on the emergence of a new writing system with attention to phonological and linguistic evidence.

Kevin Leahy and Roger Bland quickly put together *The Staffordshire Hoard* (London: British Museum) after the first fantastic news of the hoard. It tells the story of the discovery, gives a very brief and basic overview of the find and what is known, and has brief, more detailed descriptions of some of the more celebrated items, such as the eagle mount and the biblical inscription. The book contains a number of color photographs of various items in the hoard. There is also a brief bibliography.

Art historians will hail the publication of Roger Rosewell's *Medieval Wall Paintings in English and Welsh Churches* (Woodbridge: Boydell P, 2008). The first such book of its kind in half a century, it provides a thorough guide to wall paintings in churches with copious color plates. After a brief introduction, the chapters cover the history of medieval wall paintings in brief, the iconography of the paintings, the patrons and painters who produced them, their methods of production, the interpretation of the works of art, and finally their restoration. Rosewell also provides a gazetteer, a subject guide, and a bibliography. The

photographs in the book are fabulous. Yet there is regrettably little of interest for Anglo-Saxonists because, according to Rosewell, very few wall paintings from the Anglo-Saxon period survive. In fact, that is a general problem with the subject: less than 10% of the medieval churches that survive in England and Wales have paintings or portions of paintings that survive, and that percentage plummets for any church dated before the twelfth century. The few that do survive are mentioned or examined briefly, but not in great detail: the history portion for Anglo-Saxon churches covers a page and a half, including photographs. Of greater interest are later depictions in church paintings of Anglo-Saxon saints. St. Dunstan, St. Swithun, and other Anglo-Saxon saints do make appearances in some churches, particularly in the twelfth century. But though saints, even Anglo-Saxon saints, form a portion of wall paintings and other decoration, they are outnumbered by depictions of holy history, particularly biblical events. So even here, while there is material of interest, the book is of limited use directly for Anglo-Saxon studies.

It is a beautifully-produced book containing a great deal of information. The author has tried to straddle the line between a scholarly and non-scholarly audience, an approach that has both strengths and weaknesses. One such weakness concerns references to primary literature, with no citation, which makes tracing the reference difficult at best. The select bibliography in the back is insufficient to overcome this frustration. But this is but one weakness in an otherwise very strong book.

Quite apart from what interest there is for Anglo-Saxonists, Rosewell makes an important argument in the book. We are all familiar with the interpretation of stained glass windows, sculpture, and paintings in churches as “books for the illiterate”—depictions of biblical stories, saints, and other matters related to the faith for those who could not read. Rosewell rejects this interpretation of wall paintings (and by extension other forms of graphic art). Rosewell places paintings in a different category from other forms of art, though: the church structure itself is not just the support of the painting, but the walls and plaster are the canvas. More importantly, he argues that paintings cannot be merely “books for the illiterate” since to derive meaning from the painting, one must know the story. Rather, he argues that the depictions of holy scenes are an integral part of the worship and liturgy—aids to contemplation and prayer, rather than didactic tools for the unlearned. These need not be exclusive interpretations, but Rosewell does mount a good argument to reject the typical understanding of wall paintings in churches. While there is little directly applicable to Anglo-Saxon

England in the book, it nonetheless is an excellent overview of the subject.

LS

9E. REGIONAL STUDIES AND ECONOMIC STUDIES

In *Artefacts and Society in Roman and Medieval Winchester: Small Finds from the Suburbs and Defences, 1971–1986* (Winchester: Winchester Museums and English Heritage, 2008). H. Rees, *et al.*, present the material recovered from a series of excavations conducted just outside the city of Winchester. It is arranged by period: Roman, followed by Anglo-Saxon and medieval. The finds are catalogued by functional groups: objects of personal ornament and dress; toilet, surgical, and pharmaceutical instruments; objects used in the manufacture of textiles, etc. The publication is well-indexed and the illustrations excellent but, from our point of view, it is unfortunate that the areas excavated, on the edge of Winchester, saw little activity during the Anglo-Saxon period. There are some early medieval finds (a few dress fittings and material related to textile working) but this publication is mainly concerned with Roman and High Medieval material. This is still a useful book, the contextual material relating to the late Roman occupation is important, but it is not a prime source for the Anglo-Saxon period.

KL

When the future Bishop Æthelwold of Winchester was given his first “assignment”—namely, to revitalize and reform the Abingdon Abbey in Oxfordshire—he discovered that the local waterway was in an inconvenient place. Wanting to build a mill for his new and improved abbey, he simply ordered the river to be rerouted to accommodate his plans. While this says a great deal about Æthelwold’s administrative prowess (and possibly the levels of exhaustion suffered by his monks), it also provides an interesting corollary to Duncan Sayer’s excellent analysis of Anglo-Saxon economic structures as they relate to the creation and maintenance of local waterways. In “Medieval Waterways and Hydraulic Economics: Monasteries, Towns and the East Anglian Fen,” *World Archaeology* 41: 134–50, Sayer examines two Cambridgeshire towns, Swavesey and Burwell, and the evidence they present for a comparison between manorial and monastic administration and their creation and use of fenland waterway structures. As a theoretical context for this discussion, Sayer introduces the work of Wittfogel, a mid-century scholar who developed a non-feudal model for societal development based around irrigation systems. Sayer sides with those scholars, such

as Mitchell (1973) and Price (1994), who do not dismiss Wittfogel's theories, but instead see how they might be more broadly applied in medieval European contexts. In this article, Sayer uses Wittfogel's "hydraulic hypothesis" to account for the extensive development of canals and fen waterway maintenance seen in the Cambridgeshire area under discussion. He especially focuses on the administrative power of local monastic landowners (Ely, Peterborough, Ramsey, etc.). For example, in the two towns he focuses on, the one with a primarily manorial administrative structure (Swavesey) had shrunk considerably by the end of the Middle Ages, while the other, Burwell, which had been "actively encouraged to expand by its patron and chief landowner Ramsey Abbey" (144) had prospered. Sayer concludes that "monastic foundations seem to have been the key to success" (144), and their centralized administration places them firmly within the scope of Wittfogel's thesis and provides an important context for understanding the local and regional economies of the fens.

RSA

Jeremy Haslam, "The Development of Late-Saxon Christchurch, Dorset, and the Burghal Hidage," *Medieval Archaeology* 53: 95–118, takes on questions of dating Christchurch, a late Saxon *burh* in Dorset by reexamining the finds around the Alfredian era defenses here with those of nearby Cricklade. His conclusions are startling: it is "not appropriate" to use the figures in the Burghal Hidage to predict or talk about any of the actual defenses of any particular *burh*. In rather strong terms in the conclusion, Haslam concludes that to use figures from the Hidage to predict the location and/or length of any of the defenses is "to enter Alice-through-the-Looking-Glass world." In spite of the rather poetic and forceful conclusion, Haslam does appear to have proven his point in this case, since he shows there is no connection between the text of the Hidage and the late Saxon defense works at Christchurch.

Mary Chester-Kadwell's *Early Anglo-Saxon Communities in the Landscape of Norfolk* (Oxford: Archaeopress) seeks to do big things. The author aims to unite heretofore disparate areas, foci, and methods of British archaeology. Recent archaeological methods involve examining mortuary sites and remains in conjunction and relationship with settlement sites. The two subfields have developed separately with different methodologies and concerns; the author's concern is in part to study Norfolk in a way that includes both. Further, the author explains that another shift in the field has been to note that the diversity of remains can no longer be explained simply on the grounds of ethnicity, but now

must also consider gender, status, and household identities. Not only this, archaeologists must also consider the landscape and compare to other settlements where practices may, and do, differ. Putting all this together into a narrative means attempting to craft a description that is more local and specific than the historical sources indicate but that is less concerned with the description of individual graves and contents.

Another feature of this book is the consideration of metal detector finds. Over the last ten to fifteen years, amateur and professional detectors have discovered and uncovered some amazing finds, but until recently they have made little impact on the discipline. The author aims to combine all of these in her study of Norfolk County.

The book falls neatly into sections. After the introductory first chapter, the following chapters establish the methodological framework and make an argument for community practice (chapters 2–4). The second section covers chapters 5–8 and provides a case study for Norfolk utilizing mortuary, settlement, and detectorist finds and methods. Chapter 8 also includes a short conclusion. There are three appendices: the first a comparative analysis of metal finds, the second an interpretation of Early Anglo-Saxon archaeological material, and the third a gazetteer of early Anglo-Saxon sites that includes all of England. In addition, there is a full bibliography and color plates. Notions of community are central to Anglo-Saxon literature and in archaeological remains. The conclusions reached in this book are that each locale had similar practices, but also practices engaged in only at each individual locale. Symbolism and ideology in the burial practices reflect kinship identity as well as residential, tribal, and kingdom identities. Taken together, the author's findings suggest a model to explain the sites in and around Norfolk. Chester-Kadwell has done an impressive job in examining these sites and merging the various methodologies to propose an interesting model of burial site distribution.

Gerald Moody's *The Isle of Thanet: From Prehistory to the Norman Conquest* (Stroud: Tempus, 2008) takes a broad view of an important piece of real estate. The author happens to be the head of the Trust of Thanet Archaeology and surveys the disparate and unique archaeology of the island. The book claims to be the first comprehensive survey of the archaeology of the island. This less a report of archaeological digs, however, than a synthesis of many studies about Thanet. The volume begins with a review of archaeological work done in the last three centuries followed by an overview of the geology of the island and its relationship to the

estuary that defined it from the prehistoric period to the post-medieval. The author then gives an overview of the archaeology from the prehistoric periods. The remainder of the book discusses the archaeology of human habitation from the earliest evidence to the Normans.

Only one chapter is of direct interest to Anglo-Saxonists, and that is the penultimate one, which covers the entire Anglo-Saxon period up to the Norman Conquest. Frustratingly, of the chapters dealing with human history on Thanet, it is the shortest. There are few items of surprise in the mix: Thanet in the early and mid-Saxon period had contacts with the Scandinavian countries (and Moody posits that this is likely to have been true also in the late Roman period because of Richborough fort) as did Kent and East Anglia in the same periods. In early female graves, the presence of items such as straining spoons indicates that women had an important role in hospitality distribution. Jutish influence is also indicated by the presence of certain grave goods like bracteates that have designs also found in Kent. The earliest grave goods show mixed Scandinavian and Frankish contacts as well as Jutish. The later Anglo-Saxon period shows continued Scandinavian influence; there were Vikings running amok in the area. The period from 830 to 1066 is covered in less than two pages and contains very little detail. The book is attractively illustrated with photographs, drawings, and maps. There is a good bibliography and a final word at the end. The narrative Moody weaves is interesting and fills in some gaps about one of the key places in English history.

LS

9F. INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES

The collection of essays in *Approaching Interdisciplinarity: Archaeology, History, and the Study of Early Medieval Britain, c. 400–1100*, ed. Zoë L. Devlin and Caroline N. J. Holas-Clark (Oxford: Archaeopress), bring together eight papers originally presented at a one-day conference at York, along with an introduction by Professor Julian D. Richards (co-director, Centre for Medieval Studies, University of York, 2003–6) and a summation by Devlin. The book's unifying theme is methodological: namely, how might interdisciplinarity impact research on topics related to early medieval England? As Alex Woolf, in the opening article "A Dialogue of the Deaf and Dumb: Archaeology, History and Philology" (3–9), notes, the fields of archaeology, history, and philology often found themselves at odds with one another, with archaeology often struggling to prove

that it was not the "handmaid of history," and "good for something other than providing the illustrations to history books" (4, 5). Woolf's article reviews the "invasion" debate to illustrate how these disciplines approach a question in markedly different manners, and notes that a philological approach (in passing, he reminds us that "palaeography is an archaeological skill" [7]) using linguistic data ignored by many historians and archaeologists provides a rich trove of data from which to hypothesize. He concludes by persuasively arguing that to fully analyze the question of cultural assimilation during the "migration" period, a scholar must use an interdisciplinary approach that combines philology, DNA analysis, and settlement archaeology.

The next two articles in the book, which, along with Woolf's, comprise the volume's more "theoretical" section, elaborate on the authors' recent doctoral work. Both Morn Capper "The Practical Implications of Interdisciplinary Approaches: Research in Anglo-Saxon East Anglia" [10–23]) and Caroline Holas-Clark ("Archaeology, History and Economics: Exploring Everyday Life in Anglian Deira" [24–7]) undertook projects that had an interdisciplinary methodology; both remark that the biggest issue this presented was the additional time needed to become conversant in the disciplinary debates related to their thesis work. The remaining five articles in the volume are studies which used an interdisciplinary methodology to arrive at conclusions. In the first, "The End of Anglo-Saxon Furnished Burial: An Interdisciplinary Perspective" (28–37), Devlin examines the shift from burials furnished with grave goods, which were plentiful in the early years of Anglo-Saxon England to a practice that eliminated or drastically reduced the number of goods which were found with human remains, starting with burials in the late sixth and early seventh centuries. Devlin places this shift into the context of the conversion to Christianity and the "meaning of objects" in Anglo-Saxon society through an examination of textual documents like charters, wills, and saints' lives.

In "Sculpture and Lordship in Late Saxon Suffolk: The Evidence of Ixworth" (38–46), Michael F. Reed presents a fascinating study of the intricacies of taste and artistic production within what can only be described as a late Anglo-Saxon "multicultural" context. By contrasting the artistic styles of sculpture commissioned for religious institutions by East Anglian lords with the styling of metalwork commissioned by these same lords for such uses as stirrup mounts and bridle fittings, he finds a clear pattern: namely, "East Anglian Late Saxon ecclesiastical sculpture is devoid of Scandinavian motifs," but the contemporaneous metalwork recovered from

the same area has “apparent evidence of a Scandinavian idiom” (43). He concludes that “in secular contexts, Danish identity was seemingly visible and/or asserted” (43) and “signification of lordly status in Late Saxon Suffolk was a multivalent process dictated by context” (44). This article is an excellent reminder of the cultural complexity of Anglo-Saxon life in the eleventh century, especially during the reign of Cnut. Similarly, Sharon A. Greene’s article “Reassessing Remoteness: Ireland’s Western Off-shore Islands in the Early Medieval Period” (47–54) challenges simple linguistic assumptions and encourages scholars to be more wary with assuming a “remote” perspective when it comes to island culture, especially with the islands off of Ireland’s west coast. By taking a combined archaeological, geographic, and textual approach, Greene reminds her readers that what we might consider remote in this modern age (i.e. an island) might not be as remote to a people who could travel much more swiftly and surely over water than over land. While the textual analysis Greene provides is a bit perfunctory, her main point that “the term ‘remote’ is not a helpful one” (52) is a good reminder against assumptions based on modern versus medieval experience.

Michael Garcia’s contribution, “Romans go Home? An Archaeological and Historical Exploration of the Cult of Saints in Late Antique Britain” (55–61), is more of a report on a work-in-progress that seeks to explore the persistence of Christianity in sub-Roman (or Late Antique, as he styles it) Britain, specifically through the survival of saints’ cults. While Garcia’s textual work is compelling, the interdisciplinary archaeological aspects are simply sketched as potential future directions of research. Conversely, the final article in the collection, Sarah Jane Boss’s “Alcuin of York on Wisdom and Mary: Texts and Buildings” (3–7), is a model of interdisciplinary integration as it examines the building of a (possibly) octagonal church dedicated to Sophia, or Wisdom, in York in the late eighth century. Boss juxtaposes Alcuin’s poem “On the Saints of the Church of York” with archeological, liturgical, and typological sources to critically examine the building’s potential to serve as an “investigation into the origin of the identification of Mary with Wisdom” (62).

On the whole, this book’s approach to interdisciplinary seemed to be a move toward reuniting the disciplines traditionally associated with texts (history, literature) with those associated with materiality, primarily archaeology but also some kinds of history. As the textual disciplines become more and more interested in the way the material world necessarily influences textual production, I predict that studies like those

in this volume will become more common and the problems outlined by several of the contributors will become issues to be resolved in the wider field of Medieval Studies.

RSA

9G. THE ANGLO-SAXON CHURCH

Tomás Ó Carragáin reviews evidence for local ecclesiastical and other burial sites in pre-Viking Ireland and illustrates the contrasting picture that emerged in contemporary Anglo-Saxon England in the essay “Cemetery Settlements and Local Churches in Pre-Viking Ireland in Light of Comparisons with England and Wales,” (*Anglo-Saxon/Irish Relations Before the Vikings*, 329–366). Rather than focus on Irish/Anglo-Saxon relations, Ó Carragáin presents an interesting analysis of ecclesiastical sites in Ireland and Anglo-Saxon England and offers insights into “why they became far less pronounced during the Viking Age” (329). In this compare-and-contrast examination, Ó Carragáin scrutinizes the density of the pre-Viking ecclesiastical sites in Ireland in conjunction with church density and social structure in Anglo-Saxon England. Form and character of specific cemetery settlements is also examined, while further attention is given to local ecclesiastic sites in Cornwall and Wales in an attempt to identify whether some sites were cemeteries or settlements. Upon thorough analysis of the archaeological evidence, dating and site distribution, the notion emerges that “the vast majority of Irish ecclesiastical sites were established before the Viking Age” (357), whereas “virtually no new churches were founded in Ireland during this period.” On the other hand, “the proto-parish centres of Anglo-Saxon England, during the Viking Age, especially comprise a new network of thegnly churches at which not only the lord and his family, but also many of the people on his estate, were buried.” Ó Carragáin calls for more studies in order to properly understand the varying effects of the Viking Age shift in relation to community burials. He concludes that “by the eleventh century the ecclesiastical landscape of Ireland was broadly similar to that of contemporary England . . . however; the contrasting processes that were necessary to arrive at this stage are indicative of significant differences between the two countries in the density and character of ecclesiastical settlement before the arrival of the Vikings” (358). Accompanying the essay are a number of maps relating to ecclesiastical sites, burial sites, and cemetery plans, as well as a detailed appendix which focuses on the dating evidence for ecclesiastical settlements in peninsular Kerry.

9H. NUMISMATICS

Anna Gannon's ". . . And Pretty Coins All in a Row" in *ASSAH* 16: 13–17 explores the challenges faced in classifying eighth-century Anglo-Saxon silver pennies (*sceattas*) when traditional numismatic techniques are employed in analysis. Gannon considers our present standards of ordering and queries whether "our sense of order is the same as an Anglo-Saxon sense of order" (13). The author argues that classification and iconography studies risk creating an "artificial arrangement that fits our mode of thinking" (13), which in turn jeopardizes better understanding coins in a historical context. Gannon refers to a previous study (from 2006) in which she considered imagery and iconography in order to uncover more information about a specific Anglo-Saxon coin. Her approach suggested "different dynamics amongst the coinage to those rigidly defined in numismatic studies" (14), and further attested to the idea of an "iconography of 'implied text' amongst the *sceattas*." Gannon's main argument is to examine *sceattas* as "implied texts" as she postulates whether the coinage system can be akin to language and examined under principles of linguistics. The author clearly defines seven principles of textual analysis including: the principles of "textuality," "textual cohesion," "coherence," "intentionality and acceptability," "informativity," "situationality," and "intertextuality." In defining the principles of textual analysis, Gannon draws on examples of specific Anglo-Saxon coins and their features to strengthen her case for a new framework of numismatic investigations. The article concludes by highlighting that a "different sense of order has emerged" (17) when one considers the principles of textuality and iconography rather than simply relying on the rigidly defined method of numismatic studies. This article will be of use to scholars of numismatics, literary historians, linguists, Anglo-Saxons, and theorists alike.

MR-O

■ Works Not Seen

- Abramson, Tony, ed. *New Perspectives. Studies in Early Medieval Coinage* 2. Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2009. 261 pp. ill.
- Agate, Andrew. "Saxon Kingsbury and St Andrew's Old Church: The Topographical Setting of a Neglected Medieval Church." *London Archaeologist* 12 (2008), 3-8.
- Allen, Valerie. "On the Nature of Things in the Bayeux Tapestry and its World." *The Bayeux Tapestry: New Interpretations*. Eds. Foys, Overbey, and Terkla. 51-70.
- Anon. "Anglo-Saxon Pennies." *Medals, Bonds, Banknotes and Coins*. London: Bonhams, 2009. 15.
- . "Late Saxon Kilns Found in Stafford." *Current Archaeology* 237 (Dec. 2009), 11.
- . "Uncovering Saxon Faversham." *Current Archaeology* 231 (June 2009), 5.
- Astill, Grenville. "Anglo-Saxon Attitudes: How Should Post-AD 700 Burials be Interpreted?" *Mortuary Practices and Social Identities in the Middle Ages*. Eds. Sayer and Williams. [see sect. 2] pp. 222-35.
- Aston, Mick. "An Early Medieval Estate in the Isle Valley of South Somerset and the Early Endowments of Muchelney Abbey." *Somerset Archaeology and Natural History* 152 (2009), 83-103.
- and Michael Costen. "An Early Medieval Secular and Ecclesiastical Estate: The Origins of the Parish of Winscombe in North Somerset." *Somerset Archaeology and Natural History* 151 (2008), 139-57.
- Beresford, Guy, with contributions by Alistair Barclay. *Caldecote: The Development and Desertion of a Hertfordshire Village*. Society for Medieval Archaeology Monograph 28. Leeds: Society for Medieval Archaeology, 2009. xi + 267 pp. figs.
- Billingsley, John. "An Early Carved Head and Anglo-Danish Sculptures at Kildwick Church, North Yorkshire." *Yorkshire Arch Jnl* 80 (2008), 43-50.
- Blackmore, Lyn. "Schätze eines angelsächsischen Königs von Essex: die Funde aus einem Prunkgrab von Prittlewell und ihr Kontext." *Zwischen Spätantike und Frühmittelalter: Archäologie des 4. bis 7. Jahrhunderts im Westen*. Ergänzungsbände zum Reallexikon der germanischen Altertumskunde 57. Ed. Sebastian Brather. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2007. pp. 323-40.
- Bogucki, M. "Two Northumbrian stycas of Eanred and Æthelred II from Early Medieval Truso in Poland." *British Numismatic Journal* 79 (2009), 34-42.
- Bradley, Richard. "Beowulf and British Prehistory." *Mortuary Practices and Social Identities in the Middle Ages*. Eds. Sayer and Williams. [see sect. 2] pp. 38-45.
- Brilliant, Richard. "Making Sounds Visible in the Bayeux Tapestry." *The Bayeux Tapestry: New Interpretations*. Eds. Foys, Overbey, and Terkla. 71-84.
- Brown, Shirley Ann. "Auctoritas, consilium et auxilium: Images of Authority in Bayeux Tapestry." *The Bayeux Tapestry: New Interpretations*. Eds. Foys, Overbey, and Terkla. 25-35.
- Carroll, Jayne. "Coins and the Chronicle: Mint-Signatures, History, and Language." *Reading the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: Language, Literature, History*. Ed. Jorgensen. [see sect. 7] pp. 243-73.

- Carver, Martin. "Reading Anglo-Saxon Graves." *The Kemble Lectures on Anglo-Saxon Studies*. Ed. Roberts. [see sect. 2] pp. 81-103. [Kemble lecture for 2008]
- Caviness, Madeline H. "Anglo-Saxon Women, Norman Knights and a "Third Sex" in the Bayeux Embroidery." *The Bayeux Tapestry: New Interpretations*. Eds. Foys, Overbey, and Terkla. 85-118.
- Christie, Neil. "Medieval Britain and Ireland in 2008." *Medieval Archaeology* 53 (2008), 327-82.
- Chuter, Greg. "Fieldwalking at Duttle's Brow near Jevington, East Sussex: Prehistoric to Romano-British Downland Occupation and an Anglo-Saxon Cemetery." *Sussex Archaeological Collections* 147 (2009), 25-36.
- Clucas, Ronnie, Timothy Darvill and Alan Kelly. "Copper Alloy Bar-Ingots from Ballacreggan Farm, Port St Mary." *Proc. of Isle of Man Natural History and Antiquarian Soc.* 12.2 (2007-09), 295-300.
- Cocco, Gabriele. "The Bowman Who Takes the Lid off the Franks Casket." *Studi anglo-norreni in onore di John S. McKinnell*. Ed. Ruggerini. [see sect. 2] pp. 15-31.
- Craig, Elizabeth. "The Investigation of Social Identity in Later Anglo-Saxon Cemeteries: the Application of Bio-cultural Analysis." *Church Archaeology* 11 (2009), 19-34.
- Craig, Elizabeth Flora. "Burial Practices in Northern England c. A.D. 650-850: A Bio-Cultural Approach." Ph.D. Diss. Univ. of Sheffield, 2009. [uk.bl.ethos.521889]
- Crawford, Sally and Helena Hamerow. *Form and Order in the Anglo-Saxon World, AD 600-1100*. ASSAH 16. Oxford: Oxford University School of Archaeology, 2009. 118 pp. ill.
- Creighton, Oliver. "The Big Dig: Wallingford." *British Archaeology* 106 (May-June 2009), online.
- Devlin, Zoë. "Approaching Interdisciplinarity." *Approaching Interdisciplinarity: Archaeology, History, and the Study of Early Medieval Britain, c. 400-1100*. Eds. Devlin and Holas-Clark. pp. 72-75.
- Fenton-Thomas, C. *A Place by the Sea: Excavations at Sewerby Cottage Farm, Bridlington*. On-Site Archaeology Monograph 1. York: On-Site Archaeology, 2009. xxi + 336 pp. ill. maps.
- Fox, Allison. "Small Things Discovered: Recent Archaeological Finds from the Isle of Man." *Proc. of Isle of Man Natural History and Antiquarian Soc.* 12.2 (2007-09), 283-93.
- Foys, Martin K., Karen Eileen Overbey, and Dan Terkla, eds. *The Bayeux Tapestry: New Interpretations*. Woodbridge: Boydell P, 2009. xvi. + 216 pp. ill. plates.
- Foys, Martin K. "Pulling the Arrow Out: The Legend of Harold's Death and the Bayeux Tapestry." *The Bayeux Tapestry: New Interpretations*. Eds. Foys, Overbey, and Terkla. 158-75.
- Gardiner, Lorna. "An Anglo-Saxon Felon at Maiden Castle?" *Proc. of Dorset Natural History and Arch. Soc.* 130 (2009), 213-15.
- Gilchrist, Roberta. "Rethinking Later Medieval Masculinity: The Male Body in Death." *Mortuary Practices and Social Identities in the Middle Ages*. Eds. Sayer and Williams. [see sect. 2] pp. 236-52.
- Godden, David. "Romano-British and Medieval Occupation at Pallant House Gallery, Chichester, West Sussex." *Sussex Archaeological Collections* 146 (2008), 75-94.
- Goldberg, Ira and Larry Goldberg, eds. *The Millennium Collection: Catalogue One, Ancient Coinage & Anglo-Saxon*. Beverly Hills, CA: Ira & Larry Goldberg Coins & Collectables, 2008. 152 pp. ill.
- Groves, Sarah, Philip Wood and Graeme Young. "The Bowl Hole Early Medieval Cemetery at Bamburgh, Excavations 1998 to 1999." *Archaeologia Aeliana* 28 (2009), 105-22.
- Hall, R. A., J. Buckberry, R. Storm, P. Budd, W. Derek Hamilton and Gerry McCormac. "The Medieval Cemetery at Riccall Landing: A Reappraisal." *Yorkshire Arch Jnl* 80 (2008), 55-92.
- Hammond, Brett. *British Artefacts: Vol. 1, Early Anglo-Saxon*. Witham: Greenlight, 2009. 132 pp. ill.
- Hardy, Alan. "Worship, Death and Taxes: The Story of Higham Ferrers." *Current Archaeology* 235 (Oct. 2009), 14-21.
- Harrison, Sarah and Tom Williamson. "The Supposed Saxon Earthworks at Rendlesham." *Proc of the Suffolk Institute of Arch and History* 41 (2007), 351-54.
- Hills, Catherine. "Anglo-Saxon DNA?" *Mortuary Practices and Social Identities in the Middle Ages*. Eds. Sayer and Williams. [see sect. 2] pp. 123-40.
- Hills, Catherine M. and Tamsin C. O'Connell. "New Light on the Anglo-Saxon Succession: Two Cemeteries and their Dates." *Antiquity* 83 (2009), 1096-108.
- Hutcheson, Andrew Robert John. "The Origins of East Anglian Towns: Coin Loss in the Landscape, AD 470-939." Ph.D. Diss. Univ. of East Anglia, 2009. [uk.bl.ethos.530950]
- Jervis, Ben. "Pottery from Late Saxon Chichester: A Reassessment of the Evidence." *Sussex Archaeological Collections* 147 (2009), 61-76.
- Kevin, Philip, Clare Ward, Duygu Camurcuoglu Cleere, and Caroline Cartwright. "The Conservation of an Anglo-Saxon Composite Stave-Made Vessel from Ringlemere, Kent." *Jnl of the Institute of Conservation* 33 (2009), 163-77.

- Laycock, Stuart. "Buckles, Belts and Borders: How Soldiers' Fashions Reflect Political Turmoil in Late Roman Britain." *Current Archaeology* 234 (Sept. 2009), 12-19.
- Leahy, Kevin and Duncan Slarke. "Trophies of Kings: The Staffordshire Hoard." *Current Archaeology* 236 (Nov. 2009), 12-21.
- Lewis, Hana. "The Elusive Vill: In Search of Kingston's Late Saxon Manor." *London Archaeologist* 12 (2009), 119-26.
- Lewis, John Lewis. "A Embroidery Errors in the Bayeux Tapestry and Their Relevance for Understanding its Design and Production." *The Bayeux Tapestry: New Interpretations*. Eds. Foys, Overbey, and Terkla. 130-40.
- Lucy, Sam, Jess Tipper and Alison Dickens. *The Anglo-Saxon Settlement and Cemetery at Bloodmoor Hill, Carlton Colville, Suffolk*. East Anglian Archaeology 131. Cambridge: Cambridge Archaeological Unit, 2009. xiii + 462 pp. ill. maps.
- MacDougall, Philip. "Bosham: A Key Anglo-Saxon Harbour." *Sussex Archaeological Collections* 147 (2009), 51-60.
- Magoula, Olga. "Usage and Meaning of Early Medieval Textiles: A Structural Analysis of Vestimentary Systems in Francia and Anglo-Saxon England." Ph.D. Diss. Univ. of Birmingham, 2009. [uk.bl.ethos.523243]
- Martin, Edward and Max Satchell. 'Where Most Inclosures Be': *East Anglian Fields: History, Morphology and Management*. East Anglian Archaeology 124. Ipswich: Archaeological Service, Suffolk County Council, 2008. xvii + 275 pp.: Richard Britnell, *Medieval Archaeology* 53 (2009), 457-58; Tom Williamson, *Economic History Review* 62 (2009), 1010-12.
- Mason, Austin. "Buried Buckets: Rethinking Ritual Behavior before England's Conversion." *Haskins Society Jnl* 20 (2008), 3-18.
- McGuire, Erin-Lee Halstad. "Manifestations of Identity In Burial: Evidence From Viking-Age Graves In The North Atlantic Diaspor." Ph.D. Diss. Univ. of Glasgow, 2009. [uk.bl.ethos.526976]
- McSloy, E. R., Teresa Gilmour, Elizabeth Rowe and Andrew Reynolds. "The Medieval Cemetery at Riccall Landing: A Reappraisal." *Wiltshire Arch and Natural History Magazine* 102 (2009), 160-74.
- Metcalf, D. M. "Betwixt Sceattas and Offa's Pence: Mint-attributions, and the Chronology of a Recession." *British Numismatic Journal* 79 (2009), 1-33.
- Meyer, Kellie S. "The Lady and the Vine: Putting the Horsewoman on the Hilton of Cadboll Cross-slab into Context." *Poetry, Place, and Gender: Studies in Medieval Culture in Honor of Helen Damico*. Ed. Karkov. [see sect. 2] pp. 171-96.
- Nightingale, Pamela. *Trade, Money, and Power in Medieval England*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007. xii + 352 pp.
- Niles, John D. "Two Articles from Roskilde Museum, October 2009." *OEN* 42.1 (2009), [online].
- Norton, Elizabeth. "Scandinavian Influences in the Late Anglo-Saxon Sculpture of Sussex." *Sussex Archaeological Collections* 147 (2009), 215-17.
- Ó Carragáin, Éamonn. "Chosen Arrows, First Hidden then Revealed: The Visitation-Archer Sequence as a Key to the Unity of the Ruthwell Cross." *Early Medieval Studies in Memory of Patrick Wormald*. Eds. Baxter, et al. [see sect. 2] pp. 185-204.
- _____. "The Wearmouth Icon of the Virgin (A.D. 679): Christological, Liturgical, and Iconographic Contexts." *Poetry, Place, and Gender: Studies in Medieval Culture in Honor of Helen Damico*. Ed. Karkov. [see sect. 2] pp. 13-37.
- Overbey, Karen Eileen. "Taking Place: Reliquaries and Territorial Authority in the Bayeux Embroidery." *The Bayeux Tapestry: New Interpretations*. Eds. Foys, Overbey, and Terkla. 1-24.
- Owen-Crocker, Gale R. "Behind the Bayeux Tapestry." *The Bayeux Tapestry: New Interpretations*. Eds. Foys, Overbey, and Terkla. 119-29.
- Pastan, Elizabeth Carson and Stephen D. White. "Problematizing Patronage: Odo of Bayeux and the Bayeux Tapestry." *The Bayeux Tapestry: New Interpretations*. Eds. Foys, Overbey, and Terkla. 1-24.
- Perkins, Christopher Henry. *England's Striking History: A Brief History of England and Its Silver Hammered Coinage*. Chichester: Rotographic, 2008. [esp. ch. 4, "The Anglo-Saxon Kings of All England"]
- Phillpotts, Chris. "Docklands before the Docks: A Model of Settlement History c. 1800 BC to c. 1800 AD." *London Archaeologist* 12 (2008), 23-28.
- Pitts, Mike. "Staffordshire Gold." *British Archaeology* 109 (Nov.-Dec. 2009), [online].
- Poore, Daniel, Andrew Norton and Anne Dodd. "Excavations at Oxford Castle: Oxford's Western Quarter from the Mid-Saxon Period to the Late Eighteenth Century (Based on Daniel Poore's Tom Hassall Lecture for 2008)." *Oxoniensia* 74 (2009), 1-18.
- Powell, Andrew B., John Chandler, Dave Godden, Lorraine Mephram, Chris Stevens and Stephanie Knight. "Late Saxon and Medieval Occupation Near Salisbury Street, Amesbury." *Wiltshire Arch and Natural History Magazine* 102 (2009), 188-201.
- Reynolds, Andrew. *Anglo-Saxon Deviant Burial Customs*. Medieval History and Archaeology. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2009. xii + 324 pp. ill.

- Richards, Julian D., John Naylor and Caroline Holas-Clark. "Anglo-Saxon Landscape and Economy: Using Portable Antiquities to Study Anglo-Saxon and Viking Age England." *Internet Archaeology* 25 (2009), [online].
- Ridgeway, Victoria. "Southwark Cathedral: Towards a Third Millennium." *London Archaeologist* 12 (2008/09), 67.
- Sayer, Duncan. "Laws, Funerals and Cemetery Organisation: The Seventh-Century Kentish Family." *Mortuary Practices and Social Identities in the Middle Ages*. Eds. Sayer and Williams. [see sect. 2] pp. 141-69.
- Schofield, John, Lyn Blackmore and David Stocker. "St Paul's Cathedral, AD 604-1087." *London Archaeologist* 12 (2008/09), 79-86.
- Shepherd Popescu, Elizabeth. *Norwich Castle: Excavations and Historical Survey, 1987-98*. East Anglian Archaeology 132. Norwich: NAU Archaeology, 2009. 2 vols. ill. maps. See part 1 "Anglo-Saxon to c. 1345."
- Soulat, Jean. *Le matériel archéologique du type saxon et anglo-saxon en Gaule mérovingienne*. Mémoires publiés par l'Association française d'archéologie mérovingienne 20. Saint-Germain-en-Laye: Association française d'archéologie mérovingienne, 2009.
- Stevick, Robert D. "The Primary Plan of the Battersea Shield." *AntJ* 89 (2009), 53-61.
- Terkla, Dan. "From Hastingus to Hastings and Beyond: Inexorable Inevitability on the Bayeux Tapestry." *The Bayeux Tapestry: New Interpretations*. Eds. Foys, Overbey, and Terkla. 141-57.
- . "The Bayeux Tapestry: A Selective Bibliography." *The Bayeux Tapestry: New Interpretations*. Eds. Foys, Overbey, and Terkla. 176-210.
- Thomas, M. G., M. P. H. Stumpf and H. Härke. "Limits of Inter-Ethnic Marriage: Differential Reproductive Success and the Spread of 'Continental' Y Chromosomes in Early Anglo-Saxon England." *Simulations, Genetics and Human Prehistory*. Eds. Suichi Matsu-mura, Peter Forster and Colin Renfrew. Cambridge: McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research, 2008.
- Thomson, George. "The Dalston Discoid Marker." *Trans. of the Cumberland & Westmorland Antiquarian and Arch. Soc.* 9 (2009), 47-56.
- Thorn, F. R. "Shapwick, Domesday Book and the 'Pol-den Estate.'" *Somerset Archaeology and Natural History* 151 (2008), 1-30.
- . "Kelston in Domesday Book." *Somerset Archaeology and Natural History* 152 (2009), 139-51.
- Twomey, Carolyn. "From Nave to Chancel: The Metaphoric Implications of Anglo-Saxon Altar Placement." *Quaestio Insularis* 9 (2009), 118-28.
- Waddington, Clive. "A Note on Neolithic, Bronze Age, Iron Age and Anglo-Saxon Remains at Lanton Quarry near Milfield, Northumberland." *Archaeologia Aeliana* 38 (2009), 23-29.
- Wallis, Sean. "Roman and Late Saxon Occupation at 61 Priory Road, Bicester, Oxfordshire." *Oxoniensia* 74 (2009), 127-36.
- Watson, Bruce. "Saxo-Norman Southwark." *London Archaeologist* 12 (2009), 147-51.
- Westcott, Lisa. "New Light on King Alfred's Winchester." *Current Archaeology* 230 (May 2009), 7.
- Williams, Howard. "On Display: Envisioning the Early Anglo-Saxon Dead." *Mortuary Practices and Social Identities in the Middle Ages*. Eds. Sayer and Williams. [see sect. 2] pp. 170-206.
- Williams, Howard and Duncan Sayer. "Hall of Mirrors: Death and Identity in Medieval Archaeology." *Mortuary Practices and Social Identities in the Middle Ages*. Eds. Sayer and Williams. [see sect. 2] pp. 1-22.
- Young, Graeme. "Bamburgh Castle: Digging the Home of Northumbria's Kings." *Current Archaeology* 237 (Dec. 2009), 36-41.

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 Stephen Harris, Department of English, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MA 01003. You can also submit this information on-line at the address below. If the subject of your project is not obvious from the title, please add a note indicating its best classification. For dissertations, please provide the name of the director.

Name _____

Address _____

Academic Affiliation (if not given above) _____

a = article, b = book or monograph, d = dissertation; IP = in progress, C = completed, TBP = to be published in/by

1. Research in progress (aIP, bIP, dIP):

2. Research completed (aC, bC, dC):

3. Research forthcoming (TBP):

How to Contact OEN

All correspondence regarding *OEN*, specifically submissions, all business correspondence, publication information, subscriptions, back orders, or change of address, please contact:

STEPHEN HARRIS
Editor, *Old English Newsletter*
Department of English
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, MA 01003-9269
phone: 413-545-6598 | fax: 413-545-3880 | editor@oennewsletter.org

Regarding the *Old English Newsletter Subsidia* series, please contact the Editor of OEN

Regarding the *Year's Work in Old English Studies*, contact:

DANIEL DONOGHUE
Department of English
Barker Center, Harvard University
Cambridge MA 02138
phone: 617-495-2505 | fax 617 496-8737 | dgd@wjh.harvard.edu

Regarding the annual *Old English Bibliography*, including citations and offprints, contact:

ROBERT HASENFRATZ
Department of English
University of Connecticut
215 Glenbrook Rd.
Storrs, CT 06269
hasenfratz@uconn.edu

Regarding research in progress, including current research, work completed, and forthcoming publications, contact:

STEPHEN HARRIS
Department of English
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, MA 01003-9269
fax: 413-545-3880 | editor@oenwesletter.org

OLD ENGLISH NEWSLETTER
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH
UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS
AMHERST, MA 01003-9269