

OLD ENGLISH NEWSLETTER

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

| | |
|--------|-------|
| VOLUME | 42 |
| NUMBER | 1 & 2 |
| 2009 | |

ISSN 0030-1973

OLD ENGLISH NEWSLETTER

Volume 42 Number 1 & 2

2009

EDITOR

R. M. Liuzza, University of Tennessee, Knoxville

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

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

Bibliography: Thomas Hall, University of Notre Dame

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

Research in Progress: Heide Estes, Monmouth University

Conference Abstracts: Dana Oswald, University of Wisconsin, Parkside

Bibliography: Melinda Menzer, Furman University

EDITORIAL BOARD

Patrick W. Conner, West Virginia University

Antonette diPaolo Healey, *Dictionary of Old English*

David F. Johnson, Florida State University

Catherine Karkov, University of Leeds

Ursula Lenker, University of Munich

Mary Swan, University of Leeds

ASSISTANT TO THE EDITOR: Teresa Hooper

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

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

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

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

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

Copyright © 2010 The University of Tennessee.

www.oenewsletter.org

THE YEAR'S WORK IN OLD ENGLISH STUDIES

2007

CONTRIBUTORS

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Anthony Adams | <i>Brown University</i> |
| Frances Altvater | <i>University of Hartford</i> |
| Rachel Anderson | <i>Grand Valley State University</i> |
| Daniel Anlezark | <i>University of Sydney</i> |
| Dabney Bankert | <i>James Madison University</i> |
| Tom Bredehoft | <i>West Virginia University</i> |
| John David Cormican | <i>Utica College</i> |
| Christopher Cain | <i>Towson University</i> |
| Craig R. Davis | <i>Smith College</i> |
| Glenn Davis | <i>St. Cloud State University</i> |
| Peter Dendle | <i>University of Pennsylvania—Mont Alto</i> |
| Nicole Guenther Discenza | <i>University of South Florida</i> |
| Michael Fox | <i>University of Alberta</i> |
| Eugene Green | <i>Boston University</i> |
| John Harkness | <i>Augsburg College</i> |
| Richard F. Johnson | <i>William Rainey Harper College</i> |
| Stefan Jurasinski | <i>State U of New York—Brockport</i> |
| Aaron Kleist | <i>Biola University</i> |
| Joseph P. McGowan | <i>University of San Diego</i> |
| Zoya Metlitskaya | <i>Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow</i> |
| Robin Norris | <i>Carleton University</i> |
| Andrew Rabin | <i>University of Louisville</i> |
| Mary Rambaran-Olm | <i>University of Glasgow</i> |
| Mary K. Ramsey | <i>Southeastern Louisiana University</i> |
| Elizabeth A. Rowe | <i>Somerville, MA</i> |
| Andrew Scheil | <i>University of Minnesota</i> |
| Douglas Simms | <i>Southern Illinois University—Edwardsville</i> |
| Larry Swain | <i>Bemidji State University</i> |
| Jun Terasawa | <i>University of Tokyo</i> |
| Elaine Treharne | <i>Florida State University</i> |
| Benjamin C. Withers | <i>University of Kentucky</i> |

EDITOR

Daniel Donoghue *Harvard University*

Contents

| | |
|---|------------|
| Foreword | 5 |
| 1. General and Miscellaneous Subjects | 6 |
| 2. Memorials, Tributes, History of the Discipline | 11 |
| a. History of the Discipline | 11 |
| b. Memorials and Tributes | 14 |
| 3. Language | 17 |
| a. Lexicon, Glosses | 17 |
| b. Syntax, Phonology, Other Aspects | 26 |
| 4. Literature | 46 |
| a. General and Miscellaneous | 46 |
| b. Individual Poems | 65 |
| c. <i>Beowulf</i> | 92 |
| d. Prose | 127 |
| 5. Anglo-Latin and Ecclesiastical Works | 144 |
| 6. Manuscripts, Illuminations, Charters | 159 |
| 7. History and Culture | 169 |
| a. General Sources and Reference Works | 169 |
| b. Religion and the Church | 171 |
| c. Ecclesiastical Culture | 172 |
| d. Gender and Identity | 174 |
| e. The Economy, Settlement and Landscape | 174 |
| f. Magic, Medicine and Science | 174 |
| g. Law, Politics and Warfare | 175 |
| h. Vikings | 179 |
| i. The Norman Conquest and Settlement | 180 |
| 8. Names | 183 |
| 9. Archaeology, Sculpture, Inscriptions, Numismatics | 187 |
| a. Excavations | 187 |
| b. The Anglo-Saxon Church | 193 |
| c. Funerary Archaeology and Practices | 193 |
| d. Regional Studies and Economic Studies | 201 |
| e. Artifacts and Iconography | 205 |
| f. Numismatics | 215 |
| g. Miscellaneous | 217 |
| Abbreviations | 225 |

Foreword

As medievalists we are familiar with Latin texts that circulated with a spurious attribution to one of the great church authorities such as Augustine or Bede. Whatever the motivation behind their production, the twelve texts that Helmut Gneuss's *Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts* categorizes under "pseudo-Augustine," for example, were received by more than a few Anglo-Saxon clerics as genuine products of the bishop of Hippo. And why shouldn't they? In this issue of *YWOES* under section 4d, Prose, for example, you can read about how Ælfric, that most careful advocate of orthodoxy, relied on a pseudo-Augustinian sermon that flirted with Pelagianism. He did so in good faith.

In a faintly similar way, the reviewers of this issue of *YWOES* relied in good faith on a draft bibliography that circulated before the final version of the *OEN Bibliography* for 2007 was completed. It was only after collating the two that we realized the extent to which the two versions differed, and even if no one's orthodoxy was imperiled by heresy, that difference accounts for some unusual features of this year's reviews. One of the frustrations was that texts assigned to one section in the draft were assigned to another in the final bibliography. If an archaeologist, for example, writes about the language of Kent in light of the kingdom's political fortunes, does that item belong under Language, or History, or Archaeology? As it turns out, John Hines's "Writing of English in Kent" is found under none of these, but instead under section 4a, Literature: General and Miscellaneous, where it is reviewed by Chris Cain of the Language team, because that is where it was originally assigned. From a certain perspective, less involved with the immediate business of categorizing items and writing reviews, we might celebrate the lack of congruence between the two bibliographies as a measure of our field's real and growing interdisciplinarity (as Hines's career itself attests). Whether celebrated or not, one consequence of the discrepancy is that the initials of reviewers are sprinkled among more sections than is usual. It also means that some items have been reviewed twice (marked by double daggers: ‡‡). The curious can search, as in a scavenger hunt, for these duplicates.

Among the various delights of this issue, let me call particular attention to the opening paragraphs of Craig Davis's review section on *Beowulf*, where he surveys the attention that *Beowulf* continues to receive among Anglo-Saxonists and in the larger world of scholarship, arts, and entertainment. As a simple index of his main point, the number of entries on *Beowulf* is as large as it has ever been and shows no sign of diminishing.

The unusually large number of unreviewed items in Syntax is a consequence of a reviewer who failed to follow through and is no reflection on those who with admirable professionalism carried out their responsibilities for this section.

With this issue we welcome eight new reviewers to our team: Anthony Adams to Anglo-Latin, Ecclesiastical Works; Daniel Anlezark to Literature: General and Miscellaneous; Jun Terasawa to Language: Syntax, Phonology, Other Aspects; and Elaine Treharne to Manuscripts, Illumination, Charters. To History and Culture we welcome Rachel Anderson and Zoya Metlitskaya; and to Archaeology, Sculpture, Inscriptions, Numismatics we welcome Mary Rambaran-Olds and Larry Swain. We also bid a fond farewell to Christina Lee from Archaeology and to Emily Thornbury from Manuscripts.

As always, let me express my deep gratitude for the efforts of the reviewers and especially, this time, for their good humor. I also thank Johanna Rodda for her help with various tasks in editing this issue.

DD

NOTICE

Subscribers are reminded that the *Old English Newsletter* has returned to its original publishing schedule of two issues a year. Beginning with this volume, *OEN* will print 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 available on the *OEN* website, www.oennewsletter.org/OEN/.

1. General and Miscellaneous Subjects

a. Teaching Old English

Four essays in a special volume of *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Teaching* (SMART) consider the status of Anglo-Saxon studies in the liberal arts curriculum and propose ways to strengthen it. Mark LaCelle-Peterson's essay, "Claiming a Place at the Table: Anglo-Saxons in the Liberal Arts Curriculum" (15–29), is perhaps the most strident call to action of the four. LaCelle-Peterson, a Professor of Education at Houghton College, argues for a "renewed focus on the undergraduate curriculum in two areas: first, reaching the general student body through courses in general education..., and second,...through education courses taken by future English and history teachers" (15–16). He delineates a recognizable set of rationales for teaching Anglo-Saxon studies at the college level: the field has clear temporal and geographical boundaries, a fact which allows teachers and students to focus intensely on a single period; it is without question multicultural and multilingual; it challenges the notion of a single master narrative; and it is inherently both multi- and interdisciplinary (22–23). The problems, of course, are that "there is not much of a curricular base on which to build," that students are inadequately prepared even for broad survey and introductory courses in the period, and that the professional training and experience of faculty discourage interdisciplinary work. So, "how might Anglo-Saxonists begin to create a demand for the unique contributions that their field has to offer?" LaCelle-Peterson asks (23). He offers the obvious ways: incorporating Anglo-Saxon studies into survey courses and introductory writing courses, offering special topics courses at lower levels, developing a medieval studies minor, or proposing innovative interdisciplinary courses in medieval studies. But, more specifically, he suggests, "in the short term, Anglo-Saxon texts and topics can be used to illustrate approaches to teaching and issues in curricular reasoning; [and] in the long run, prospective teachers who experience such content integration can be encouraged to move Anglo-Saxon content further back in the educational pipeline as they teach middle and high school students" (23–24). In the last section of his essay, LaCelle-Peterson draws on "two thinkers from [his] base field of educational studies whose ideas about curriculum are certainly applicable to situating [Anglo-Saxon] studies in education courses and probably also to discussions relating to general education," John Dewey and Jane Roland

Martin (24). Using their philosophical precepts, he argues that we might encourage those students preparing to teach English and history "to incorporate Anglo-Saxon experiences, texts, artifacts, and scholarly debates in the materials in front of the students with whom they work...ensuring that such lessons are part of the files that they take into their teaching careers" (26). He notes, however, that the training of many faculty "probably left them ill-equipped and disinclined to take up Anglo-Saxon texts or topics as the means of accomplishing these aims" (26). He proposes partnerships with education faculty and their students to "feed the educational pipeline earlier" as a way to "increase the capacity for and the demand for additional study of Anglo-Saxon texts, times, themes, and issues at subsequent levels" (26). While this is clearly a valid point, it glosses over the reality that in many universities there are few faculty in medieval studies, who would have to fight the good fight with few resources and little support. LaCelle-Peterson admits the challenges of general education curricula and of acquiring institutional allies, and that the proposal he makes is a tentative one. Nevertheless, he concludes with an impassioned plea to "locate the history and literature standards for the state in which you live, and get to know the faculty members on your campus who teach courses in educational foundations and in English and history (or social studies) education. Approach them with the question of how they address those standards, how well your disciplinary department is helping teacher candidates prepare to teach them and whether there might be opportunities to collaborate on such matters" since such teachers "each have, at least potentially, responsibility for teaching your and my future students something about Old English and about Anglo-Saxon history. Often they are not adequately prepared for that aspect of their work and the risk is great that they will not only fail to lay an adequate foundation...but will, by their silence, lay down the first course of blocks in the wall of studied ignorance about the Middle Ages, in general, and the Anglo-Saxon period, in particular" (28).

Glenn Davis takes up LaCelle-Peterson's appeal to galvanize student interest at the high school level in his essay, "Beowulf in Fourth Period: Anglo-Saxon England in the High School Classroom" (31–39). Davis, an Associate Professor of English at St. Cloud State University, Minnesota, argues that "it is important—even vital—that we engage students' interest in Anglo-Saxon England before they ever set foot on a college campus"

(31). Doing so, he argues, affords students a broader historical understanding of the past and helps them conceptualize English linguistic and literary history. He divides his essay into four sections: “Finding (and Keeping) an Audience,” “Language Then and Now,” “Manuscripts and Illumination,” and “Poetry.” In each section, he offers concrete advice and suggestions based on his own experience giving outreach presentations at high schools. Davis acknowledges that his approach does not provide a student with a comprehensive introduction to Anglo-Saxon England, but he argues convincingly that “it is designed to spark interest in a subject that often gets short shrift at the high school level, and to demonstrate how the subject, despite its apparent difficulty and obvious alterity, is not lodged in the distant, inaccessible past” (38).

The final two essays offer concrete remedies to the dwindling position of Anglo-Saxon studies in the undergraduate curriculum. In “Retrieving the Anglo-Saxon Past: A Course Plan” (71–88), Marcia Smith Marzec outlines in detail her plan for a semester-long exploration of the literature, history, and archaeology of Anglo-Saxon England. Marzec divides the course into two units: the first introduces students to the tools of Anglo-Saxon studies and the second the principal “canonical” texts. From the start, Marzec prepares the students for the pitfalls of historical research in our field. Students examine a variety of excerpts from the anonymous lives of Wilfrid and Gregory to the historical texts of Gildas, Bede, the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicles*, and the Bayeux Tapestry, “in an attempt to characterize the culture and its literature” (72). As the readings suggest, the first several weeks are devoted to exploring problem of recording, transmitting, and interpreting history. After a consideration of the problems associated with oral literature and its transmission, Marzec’s course moves on to a unit devoted to the archaeology and art of the Anglo-Saxon period. In this unit, she also introduces students to Anglo-Saxon coinage, stone sculpture, and ivories. The final section of this first unit is devoted to manuscript studies, in which she focuses on notable cruxes in “The Wife’s Lament,” “Deor,” “The Wanderer,” and “The Seafarer.” The balance of the unit revolves around the study of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (in Garmonsway’s edition) and Bede’s *Ecclesiastical History*. At midterm, students prepare a project, “comparing and analyzing a number of medieval sources (both contemporary and those from the latter Middle Ages) on a single topic or historical figure” (79). The second part of the course is dedicated to a concerted study of the principal poetic texts of the period. Marzec divides this unit up by type of poetry. She begins with martial

poetry (“The Finnsburg Fragment,” “The Battle of Brunanburh,” “The Battle of Maldon”), supplemented by a dose of Tacitus. As a transition to the elegies, Marzec emphasizes the importance of the lord-thane relationship and the grievous state of loneliness one suffers at the loss of a lord. The elegies are formally introduced through the vehicle of Egburga’s letters to Boniface in which the abbess laments the loneliness and poverty she and her daughter experience from the loss of loved ones. The major elegies treated are “The Ruin,” “The Wife’s Lament,” “Wulf and Eadwacer,” “Deor,” “The Wanderer,” and “The Seafarer.” At the end of the course, students present twenty-page papers on one of the major poems studied in class, “papers which show their facility with not only literary sources but also historical and archeological evidence, not only secondary but also primary sources” (82). Marzec closes her essay with the heartfelt wish that such a course might conclude with “an optional summer trip to England, where students will view Anglo-Saxon art and artifacts in the British Museum and elsewhere; Anglo-Saxon manuscripts at the British Library, the Bodleian, or the Parker Library; and extant Anglo-Saxon structures, such as church buildings or standing crosses” (83). Marzec’s detailed course plan with its clear thematic units is a useful starting point for anyone who is contemplating the revision of such a semester-long course, but especially for someone who is faced with the prospect of constructing such a course for the first time.

Ronald Stottlemeyer picks up on Marzec’s parting suggestion of a summer trip to England to study remnants of the Anglo-Saxon past in “A Study-Abroad Course in Anglo-Saxon Culture: On-Site Experiential Learning” (107–16). Stottlemeyer has designed an interdisciplinary “hands-on” study-abroad course that surveys “not just Old English poetry and prose but also the archaeology of Anglo-Saxon churches, the history of the era’s political turmoil, the graphic art of its religious manuscripts, and so on” (110). The course he outlines, in conjunction with Cambridge University’s five-week summer school programs, “transports [students] from their familiar college or university setting” (110). “Having them shout to classmates across the causeway that separates Northey Island from the battleground, as the Anglo-Saxon and Danish warriors did on the day of the battle [of Maldon], gives them a powerful insight into the physical setting in which the battle took place. The landscape will help them to understand the grim feelings that Bryhtnoth and his men experienced that October day when they offered their lives to the heroic struggle” (111). The course, titled “Gods, Monsters, and Men: The World of the Imagination

in Anglo-Saxon England," is "an excursion into England's medieval past, one that invites students to imagine what living in that long-ago world must have been like," and focuses on the pagan, historical, individual, heroic, and religious imaginary, one topic each of the five weeks. Assignments, responses and research paper, are designed "to evoke emotional experiences about other human beings dealing with the vicissitudes of living in an uncertain world" (112, 113). The readings and assignments are helpfully summarized at the close of the essay (113–116).

In her introduction to a special edition of *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses*, 55: 9–12, entitled "Old English Studies in the 21st Century: A New Understanding of the Past," María de la Cruz Expósito González draws a sharp line between "traditional" philological approaches to the field which provided "profound knowledge of pre-modern texts" and "new methods of study that include a correlation with our modern states of mind, emotions, etc." (9, 10). In her view, earlier scholarship was constrained by "scientific methodology" that did not take into account the fact that the literary and linguistic production was generated by human beings in their social and personal context" (9–10). She goes on to argue that the advent of new historical, archeological, linguistic, and "metatheoretical renewals" in philology have combined to "give us a greater feelings of closeness to our object of study" (10). The remainder of the introduction briefly touches on a variety of interdisciplinary approaches "other than the merely literary and linguistic" (11), including gender, discourse analysis, socio-linguistics, cognitive studies, metaphor, and comparisons of modern recreations with their original counterparts (11–12). Although her introduction draws attention to important work in each of these areas, the necessary limitations of space in such an introduction make for some surprising and unwarranted generalizations.

With his "Old English Textbooks and the 21st Century: A Review of Recent Publications" (*OEN* 40.3, 47–59), Andrew Scheil provides a valuable service to all instructors of Old English. He reviews eight textbooks designed to introduce students to Old English and published during the first decade of this century. Scheil begins his review by remarking on three commonalities that mark this generation of textbook as different from their predecessors. They each acknowledge the lack of knowledge of English grammar and familiarity with foreign languages (especially inflected languages), emphasize the cultural context of the language and its literature, and display a variety of pedagogical missions, though each essentially targets a particular

audience and market. Scheil urges instructors of Old English language to adopt these new textbooks rather than rely on the old standards that many of us cut our teeth on. Scheil's essay is a mandatory first stop for anyone just beginning his career as an instructor of Old English language and literature, and a helpful overview of the latest generation of textbooks for the rest of us.

b. Research Resources, Print and Electronic

With *Virtually Anglo-Saxon: Old Media, New Media, and Early Medieval Studies in the Late Age of Print* (Gainesville: UP of Florida), Martin K. Foys has produced a ground-breaking analysis of digital technology and how it might be used to great advantage in the study of early medieval material and manuscript culture. Foys argues that print culture has blinded modern readers to much of the richness and complexity of medieval texts and images that would have been clearly visible to their original audiences. Using digital media theory, Foys proposes new ways of approaching and interpreting traditional, or "pre-print," modalities of expression. In a sustained and artfully developed argument, Foys brings into sharper—dare I say HD?—focus a representative cross-section of Anglo-Saxon material culture, including "The Dream of the Rood," Anselm's devotional writings, the Anglo-Saxon Mappamundi, Viking stone sculptures, and the Bayeux Tapestry. Foys's book is essential reading for anyone interested in the application of new media theory and technology to the study and teaching of early medieval culture.

Volumes 34 and 35 of *Reallexikon der Germanischen Altertumskunde* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter), edited by Heinrich Beck et al., have gone into a second edition. Volume 34 covers *Weilbark-Kultu* to *Zwölften*, and includes entries on Wilfrid, William the Conqueror, Willehad, Willibald, Willibrord, Winchester, Winwæd, *Wissensdichtung*, Wuffingas, Wulfhere of Mercia, Yeavinger, *Zauberspruch* and *Zauberdichtung*. Volume 35, covering *Speckstein* to *Zwiebel*, includes essays on *Tiersymbolik*, *Totenklage*, Whitby, Witenagemot, and Wulfstan II.

Robert Butler has compiled and edited "Abstracts of Papers in Anglo-Saxon Studies" (*OEN* 40.3, 60–140). For 2006–2007, Butler prints over 200 abstracts of papers presented at various conferences and meetings.

c. Bayeux Tapestry

As Richard Burt points out in "Re-embroidering the Bayeux Tapestry in Film and Media: The Flip Side of History in Opening and End Title Sequences," *Exemplaria*

19: 327–50, the Bayeux Tapestry has enjoyed a lively film career unrivalled by any other textile. While scholars have frequently compared the Tapestry to a variety of modern visual media, it may be surprising to some readers that the Tapestry has been “cited” in at least nine films to date. Focusing on the opening and closing title sequences in *The Vikings* (1958), *Bedknobs and Broomsticks* (1971), *La Chanson de Roland* (1978), *Robin Hood, Prince of Thieves* (1991), and *Blackadder: Back and Forth* (1999), Burt explores the Tapestry as a cinematic analogue which affords the viewer both a more complex model for understanding the material object itself and the historical time period of the subject. Burt argues that “The cinematic adaptation of a medieval artifact such as the Bayeux Tapestry suggests that history, whether located in the archive, museum, or movie medievalism, always has a more or less obscure flip side, and that history, written or cinematic, tells a narrative disturbed by uncanny haunting and ghostly citations” (331). Thus, according to Burt, the representations of the Tapestry in film entail a “hermeneutics of flip sides including both iconoclastic damage and iconic reparation, both invisibility and hypervisibility: What is seen becomes clear in the process of its unfolding/unrolling even as what is seen is frayed/scratched and damaged by the Tapestry/film’s unrolling” (330). In the end, Burt concludes that the “analogies between the Bayeux Tapestry and film not only keep expanding uncannily because film and media change (from celluloid to digital) but will never stop doing so” (345).

Michael J. Lewis, who works in the Department of Portable Antiquities and Treasure at the British Museum, sheds some light on a little-known chapter of the history of the famous tapestry in “The Mystery of Charles Stothard, FSA, and the Bayeux Tapestry Fragment,” *AntJ* 87: 400–06. In the fall of 1816, as Lewis reconstructs the tale, the Society of Antiquarians dispatched its principal historical draughtsman, Charles Stothard, to Bayeux to produce a full-scale reproduction of the tapestry. Stothard made two visits to Bayeux, once accompanied by his wife, Eliza. By March 1819, he had completed work on the reproduction, and returned to England where he oversaw a variety of other projects stemming from his work with the tapestry. These included an “engraving of a one-third size facsimile, reproduced as seventeen plates” (400), of which five hundred hand-colored prints were made from the first plate produced. While in Bayeux, he had also taken wax impressions of details of the tapestry, from which plaster casts were made. These casts were later painted to resemble the original. Sometime during this period, at least one small fragment from the upper registry of the

tapestry was removed. Then on May 28, 1821, Charles Stothard died from injuries suffered during a fall from a ladder he was using to make tracings of a stained glass window. By 1864, the fragment was being displayed in the South Kensington Museum. According to an 1870 catalog of the museum’s textile holdings, the fragment “was brought away from Bayeux by Mrs Stothard, when her husband was occupied in making drawings” (401). The accusation, however, was unfounded, and Lewis recounts how Eliza Stothard was absolved of the crime in 1881. Despite the lack of definitive evidence, Lewis reaches the only logical conclusion: “It therefore seems Charles Stothard removed the tapestry fragment” (404). Although this jewel of a mystery remains technically unsolved, Lewis’s supposition that Charles Stothard did indeed snip the fragment during his work on the tapestry seems plausible, even probable.

d. Announcements and Reports

C.P. Biggam reports on the progress of the Anglo-Saxon Plant Name Survey (ASPNS) in her “Eighth Annual Report, January 2007” (*OEN* 40.3: 27). In addition to a report on the activities of the ASPNS, Biggam lists several new publications by members. As always, the work of ASPNS and its members can be followed on its website, www2.arts.gla.uk/SESL/EngLang/ihs/projects/plants.htm.

In a rhetorical flourish worthy of the *Beowulf* poet, André Crépin’s begins his report on the status of “Old English Studies in France” (*OEN* 40.3: 28–30) with an ironic understatement: “The French cannot fail to be interested in their neighbours, the English, with whom they have long entertained a love-hate relationship” (28). Prior to the 1968 university reforms, Crépin notes that two dissertations were required of students specializing in medieval English studies and Anglo-Saxon was often the subject of the minor thesis. Much of Crépin’s overview comprises a discussion of a variety of studies, literary and linguistic, translations and editions, of Anglo-Saxon texts and subjects published from the middle of the twentieth century through 2006. A detailed Works Cited list of these studies follows the essay. Crépin notes the importance of the work of the Association des Médiévistes Anglicistes de l’Enseignement Supérieur (AMAES), which publishes two Bulletins and one volume each year, and organizes symposia and monthly seminars during the academic year, in the ongoing effort to demonstrate the “relevance and vitality of the study of medieval English” in France (29). The structure of the *licence* (third-year baccalaureate) level is reviewed, and the variety

of medieval courses, including numbers of students enrolled and doctoral thesis written, are enumerated. In general, Crépin laments the lack of university support for the study of medieval English subjects. Nevertheless, he concludes that the Universities of Paris IV-Sorbonne and Nancy II “have active and attractive research centres with annual conferences whose proceedings are systematically published” (29).

Two additional reports on the state of our discipline include David Dumville’s introduction to and review of “The Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies at the University of Aberdeen,” *Anglo-Saxon* 1: ix–x, and Joanna Bukowska’s comprehensive bibliography of “Studies on Old and Middle English Literature in Poland (1910–2006),” *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 42 (2006): 405–25, both of which suggest the vibrancy of Anglo-Saxon studies in Europe.

e. Varia

¶¶Shortly after the release of Robert Zemeckis’s *Beowulf*, Stephen T. Asma, Professor of Philosophy at Columbia College (Chicago), muses on the original poem and the new film version in “Never Mind Grendel. Can Beowulf Conquer the 21st-Century Guilt Trip?” *Chronicle of Higher Education* 54.15 (December 7, 2007): B14–B15. For Asma, the original poem celebrates the “honor culture” values of “brute strength, tribal loyalty, and stoic courage” (14) while Zemeckis’s film reflects the anxieties of our own age. The heroes of the original poem were truly heroic and the monsters palpably evil. And yet the film presents, on the one hand, an “emasculated” Beowulf, a hero who’s “basically a jerk, [and] whose most sympathetic moment is when he realizes that he’s a jerk,” and on the other, a humanized Grendel, a monster who is “visually altered after his injury to look like an innocent, albeit scaly, little child” (15). Despite a few glaring errors (e.g., his claim that “Most scholars put the date of the manuscript around 1100 A.D.”), Asma’s meditation on the place of honor culture values in the “guilt trip” culture of the 21st century is entertaining and even intriguing.

RFJ (with help from DAB)

¶¶Stephen T. Asma responds to this film in “Never Mind Grendel: Can Beowulf Conquer the 21st-Century Guilt Trip?” *Chronicle of Higher Education* 54: B14–15. Asma observes that while Beowulf may have survived his encounter with the monster Grendel in the Old English poem, his very status as a hero is seriously challenged by our own cultural antipathy to the aristocratic

chauvinism of honor cultures celebrated in the epic. We are “more tender-minded” toward the marginalized, displaced, and downtrodden, Asma believes. The “real monsters” of *Beowulf*, according to the new film, are “the people who cast out Grendel” in the first place, as he is no more than a “confused soul” in need of “a hug rather than a sword thrust.”

CD

Brenda Bolton and Christine Meek have edited a volume on *Aspects of Power and Authority in the Middle Ages* (International Medieval Research 14 [Turnhout: Brepols]). The volume collects a selection of essays originally presented at the International Medieval Congress at the University of Leeds in July 2003. They present case studies which differ in chronological periods and geographic regions, ranging from Lombard Italy to early modern Iberia and from Anglo-Saxon, Norman, and later medieval England to twelfth-century France. The first section of this volume, “Image-making,” includes five essays considering the anxieties of rulers seeking to establish the legitimacy of their new dynasties, and the second section, “Informal Influence,” is comprised of six essays that examine groups and aspects less obviously connected to power and authority. The third and final section, “The Power of Words,” contains seven essays that discuss the power of the written word, papal bulls, collections of miracle stories or the documents produced in lawsuits. As a whole, the essays in this volume “demonstrate that neither power nor authority was a simple matter of royal or ecclesiastical authority and military or judicial power. There were many other claims to be heard and respected and many other ways of influencing one’s fellow men” (19).

With an eye to their ancient origins, Joe Moffett analyzes four long poems by Armand Schwerner, Judy Grahn, Derek Walcott, and Geoffrey Hill in *The Search for Origins in the Twentieth-Century Long Poem: Sumerian, Homeric, Anglo-Saxon* (Morgantown, WV: West Virginia UP). Moffett’s premise is that these four poets of the twentieth century are preoccupied with the past in their long poems. They engage in what he calls a “search for origins” in an attempt to connect with the past as they conceive of it. Moffett boldly states his thesis at the beginning of Chapter One: “a number of long-poem writers in twentieth-century literature are preoccupied with a search for origins. But the nature of the search changes. For modernist poets, the search usually entails divining or recovering lost originary moments; for postmodernists, it typically means questioning, revising, or even repudiating origins identified by modernists” (1). Nevertheless, Moffett argues,

it is significant that they have taken up the search; the issue of origins clearly still poses a problem for post-modern poets. Chapter Four, “Narrating the Origins of the Nation: Geoffrey Hill’s *Mercian Hymns* and “An Apology for the Revival of Christian Architecture in England,” will be of greatest interest to Anglo-Saxonists. Moffett views Hill as a poet contemplating his relation to history and what Moffett loosely designates the “Anglo-Saxon” past in particular. In his *Mercian Hymns*, Hill struggles with the historical dislocations that result from trying to locate the origins of the present in the past, particularly with the nationalist (i.e., imperialist) impulses that rear their ugly heads when the origin of Britain is identified as Anglo-Saxon. While this work does not deal directly with Anglo-Saxon language or literature, it is, in the end, a quick and worthwhile read.

In her exhaustive study of “*England’s Darling*”: *The Victorian Cult of Alfred the Great* (Manchester: Manchester UP), Joanne Parker takes up the story of King Alfred’s historical reception where earlier studies, most notably those of Simon Keynes, left off. Parker begins with an analysis of the four-day celebration commemorating King Alfred’s death in 1901 and the preparations leading up to it. Her second and third chapters survey the cultural movements in Victorian England that fostered the popular *cultus* of the ninth-century king and present the traditions and myths of Alfred that the Victorians inherited. Chapter four examines the extent to which the popular Alfredianism of the day shaped the debate about the future of the monarchy; chapter five explores the ways in which Alfred’s legacy was invoked to validate and justify civic and military institutions, such as the British law codes and the navy. Together, these chapters argue that

Victorian appropriation of Alfred’s legendary achievements as king laid the foundation for the burgeoning myth of empire. Extending this argument, chapter six examines the revision of Alfred’s life story by nineteenth-century authors as a parable of human failure and future redemption, an enterprise which served to sanctify Victorian moral values. Chapter seven focuses on the dramatic decline of Alfred’s popularity in the twentieth century and posits a number of reasons for that decline, including the deleterious effect on his legendary status of research scholarship that stripped from the king many of his grandest achievements. Parker concludes by noting that Alfred’s future popularity may well rest on whether he is able to “overcome or coexist beside that twentieth-century icon of the silver screen, favourite of the fantasy game genre, and hero of South-Western tourist boards—the Excalibur-wielding Celt” (216).

RFJ

Works not seen:

Forni, Kathleen. “Graham Baker’s *Beowulf*: Intersections between High and Low Culture.” *Literature/Film Quarterly* 35 (2007), 244–49.

Ogawa, Hiroshi. “On Old English Studies—A Philological View.” *Gakuen, English Language and Communication, Showa Women’s Univ.* (Tokyo) 798 (April 2007), 33–46. [in Japanese]

Starr-Reid, Kimberly Ann. “The Ghosts of Britain Future: The Trauma of 1066 in Geoffrey of Monmouth’s *History of the Kings of Britain*.” Ph.D. Diss., Univ. of California, Berkeley, 2006. *DAI* 67A (2007), 2980.

Tolley, Clive. “Old English Influence on *The Lord of the Rings*.” *Beowulf & Other Stories*. Ed. North and Allard. [see sec. 4 under *Beowulf*], pp. 38–62.

2. MEMORIALS, TRIBUTES, HISTORY OF THE DISCIPLINE

a. History of the Discipline

A Century of British Medieval Studies, the British Academy collection of surveys of “work by scholars whose professional residence is or was in the United Kingdom” chiefly during the twentieth century, edited by Alan Deyermond (Oxford: Oxford UP), is a unique contribution to the year’s offerings (1). One should consult the Introduction for details on scope and organization, but the contents are divided into four main categories: history, scholarship “in particular geographical or cultural areas,” linguistic and literary scholarship, and other disciplines (archaeology, numismatics, cartography, etc.)

(2–3). Two of the essays, Henry Loyn’s “Anglo-Saxon England” (6–26), and Michael Lapidge’s “Old English” (363–81), are reviewed below.

Loyn’s discussion begins and ends with Frank Stenton’s *Anglo-Saxon England* (1943), “still, nearly sixty years later, the best single guide to the period” (7). Stenton, the first “since Kemble in the 1840s to appreciate fully the vital importance of non-literary material... to the construction of a general picture,” Loyn argues, serves as a fixed point from which to assess those who followed (8). *Anglo-Saxon England* provided the first real “intelligible historical context” for connecting the two major disciplines, English and history, which “had

developed along vastly different lines," a problem that had concerned Stenton (9). Loyn looks backward to the nineteenth-century works of Sharon Turner and John Kemble before turning to the seminal historical studies of the past century, up to and including the first volume of Patrick Wormald's *The Making of English Law: King Alfred to the Twelfth Century* (1999). Concluding with a nod toward Oxford's proposed two-volume replacement for Stenton's seminal study by Nicholas Brooks and Simon Keynes, Loyn confesses to the personal nature of his essay. It is also true to Stenton's interdisciplinary focus. Ranging widely from wills, charters, and laws to coinage; from manuscripts to place-names; from archaeology to church history; from visual arts to Latinity, Loyn cites eclectically yet, at the same time, forges connections among these many works. A synopsis of the founding of various medieval societies, and of *Old English Newsletter* and *Anglo-Saxon England* (Loyn quips that his "suggestion that [the latter] should be called *Hwaet* was not well received," 13), remind us of Loyn's own not insignificant contributions.

Lapidge's chapter on "Old English" also looks to the nineteenth century as a foundation for the twentieth. "The field of Old English—the nature of the language, the corpus of the literature," he explains, "was essentially discovered and defined during the course of the nineteenth century, principally by scholars in Germany and Scandinavia" (363). The influence German philological scholarship had on nineteenth-century English scholars is due chiefly to John Mitchell Kemble, the first in England to employ German philology in his 1833 edition of *Beowulf* (364). Next in importance is Joseph Bosworth's *Dictionary of the Anglo-Saxon Language* (1838), "still, after various campaigns of revision and supplementation, the only large-scale dictionary of Old English now available" (365). The English scholarship of Benjamin Thorpe, F.J. Furnivall, Henry Sweet, and W.W. Skeat, Lapidge argues, "retrieved some of the initiative in Old English studies that had hitherto been the domain of German and Scandinavian scholars" during the last half of the century (365). This recovery made possible the entry of Old English into "the curriculum in British universities at the time when courses in English literature were being established" despite "widespread resistance" to it as "too easy" to be a fit subject for study (365–6). The subsequent growth of the discipline is traced first to the establishment of university lectureships and chairs, fellowships (The British Academy), publication series (EETS), and the *NED*; second, to those scholars who played significant roles in this growth; and third, to transformative moments in approaches and methods. In short, Lapidge's survey

identifies "the principal contributions that Fellows of the British Academy have made to the study of Old English during the past century" in the areas of lexicography and dictionary compilation, interdisciplinary approaches, and manuscript studies (376). It also points to some important projects completed or underway outside Britain. For its relative brevity, this is a magisterial survey that optimistically assesses "the vitality of Old English studies" in welcome counterpoint to some recent more gloomy appraisals (378).

In "*The Henry Loyn Memorial Lecture for 2006: Henry Loyn and the Context of Anglo-Saxon England*," *Haskins Society Jnl* 9: 154–70, Janet L. Nelson explores the "imaginative world which framed and shaped Henry's scholarly work on Anglo-Saxon England" (169). Loyn's challenge to the "conventional wisdom [that] saw England cut off from 'civilized Europe'" in his study of English trade, agriculture, and "social development" in "its wider European setting," had "far-reaching effects" (156, 155). Nelson traces the "Continental theme" that runs through Loyn's work, beginning with *The Reign of Charlemagne*, in which he used detailed estate surveys to identify "links between landowners and the state," and between "landlordship and peasant life" (158). His study of kin-relations in tenth-century England, in which he compared Edmund's attempts to curb feuds with earlier Merovingian attempts, further exemplifies his comparative and "independent-minded" approach (163). His "favourite problems," Anglo-Saxon coinage, reeves, and freedom and servitude, Nelson explains, reveal his debt to Marc Bloch (164). Loyn's 1986 lecture, "The Beyond of Domesday Book," in which he admits to finding "yet another Mr Facing Both Ways problem" exemplifies how "Continental, alias European, history" influenced his approach to Anglo-Saxon history (164, 170). In that lecture, he looked both ways, Nelson explains, "sideways—to eleventh-century Italy, to Lanfranc, to the study of Roman Law" and "back to Charlemagne, to explain Domesday Book's nature and purpose" (164, 165). The capacity for seeing such connections, for seeing in Europe a context for Anglo-Saxon England is unique. "It's hard," remarks Nelson, "to think of many other historians with a sufficiently cross-Channel vision to have brought a Carolingian perspective to bear on Domesday Book" (165). The essay clearly shows that "[t]he context of Henry Loyn's Anglo-Saxon England was, and is, Europe" (170).

In "King Alfred the Great and the Victorian Translations of His Anglo-Saxon *Boethius*," in *Global Perspectives on Medieval English Literature, Language, and Culture*, edited by Noel Harold Kaylor, Jr., and Richard Scott Nokes, 155–73, Philip Edward Phillips examines

“the fascination with Alfred and the developing field of Anglo-Saxon studies in the nineteenth century, Alfred’s Anglo-Saxon adaptation of the *Boethius*, and in particular the long-neglected Modern English translations of the Old English *Boethius* within the context of the millenary celebrations at Wantage [1849] and at Winchester [1901]” (156). Alfred was at the center of a growing nationalistic interest in the Middle Ages during the late eighteenth- and early-nineteenth centuries. He was “popularly regarded as the father of the English nation, the founder of the British Navy, and the father of English prose,” but it was in this latter role, Phillips remarks, that Alfred “provided scholars with some of the first and certainly some of the finest examples of Anglo-Saxon prose, and his moral and spiritual qualities, exemplified especially in the Anglo-Saxon *Boethius*, typified to many of his readers those qualities that made Britain ‘Great’” (157).

A contextual discussion of the Wantage and Winchester millenary celebrations is followed by detailed analysis of the nineteenth-century translations of Alfred’s *Boethius*. Summarizing problems the manuscripts have posed and still pose for editors and translators, Phillips turns to the ideological differences, goals, and intended or implied audiences reflected in the translations of J.S. Cardale, Samuel Fox, Martin Farquhar Tupper, and Walter John Sedgefield. Each attempted “to increase appreciation of Alfred’s work among larger, contemporary audiences, in England and abroad” by making it accessible to those who could not read Old English but whose agendas differed (162). Beginning with Cardale’s (1829) translation and working forward chronologically, Phillips identifies the manuscripts and editions each translator employed, describes each translation (e.g. Cardale’s was a facing page Anglo-Saxon/Modern English edition with a “literal” prose translation and “sample” meter), and analyzes each translator’s preface and introduction, concluding that these four translators “seem to have been motivated by different interests” (171).

Cardale expresses a deep interest in Anglo-Saxon studies in general and in the Anglo-Saxon language, in particular. Fox draws attention to the life and character of King Alfred...and those sections of the Alfred’s *Boethius* that are the most ‘Alfredian’...and inspirational.... Tupper...reveal[s] the Victorian popular philosopher’s enthusiasm for Alfred and all things Alfredian. Sedgefield’s scholarly edition and Modern English translation, finally, attempts to reclaim the text for the purposes of academic study while simultaneously making the work appealing to a generation of educated readers, just in time for the millenary

celebrations” (171). Together, however, the translations “served to perpetuate Alfred’s legacy and to make available, once again, the words and wisdom of the Anglo-Saxon *Boethius* in accessible, Modern-English renderings of Alfred’s original Anglo-Saxon text” (171).

George Ballard “has long been recognized as a pioneer biographer of learned women,” but what role did Elizabeth Elstob’s notebook “of entries on ‘illustrious women,’ compiled...when in her twenties,” play in Ballard’s work (352, 351)? Greg Waite takes up this question in “The Saxon Nymph and Her Illustrious Women: Elizabeth Elstob’s Notebook (Oxford Bodleian Library Manuscript Ballard 64)” (*New Windows on a Woman’s World: Essays for Jocelyn Harris*, ed. Colin Gibson and Lisa Marr [Dunedin, NZ: U of Otago], I.351–7). Waite outlines the lives of Ballard and Elstob, traces the history of Elstob’s notebook (along with her other manuscripts) and how it came into Ballard’s hands, and provides an edition of that notebook, which has, to date, received little attention. It was not among the Elstob manuscripts acquired by Joseph Ames after Elstob fled London in 1718 and may, in fact, have gone with her. Ballard purchased it from a Gloucester bookseller in June 1747, rescuing it much as he had “its unfortunate mistress!” (356). How he found it is unclear, but what “has not hitherto been noticed,” Waite points out, is that a later owner had “inverted the book and used the blank or partially used leaves available to collect domestic cooking recipes, including one for toothpaste” (356). Waite challenges Perry’s assertion that Elstob’s and Ballard’s plans differed; instead, he argues, they “illuminate one another” (356). In her prefaces, especially to her *Grammar*, Elstob “launches an all-out attack on several luminaries of her day,” including Swift, and asserts “the rights of women to education and participation in scholarship” by reminding readers that women had made contributions “to learning and culture in the past,” particularly “in the history of spiritual enlightenment” (357). Citing Catholic, Protestant, and even pagan women, she argues for tolerance toward all who demonstrate “spiritual and intellectual integrity” (358). The notebook, Waite explains, “is a working draft only, somewhat eclectic in nature but revealing of Elizabeth’s character and interests, and worthy of attention alongside her published works” (359). The balance of the essay (359–70) is “a transcription in full of those entries in Elstob’s own words, a paraphrase and sourcing of entries copied verbatim from other sources, and a brief biographical guide to names not provided with any other information” (359). This edition enriches our knowledge of Elstob’s life and work, particularly the role her notebook played in Ballard’s *Memoir*.

A new contribution to the growing scholarship on Matthew Parker's *Testimonie of Antiquity* is "Blood, Flesh and Word: The Importance of Language in *A Testimonie of Antiquity*" in *Insights and Bearings: Festschrift for Dr. Juan Sebastian Amador Bedford*, ed. Manuel Brito, Matilde Martín González, Juan Ignacio Oliva, and Dulce Rodríguez González. Publicaciones institucionales, Homenajes 2 (Santa Cruz de Tenerife, Canary Islands: Universidad de La Laguna), 95–103. Margarita Mele Marrero argues that the "linguistic aspects of the text" have been largely ignored in favor of Parker's use of Ælfric's homilies "to establish an early origin for the Church of England and its objections to the transubstantiation in the Eucharist" (99–100, 95). That "Parker used Ælfric's homily [XV] to assert that the doctrine they were now preaching came from their ancestors and certain new practices were not so new," and that he "found in Ælfric an earlier supporter" for his "rejection of transubstantiation as part of the doctrine of the Church of England," is now widely accepted (97, 98). Yet one can also compare in *Testimonie* "the old and the early modern language, evaluating the evolution of the graphemes, the lexicon, the morphology and the syntax. The 'new' printing techniques can also be contrasted with the modern presentation of this work, nowadays available as an e-book" (102).

Marrero examines twenty-six marginal notes on the homily marked with an asterisk, twenty-one of which are connected to the idea of "no transubstantiation." If one pays attention "to the space dedicated to Old English in different ways," she suggests, one sees "a great concern for the ancient form of the language proper of the Anglo-Saxon revival" (100, 102). Translation changes in the language of these annotations, Marrero argues, urge readers to see the language as "apt for religious practices," effective "for vindicating a prestigious past for the emerging standard," and a source of "reputable roots" (102). To focus solely on transubstantiation, she concludes, is to underestimate "the whole value of a book which is the perfect hypertext for a philologist" (102).

In "William Camden and the F-Text of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*," *N&Q* 253: 222–24, Julian Harrison adds support to Peter Lucas's recent argument that William Camden "possessed and 'almost certainly owned' the unique manuscript of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* F-text" (Cotton Domitian A.VIII, ff. 30–70) (222). The evidence? First, Camden annotated "the annal for AD 527," annotations that have been previously misattributed to William L'Isle and Robert Talbot (223). Second, the word "*andan* beside the annal for 694 (f. 44v), is in the hand of Richard James" who was "closely associated

with the Cotton library," and Cotton had acquired much of Camden's library through bequest (223). Third, the "distinctive form of the ampersand (&), in which an exaggerated loop joins the tongue to the main body of the ligature," a feature of Camden's hand, is "key in identifying [that] hand" as responsible for "the marginalia on f. 37r–v and the entry for 527" (223). Harrison also argues that "there is reason to suppose that other components of what became Cotton Domitian A.VIII also passed through Camden's hands" because these contain notes in a similar hand and the manuscript is "a typical Cottonian miscellany" of "ten independent items bound together in the seventeenth century" (223). In short, Harrison has "no doubt...that William Camden owned the F-text of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, and the weight of evidence suggests that several other portions" of the manuscript also belonged to him (224).

In their introduction to a collection of essays devoted to Christine Fell ("Women in Anglo-Saxon England and the Impact of Christine Fell," *Nottingham Medieval Studies* 51: 201–5), Jayne Carroll and Christina Lee assess Fell's continued influence on our conception of Anglo-Saxon women "two decades after the publication of the seminal book *Women in Anglo-Saxon England and the Impact of 1066*" (201). Connecting the ideas explored in the volume's essays to Fell's own studies on the domestic, political, legal, and ecclesiastical aspects of women's lives, the authors show that Fell's work has been enriched and expanded by subsequent work in the areas of gender ("what used to be called 'women's studies,'" 201), and of vocabulary. In particular, her study of the contextual meanings of *agan* and *bicgan* demonstrated "how important the understanding of individual lexical items is for an accurate comprehension of women's place in Anglo-Saxon society" (202–3). Fell's investigation of the role women played in the religious life of seventh- and eighth-century England has led to a wider debate among such scholars as Stephanie Hollis, Sarah Foot, Clare Lees, and Gillian Overing. Finally, her innovative study of "Viking Women in Britain" opened up an important area of research into Old English and Old Norse contacts and the "role of women in the Viking diaspora," to which the Viking Identities Network project (viking.nottingham.ac.uk/english/csva/vin/) is partly dedicated (204–5).

b. Memorials and Tributes

From his early "'figural' readings of *Andreas*...and *Elene*," Thomas D. Hill effected a revolution in Old English studies, helping to spread the exegetical approach that emerged at Cornell and that was "fundamentally

opposed to the reductive Robertsonian method” (x). A collection of nineteen essays, *Source of Wisdom: Old English & Early Medieval Latin Studies in Honour of Thomas D. Hill*, ed. Charles D. Wright, Frederick M. Biggs, and Thomas N. Hall (Toronto: U of Toronto), honors “one of the most prolific and influential scholars of OE poetry” (x). Its five parts—*Beowulf*, Old English Religious and Sapiential Poetry, Old English Prose, Old English beyond the Conquests, and Early Medieval Latin—represent Hill’s wide range of scholarly interests. The essays honor the tradition of “Tom’s OE scholarship [which] has always been about sources, especially the Christian-Latin sources of OE religious poetry and prose” (ix). “Back in the day when locating a given idea or motif and tracing its development in the ocean of printed patristic and medieval Christian-Latin literature was both a fine art and honest work,” the editors note, “no one was more adept than Tom” (ix).

If it was in the *Patrologia*, he could find it... [S]ince Tom acquired a personal copy of the *CETEDOC Library of Christian-Latin Texts*, no crux of the sacral variety in OE poetry or *Piers Plowman* has had a safe place to hide... Tom solves cruces that nobody even realized were cruces, and that is where the art lies now. If the heyday of the typological approach is now past, it is not because it was misguided or even because it was overtaken by new theoretical approaches, but rather because the most compelling cases to be made (at least for OE poetry) had mostly been made (and mostly by Tom) by about the mid-1980s. (xi)

The preface surveys and assesses Hill’s scholarship in each of the five areas before discussing connections between the volume’s essays and that work. The appendices list Hill’s many publications to 2006 (387–98)—he’s not done yet—and the dissertations he has directed during the same period (399–400).

Paul Szarmach’s influence has been no less pervasive than Hill’s, and *Global Perspectives on Medieval English Literature, Language, and Culture*, ed. Noel Harold Kaylor, Jr., and Richard Scott Nokes [Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute], honors one such influence, the fostering of collaboration among scholars from different cultures. The collection of twelve essays is the result of “positive interaction of members of the Medieval and Early Modern English Studies Association of Korea, the Medieval English Studies Symposium of Poland, and the International Boethius Society during the period of Paul Szarmach’s leadership at the

Medieval Institute of Western Michigan University” (ix). The essays, which focus on Old and Middle English literature, reflect “developing globalization of the discipline” (ix).

The fifteen essays in *Collectanea Antiqua: Essays in Memory of Sonia Chadwick Hawkes*, ed. Martin Henig and Tyler Jo Smith. BAR International Series 1673 (Oxford: Archaeopress), respond to Hawkes’s “rather wide-ranging archaeological interests—everything from metalwork and iconography, to burials and excavations” (3). Categories include History and Collecting, Culture and Society, Sites and Objects, and a final section which includes a reprint of *The Independent* obituary by Martin Welch (151–2) and two essays by Hawkes herself. The first, “Oxford University Lectureship in European Archaeology (Early Medieval Specialism),” was found among her papers after her death (153–6), and the second, “The Oxford Institute of Archaeology, 1961–86: An Informal Retrospect” is a reprint of the Institute’s Silver Jubilee lecture which previously appeared only in brochure form (157–64). David Davison’s Preface acknowledges Hawkes’s role in the 1974 founding of the British Archaeological Reports series, and the Introduction consists of personal tributes by a number of her former students (1–4).

The twenty-three essays in *Text, Image, Interpretation: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Literature and its Insular Context in Honour of Éamonn Ó Carragáin*, ed. Alastair Minnis and Jane Roberts (Turnhout: Brepols), take up “issues relating to ‘text, image, interpretation,’ with the aim of producing a volume that was both intellectually cohesive and celebratory of Éamonn’s polymathic passions” (xix). The essays are divided into three sections: the first “looks outwards to medieval Rome, more generally to western Europe, and backwards to the world-geography of the ancient world”; the second focuses on Latin, English and Scandinavian texts, including those contained in the four major codices of Old English poetry; and the third “deals with less vocalized sculpture, with buildings, and with the insular landscape” (xix, xx, xxi). A foreword by Mary Clayton summarizes Carragáin’s education and career at University College Cork before concluding that “the very air that Éamonn breathes is interdisciplinary and this approach is now, because of him, recognized as crucial to an understanding of the Ruthwell Cross,” a subject that “has dominated his publications” since his 1975 “PhD thesis on the Vercelli Book” (xxiv). A bibliography of his work (569–72) concludes this impressive volume.

The foreword to *Constructing Nations, Reconstructing Myth: Essays in Honour of T.A. Shippey*, ed. Andrew Wawn, with Graham Johnson and John Walter

(Turnhout: Brepols), xiii–xvii, summarizes the “three intersecting themes that have informed much of [Shippey’s] work over almost four decades: philology, mythology, and nationalism” (xiii). Sixteen essays are organized in three parts to reflect these themes: Nations and Nationalism, Philology and Philologists, and Myths and Mythology. Shippey’s interest in the “ultimate nature and significance of the ‘Grimmian’ revolution” has served as the underpinning for larger questions about the relationships between comparative philology and mythology, between the linguistic and the literary (xv). The essays featured here address this “Grimmian revolution” by considering how “philology help[ed] to create nationhood” (xvi), how the influences of nineteenth-century editorial methodology still influence twentieth-century editors, and how Grimmianism, although “too easily forgotten,” much like Darwinism, had and continues to have impact “on the map of Europe, on people’s sense of the past, on national and regional identities, and even on what we might call the mental furniture of the general public” (xvii). The contributors “seek to explore...the intersections of words, grammar, myth, folklore, and nationhood... [to] acknowledge the continuing creative resonance of the Grimmian legacy, and salute the dedicatee of the volume who has staked out the Grimmian ground so excitingly” (xvii). The volume concludes with a list of Shippey’s academic publications (357–66)

Cross and Culture in Anglo-Saxon England: Studies in Honor of George Hardin Brown, ed. Karen Louise Jolly, Catherine E. Karkov, and Sarah Larratt Keefer (Morgantown, WV: West Virginia UP), is the first in a series of three volumes in the Sancta Crux/Halig Rod series. The eleven essays address how “the cross, the central image of Christianity in the Anglo-Saxon period, was textualized, reified, visualized, and performed.”

West over Sea: Studies in Scandinavian Sea-Borne Expansion and Settlement before 1300: A Festschrift in Honour of Dr. Barbara E. Crawford, ed. Beverley Ballin Smith, Simon Taylor, and Gareth Williams (Leiden: Brill), includes a bibliography of Crawford’s work from 1967 to 2006 (xxv–xxix), and is divided into four sections: History and Cultural Contacts; The Church and the Cult of Saints; Archaeology, Material Culture, and Settlement; and Place-Names and Language. While the essays focus chiefly on Scandinavian topics, Elisabeth Okasha’s “Anglo-Saxon Inscriptions found outside the British Isles” (69–80), reviewed in the “Archaeology Sculpture, Inscriptions, and Numismatics” section, is of interest to Anglo-Saxonists. Several essays examine interactions between the Vikings and Anglo-Saxons and consider the linguistic, material, and historical

contexts of the Northern peoples during the early Middle Ages.

Indo-European Perspectives: Studies in Honour of Anna Morpurgo Davies, ed. J.H.W. Penney (Oxford: Oxford UP), collects essays on linguistic topics divided by language groups (Indo-European and Western Indo-European, Greek, Anatolian, Indo-Iranian and Tocharian), and on the History of Indo-European Linguistics. Essays on Old English words by Don Ringe and Patrick Stiles are discussed in the “Language” section below. A bibliography of Davies’s major publications on philology and linguistics (587–93), and a useful Index of Words Discussed (594–98), conclude the volume.

Two festschriften focus on English and Germanic linguistics and philology in honor of their subjects. *Insights and Bearings: Festschrift for Dr. Juan Sebastián Amador Bedford*, ed. Manuel Brio, et al., offers thirty-five essays on literary and linguistic topics, several of which are devoted to Old English lexicography and philology. The essay by Margarita Mele Marrero (reviewed above) examines language use in *A Testimonie of Antiquity*. An essay by Maria Cruz González, “Some Aspects of Semantic and Lexical Change: From Old to Middle English,” is reviewed in the Language section below. The second festschrift, *Language and Text: Current Perspectives on English and Germanic Historical Linguistics and Philology*, ed. Andrew James Johnston et al. (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter), in honor of Klaus Dietz, co-editor of *Anglo-Saxon England* from 1986–1991, summarizes Dietz’s life and work and lists his publications in the brief introduction (7–16). Included are several essays on Old English topics reviewed in the appropriate sections of this volume.

New Windows on a Woman’s World: Essays for Jocelyn Harris (ed. Gibson and Marr), collects a wide variety of essays in two volumes, chiefly, but not entirely, on eighteenth-century literature. The exceptions, Susan Irvine’s “Rewriting Women in the Old English *Boethius*” (I. 488–501), and Paul Sorrell’s “A Bee in My Bonnet: Solving Riddle 17 of the Exeter Book” (I. 544–53) are reviewed in the appropriate sections below. George Waite’s “The Saxon Nymph and Her Illustrious Women: Elizabeth Elstob’s Notebook (Oxford Bodleian Library Manuscript Ballard 64)” I. 351–73) is discussed above.

Memoirs for both Nicholas Howe (by Robert W. Hanning, Anne Middleton, and Roberta Frank) and John Frank Leyerle (by Larry D. Benson, V.A. Kolve, and George Rigg) appeared in *Speculum* 82: 813–15 and 815–17 respectively; for Richard Hogg (by David Denison and Bas Aarts) in *English Language and Linguistics* 11.3: 1–11; for Leslie Alcock (by Stephen T. Driscoll) in *MA* 51: 199–203; for Phillip Pulsiano (by Jill Frederick)

in *Signs on the Edge*, ed. Sarah Keefer and Rolf Bremmer (1-2); and for Stephen O. Glosecki (by Jill Frederick, Marijane Osborn, and Elaine Treharne), in *OEN* 40.3: 3-4. Appearing in the same volume (*OEN* 40.3: 24-26) is Patrick Stiles's useful "Bibliographical Appreciation" for Joan Turville-Petre.

DAB

3. Language

3a. Lexicon

Anna H. Bauer's "Old English *-fæst*: A Case of Grammaticalisation," *Folia Linguistica Historica* 28: 27-53, traces the development of (*-*)*fæst* from a free morpheme to an adjectival suffix with reference to the notion of grammaticalization. In Old English, the word *fæst* bears various functions: as an independent adjective meaning 'fixed, firm', a second element of compounds, or an adjectival suffix. The grammaticalization of *-fæst*, Bauer argues, would originate in compounds of locality (e.g. *eorþ-fæst* 'fixed in the earth') and those of relation (e.g. *word-fæst* 'firm with regard to one's word') since "both contribute to the semantic weakening of *fæst*, and in addition to that, the compounds of relation have more than one possible analysis due to their semantic vagueness" (45). In the history of English, the formation with the adjectival suffix *-fæst* showed sharp decline in favor of other adjectival suffixes, with only a few examples surviving, including *steadfast*, which "must be lexicalised a long time ago, probably at some point in Early Middle English when the suffix was still alive" (49).

JT

Thomas E. Bredehoft's note "OE *yðhengest* and an Unrecognized Passage of Old English Verse," *N&Q* 54: 120-122 views the *hapax legomenon* "*yðhengestas*" from ASC entry for the year 1003 [C, D, and E] as an overlooked crux. Rather than treating the passage as prose, Bredehoft sees in the passage words reminiscent of Old English poetry in its late years. That this *hapax* occurs in what we assume to be a prose text contrasts with *yðhengest*'s being a compound-noun and kenning, more at home in poetic speech. Taking this word as the end of a passage, Bredehoft works back and parses the text into units compatible with the verse of late Old English poetry, more thoroughly addressed at the end of Bredehoft's 2005 book, *Early English Metre*. Divided

Works not Seen:

Nakao, Yoshiyuki; Shoko Ono, Naoko Shirai, Kaoru Noji, and Masahiko Kanno, eds. *Text, Language and Interpretation: Essays in Honour of Keiko Ikegami*. Tokyo: Eihosha.

Sawada, Mayumi; Larry Walker, and Shizuya Tara, eds. *Language and Beyond: A Festschrift for Hiroshi Yonekura on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*. Tokyo: Eichosha.

into syntactic units of verse-length, Bredehoft notes the presence of alliteration (ll. 2-4, 6-8, and 10-11), some with cross alliteration (2, 3, and 11). The remaining lines 1, 5, and 9 possess alliterative links to stressed syllables in adjacent lines, and line 12 joins its two verses together through off-rhyme. As such, the entry for 1003 in the CDE versions of the ASC may present an instance of late OE poetry, structurally quite distinct from the classical verse of the poetic corpus. Although this article is sure to draw healthy debate as to what constitutes poetry and its structural properties in the OE context, Bredehoft provides hope that there is verse yet to be discovered.

DPAS

Harald Bjorvand briefly considers "The Etymology of English *ale*," *The Journal of Indo-European Studies* 35: 1-8, and finds that earlier explanations by Pokorny, Polomé, and others are inadequate. The heart of the matter is that, while the lexeme "ale" is well-attested in several of the ancient Germanic dialects, the etymology of Germanic **alúþ-* is unknown, giving rise to some fairly wild speculations on its origins. The author suggests that "the most precise Gmc. proto-form of Eng. *ale*, etc. is **alúþ-*, which is a formation containing a *þ*-suffix and a radical element **alu-*" (3). The root **alu-*, therefore, can be interpreted as allied to the adjectival root **alu-*, meaning 'yellowy, reddish' and seen in Old English *alor*, 'alder'. Bjorvand also shows that another color adjective has an extension with **þ*, the Germanic word for 'gold', **gúl-þa-* and suggests an Indo-European reconstruction of **olú-t-* on the basis Old Indic *aruśá-* 'reddish' and Avestan *auruša-* 'bright, white'. By contrast, Bjorvand shows that older etymologies tended to rely on less convincing formal evidence, such as Pokorny's suggestion of a link between Gmc. **alúþ-* and Latin *alumen* 'alum' and Polomé's connection to Hittite *alwanzatar* 'witchcraft, magic, spell' as a reflex of beer's magico-religious function in Germanic society. But the

Finno-Ugric languages borrowed the term, as in Finnish *olut* and Estonian *õlu*, showing that the Indo-European form must have entered these languages before the initial *o*-vowel became *a* in Germanic.

In “*Gēmsten* and Other Old English Pearls—A Survey of Early Old English Loanwords in Scandinavian,” *NOWELE* 50–51: 131–161, Peder Gammeltoft and Jakob Povel Holck establish something like a set of first principles for the study of Old English loanwords in Scandinavian, a field that has suffered, they insist, from the absence of focus on the linguistic details of transfer from one language to another. The authors describe the difficulties of tracing loanword origins from early English to Scandinavian, pressing the point that earlier scholars in the field have typically only drawn simple comparisons based on form and meaning. Gammeltoft and Holck suggest that part of the opacity of Scandinavian borrowings from English can be rendered somewhat more transparent through “the use of phonological, morphological and syntactical criteria for determining the origin of loanwords” (136). So, for example, the authors’ phonological criteria for early English loanwords in Scandinavian are based on developments that were peculiar to Old English. The development of Old English stressed vowels are generally preserved as loanwords in Scandinavian, while the development of Old English consonants are generally not transferred (especially those resulting from processes of palatalization) into Scandinavian; cf. Norwegian *såpe* ‘soap’ < Old Norse *sápa*, *f.* < Old English *sāpe* with Old High German *seifa* and Germanic **saip-*, and cf. Old English *cyrice* ‘church’ with Old Danish *kirkia*. The authors go on to consider gender as a possible morphosyntactic criterion, although they acknowledge that its usefulness is severely limited since gender correspondences may be due to common origin or to mere coincidence. Still, Old Danish *nōn* ‘the ninth hour’ may come from several of the Germanic languages and from Latin, but the only language in which it appears as a neuter monosyllable is Old English. Semantic developments may also allow for a better determination, according to the authors. Attention to linguistic detail provides the opportunity to achieve a more rounded description of borrowing; Gammeltoft and Holck even suggest that the incidence of direct transfers from Old English to Scandinavian indicates “a relatively high degree of OScand-OE bilingual proficiency, where the borrowing person(s) are mostly capable of borrowing according to the correct word-class, gender and type of declension” (150), a situation that many have presumed to have existed, and which the evidence of the early loanwords may well support. Even though the line of

inquiry advocated in the article appears to offer the possibility of richer analyses of loanwords, the authors themselves depreciate the value of this kind of study by insisting that it is not a set of protocols for discovering loanwords’ origins but simply a “process of pointing out the complexity of the topic” (156).

Sara M. Pons-Sanz contributes “An Etymological Note on Two Old English Medical Terms: *ridesoht* and *flacg*,” *SN* 79: 45–53. These *hapax legomena* appear as glosses on Latin *febris* ‘fever’ and *cataplasma* ‘poultice’, respectively, the former in Farman’s glosses on Mark in the Rushworth Gospels, the latter in the First Cleopatra Glossary. Scholars have suggested a Norse origin for the perplexing etymology of these two terms, but Pons-Sanz carefully examines the phonology of *ridesoht* and *flacg* and finds that nothing in either term indicates foreign origin. The author first considers the determinant of *ridesoht*. The *h*-less form, where Old English *hrið* ‘fever’ is to be expected, has prompted some to posit its borrowing from Old Norse *riðusótt*, but Pons-Sanz points out that Farman normally dropped the *h* in initial *hr*- clusters (e.g., <raegl> for *hrægl*), and the medial dental stop, where /θ/ is to be expected, yields no insight as to origin since, again, Farman’s spellings frequently confuse <ð>, <þ>, and <d> (e.g., <eorðan> for *eorþe*). Similarly, the determinatum, upon close inspection, lacks any markers of borrowing from Norse, and the author identifies other possible factors supporting the native origin of the term. As for *flacg*, Pons-Sanz explains that its glossing of *cataplasma* seems to derive from a misunderstanding of Isidore’s account of the term in his *Etymologies*, and in conjunction with the Middle English *flagge* ‘piece of sod, flagstone’ and Old Norse *flag* ‘spot where turf has been cut out’ and *flaga* ‘slab of stone’, scholars have again posited Norse origin for the *hapax legomenon* in Old English. But the author argues that <lacg> could be a shortened form of *lacnung*, which elsewhere glosses *medicina* (which also renders *cataplasma*), while the initial *f* may be explained as an abbreviation of the unattested **fyrlacnung* (based on her careful reading of the relevant portion from Isidore’s *Etymologies*, or, she speculates, *f* may be the common abbreviation for *for*, which could possibly be a gloss on Isidore’s “eo quod”). This extremely perceptive study demonstrates that etymologies long considered obscure can be rescued from the trash heap of supposed foreign borrowing through painstaking attention to details frequently overlooked.

CC

In her essay “*Wod et wude dans la littérature médiévale anglaise ou l’espace de la folie*,” *Le Moyen Âge* 113:

361–382, Marie-Françoise Alamichel considers the semantics and uses of madness. This summary of her analysis limits itself to OE texts, but the essay has a scope extending to Shakespeare. Alamichel’s approach is to identify lexemes associated with folly, to classify the semantic fields of these associations, and to identify genres that provide context for her morphological and semantic analysis. She also cites contextual occurrences of folly, some of them in OE not linked to a denotative lexeme. For a lexical connection the phrase *weden heorte* (the *Leechbook* has eight instances) bears associations with epilepsy or demonic seizure. The OE account of Nebuchadnezzar refers briefly to the biblical king’s derangement with the term *wodan*. Hagiographic texts, however, are likely to allude to folly either lexically or contextually. The Vikings become *wodlice yrre*, aroused by Edmund’s refusal under torture to renounce his faith. In contrast, Guthlac’s retirement to the wilderness exemplifies contextually, but not lexically, the tradition of God’s holy fools. The primary function of lexemes, however, connected with OE folly centers on rage overtaking warriors in battle. In this connection, Alamichel lists compounds joined to *wod* and *wede*. This form of folly recurs in *Beowulf*, *The Battle of Maldon*, *Judith*—poems secular and biblical—associated with heroic contexts. Whether these allusions to folly, lexically and contextually, bespeak an overall conceptual response to the mind and culture Alamichel does not say.

Eulalia Sosa Acevedo enlists a formal construct to explore the properties of two verbs. In “The Semantic Representation of Anglo-Saxon (ge)*sēon* and (ge)*lōcian*: Syntactic Evidence for Meaning Decomposition,” *Rael, Revista Electrónica de Lingüística aplicada* 6: 92–107, she links grammar to lexis to explicate these verbs’ perceptual properties. Her formal construct is the Lexical Constructional Model, designed to reveal lexical meaning through analyses of morphosyntactic structures. This model lays out three structures for the verbs. The first (1) involves *sēon* as transitive, taking an object in the accusative case; a second (2) connects *lōcian* with the preposition *tō*, its object in the dative case. Both verbs (3) take the preposition *on*, its object in the accusative case. These morphosyntactic structures provide, for Acevedo, a direct link to their semantic properties. Structure (1) typically has a semantic counterpart indicating physical perception; structure (2) marks location; both verbs (3) appearing with *on* indicate intentional perception. Most of the exposition in this essay presents evidence to support this linkage of grammar to lexis; the essay also outlines a formal device to lay out the findings. A challenge to the argument lies

in examples found in the online OE Corpus. The utterance, for example, *Ic andette eal þæt ic æfre mid eagum geseah to gitsunge...*, instances *gesēon* preceding prepositional *tō*, a pattern that Acevedo does not include.

Carole P. Biggam’s “The Ambiguity of *brightness* (with Special Reference to Old English) and a New Model for Color Description in Semantics,” *Anthropology of Color*, ed. MacLaury, et al., 171–187, is perceptive. Her essay discusses (1) ambiguities on the nature of brightness found in past work on OE, (2) offers a model designed to produce replicable results, and (3) presents a view of historic developments. To support her argument for a new model to evaluate Anglo-Saxon perceptions of color, Biggam first identifies shortcomings in a century of published work. These shortcomings are due primarily to inconsistencies that prevent a cogently derived concept of brightness. In some work brightness concerns the emitting and reflecting of light (respectively *sunne* and *goldbeorht*), its pervading space as in *æfenleoht*, and its transparency (*glæshluttor*). Further perspectives on brightness result in scales for the effects of light on color: one scale has *brun* defined as ‘brown, dark, shining’, *fealu* as ‘yellow, tawny, grey’, *wann* ‘dark’. Yet Biggam shows that reliance on a scale does not assure consistency: a second scale for brightness includes degrees of paleness and darkness; a third does not. A fourth scale depends on degrees of variance between brightness and hue: i. pure brightness; ii. brightness-dominated; iii. hue-dominated; iv. pure hue. A lack of concord also attends the word *brun*: in some studies it is primarily a hue, in others an indication of brightness. These ambiguities stem from insufficient analyses of OE data, as in the instance of *græg*, chosen in part because in most studies it denotes color, in two also brightness. Much work reviewed associates *græg* with nouns for referents: armor (spearhead), wildlife (wolf), topography (flood of the sea), vegetation (wheat), mineral (stone), hair (human, animal). Quotations are few. The inadequacy of this compilation lies in the method underlying it—a centering on nouns that ignores context. Biggam’s contribution is to study the semantics of color by examining diverse contexts for words like *græg*. Ample contexts include the range of OE words for color, cognates, comparable adjectives and nouns in Latin, alliterative patterns, citations traced to the same source (to avoid undue emphases). Further, Biggam lays out a scheme of five qualities for classificatory purposes: hue, saturation, tone, brightness, and transparency. Her discussion of this scheme relies, understandably in an essay, on the lexicon of Modern English. Finally, she offers a perspective on the history of qualities in her scheme, her assessment

emphasizing systematic study still needed rather than an acceptance of that so far set forth.

Isabel de la Cruz Cabanillas's "Shift of meaning in the animal field: Some cases of narrowing and widening" (*Bells Chiming from the Past: Cultural and Linguistic Studies in English*, ed. Moskowich-Spiegel and Crespo-Garcia [see sec. 3b], 139–150) is descriptive. Her inventory of OE lexemes for animals includes these: *fugol*, *hund*, *hara*, *beste*, *feoh* (variants *fioh*, *feo*), *neat*, *hroðer* (also *hryðer*), *orf* (also *hworf*), *buc*, *cocc*, *assa*, *eosol* (also *esol*), *eofor*, *bar*, *hana*, *carlfugol*. Other words like *bird* appear in forms later than OE. The approach is chronological in regard to reference and semantics: how did this collection of lexemes widen, narrow, or shift in meaning in later centuries? What referents did they have after the OE period? Notes on their developments in OE are sporadic: *assa*, a diminutive, derived from Northumbrian forms of Celtic provenance; the etymology of *feoh* is outlined. A line from Bede's story of Cædmon on looking after cattle is the single OE quotation presented. The hope is that through further studies of contexts the results will extensively and analytically demonstrate patterns of use for lexemes on animals in OE.

Carole Hough offers a fresh analysis of a place name in "Old English *weargeborg*," *N&Q* 54: 364–365. The received interpretation, offered by Wallenberg in *Kentish Place-Names* (1931), glosses the compound's first element *wearg* as 'felon' or 'criminal', the second as 'hill', the whole concretized as 'gallows'. Hough's alternative gloss depends on Germanic cognates, glossed as 'wolf', that resemble OE *wearg*. Secondly, she presents place-name evidence to liken *weargborg* to Wreighburn 'wolf stream' in Northumberland, also Warnborough, 'wolf hill', in Hampshire. Finally, Hough notes that patterns of compounds for place names in OE typically suggest location, terrain, or fauna. Even so, Wallenberg's gloss for *weargborg*, appearing in *Textus Roffensis*, retains its credibility.

EG

The essential point of Javier E. Diaz Vera's "Metaphors we learnt by: cultural traditions and metaphorical patterns in the Old English vocabulary of 'knowledge'" (*Revista canaria de estudios ingleses* 55: 99–106), that there are often historical connections between words for mental processes and words for physical activity, is unquestionably true in OE and in many other languages. This unoriginal claim, however, is supported by some simplistic arguments. For one thing, the so-called mind-for-body metaphor sometimes goes in the opposite direction—consider MnE *mention* (a physical

act) from the Latin root for 'mind'. Another hasty claim is that the inscription "Alfred made me" on the Alfred jewel shows a special propensity for OE speakers to want to read words on inanimate objects as a conversation because of the two meanings of OE *rædan*: 'read' and 'give or take counsel'. But this touching inscriptional practice was widespread in the classical world. Further, many of the etymologies presented are not universally accepted. Old English words discussed in the article include: *seon*, *behealdan*, *witan*, *sceawian*, *hlystan*, *hieran*, *felan*, *þencan*, *gefandian*, *eodorcende*, *bræþan*, *broþor*, *bryd*, *fulian*, *fah*, and *feond*.

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

In "The Evidence for *maran*, the Anglo-Saxon 'Nightmares,'" *Neophilologus* 91: 299–317, Alaric Hall reexamines the passages that use this word and its various forms and concludes that the compound *wudumaer* refers to a female spirit, potentially aggressive, and that its gloss *echo* is to be properly understood not as the acoustic phenomenon but as the nymph *Echo*.

Ekkehard König and Letizia Vezzosi in "On the Historical Development of Attributive Intensifiers" (*Language and Text*, ed. Johnston et al. [see sec. 2], 151–68) discuss the current function and the historical

development of the Modern English intensifier *own*, from its origin as a participle of OE *agan*, to its (most common, in OE) use as a verbal adjective *agen*, to its modern use, already common in Middle English, of emphasizing alternatives to the object owned or the one owning. Syntactic patterns similar to *-self* forms throughout its history are noted.

Lucia Kornexl's "Female Husbands in Old English Lexicography" (*Language and Text*, ed. Johnston et al. [see sec. 2], 169–78) points out that a proposed **husbonde* as a feminine form of OE *husbonda* rests on a single instance from Exodus 3.22 where *husbondum* is used to translate the Latin *hospita*, paralleling such "gender pairs" as OE *wicce/wicca* and *widuwe/widuwa*. But since, even with these pairs, the male represents the unmarked form that could be used of either sex, there is no strong need to posit an underlying feminine in spite of the Latin, seeing that the dative plural form does not distinguish gender here.

What a pleasure it is to read an article that is not just a careful analysis of the history of a word, but a thorough examination of the long history of the scholarship. Anatoly Liberman in "English *Ivy* and German *Epheu* in Their Germanic and Indo-European Context" (*Proceedings of the Thirteenth Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference; Los Angeles, November 9–10, 2001*, ed. Karlene Jones-Bley, Martin E. Huld, Angela Della Volpe, and Miriam Robbins Dexter, *Journal of Indo-European Monograph Series* 44, [Washington, DC: Institute for the Study of Man, 2002], 129–44) provides such a rare treat in his examination of OE *īfig*. His exhaustive review of the literature (there are nearly six pages of bibliography for nine pages of text) reaches as far back as the seventeenth century. Absurdities, such as connection with Greek *ἐπιζάινω* 'invade' (where *ἐπι* is a prefix) and *ἰφι* 'strongly' (where *-φι* is historically a case ending), are dispensed with briskly, while equally untenable but more promising-looking proposals, such as that the second syllable contains the word 'hay', are dealt with more fully. The tentative conclusion posits a Proto-Germanic root **īb-* 'bitter', to which the name of the mythological river Oic *Ifing* (*if* 'stormy, violent') and OHG *eibar*, OE *āfor* 'fierce; pungent' may also be derived.

J.P. McGowan in "On the 'red' Blickling Psalter glosses," *N&Q* 54: 105–207, offers two corrections on edited versions of these glosses: Pulsiano's emendment of *tuifalþ* to *tuif[e]ald[um]* 'twofold (robe)' glossing Latin *diploide* is unnecessary since the former is a perfectly acceptable early English form; close examination of the manuscript leads to the emendation of *berende* (with L. *fecundae*, glossing L. *foetosae*) to *g<e>berende*.

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

S.M. Pons-Sanz's "A reconsideration of Wulfstan's use of Norse-derived terms: The case of *þræl*," *English Studies* 88: 1–21, points out that the claim that Wulfstan's high usage of Norse-derived words was a consequence of his contact with York as its archbishop, though often repeated, is not well supported by the evidence. Words such as *grīð* and *lagu* were already common in Wulfstan's earliest writing before his association with York, and his later use of numerous compounds incorporating these elements mirrors his creation of many other compounds using purely native elements, so they need not be attributable to contact with speakers in the Danelaw. A careful analysis of his use of Norse-derived *þræl* shows that Wulfstan picked an already widespread term to express the specific meaning 'slave', since the common native term *þeow* was ambiguous, meaning both 'slave' and 'servant'.

Douglas P. A. Simms's "A Word for 'Wild Boar' in Germanic, Italic, Balto-Slavic and Greek and Its Possible Semitic Origins" (*Indo-European Perspectives*, ed. Mark R. V. Southern. *Jnl of Indo-European Studies Monograph* 43 [Washington, DC: Institute for the Study of Man, 2002], 267–83) discusses OE *eofor* 'boar' and the words generally considered its cognates in Indo-European. Its distribution exclusively in Europe, unusual variations in form in the various branches, and similarities in the ritual use of the animal all lead to the conclusion that the word is borrowed from Semitic and has spread along with the ritual it is associated with. Clear evidence of other such Semitic rituals which spread throughout Europe in the centuries before the current era would help bolster this intriguing claim.

‡‡Piotr Gąsiorowski's "The Etymology of Old English **docga*" (*Indogermanische Forschungen* 111 (2006): 275–84) proposes a connection between Modern English *dog*, *dusk* (related to the OE color term *dox*), and *dun*, with the color meaning as basic. The unusual phonological development from **-sk-* to *-gg-* finds a

parallel in *frog* < OE *frocga* < *frox* (compare German *frosch* < OHG *forsk*) and both can be explained through hypocoristic (nick-naming) shortening and gemination; even the weak declension finds a happy explanation here. Formally attractive, it remains unclear why a color term would come to designate first a large or vicious dog (especially since hypocoristic derivatives mentioned also are often diminutive) and then the generic term for *canis lupus familiaris*.

JH

‡‡In “The Etymology of Old English **docga*” (*Indogermanische Forschungen* 111 [2006]: 275–84), Piotr Gašiorowski attempts an admittedly speculative etymology to MnE *dog* and OE **docga*, which is attested only once among the Prudentius glosses in the genitive plural *canum: docgena*: “[b]eyond the fact that **docga* must have been roughly synonymous with *hund*, its precise semantic value in Old English can hardly be determined on the basis of a *hapax legomenon*” (277; Gašiorowski notes also its use as a place-name element, e.g. *doggene ford*; cf. *DOE*, s.v. *docga*, sense 1b). Gašiorowski surveys the synonymy between **docga* and *hund* (277–79), especially in the ME period for which there is more evidence, noting that the MED added that “in early ME *dogge* is usually deprecatory or abusive” (277). This sets out the groundwork for Gašiorowski’s argument that the form of OE **docga* (discussed in detail 279–81; concerning Gothic *atta* ‘father, dad’ [at 280], see now also Ringe, *From Proto-Indo-European to Proto-Germanic*, rev. ed. [Oxford: Oxford UP, 2008], 71, 145) “suggests a typical Old English hypocorism derived from something like /doγ-/ or /dox(C)-/ ... Practically the only word that fits the bill is the sparsely attested colour adjective *dox* (~*dohx*), whose pre-metathetic counterpart **dusc* is reflected as *dusk* ‘dim, dark-coloured, dull’ in Middle English” (281). While this sets up with *dox* : **docga* a morphological pattern harmonious with *frox* : *frogga* and possibly also *fox* : **focga* (the proper name *Focga* seen as “a hypocoristic variant of *fox*,” 283), it makes for a tricky semantic leap: from *dox* ‘dark, dusky, gloomy’ to near-synonymy with terms meaning ‘shining’ and ‘yellow, golden’ (from a glossary entry in which *flava specie* is rendered *of glæterendum vel scylfrum hiwe vel doxum* [281]) to Gašiorowski’s own interpretive comment: “[a] less specific sense such as ‘yellowish-brown,’ perhaps referring to saturation, brightness and textural features rather than just a particular hue, might reconcile the apparent contradiction between the implications of the two glosses” (281–2). The weak class II verb **doxian*, extant in the 3rd sing. pres. *doxaz* in the Vercelli Homilies, is said to have “the

probable meaning of ‘turn purplish yellow (the colour of a bruise)’ (282); the *DOE* is more staid with ‘dark in colour’ for *dox* and ‘to darken, become dark in colour’ for *doxian* (s.vv.). Thus a proposed **dox hund*, the color term serving for the pet-form as *grizzly* < *grizzly bear* and *tabby* < *tabby cat* (282). Gašiorowski’s conclusion that “it is my contention that the etymology of **Focga* suggested here makes more sense than any other proposed so far, and that the pairs *dox* : **docga* and *fox* : **focga* reinforce each other’s plausibility” (283) is in danger of some circularity as he was the one to propose the existence of these two pairs, but this is an interesting effort at solving an etymological puzzle despaired of so often.

In “The Old Cornish Gloss on Boethius,” *N&Q* 54: 367–8, Andrew Breeze reviews the discovery by Malcolm Godden and Rohini Jayatilaka in Vatican City, BAV, MS lat. 3363 of the oldest occurrence of Old Cornish, the gloss *ud rocashaas* to Boethius’s *terras perosa despicit* (*De consolatione Philosophiae* Bk. IV, metrum 1); Godden had taken the Old Cornish as the phrase “it [Thought] hated the gloomy places,” an interpretation made also by Patrick Sims-Williams (“A New Brittonic Gloss on Boethius,” *Cambrian Medieval Celtic Studies* 1 [2005]: 77–86). While *ro-cashaas* is taken as 3rd sing. pret. ‘hated’ (and cognate with Welsh *casáu* ‘to hate, abhor’), Breeze dissents from the equation *ud* = ‘gloomy places’ as it “has the fatal air of desperate translation” (367). With comparison to uses of Welsh *udd*, as in *Môr Udd* (‘English Channel,’ but also ‘North Sea’ and, in Breeze’s extended view, ‘Sea of the [European] Continent’ or ‘Sea of [the Continental] Landmass’), Breeze sees in the Old Cornish *ud* a gloss to the Boethius passage’s *terras*. Here Breeze brings in the connection to OE matters; to “see *terras perosa* ‘loathing the lands’ as directly rendered by *ud rocashaas* ‘she hated the land’: a gloss perhaps written at King Alfred’s court by the anonymous Cornishman who, it has been suggested, was the author of the Old English Orosius” (368; the reference here is to his *Medieval Welsh Literature* [Dublin: Four Courts Press, 1997], 16).

Hans Sauer’s “Old English Words for People in the *Épinal-Erfurt Glossary*,” in *Beowulf and Beyond*, ed. Sauer and Bauer, 119–81 (see sec. 4b, *Beowulf*), not only considers the ca. sixty-four OE terms for people (that is, terms for people as such and also abstract nouns for occupations in *-end* or *-ere*) in the early *Épinal* and *Erfurt* glossary manuscripts but sets out, among other things, an important “Model for Describing Word-Formation” (134–57) filled in with data from the glossary. Sauer declares that Marchand’s model “still is useful although it has to be modified and supplemented”

(134)—that is, Hans Marchand's *The Categories and Types of Present-Day English Word-Formation*, 2nd ed. (Munich: Beck, 1969). He expands the usual morphological classification and analysis to include such matters as "syntactic paraphrase"—to an extent, decompacting a compound formation, e.g., *teblere* 'someone who [-ere] gambles or has to do with gambling [*tebl*]' (135)—and "semantic structure," which "is probably the most complex level and thus also the most difficult to describe in a systematic and satisfactory way. In the case of complex words, at least a threefold distinction can be made, that is between reference, sense (meaning) and the internal relation of the constituents" (135). Sauer has over the course of a number of studies constructed an intensely in-depth description of the OE vocabulary of Épinal-Erfurt, in fact, in its detail and classificatory specificity, it might be said that this early glossary (its genesis belonging approximately to the third quarter of the seventh century) will by Sauer's researches be the most thoroughly analyzed OE text in terms of morphology and lexis. Sauer's "Adverbs and Adverbials in the Earliest English Text (Épinal-Erfurt)," (*Language and Text*, ed. Johnston et al., 255–68), was reviewed in this section last year, and in earlier issues were reviewed his important "The Old English Suffix *-el/-il/-ol/-ul/-l* (>Mod E *-le*, cf. *beetle*, *girdle*, *thistle*) as Attested in the *Épinal-Erfurt Glossary*" (*Innovation and Continuity in English Studies: A Critical Jubilee*, ed. Herbert Grables [Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2001], 289–314), and two studies on other vocabulary sub-groupings (or semantic fields) from this glossary that appeared in 1999: "Old English Plant Names in the Épinal-Erfurt Glossary: Etymology, Word-Formation and Semantics" (*Words, Lexemes, Concepts: Approaches to the Lexicon: Studies in Honour of Leonhard Lipka*, ed. Wolfgang Falkner and Hans-Jörg Schmid [Tübingen: Narr], 23–38), and "Animal Names in the Épinal-Erfurt Glossary" (*Text and Gloss: Studies in Insular Learning and Literature Presented to Joseph Donovan Pheifer*, ed. Helen Conrad-O'Briain et al. [Dublin: Four Courts], 128–58). The ca. sixty-four names for people (their status, and occupations) seem to constitute a relatively restricted lexical set in the context of the ca. 1100 Latin lemmata (out of the glossary's ca. 3280 Latin lemmata overall) glossed by OE; by comparison, Sauer noted more than 120 plant names in Épinal-Erfurt and more than 110 animal names. Of course, this early glossary is not a dictionary in the modern comprehensive sense but a work of useful or "hard" words based upon commonly read texts in the monastic schools (classical and postclassical Latin authors). Thus, it is a little difficult to gauge the significance that "The number of clearly

marked names for women (circa six) is much smaller than that of the names for men.... It is also striking that relatively many of the names for women have a negative denotation or connotation (*cebisae*, *haegtis*, *mera*)" (122). The pejorative forms listed, *cebisae*, i.e. *cifes* (Erfurt *caebis*) 'concubine, kept mistress, harlot', *haegtis* (*haegtesse*; Erfurt *hegtis*) 'fury, witch' (Clark Hall-Meritt adds 'pythoness'), and *mera* (as in the surviving element *-mare* in *nightmare*) 'female incubus', involve some context dependency here that is glossarial—that is, dependent upon native interpretations of classical or patristic allusions or lore. Thus *mera/mare* is seen as pejorative but *uuydu-mer* 'wood-nymph' (glossing Echo) is not (when it may very well have been part and parcel of 'pagan' lore to a Christian scribe). *Hægtes(se)* occurs outside the glossaries also and may not just refer to classical 'witches' or 'sorceresses'. Eminently useful is the division of the ca. sixty-four terms for people/persons into five sub-groupings based on semantic fields: kinship; profession and occupation; warlike or destructive occupation (including the historically interesting *uicing-sceadan*, as this instance of *wicing* 'pirate' antedates the Vikings); status, social relation and interaction; mythology, extrasensorial and extraterrestrial world. A sixth grouping considers the class 'women, females' in the semantic sub-groupings: kinship; Gods, mythology; demons, witches; stars (122–23). The last classification for female nouns for persons consists of one instance *pliadas: sifunsterri*; here the Pleiades are de-mythologized and de-personalized by loan translation to "the seven stars." Sauer's study is a thoroughly programmatic one, divided into ten sections, which are then, often, as with section six "Morphology, especially word-formation" (133 ff.), further sub-divided; the useful word lists in section ten (163–70) include a mini-glossary of sorts of the sixty-four OE names and the Latin lemmata they render in Épinal-Erfurt. Occasionally a sub-section may be too brief; thus section 5.1 'Indo-European' notes that "[o]f the c. 64 words for people in *ÉpErf*, only c. four can be traced back to Indo-European; all of them simple nouns" (127), which may be an under-estimate; possibly one could add *burg-leod* as the first element likely derives from PIE for 'high'; Ringe traces OE *burg/burh* to PGmc. **burg-* 'hill-fort' < (post-)PIE **b^hǵh-* 'hill' (Don Ringe, *From Proto-Indo-European to Proto-Germanic* [2008], 82); OE *læce* 'physician', traced by Sauer to PGmc. **lækjaz* [127] Ringe gives as **lækijaz* [222; compare Gothic *lekeis*]). Sauer concludes by observing that "[e]ventually, this study could be expanded into a more comprehensive survey of the areas mentioned as attested in *Épinal-Erfurt*, but especially as far as word-formation is concerned"

(162); one could say that Sauer has already written a monograph's worth of material on precisely that matter, material that is already important not just to the interpretation of this very early OE text but to OE vocabulary and word formation overall.

As to "The Origins of the Theophoric Week in the Germanic Languages," *Early Medieval Europe* 15: 386–401, Philip Shaw outlines a proposal to locate the names of the days of the week later than has generally been supposed—not from Roman-Germanic interactions in the fourth century AD (or earlier), but in a Christianizing or Christianized milieu as late as the seventh or eighth centuries as a "plausible alternative model" (387). Shaw follows the course of naming days for the "great gods" in late Roman imperial times through the early medieval period, from presumed Romano-Germanic contacts (the epigraphic evidence seems particularly abundant on the Rhine frontier in the fourth century; 393–5) to the evidence of the Romance languages. The focus is on Germanic, OE and OHG in particular; standard and dialectal forms brought into play: *Mittwoch* < OHG *mittaweche*, *Samstag* < OHG *sambaztag* < MLat. *sambatun dies*, or, as "[l]ess common alternatives to the planetary names" (388), *Ertag* ('Tuesday', in Bavarian), *phinztag* ('Thursday', 'the fifth day'), *pherintag* ('Friday', from Greek *paraskewe*), *aftermontag* ('after Monday' = 'Tuesday', in the Augsburg diocese), and *sunâbent* ('sun evening' = 'Saturday', in MHG). Linguistically, Shaw focuses mainly on the matter of the direction of the calques (loan translations), preferring a Christianizing or missionary milieu rather than a pre-Christian Romano-Germanic one; other linguistic arguments, as of internal (phonological) evidence, are not brought to bear. One point of objection to the "early dating" consensus Shaw raises is apparent inconsistency in the *interpretationes germanicae* of the "great gods," especially in some Romano-Germanic votive inscriptions to Mercury, Mars, and Hercules (394–5); this is compared to Tacitus's account in the *Germania* and "[i]f, as seems likely, his fullest information on Germanic tribes came from the Rhine region, then the picture he received would have been just what has been outlined here: Mercury received the widest cult, while Hercules and Mars were also both significant deities. The existence of these *interpretationes germanicae* calls into question the claim that the names of the days of the week reflect Germanic loan-translations of the Latin names in the late Roman period. It is apparent from these votive inscriptions that different Germanic groups, even within a relatively restricted geographical area, equated quite a variety of deities with Mercury and Mars. It would be surprising indeed if all or most of

these tribes chose to equate two different deities (to whom no extant votive inscriptions attest) with Mercury and Mars in the specific context of naming the days of the week. The simplest way of accounting for this data is to suppose that the Germanic day-names were borrowed from Latin in a different cultural context" (395). The very interesting subject under consideration and outline of an alternative explanation by Shaw to the Germanic theophoric names of days of the week deserved much more development. The last point cited, for instance, could serve to vary the direction of loan translation (from pagan Germanic to a Christianizing milieu, rather than from late Roman to early GMC) but not necessarily the chronology—at some point in the chain of transmission one has to grapple with what are, to a Christian milieu, pagan gods. No doubt part and parcel of a general skepticism of all things "pagan" (indeed, Shaw cites the late Christine Fell's "Paganism in *Beowulf*: A Semantic Fairy-Tale," *Pagans and Christians: The Interplay between Christian Latin and Traditional Germanic Cultures in Early Medieval Europe*, ed. T. Hofstra, L.A.J.R. Houwen and A.A. MacDonald [Groningen, 1995], 9–34), one still wishes to see pointed out the serious problems with the consensus view. The reference to inconsistencies in *interpretationes germanicae* is actually to be expected: a quick comparative look at Romano-Celtic votive cults, for which we have far more abundant evidence than Romano-Germanic (especially in Gaul and Britain), as of, for instance, Mars Rigisamus (to whom was dedicated a bronze votive plate found at West Coker, Somerset; cf. R.G. Collingwood, "Mars Rigisamus," *Somerset Archaeology and Natural History Society* 77 [1931]: 112–14), would indicate that such varying identifications, alignments, and re-alignments of the "great gods" among native traditions of cult would be the norm—especially as we often rely upon such Romano-Celtic or Romano-Germanic pairings to tell us the significance of the indigenous counterpart (a point of vital moment to Shaw's argument: that we know much more about the Greek or Roman "great gods" and the direction of inquiry is normatively from classical pagan to late [Germanic, Celtic] pagan). Perhaps unfair to the body of work that is the consensus view is that it is rehearsed from only one source: the work of Dennis Howard Green (see his *Language and History in the Early Germanic World* [Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998]). Given the subject, surprisingly little has been cited from German-language sources: not even Kluge (*Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*, 24th ed., ed. Elmar Seebold [Berlin: De Gruyter, 2002]). Reference to "very early loan words" in OE (389) is to Campbell's

Grammar (§530), but not Alfred Wollmann's *Untersuchungen den frühen lateinischen Lehnwörtern im Altenglischen: Phonologie und Datierung* (Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1990). While it is suggested that "[w]e would be unwise to place great reliance on i-mutation as evidence for a pre-migration borrowing of the name [sæterdæg]" (390), the chronology of changes in PGmc. and early OE is not considered. The citation of Jonas of Bobbio's *Vita sancti Columbani* as containing "what could be the first equation of one of the great gods with a Graeco-Roman god, apparently equating Wodan with Mercury" (396) is highly interesting (as is the Irish-Alemannic milieu involved); so too that "[t]he Old English glossaries provide evidence of deliberate, scholarly efforts to equate Mercury with Wodan and Mars with Tiw and Jove with Thonar" (396), though this is not followed up with actual citation of said glossaries. In noting that "[i]n no case of which the present author is aware is any of these gods called Wodan, Thonar or Tiw, or anything similar to these names" (394) in the early votive inscriptions, Shaw raises a point not so much invalidating the early dating of theophoric names of days of the week as delimiting the corpus of evidence: the early Germanic tribes were by and large not widely literate; early runic inscriptions are often difficult to interpret, and often what we believe we know about the early Germans comes from their literate Mediterranean neighbors (from Caesar to Tacitus to Procopius). Shaw later notes that "[i]n England, in contrast, Woden was enthusiastically adopted by the Christian English as a royal ancestor figure" (399; citation here only of Bede although the royal genealogies would have been of good use); one could note that so too did the pagan Anglo-Saxons. A line of evidence not considered is the numismatic; whereas we do not have much clear evidence of the citation of a god such as *Tiwaz so named, one might ask, as one can in the case of the early votive inscriptions and statue dedications, whether one finds the "great gods" depicted by other means. Compare the "Wodan"-head silver to base sceattas with stylized portrait of the god on the obverse, and a stylized, often dragon-like monster on the reverse, usually dated to between AD 695 and 740, with a number of surviving exemplars minted in Frisia and imported (cf. Philip Grierson and Mark Blackburn, *Medieval European Coinage: with a Catalogue of the Coins in the Fitzwilliam Museum*, Vol. 1, [Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1986]). Here one finds Wodan/Woden, if one is looking for him. Shaw's "The Theophoric Week in the Germanic Languages" is an interesting overview of a fascinating subject, and a tentative advancement of an alternative dating to the loan translation process

(seventh to eighth centuries, rather than first to fourth); much more detailed work remains to be done, which one hopes will occur soon.

The abstract to Kenichi Tamoto's Sophia University (Tokyo) 2001 dissertation "The Old English Words Rendering *Virgo*, *Virginitas* and *Puella* in the Anglo-Saxon Gospels: Their Semasiological Background in Anglo-Saxon Literature" (*DAI* 68A [2007], 585, and YUSODO (Japan Doctorial Dissertation Registration System [2006])), provides the preface and table of contents to this highly concentrated look at renderings of words for "virgin" and "virginity" in the Anglo-Saxon Gospels (here especially meant are the Rushworth and Lindisfarne glosses); a primary focus is placed upon *fæmne* (and *fæmnhad*), *hagosteald*, *mægden* (and variants), though the table of contents to this 950-page plus dissertation indicates consideration of every instance of each of the OE renderings to the Latin terms in the title as available in the length and breadth of the *DOE Corpus*.

Joyce Hill's "Dialogues with the Dictionary: Five Case Studies," *Making Sense*, ed. Healey and Kiernan, 23–39, is reviewed in section 4a.

JMcG

Works Not Seen:

- Bammesberger, Alfred. "The Etymology of Germanic **idis-*." *NOWELE* 52 (2007), 81–89.
- Battles, Paul. "What Is 'Middle-Earth'? Origin, Evolution, and Mythic Function." *Constructing Nations, Reconstructing Myth*. Ed. Wawn. [see sec. 2] pp. 319–42.
- Bulotta, Donata. "Anglo-Saxon Female Clothing: Old English *cyrtel* and *tunec*." *Rivista di cultura classica e medioevale* 49 (2007), 307–25.
- Cortés Rodríguez, Francisco J., and Marta González Orta. "Anglo-Saxon Verbs of Sound: Semantic Architecture, Lexical Representation and Constructions." *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 42 (2006): 249–84.
- Dietz, Klaus. "Denominale Abstraktbildungen des Altenglischen: Die Wortbildung der Abstrakta auf *-dōm*, *-hād*, *-lāc*, *-rāden*, *-sceaft*, *-stæf* und *-wist* und ihrer Entsprechungen im Althochdeutschen und im Altnordischen." *Beiträge zur Morphologie: Germanisch, Baltisch, Ostseefinnisch*. Ed. Hans Fix. *NOWELE* Supplement 23. Odense: Univ. Press of Southern Denmark, 2007. pp. 97–172.
- Esteve Ramos, María José. "Different Aspects of the Specialized Nomenclature of Ophthalmology in Old and Middle English." *Bells Chiming from the Past*. Ed. Moskowich-Spiegel and Crespo-García. [see sec. 3b] pp. 151–67.

- Expósito González, María Cruz. "Some Aspects of Semantic and Lexical Change: From Old English to Middle English." *Insights and Bearings*. Ed. Brito et al. [see sec. 2] pp. 63–77.
- Hall, Alaric. "The Etymology and Meanings of *eldritch*." *Scottish Language* 26 (2007): 16–22.
- Hirao, Masayuki. "The Vocabulary in the West-Saxon Gospel according to St John." *Takushoku Language Studies* (Tokyo) 114 (2007): 143–53. [in Japanese]
- Inoue, Shoki. "A Glossary of the Old English *Letter of Alexander to Aristotle*." *Jnl of Okayama Shoka Univ.* 42.3 (March 2007): 87–132.
- Kerttula, Seija. "Relative Basicness of Color Terms: Modeling and Measurement." *Anthropology of Color*. Ed. MacLaury et al. pp. 151–69.
- Killie, Kristin. "On the Source(s) and Grammaticalization of the Germanic *-lik* Suffix." *NM* 108 (2007): 659–82.
- Kortlandt, Frederik. "English *bottom*, German *Boden*, and the Chronology of Sound Shifts." *Amsterdamer Beiträge zur älteren Germanistik* 63 (2007): 5–8. [OE *botm*]
- Kotake, Tadashi. "Old English *andswarian* and *andwyrðan*: A Stylistic Choice?" *Colloquia* (Keio Univ., Tokyo) 28 (2007): 1–12.
- Lenker, Ursula. "*Forhwi* 'because': Shifting Deictics in the History of English Causal Connection." *Connectives in the History of English*. Ed. Lenker and Meurman-Solin. pp. 193–227.
- Lenker, Ursula, and Anneli Meurman-Solin, eds. *Connectives in the History of English*. Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science, Series IV: Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 283. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2007. viii, 318 pp.
- López-Couso, María José. "Adverbial Connectives within and beyond Adverbial Subordination: The History of *lest*." *Connectives in the History of English*. Ed. Lenker and Meurman-Solin. pp. 11–29.
- Los, Bettelou. "*To* as a Connective in the History of English." *Connectives in the History of English*. Ed. Lenker and Meurman-Solin. pp. 31–60.
- MacLaury, Robert E.; Galina V. Paramei, and Don Dedrick, eds. *Anthropology of Color: Interdisciplinary Multilevel Modeling*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2007. xx, 485 pp. ill.
- Mańczak, Witold. "Ancien anglais *mæþelian*, *mæþlan*, *mæþlan*." *Kwartalnik neofilologiczny* 54 (2007): 23–25. [response to Don Ringe, below]
- Méndez Naya, Belén. "Adjunct, Modifier, Discourse Marker: On the Various Functions of *right* in the History of English." *Folia Linguistica Historica* 27 (2006): 141–95. [OE *riht*, *rihte*]
- Molencski, Rafał. "The Evolution of *since* in Medieval English." *Connectives in the History of English*. Ed. Lenker and Meurman-Solin. pp. 97–113.
- Pierce, Marc. "The Book and the Beech Tree Revisited: The Life Cycle of a Germanic Etymology." *Historische Sprachforschung* 119 (2006): 273–82.
- Pons-Sanz, Sara M. *Norse-Derived Vocabulary in Late Old English Texts: Wulfstan's Works. A Case Study*. NOWELE Supplement 22. Odense: Univ. Press of Southern Denmark, 2007. xviii, 318 pp.
- _____. "Two Compounds in the Old English and Old Norse Versions of the *Prose Phoenix*." *Arkiv för nordisk filologi* 122 (2007): 137–56.
- Ringe, Don. "Old English *mæþelian*, *mæþlan*, *mæþlan*." *Indo-European Perspectives*. Ed. Penney. [see sec. 2] pp. 417–35.
- Rissanen, Matti. "From *oþ* to *till*: Early Loss of an Adverbial Subordinator." *Connectives in the History of English*. Ed. Lenker and Meurman-Solin. pp. 61–75.
- Roméro, Céline. "De *ÐURFAN* à *NEED*: histoire d'une disparition." *Anglophonia: French Jnl of English Studies* 22 (2007): 179–204.
- Sauer, Hans. "Adverbs and Adverbials in the Earliest English Text (Épinal-Erfurt)." *Language and Text*. Ed. Johnston et al. [see sec. 2] pp. 255–68.
- Sayers, William. "The Old English Antecedents of *ferry* and *wherry*." *ANQ* 20.2 (Spring 2007): 3–8.
- Toeda, Kazuyoshi. "A Study of Old English *hyge*." *Keizai Ronshu: The Economic Review of Tokyo Univ.* 33.1 (December 2007): 55–69.*
- Voss, Manfred. "Zur Abschrift des alphabetischen Cleopatraglossars in MS British Library Cotton Otho E.i." *Language and Text*. Ed. Johnston et al. [see sec. 2] pp. 393–409.
- Warburton, David A. "Basic Color Term Evolution in Light of Ancient Evidence from the Near East." *Anthropology of Color*. Ed. MacLaury et al. pp. 229–46.

3b. Syntax, Phonology, Other Aspects

Phonology, etc.

Thomas Cable offers a brief reminiscence of his collaboration with Albert C. Baugh and an outline of his ongoing re-imagination of their widely used textbook in "A History of the English Language," *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Teaching* 14: 17–25. Cable reviews Baugh's early editions of the book against the broader sweeping changes in linguistics and in the composition of the English-speaking world from the 1920s and early 1930s when Baugh wrote the first edition. Cable's collaboration on the book began with its third edition,

published in 1978, and Cable has updated and revised it in subsequent editions in 1993 and 2002. That *A History of the English Language* has been a classroom standard for nearly three-quarters of a century stands as proof of its esteem in the minds of many who teach the subject, but it is also a rather profound statement on the pedagogical inconsequence of the radical evolution of linguistics over the same period. Cable notes the ways in which the study of language transformed itself more than once since the first publication of the book, and points out, too, how little impact these transformations have had on what the book delivers to instructors and to students. “A moral to draw from the successes and failures of twentieth-century narratives and summaries of the history of the language,” Cable drolly states, “is that developments in linguistic theory have only limited usefulness” (19). Instead, the radical changes from structuralist to Chomskyan to post-Chomskyan theories of language provide only “incremental improvements” that are “minor within the context of the whole picture” (20). And anyone who has taught a course on the history of the English language understands the basic truth of Cable’s observation here. The sorts of changes that Cable describes as having formed the bulk of improvements to the third, fourth, and fifth editions of the textbook have practically nothing to do with the development of linguistic theory and have been dictated instead by developments in English as a post-colonial, world-wide language.

In “Palatalized and Velarized Consonants in English against their Germanic Background, with special reference to *i*-umlaut” (*Managing Chaos: Strategies for Identifying Change in English*, ed. Christopher M. Cain and Geoffrey Russom [Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter], 5–36), Anatoly Liberman offers a sweeping revisionist history of sound change in English that concludes with the startling declaration that “[h]istorical phonology does not need allophones. They are beyond reconstruction...” (28). Only someone whose knowledge of the Germanic languages is as vast and whose understanding of the complicated body of scholarship on the subject is as deep as Liberman’s could hope to craft an argument that delivers such resounding apostasy to the world of historical linguistics. Few scholars are in a position to cast such radical doubt on the basic assumptions underlying an entire discipline; Liberman’s expertise is unassailable, though, and the avalanche of learning he pours out here demonstrates that serious scholarship need not be securely entrenched within conventional thinking. And it is not as if the matter of palatalized and velarized consonants does not present opportunities for out-of-the-box thinking, since these segments

are implicated in so many (sometimes contradictory) phonological processes in the Germanic languages. The matter of umlaut, moreover, poses challenges of its own, not the least of which is the somewhat absurd history of bellicose rhetoric in the scholarship: anyone who dares commit his or her ideas on umlaut to print must be prepared to be subsequently attacked in print. Liberman is undeterred: “Knowing this [history of scholarly discord] and having read just about everything written on umlaut and breaking in Germanic, I have little doubt that I, too, will go the way of all flesh. However, the temptation to join the conspiracy of the doomed turned out to be stronger than common sense and the instinct of self-preservation” (14–15).

And we are fortunate for the author’s bravado because his essay is an uncommonly learned piece of scholarship that reconsiders some of the fundamentals of historical phonology, at the very heart of which lies phonetic assimilation. Assimilatory processes are the mother’s milk of practically all explanations of palatalization, velarization, and umlaut, but Liberman calls assimilation a “false lead” (15) and points out that assimilation fails the test of explanatory adequacy because it is a phonological *primum movens* without beginning and without end. As Liberman states, “[i]f Old English breaking was due to the velar quality of /l r h/, the question arises why their backness did not affect the preceding vowels three centuries earlier or two centuries later” (15). Liberman provides an explanation of umlaut without assimilation and without allophones, relying instead on the palatalization of intervocalic consonants to explain the change. Of course, when Liberman assails assimilation as an inadequate explanation of umlaut, he is talking about non-contact assimilation, the influence of post-tonic *i* and *j* on the preceding radical vowel, for the hypothesis that he advances asserts that West Germanic germination resulted in palatalized phonemes, not allophones, whose “influence... on preceding vowels consisted in the transfer of their *distinctive features* to the vocalic nucleus of the syllable” (27). Under Liberman’s theory, the label “*i*-umlaut” is a misnomer, since the distinctive palatalization of vowels could have happened before or after the deletion of the following *i* or *j*, those two segments’ distinctive feature having been transferred to the intervocalic consonant(s).

Duncan Probert contributes a careful study of aspects of the phonology of Brittonic toponyms in Old English in “Mapping Early Medieval Language Change in South-West England” (*Britons in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. N.J. Higham [see sec. 6], 231–44). The paucity of names showing Brittonic forms in the southwest can be negotiated, the author suggests, through close

attention to the relative chronologies of phonological changes in Old English and in Celtic in the few forms that are attested. The stability and reliability of the phonological changes established by philologists offer possibilities for interpretation of the evidence that a lack of quantity has traditionally discouraged. As Probert states, "English place-names with the potential to have been affected by early medieval developments in Brittonic may indicate whether or not these had occurred when each place-name was adopted by English speakers" (234). The author first considers Old English borrowings of British /ū/ and Brittonic /ū̄/, and he finds that, in the area east of Dorset, Brittonic survived into the mid-sixth century and possibly after the mid-seventh century. In the Old English borrowing of lenited British /m/, the evidence suggests the possibility of borrowing into the eighth century. Furthermore, "pretonic reduction" in British, in which a high vowel reduced before a stressed syllable, "implies a local Brittonic developing into Primitive Welsh that survived into the late sixth century" (243), although "internal i-affection," in which /i/ or /e/ modified the vowel of the preceding syllable, may indicate a borrowing in or after the later seventh century. The sum of Probert's work may demonstrate that enclaves of Brittonic speakers in the southwest survived well past the time that Anglo-Saxons achieved political control of these border areas as well as the presence of English speakers by the late sixth century, casting some light on a particularly dark part of Anglo-Saxon England's settlement history. Though the use of some rather old-fashioned Celticist linguistic terminology poses something of an obstacle to comprehension, the steadiness of Probert's exposition rewards patient readers with a meaningful contribution to the eternally difficult subject of Anglo-Saxons' contact with their British neighbors.

In volume one of the new Oxford University Press series *A Linguistic History of English*, Don Ringe guides us *From Proto-Indo-European to Proto-Germanic*. It is a handbook of Proto-Indo-European and Proto-Germanic phonology and morphology in the tradition of handbooks such as those by Brugmann, Hirt, Prokosch, Kuryłowicz, and Szemerényi, to name a few. Given the already substantial list of rather similar titles in the bibliography of Indo-European studies and *Germanistik*, one may ask what justifies another contribution, particularly one as conservative as Ringe's. Oxford University Press has undertaken to publish a multi-volume linguistic history of the language, so, naturally, the first volume deals with the prehistory of English. But the presentation of the prehistory of English is so mechanically conventional in *From Proto-Indo-European to*

Proto-Germanic that the only practical advantage the book confers over its other numerous direct competitors is its updated bibliography. That said, the book is a new, comprehensive, carefully written treatment of the phonological and morphological relationship of Proto-Germanic to its parent language. The author assumes "a basic grounding in *modern* linguistics" and a basic familiarity with the principles of "language change" (2) in this book for advanced students and non-linguistic specialists. Ringe's book is likely destined to become the standard basic handbook on Proto-Germanic by virtue of its recentness, though it can hardly be said to have replaced any of the other titles in its tradition since it bears such a close affinity to them.

After a very brief general introduction, Ringe shifts immediately to the nuts-and-bolts exposition of Proto-Indo-European phonology and morphology in Chapter 2 and the literally hundreds of reconstructed and attested forms that compose the bulk of the book. As with other similar handbooks of this kind, the emphasis here is on establishing inventories and paradigms, but the book's diachronic focus takes center stage in its third chapter, which outlines the development of Proto-Germanic from the Proto-Indo-European systems described in the first chapter. This third chapter, the book's core, emphasizes the basic rule ordering required to derive the inventories and paradigms of Chapter 4 "Proto-Germanic" from those established for Proto-Indo-European in the second chapter. A requirement for usability in handbooks of this kind is a thorough, comprehensive index of reconstructed and attested forms, and Ringe's book delivers ably on this count. But a subject index would have been most helpful, too, since the list of contents is general enough to leave those searching for specific information in a bit of a dark wood.

Geoffrey Russom considers "Literary Form as an Independent Domain of Validation in HEL Pedagogy" (*Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Teaching* 14: 47–54), particularly as verse structure appeals to the creative writing students in Russom's course on the history of the English language. The author identifies a few strategies for engaging creative writing students as "excellent lead learners" (47) who take great interest in the mechanics of the language. For example, he points out some of the ways that he emphasizes basic linguistic concepts, like syllable structure, through a demonstration of perception of rhyme in verse. This strategy also allows him, he suggests, to plumb greater depths of linguistic sophistication than history of the English language textbooks generally reach. The larger (and completely valid) point that Russom's short pedagogical

article makes is that instructors of the English language must constantly scramble for methods that make use of the familiar in teaching the unfamiliar to students who are generally radically unprepared for the subject. And he shows that it need not be a trade-off between familiarity and sophistication. For example, Russom writes that the “failure to be more specific about shortening environments [in Middle English] illustrates a widespread reluctance in writing for English or Education majors to present too much ‘technical detail’” (51), even though examples of syllabication in Present Day English can be used to show students the “technical details” of a historical change such as Middle English shortening.

Jeremy J. Smith’s *Sound Change and the History of English* (Oxford: Oxford UP) is aimed at, as the author states, “advanced undergraduate and postgraduate students” (xi), but the book shoulders a burden that goes beyond that usually carried by a student’s introductory text. Phonological histories of English, which are by no means scarce in the bibliography of the history of the English language, are practically annalistic in their simplicity; though the chronology of sound changes can be an exceedingly complex matter, the overall project of historical phonology is, on the face of it, the relatively uninspired task of establishing a timeline. Smith suggests at the outset that explaining why sound change happens (in addition to the standard concerns with what changes and when these changes occur) should be a primary focus of historical linguistics—after all, “Why?” is not a question that historians of other subjects modestly decline to ask. So Smith sets for himself the task of providing a guide to just three major sound changes in the history of English (breaking in Old English, lengthening processes in Middle English, and the Great Vowel Shift) while attempting to address delicate externalities for why these changes may have occurred. In sum, the book is a theoretical exposition of social factors that may have contributed to the conditioning of these sound changes and becomes an argument (in the growing chorus of arguments) for the suitability of the study of sociolinguistics in historical works.

Coming in at a slim 196 pages, Smith’s book is a brisk reading of English historical phonology: no Luickian proportions here. The first chapter, “On Explaining Sound Change,” is, essentially, a Labovian introduction to major sociolinguistic concepts such as speaker innovation, contact, adaptation, and actuation. The first chapter makes clear to readers that what they are holding is a sociolinguistic history of English phonology. The advent of “sociohistorical linguistics” (or, as some apparently prefer, “historical sociolinguistics”)

has offered possibilities for studying aspects of language change that were previously regarded as so utterly irretrievable that mention of the social forces animating diachronic change was practically anathema to any serious historical linguist, and this attitude is still rather pervasive. So Smith’s attempt to combine traditionally asocial English historical phonology with the still-nascent acceptance of sociological explanations for language change is bound to cause some to dismiss the book as not sufficiently serious about phonology. After all, the book’s approach does exploit just three major sound changes in English, all of which are uncommonly accommodating to the sort of sociolinguistic analysis the author promotes as a better way ahead for the discipline. Some people are going to find pronouncements like “A postmodern historical linguistics is conceptually possible” (156) to be deeply troubling; Smith’s point, though, is that the “scientism” of historical linguistics has blinded its practitioners to the idea-making which forms part of the practice of actual science, and so they press on secure in their complete refusal to engage in explanations for language change. In the end, English historical phonology is just a staging ground for Smith’s larger construction of a theory of historical linguistics that is intensely historical.

Chapter 2, “On Evidence,” discusses the nature of textual witnesses in historical language study and addresses fundamental issues like writing systems and specific forms of evidence like verse, contemporary commentary, and reconstruction. Chapter 3, “Phonological Approaches and Processes,” establishes the eclectic formal and theoretical practices of the book by explaining the fundamentals of taxonomic phonology, the insights of Generative Phonology, and the possibilities of Natural and Evolutionary Phonology, gathering them all together, and deploying their various tools within a broad sociolinguistic framework. The chapter also contains a kind of case study of Grimm’s Law to illustrate how such an eclectic approach might apply in the study of historical phonology. Chapters 4, 5, and 6 apply this model to Old English breaking, Middle English lengthening, and the Great Vowel Shift, respectively. A brief final chapter, “On the Historiography of Sound Change,” surveys attitudes toward the presumed impossibility of “doing” a *genuinely historical* historical linguistics, followed by two appendices on the principal sound changes in the history of English and on Middle English Open Syllable Lengthening. The book is frequently profound in its querying of the fundamental theoretical propositions that have underpinned historical linguistics, yet I cannot escape the conclusion that its reception will mirror the effects of a

Rorschach inkblot test: those who champion the possibilities of expanding the historical linguistics enterprise to include explanation as a legitimate twin imperative to description will see in Smith's book a taut, forcefully argued, and elegantly demonstrated exposition of the "new way" of doing historical linguistics; those who believe that "language change is not amenable to proper explanation" (157) will likely view Smith's book as an exercise in futility. But there is also the competition of basic scholarly epistemologies at stake in the consequences of Smith's take on historical English phonology. Is the point of scholarship in historical linguistics to reduce the interpretive possibilities through the application of a set of protocols designed to progressively narrow potential meanings, or is the point of scholarship in historical linguistics to discover new paths of interpretation by which potential meanings are multiplied? This is the "postmodernist challenge" (157) that Smith outlines near the close of his book, and as a proponent of the latter point of view, he demonstrates that acceptance of alternative meanings is not a substitution for intellectual rigor, as those who hold the former point of view sometimes charge.

Studies of the language of individual texts in the history of early English have long formed the basis for generalizations about the language of specific time periods, for the dearth of sources requires that it be so. Perhaps scholarship has invested no individual text with greater significance for the early history of English than the *Peterborough Chronicle*, owing to the pervasive assumption that its language marks a transition from Old English to early Middle English. *The Language of the Peterborough Chronicle* (ed. Alexander Bergs and Janne Skaffari [Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang]) gathers papers from a workshop held during the Thirteenth International Conference on Historical Linguistics (Vienna, 2007): Alexander Bergs and Janne Skaffari, "Invitation to the Peterborough Chronicle and Its Language"; Malasree Home, "*The Peterborough Chronicle* in Context"; Betty S. Phillips, "Æ-Raising in the *Peterborough Chronicle*"; Alexander Bergs, "Spoilt for Choice? <THE> Problem <DE> in <DE> *Peterborough Chronicle*"; Agnieszka Pysz, "The Usage of Demonstratives in the *Peterborough Chronicle* against the Background of the Old English Paradigm"; Cynthia L. Allen, "The Case of the Genitive in the *Peterborough Chronicle*"; Elly van Gelderen, "Accelerated Grammaticalization in the *Peterborough Chronicle*"; Lynn Simms, "Do the Verb-Movement Patterns in the *Peterborough Chronicle* Reflect the Influence of a Northern Dialect?"; Bridget Drinka, "The Periphrastic Perfect in Early English: Evidence from the *Peterborough Chronicle*"; Oliver

M. Traxel, "Linking Old English and Middle English: The *Peterborough Chronicle* as an Introductory Tool to the History of English"; Carol Percy, "'To HEL with PC': Teaching 'The History of the English Language' with the *Peterborough Chronicle* in North America." The so-called "Final Continuation" of the *Peterborough Chronicle*, which includes annals from 1132 to 1154, is assumed to be one of the earliest extant examples of Middle English; this section is written in a form that is clearly different from the late Old English standard literary form of the earlier annals, making the *Peterborough Chronicle*, by some scholars' estimation, a text that captures language change in English for a period in which surviving texts are exceedingly rare, so the essays of this volume mostly focus on linguistic innovation in the text and therefore look forward to Middle English much less than backward to Old English. The papers here consider the historical, phonological, morphological, syntactic, and orthographic features of the *Peterborough Chronicle* and form a wide enough arc around the text to serve as a general introduction to its study. Most of the papers (especially those by Phillips, Pysz, and Gelderen) focus on demonstrating how the English of the *Peterborough Chronicle* is more "Middle" than "Old," although Drinka's paper demonstrates how one feature, periphrastic perfect constructions, remain archaic throughout the text.

Most of the papers that bear directly on the language of the *Peterborough Chronicle* strike this reader as rather strong contributions to the study of Early Middle English; the final two papers dealing with the classroom applications of the text, Traxel's (see below) and Percy's, while less useful than the others, satisfy a seeming requirement in such volumes these days that pedagogical matters be addressed as well. A few papers in the collection deserve extra notice here. Home's paper provides a very useful introduction to the historical, linguistic, and scholarly contexts of the *Peterborough Chronicle* and therefore makes a very welcome contribution in its synthesis of research and in its sensible framing of the most important issues in the study of the text. Betty S. Phillips' paper on æ-raising (see below) begins by taking the orthography of the text as "likely to be phonetic" (30) and proceeds to spin out a theoretically elaborate phonetic description of the evidence that runs markedly counter to many scholars' increasingly agnostic stance toward the possibility of recovering sub-phonemic details from manuscript spelling data. In fact, many of the papers are highly focused on assembling systematic phonological descriptions of the orthography of the *Peterborough Chronicle* (especially the "Final Continuation") since so much earlier

scholarship had settled on the text's spellings as simply chaotic, which Bergs calls "an unproductive simplification" (p. 45). Allen, Gelderen, Simms, and Drinka investigate morphosyntactic phenomena in the text. Allen finds that the "Interpolations," the "non-copied" parts of the *Peterborough Chronicle*, provide evidence for a more clitic-like (than inflection-like) genitive case, an innovation that forms a bridge between the Old English and Modern English genitives. Gelderen examines the grammaticalization of prepositions to complementizers and adverbs to aspectual markers and concludes that the increased frequency of each in the "Final Continuations" "symbolizes the true start of M[iddle] E[n]glish" (93). Simms studies verb-movement patterns "involving nominal and pronominal subjects when single and multiple topics are involved to determine if they reflect a more northern or a more southern Middle English dialect" (133). The author finds that Scribe A of the "First Continuation" mixed the Norse-influenced northern V2 system and the Old English V2 system, while Scribe B of the "Final Continuation" demonstrates a greater southern influence on verb-movement patterns. Drinka tracks the development of collocations with HAVE or BE + a past passive participle in the four sections of the text to conclude that, although the innovation of the construction is apparent, it is not more frequent in the later portions of the text; thus, the evidence "indicates that the *Pet[erborough]C[hronicle]* is closer to OE than to ME in the adoption of the perfect periphrasis" (160). The core essays of *The Language of the Peterborough Chronicle* demonstrate historical linguistics' heightened concern with the text: quantification is a demonstration of one's corpus-linguistic *bona fides*, and few texts lend themselves so readily to tabulation as does the *Peterborough Chronicle*, even as these authors' sometimes dizzying array of graphs, percentages, and totals verges on mere "chart pornography."

Gillian Fellows-Jensen revisits and summarizes a bit of her prodigious contribution to the study of place-name evidence for Scandinavian settlement history in England in "Nordic and English in East Anglia in the Viking Period" (*NOWELE* 50–51: 93–108). She explains that the development of her study of place-name evidence traces a path from a blunt interpretation of the origination and spread of Scandinavian place-names as a natural consequence of the colonization of vacant lands to a more precise hypothesis based on the disintegration of large estates into smaller, individually taxable entities. Fellows-Jensen carefully considers the limited distribution of *-by* names in East Anglia, as opposed to Yorkshire and northwest England, and she recounts the

results of her 1996 paper to explain patterns of distribution, a work that has been overlooked, she suggests (no doubt correctly) because it was published in Danish. She also discusses at length her 1999 paper on longstanding problems in place-name study, particularly the absence of *-by* names in East Anglia, although the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* records the Danes' partitioning of the region among themselves in the late ninth century. She points to the island of Flegg in Norfolk as a striking exception because of its thirteen place-names in *-by* out of a total of only about twenty-two in all of East Anglia, and enumerates several scholars' suggestions for an explanation of this isolated disparity. The author believes that the *-by* names in Flegg are of the same kind as those found in Yorkshire and in the East Midlands especially and "were given to them to mark a change in status, perhaps to indicate that they were now to be taxed independently and not as a dependent unit of some large estate" (100). Fellows-Jensen also briefly considers *-þveit* names and *-þorp* names to fill in the gap in East Anglia due to the absence of *-by* names. In conclusion, she states that she is "more and more convinced that the limited distribution of the names in *-by* in East Anglia must reflect the fact that the coining of the names in *-by*" (106) indicated an administrative reality of these units' taxable status.

Robert B. Howell and Katerina Somers Wicka put forth "A Phonetic Account of Anglian Smoothing" (*Folia Linguistica Historica* 28: 187–214). The difficulty that has long plagued an explanation of forms like Anglian *werc*, for example, is that the cluster *-rc* is a trigger for the diphthongization of *e* to *eo* by the widespread change known as "breaking," as in West Saxon *weorc*, which has led scholars to posit the subsequent change in Anglian known as "smoothing," in which the same trigger that earlier caused breaking later causes monophthongization. Howell has spent his entire career on the study of consonantal influences on vowels in Germanic with an emphasis on Old English; this is territory that he knows very well. The consonants *h*, *c*, and *g*, alone and in combination with a preceding liquid, monophthongized the short and long diphthongs *io*, *eo*, *ea* of whatever source most consistently in texts of Anglian provenance. First, following Howell's earlier work on breaking, the authors posit that **/x/* reduced to [h] to become a conditioning factor in breaking, for which it exerted a backing and lowering influence on the preceding vocalic segment. This would solve an apparent problem with the traditional understanding of breaking: if velar [x] conditions breaking, then we should expect the other velars, *c* and *g*, to do the same. Additionally, however, the authors must explain

the presence of [x] in Middle English, so instead of suggesting that Old English [x] traces a path to \emptyset by way of [h], Howell and Wicka point to evidence from Old High German, Middle High German, Gothic, and Modern English that indicates that [h] can be strengthened before obstruents and word-finally to [x], [ç], or [k]. "It is this initially reduced, then strengthened variant of */x/," the authors write, "which is present when the process of Anglian Smoothing takes place" (193-94). Although this phonetic two-step may seem to be unmotivated, Howell and Wicka present evidence from articulatory-perceptual research that suggests that the glottal fricative [h] preceded by a back vocalic element is often perceived as a velar and, therefore, likely to strengthen in this position. This segment, in contact with the front vowel element after the reduction to the radically underspecified schwa of the second element of diphthongs, palatalizes with the variants of /g/ and /k/ to create the smoothing environment. With liquid + consonant combinations, the authors devise a similar weakening-then-strengthening chronology (in this case for the liquid segments): *r/l* preceding the velars results in vowel epenthesis and resyllabification, eliminating the need for a transitional glide, while *r/l* preceding labials and dentals results in liquid reduction and breaking. The Rube Goldbergian design of Howell and Wicka's mechanism to explain breaking and smoothing can be a challenge to the reader and an obstacle to persuasion. They rightly point out that "scholars... have been notably silent with regard to the phonetic facts of the smoothing process" (p. 211), and the deep complexity of their own work here may well indicate a powerful reason for that silence. Still, the evidence for processes of diphthongization and monophthongization in Old English is quite conflicted, so any attempt to make unitary what seems extremely disparate will require a fair amount of reticulation.

Seth Lerer's book *Inventing English* (New York: Columbia UP), as its author states, is "a portable assembly of encounters with the language" (2), but I think that is somewhat too modest an appraisal of what the book actually delivers. It is not a history of the English language textbook, which is one of its virtues; it is a series of chronological vignettes of the language, expressed with a storyteller's design—humorous, informal, anecdotal, and intimate but still exceptionally learned. Seldom has the history of the English language been rendered thus by scholars, who usually focus on internal change versus external change, relegating to the background the way speakers conceptualize their language in a recursion of reinventions over time. *Inventing English* takes as its central principle speakers' self-consciousness

about English usage and change from the Anglo-Saxons to today's "history-free generation" (259). Lerer's book is really the record of a master pedagogue; the chapters capture the relative informality of a classroom setting in which a gifted instructor spins out a narrative on a highly focused topic. The unifying vision of *Inventing English* makes for satisfying reading even as it is a gross reduction of the subject's complexity since it is the subject's sheer baroque-ness (particularly as rendered by scholarship) that stands in the way of viewing a complete image of the history of the English language. The book also concentrates much of its energies on the relationship between the development of the language and the development of English literature, a strategy that brings a suppleness of exposition and a breadth of material to a subject that usually is confined to fairly stale linguistic history.

The first three chapters deal with aspects of Old English. The first of these, "Cædmon Learns to Sing: Old English and the Origins of Poetry," aptly underscores the central orality of the project of studying the history of the language even though all but the last century or so requires us to depend exclusively on written texts. Chapter 2, "From *Beowulf* to Wulfstan: The Language of Old English Literature," asks "[h]ow does Old English literature refract the inheritance of pagan myth and Christian doctrine; how does it give voice to a unique perspective on the world and the imagination?" (25) and focuses on explaining the way that the language of the Anglo-Saxons, especially that of their verse, projects major cultural themes and ideas. Again, this is a history of the English language that is far less concerned with the usual catalog of sound changes than with describing how English speakers have put their language to use over its fifteen hundred-year history. Chapter 3, "In This Year: The Politics of Language and the End of Old English," takes as its emphasis the way that the *Peterborough Chronicle* inscribes the acceleration of change in English after 1066 and the impact of Norman rule on the composition of English. Subsequent chapters on, for example, Chaucer, Shakespeare, and Twain reinforce Lerer's primary interest in the cultural and literary history of the language. Linguistics is not ignored in the book, but neither is it in the foreground; in fact, linguistic information is masterfully, if minimally, woven into the larger narrative of invention that the author creates to support this history of the language. Quite a few popular histories of English have been published, especially in recent years; popular fascination with the history of English has also generated the production of documentary films and television programming, both in the US and in the UK. Lerer

brings an expert's knowledge to a similar kind of project, and the result is a deeply learned, expansive, muscular account of English written with a keen eye for narrative history.

In "English and the Jutland Dialect; Or, the Demise of a Romantic Notion" (*Constructing Nations, Reconstructing Myth*, ed. Wawn [see sec. 2], 97–108), Hans Frede Nielsen revisits the criticism of direct linguistic influence between Old English and the continental Germanic languages that he has published on extensively in his career. His earlier works, such as *Old English and the Continental Germanic Dialects* (2nd ed., 1985), cast a discerning eye on the linguistic evidence that many early scholars had used to prop up the notion that English represented an offshore variety of this or that dialect of Danish or German, and the more local the particular feature the better, since it better satisfied a cultural desire to see ancient connections between modern speakers in the Germanic *Sprachbund*. In this essay, Nielsen considers connections drawn even recently between English and the dialect of southwest Jutland to be the re-emergence of a romantic notion that does not hold up under linguistic scrutiny. Nielsen examines three features that have been supposed to provide evidence for the close linguistic association between West Jutland and English: the preposed definite article, the loss of final unaccented syllables, and the merging of genders. The author points out that chronological problems pose a severe obstacle to the assumption that preposed definite articles and the loss of final syllables signal some form of direct influence between English and the dialect of West Jutland (105–06), and he suggests that the distinction between common gender and a special category of mass words in the neuter in West Jutland alone argues for skepticism on the assumption that the merging of genders constitutes meaningful evidence of linguistic influence. Nielsen has never suggested that the evidence disproves influence between early English and early Scandinavian, only that the evidence discourages the firm conclusions made by some for whom the wish of a romanticized language history has fathered the thought of linguistic influence.

Betty S. Phillips takes a careful look at "Æ-Raising in the Peterborough Chronicle" (*The Language of the Peterborough Chronicle*, 29–44). At issue is the preponderance of <e> spellings from West Germanic */a/ in the *Peterborough Chronicle* continuations, e.g. *hefde* instead of *hæfde*. The variation of <e ~ æ> has seemed so unmotivated to scholars that most are content to declare the *Peterborough Chronicle* spellings in the "First" and "Second Continuations" too confusing to explain. Phillips, however, suggests that these

spellings mark a distinct late stage in the diffusion of the sound change usually known as "æ-raising." The primary reason that most scholars find these *Peterborough Chronicle* spellings confusing is that the variation in <e ~ æ> seems to have no particular conditioning environment—that is, after all, the limit of what historical phonologists are typically prepared to conjecture. But Phillips invokes recent research on exemplar theory, a framework in which "speakers store lexical items with significant phonetic detail" (35) in partially indeterminate, broad categories consisting of continuously updated exemplars against which speakers select usage in a roughly analogical evaluation process to suggest a psycholinguistic predicate to scribal selection of orthographic symbols that match scribal pronunciation of the individual lexical item rather than the distinction and maintenance of minimal pairs. An amorphous theory of phonology that places value on a certain amount of indeterminacy can work wonders on a substantially indeterminate set of data. Phillips posits that the Peterborough continuations record the late stages of the sound change in a dialect of early English also recorded, at an earlier stage, in Rushworth 1 and, later, in the *Ormulum*. Particularly insightful is the author's consideration of hypercorrection: scholars frequently assume that back spellings indicate that a sound change as been completed, where a scribe "restores" a spelling to an unetymological form. But Phillips points out that hypercorrections, such as Farman's and the Peterborough scribes' choice of <æ> for expected <e>, "indicate that the choice between two variants has become salient to the scribe" (42). In other words, hypercorrections provide some powerful evidence that scribes were, in fact, negotiating low-level phonetic features in some components of their orthographies. Phillips suggests that <e> turns up in low-stress verbs and function words "not because of an expansion of historical æ-Raising, but because the sound [æː] was being reanalyzed as part of the exemplar phoneme /e/ in response to lower instances of [æ] merging with [a] to form the exemplar phoneme /a/" (42).

K. Aaron Smith traces "The Development of the English Progressive" (*Journal of Germanic Linguistics* 19: 205–41), a historical problem that has occasioned a lot of scholarly conjecture. The difficulty lies in the origin of the Modern English progressive as *be* + *-ing*. Scholarship has proposed that the form derives from the Old English construction *beon/wesan* + the present active participle, e.g., *we þonne beoþ standende beforan Drihtnes þrymsetle* 'we will then stand before the Lord's throne', or from a Middle English locative construction with a preposition (usually *on*), e.g., *and hii funde þane*

king; þar he was on hontyng 'and they found the king where he was hunting' (205–06). The replacement of the *-ende* ending by *-ing* and the deletion of the preposition in the locative construction resulted in the formal merging of these two originally separate structures. Smith plots a different course from other scholars who have attempted to identify the origins and development of the progressive in English. While most have accepted that the progressive derives directly from Old English *beon/wesan* + the present active participle on strictly formal grounds, Smith argues that formal and semantic clues argue for the Modern English progressive developing from the original locative construction. The author shows that the Old English construction *beon/wesan* + the present active participle occupied an extremely broad semantic range, and recent research on the grammaticalization of tense and aspect shows that semantic development overwhelmingly proceeds from more specific to more general meaning. Thus, Smith concludes that "the limiting of a verb form with so broad a semantic meaning as OE *beon* + PAP... is highly suspect" (221) and points out further that grammaticalization research shows that "the most ubiquitous source for progressivity is locativity" (222). Smith also shows that the locative form, such as *he is a coming*, was specifically and vigorously proscribed by Early Modern English grammarians, resulting in the coalescence of the two constructions and the scholarly confusion surrounding the origins of the Modern English progressive.

In "Linking Old English and Middle English: The *Peterborough Chronicle* as an Introductory Teaching Tool to the History of English" (in *The Language of the Peterborough Chronicle*, 163–174), Oliver M. Traxel describes his experience teaching a linguistics seminar at the University of Münster called "From Old English to Middle English: A Language in Transition," a follow-up to the *Sprachhistorischer Grundkurs* at the same institution. A central illustrative text used in the course was the *Peterborough Chronicle*, and the purpose of this essay, as Traxel explains, is "to demonstrate how the *Peterborough Chronicle* served to introduce students... to the study of past language stages, how the German background made a different approach necessary, and how students reacted to specific linguistic exercises based on this text" (165). The author first considers the differences between introducing Old English to students who are native German speakers and to those who are native English speakers. He concludes, (rightly, as my own experiences teaching Old English to German speakers and to English speakers supports) that German-speaking students' knowledge of aspects of the

formal grammar of their native language with reflexes in Old English (e.g., a fuller case system, verb-final word order, etc.) facilitates accelerated forms of learning in courses on the early history of English. This natural head-start positions German-speaking students to participate in a seminar such as the one described here, whereas most English-speaking students (without the benefit of having at least studied a synthetic language) would be ill-prepared for a course like this one. Traxel explains that his students are able to use the *Peterborough Chronicle* text as a diachronic fulcrum from which they can look back to Old English or forward to Middle English in a rather sophisticated interrogation of language change as realized in and represented by a single written exemplar. This holistic approach—in which students are asked to consider phonological, morphological, and syntactic change within the refracted light of a written text—demonstrates to students the fundamentals of language change while reinforcing the basic instability of our knowledge of early English due to textual uncertainties. Traxel reports that his methods have achieved good results in the teaching of vocabulary, syntax, morphology, and orthography, and his essay shows how intense concentration on a single textual form of English may have some advantages over the use of a sampling of texts, not the least of which is bringing to the fore in pedagogy the textual dimensions of the study of the history of the English language.

David Yeandle considers "Early Christian Loans in Old Frisian: The Linguistic Evidence," *Amsterdam Beiträge zur älteren Germanistik* 64: 463–489. Old English naturally plays a minor supporting role in this project, especially since the fundamental point explored in the essay is the possibility of loans that predate the Anglo-Saxons' missionary activities in Frisia. The author examines the attestations, variant forms, and phonologies of four very early borrowings, *tzerke*, *biscop*, *offeria*, and *elmissa*. *Tzerke* and *biscop* point to an early date of borrowing, he suggests, due to their wide geographical distribution and wide variety of forms. Both words could have been borrowed directly from Gallo-Roman sources and influenced later by the Anglo-Saxon missionaries. *Offeria*, less widely attested, shows forms in *-ff-*, with other Germanic dialects, from *offere*, and forms in *-pp-* suggest borrowing from *operare* or influence from Dutch forms. *Elmissa* is the only early borrowing that appears to evince clear influence from Old English (*ælmesse*), although, again, it is impossible to show that it was not a loan from Gallo-Roman sources that was later shaped by Anglo-Saxon missionary activity. The late date of our extant Old Frisian texts has long discouraged scholars from taking

the linguistic evidence of Old Frisian too seriously. But Yeandle's careful phonological histories of these four early Christian loan words show that "nothing stands in the way of the assumption of an early borrowing from Gallo-Roman" (489). [This item was not included in the 2007 Bibliography.]

CC

Frederik Kortlandt's "English *Bottom*, German *Boden*, and the Chronology of Sound Shifts," *Amsterdämer Beiträge zur ältern Germanistik* 63: 5–8, presents conditioned changes, both preceding and following Grimm's law, to homorganic stops. One stop, geminate **tt*, underwent change before a following, restored **m*, to yield preglottalization as in OE *botm*, *botem*, a process that preceded the effects of Grimm's law. The second process apparently was due to the workings of Grimm's law that resulted in the alternate OE *bodan*. A third set of forms *bythme* 'keel' and Middle English *bothem* 'bottom' resulted from the workings of both processes: **ttm* yielded preglottalized **tm*, itself subsequently altered to **pm*. This sequence of fricative+nasal became realized between the "Saxon" migration of the fifth century and the "Anglian" in the sixth. Kortlandt offers a relative chronology of change in these homorganic stops from Proto-Indo-European to the restoration of voicedness in northern English. His discussion includes developments in cognates.

In "Palatalization of Velars: A Major Link of Old English and OFrisian," *Amsterdämer Beiträge zur ältern Germanistik* 64: 165–184, Stephen Laker examines whether both languages possibly shared phonologic developments. His study reviews four issues to test this possibility: (1) breaking and palatal diphthongization; (2) breaking and palatalization of voiceless fricatives; (3) palatalization in Old English before <ea> (< Gmc *au); and (4) different conditioning factors. His finally recommending further exploration stems from his cogent synthesis of much detail and his analyses of differing premises and arguments proposed in the literature on these four issues. Since palatalization is central to these issues, Laker first summarizes its earliest Continental developments. To fix a time for its latest occurrence, he distinguishes front vowels that contributed to the palatalizing of velar stops from front vowels due to *i*-umlaut that did not. Although Laker accepts Luick's placing the onset of *i*-umlaut in the sixth century, he skeptically acknowledges that non-rounded front vowels (due to *i*-umlaut) possibly effected palatalization into the seventh century. Palatalization of place names during the early Anglo-Saxon settlement in Britain, from the mid fifth century on, also challenges support

for a Continental development. Laker argues, however, that examples such as Cheetham (Lancashire) < Brittonic **kε:d* 'forest' are perhaps due to phonemic contrasts between palatalized and non-palatalized velars in pre-OE (on the Continent). If so, velars in Romano-British place names underwent a palatalization in keeping with the properties of Anglo-Saxon phonotactics. Thus Brittonic **kε:d*, with its sequence of a velar before a front vowel, becomes, when adapted in OE, first palatalized, then assibilated in a sequence **cj* > **ʃ* > *f*. Support for Continental palatalization also appears sporadically in Old and Middle Dutch (developed from substrate Ingvaenic) and in Old Saxon. Agreeing on the sixth century as the *terminus ab quo* opens to study an issue on how palatalization developed in the West Germanic region. Yet fixing a clear chronology remains an elusive goal, since the linguistic groups in West Germanic need not have developed uniformly. At best, the hope is to determine a relative chronology, but even for OE and OFris, both providing evidence of palatalization, issues of OFris timing remain unsettled. Were they two separate dialects or languages? If dialects, then palatalization may have developed independently as OE and OFris became separate languages. If OE and OFris were already separate languages, then palatalization was an independent development in each. A further issue in establishing a relative chronology is that palatalization very likely co-occurred with other changes, such as the fronting, breaking, and retracting of vowels. How did these changes impinge on one another chronologically? Here Laker examines issue (1) noted above. Since breaking occurred independently in OE and OFris, the issue to examine is whether this change preceded or followed palatalization. Laker argues that the evidence in OE is insufficient. The difficulty is that in OE the relative chronology for breaking and palatalization remains undetermined. One argument, illustrated by (a) WGmc **kerl* > (b) breaking **ceorl* > (c) palatalization *čeorl* > (d) OE *čeorl*, does not preclude the possibility of reversing steps (b) and (c). The argument for the straight sequence is that it alone precludes a palatal diphthongization of unattested **kerl* > **čerl* > **čierl*. But Laker notes that palatal diphthongization occurs only in "North" Northumbrian and in West Saxon (its dialects alone amenable to the possibility of **čierl*) at an indeterminate time. If reversing (b) and (c) is plausible, then fixing a relative chronology for palatalization through the use of OFris breaking does not work. Whether **čierl* actually ever occurred in West Saxon is speculative. Issue (2) above centers on a distinction in regard to breaking between the voiced velar fricative *ɣ*, subject to palatalization, and the voiceless *h*, which was

not. The received teaching is that like other velar consonants, *h* (not palatalized) conditioned breaking and that this development unfolded more or less simultaneously. So the straight sequence from (a) through (d) is the preferred, relative chronology. Yet Laker suggests that this teaching is an assumption, not a result of analysis; and so the status in itself of OFris *h* as unchanged cannot clarify the matter of relative chronology, since the occasional palatalization of OFris *h* precludes a helpful perspective on relative chronology in OE. Issue (3) above presents arguments on the developments in OFris and OE of Gmc **k* before **au*. One example provided, stemming from Lat *caupo* and resulting in OE *ċeapian* and OFris *kapia*, supports the view that palatalization proceeded independently in the two languages. Much of the discussion on issue (3), however, addresses the history of **au* in the two languages. One possibility—that **au* > OE *ǣa* was a late development—invites the idea of palatalization occurring at two different times, the earlier in putative Anglo-Frisian. Reviewing five contrasting views on **au* and palatalization, Laker concludes that they remain subjective. Issue (4) reviews palatalization in non-initial position, some linguists finding it an independent development. In final position the palatalization of **k* occurred in OE. In medial position, palatalized consonants sometimes spread through paradigms, sometimes not. Sporadically, the same varied spread appears in OFris. Laker concludes that OE and OFris palatalization non-initially is due to similar influences. His overall view endorses strongly but not convincingly, except for issue (3), shared Anglo-Frisian origins for palatalization. [This item was not included in the 2007 Bibliography.]

Jarich Hoekstra's "Dental Mutation ('Dentalumlaut') in Frisian and Other Languages on the North Sea Littoral," *NOWELE* 50–51: 43–62), includes notes on OE that invite development. His thesis is that in a cluster of words Germanic short *u* not triggered by *i*-mutation underwent change in the apparent absence of a triggering historical, linguistic factor. His suggestion is that dental consonants, especially in Frisian, preceding or following the short *u* influenced the change. The consonants that occur in his analysis include *n*, *s*, *t*, *d*, and *r*. The words in his inventory appear in Frisian dialects, Danish, Dutch, Low German, and English. For the mutation of short *u* (bordered by *n*, *s*, *t*, *d*) in Frisian, Hoekstra supposes it attributable to the interference of cognates in neighboring languages or to autonomous development. For short *u* bordered by *r* he regards autonomous development as the better choice, although he assumes, without discussion, that *r* in Old Frisian was a dental consonant. The basis for this

preference is that in Frisian dialects *u/e* bordered by *r* have no counterparts elsewhere. OE mutation of this kind helps to account for *forsc* < **fruska*- 'frog,' *word* < **wurda*- 'word,' *hors* < *hrussa*- 'horse' (metathesis here), also Middle English *þrum* 'selvedge of linen.' Mutation due to *d* may account for OE *dydrin* 'egg yolk.' Hoekstra suggests a fuller analysis of dental umlaut in OE than his present study permits.

In *Studies in Phonetics, Phonology, and Morphology*, 13: 25–48, Young-Kook Kwon offers a fresh approach in "An optimality-theoretic account of ambisyllabicity in Old English." Kwon's use of optimality partially relies on a General Maximal Principle that assigns intervocalic consonants to preceding and following syllables in conformity with five constraints on initial and final clusters. Kwon's purpose, then, is to explore the cogency of assigning the same consonant to the coda of an initial syllable and to the onset of a following syllable. The first constraint, applying Moraic Theory together with other qualifications, mostly involves one or two consonants (three moras—CCC as in *seolfren* and CCCC as in *winstre*—are less frequent). Geminate consonants comprise one mora and are ambisyllabic. Single, intervocalic consonants are ambisyllabic but do not bear any weight. The second constraint, Onset, requires that all syllables have onsets. The third constraint is Onset-Well-Formedness, identified as putting limits on which consonants or glides found internally (as in VCCV or VCCCV) may precede the second vowel. These limits contrast consonant clusters that form actual sequences at the onset of OE words to those that do not (say, *pl*, *sm*, *wl* as opposed to **nk*, **tl*, **lp*). Further, the well-formed clusters conform to a consonantal sonority hierarchy, sequenced from more to less sonorous in *j* > *w* > *r* > *l* > nasal > vd fricatives > vl fricatives > vd stops > vl stops. The hierarchy itself assumes a syllable peak preceded and/or followed by a sequence of segments with progressively decreasing sonority values. The fourth constraint, Max-Coda, requires appending as many consonants as possible to a word's stressed syllable, usually the first. This constraint for Germanic languages stipulates that short vowels do not end a stressed monosyllable and that long vowels and diphthongs, ending in a consonant, attain maximal structure. The words *sunu* and *stānas* exemplify this constraint, inasmuch as *n* in both words is ambisyllabic, appended as a coda to the first syllable, as an onset to the second. The fifth constraint, Crisp, stipulates that all segments are uniquely syllabified; a syllable may not have a doubled segment linked to it. Further, Crisp and the fourth, Max-Coda, are gradient constraints and so differ from the first three. In accord with Optimality

Theory, a violation of the first three constraints is regarded as worse than a violation of constraints four and five. Kwon implies that a gradient constraint concerns the number of consonants figuring in ambisyllabicity, but constraints one through three center on quality: moraic weight and permissible clusters. Much of his analysis then presents sample applications of optimality theory (in accord with the five constraints) to various intervocalic consonants in OE words. Kwon briefly reviews other approaches, but does take issue with one argument against ambisyllabicity. This argument against ambisyllabicity concludes that the practices of Anglo-Saxon scribes in dividing words at the ends of lines offer little evidence for it. Thus scribal practice yields divisions for /VCV/ favoring V on one line preceding CV on the next and /VCCV/ favoring VC and CV (except for obstruent + liquid clusters). In instances of obstruent + liquid as intervocalic clusters, scribes chose to divide them either as VC preceding CV or V preceding CCV. Kwon's response to these patterns of consonantal alignment is to argue that scribal practice provides evidence for ambisyllabicity at least in regard to the obstruent + liquid sequence. Further, he doubts the reliability of such scribal practice, since it largely depended on patterns of intonation associated with uttering words autonomously rather than on words syllabified in natural speech. Since Kwon offers the analysis as an alternative better than earlier discussions of ambisyllabicity, the hope is that a subsequent article will defend it more fully.

The abstract of Hang T. Cho's dissertation, "Implications of Old English syllable structure and consonant phonotactics for phonological theory," *DAI, The Humanities and Social Sciences* 68: 6, indicates a study applying optimality theory. The approach involves an analysis of consonants at the onset or coda of syllables through the use of the sonority hierarchy. In Cho's analysis some of these OE consonants effect a reversal or plateauing of the usual sonority hierarchy from $j > w > r > l > \text{nasal} > \text{vd fricatives} > \text{vl fricatives} > \text{vd stops} > \text{vl stops}$. To begin, his analysis aims to displace the positing of consonant syllabifications (of *l, m, n, r*) with full syllables. To support this analysis requires a variant model of syllable structure, newly posed constraints of phonological integrity, together with other constraints already identified in the literature. The chapters of the dissertation begin with a review of OE orthography, pronunciation, and phonemic inventory. Chapter 2 reviews some analyses of the syllable and introduces a new variant model of syllable structure. Chapter 3 explores the segmental phonology of OE. Chapter 4 applies optimality theory to

OE syllabification and consonantal phonotactics. This chapter discusses the idea of sonority reversal or plateaus as linked to higher nodes in phonological trees as a way to preserve the integrity of syllables or rhymes. Yet the integrity of the onset and coda (or rhyme) may yield to modification in order to preserve the integrity of the higher ranked Sonority Sequencing Principle. The integrity constraints for onsets and codas link consonants, as much as possible, to the beginnings or ends of syllables. If such linkage does not work, then an initial consonant becomes linked to a syllable node, a final consonant preferably to a rhyme node or, if necessary, to a syllable node. This linkage permits one extra segment to occur at the beginning of a syllable, two extra segments to occur at the end of a syllable. The posited model of syllable structure, sonority-based constraints, and feature-based constraints account for gaps in consonant clusters. The dissertation offers historic connections between Old and Modern English phonology, and offers resolution between old and new theories of methodology.

In "Invisible Britons: The View from Linguistics," *Britons in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Higham [see sec. 6], 172–191, Richard Coates examines two views of the Anglo-Saxon arrival and aftermath from the fifth century on. The traditional view, drawn from documents, is that incomers from the Continent effaced the Celtic culture, killing, expelling, or enslaving the Britons of the lowlands. The more recent view, also drawing on the historical documents, supposes that the Britons largely survived their defeat and adopted the practices and language of the invaders. The Britons "became English." Relying on analyses of other circumstances involving linguistic contact, Coates argues that patterns of lexical and onomastic borrowing support the traditional view. A survey of the English lowlands, especially in the south-east, evidences few place-names of Brittonic origin and few lexical borrowings. The later view, Britons adapting themselves to Anglo-Saxon culture and the English language, relies on evidence of Brittonic funerary customs, DNA testing, agricultural practices, and religious rituals. This later view also attends to the evidence of place-names and lexical borrowing, as well as to extant inscriptions. Moreover, the survival of Britons in great numbers appears due to the newcomers and their descendants' unwillingness and insufficient numbers to displace extensively those defeated. Coates regards this evidence for extensive, Brittonic survival as problematic. Although he concedes that religious and agricultural practices point to Brittonic survival, other findings do not: DNA analysis of skeletal material indeed upholds the traditional view; archaeological

testimony is meager. The center of his argument, however, depends on his thesis that an indigenous population of Britons surviving in large numbers would have left substantial linguistic traces in OE. An obvious trace manifests itself in borrowed words—the lexicon. For Germanic immigrants to take words from Brittonic speakers presupposes some gain and little stigma through borrowing. Further, even a lexicon partially shared by indigenous Britons and Germanic immigrants implies a reduced difference in their codes. Yet a comparison of Brittonic and OE diminishes the likelihood that the two peoples had frequent conversations. At best the immigrants adapted Brittonic place-names but scarcely any vocabulary. As for Britons, they likewise borrowed few words from the immigrants. This paucity differs from colonial experience—the British in India, for example, or even from the approximately two hundred words borrowed from the aboriginal languages of Australia. To account for this paucity, Coates seeks parallels to the Brittonic English experience. These parallels involve invaders displacing indigenes, comparable material cultures, minimal linguistic interchanges, little documentary evidence on the indigenes, equivocal DNA evidence, and some likelihood of enslavement. One partial parallel is that of the contact between Romans and Basques. The Basques's material culture contained no element more technologically advanced than the Roman. Latin contains no word of Basque origin; Romance languages, before 1900, fewer than a dozen. Few Roman documents record anything more than Basque names. It is possible, yet unsubstantiated, that Romans enslaved Basques. Yet this possible parallel is inadequate, because of limited Roman Basque contact except for some areas north of the Pyrenees. In parts of the Basque areas nominally under Roman control, Latin had hardly any impact. A second parallel pertains to Norse and Gaelic in Scotland. The historical connections between people and languages, however, remain unclear, although Gaelic borrowed about fifty words from Norse. Coates concludes that like the Britons, the Gaels also withdrew from invaders, a finding that supports the traditional view of what occurred when Germanic invaders and immigrants left the Continent. Those who hold the view that the Britons entered into English life still have to account for the slight impact of these peoples' languages on each other.

Elmer H. Antonsen, "Proto-Germanic Final /-a/ In Second Syllables," *NOWELE* 52: 23–29, defends his grammatical analysis of the Reistand inscription, first presented in *Runes and Germanic Linguistics*. He argues that the final lexeme in the inscription—the verb *wraitā* < PIE /wroyd-a/—despite a lack of obvious

support in other forms, has a final *-a* in its second syllable. A first objection to this claim is that the form *was*, inscribed on the stone from Kalleby does not have a final *-a*. Yet Antonsen notes that *was*, since it occurs at a break in the stone, cannot count as evidence. Secondly, the form *ist* on the Vetteland stone, since it is an enclitic, appears without a putative final vowel *-i*. Antonsen's approach to the defense of his views on final *-a* relies on the uses of typology and analogy. Typology establishes that *wraitā* corresponds with verbs in final position often enough in inscriptions. Analogy works for Antonsen's purposes in several ways. The first use of analogy concerns the strength of conclusions drawn from single instances. Antonsen cites OE *fōn* < Proto-Germanic */fanhanan/ (a short vowel becoming long) as supplying the single evidence of /n/ followed immediately by /h/: this outcome obviates a PG /ā/. A second analogy returns to the view that final *-a* in *wraitā* of the Reistand inscription is a single instance. Here Antonsen cites 3rd sg. past tense *bēad* and *rād* as forms analogically shaped on 1st person *bēad* < */bēod-a/ < */baud-a/ and *rād* < */raed-a/ < /raid-a/. These derivations from a Northwest Germanic unstressed *-a* in the second syllable attest to the validity of Antonsen's argument. A second, disputed lexeme in the inscription is *unnam(z)*. Regarded possibly as a perfect of a preterite-present verb, Antonsen contends that such a classification for this form finds nothing comparable in any other Germanic language. Instead he classifies this form as a negated substantive, with (z) a nominative marker. If so, then the appropriate declension for *unnam(z)* is consonantal, although the corresponding Old Icelandic form suggests an *-i* stem. But with the help of apocope and shortening rules, Antonsen demonstrates the two declensions overlapped in singular forms and in the nominative plural.

Dániel Huber provides an effective summary in his conclusion to "Velars in the history of Old English," *The Even Yearbook* 7: 1–20, supplemented with issues in need of further study. His summary on the velar */x/, in particular, begins by noting that it lacks a definite "phonological place of articulation." This lack of definiteness prevents */x/ from governing a preceding nasal as in *-uŋx*; the sequence then first developed into a nasalized vowel + x (thus *-ūx*), before subsequently losing nasalization (*-ux*). Example: **-uŋxt* > **-ūxt* > *-uxt*, as in *fuht*. The loss of nasalization in this sequence also occurs at a later stage before other voiceless fricatives in all the West Germanic languages. This loss of a nasal begins before **x* because **ŋ*, too, apparently has no definite space of its own. As for the other nasal + fricative sequences, **s*, **θ*, and **f* are able to spread in the definite

space of a preceding *n or *m. Yet even in instances of a definite space, nasals in vowel + nasal + fricative sequences are lost, except in Old High German. A second consequence of an indefinite phonological space for /x/ manifests itself in OE breaking. Huber's discussion of breaking first outlines the facts long established. His analysis finds, informally, that the lack of definite space for /x/, especially, among the consonants that help to effect breaking, conditions the quality of second segments in the broken vowels. Instead of positing as a result of breaking a full vowel in second segments, Huber proposes that they are mostly schwa. In his view schwa as a reduced vowel accords with the argument that reduced vowels, like the velar /x/, have no definite, governing space. Even so, questions arise: why does breaking affect front but not back vowels? Further, the basis for voiceless /x/, but not voiced /ɣ/, as a trigger for breaking, remains unexplained. A third issue concerns the phonologic and morphologic shape of nouns in which /x/ follows a liquid /l/ or /r/. In these nouns, /x/ historically falls out of use only to give way, according to some analyses, to a compensatory lengthening of vowels occurring directly before the liquid. As Huber notes, evidence for lengthening is metrical (at best conjectural); also, the possibility of /x/ (originally found after a liquid) leaving a trace on a preceding vowel is questionable. Huber discusses in the course of his analysis the shapes of OE strong verbs and some paradigms of nouns and adjectives, based mostly on his claims for indefinite, phonological space.

Hildegard Tristram argues that English, before the advent of the Vikings, incorporated a few, distinctive grammatical patterns from Late British. In "Why Don't the English Speak Welsh?" (*Britons in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Higham [see sec. 6], 192–214), she presents the thesis that these patterns, long before they appear in writing, entered speech. Her first premise is that speakers of British whether in the south-east lowlands or western uplands very likely transferred some of their native, linguistic patterns to the English they learned. The patterns transferred from British into OE, moreover, were more readily grammatical than lexical, as studies of contact between speakers whose languages differ in prestige typically show. Toponyms from subordinated British, too, entered OE, spoken by dominant groups come from afar. The linguistic patterns that Tristram identifies as likely for speakers of Late British to manifest in OE include nouns barely inflected, strict word order, and for verbs some periphrastic phrasing. To advance the influence of Late British on the process of increasingly reduced inflections for nouns, she aims to refute the possible impact of Old Norse and that

of fixed stress on initial syllables. For her, Old Norse, as much inflected as OE, could not thereby influence change. In Tristram's view, one clearly inflected language is not likely to prompt loss of endings in another. As for the influence of fixed stress, she notes that High German, with primary accent on initial syllables of words, did not lose its rich array of inflections. A third argument addressed is that northwest languages in Europe generally shifted from synthetic to analytic word order, yet for Tristram this change characterizes Middle, not Old, English. To bolster the influence of Late British, she combines geographic and linguistic criteria. Changes in Middle English—loss of endings in declensions, periphrastic verb phrases—first appear in the northern and southwestern Middle English dialects. As for verbal aspect, Tristram adduces the Late British pattern BOT 'be' + *yn* (construction marker) + Verbal Noun, indicating the imperfective, present tense. Once this pattern took hold in OE, it also spread to the preterit, as in *drincende wæron*. Further, the Middle English *-ing(e)*, first emerging in southwestern Middle English as inflections for the present participle and gerund, stems from the late British verbal noun. One other change concerns the development of periphrastic *do*, very likely influenced by Welsh GWENEUTHUR 's/he does'. The general construction, found also in Middle Breton and Middle Cornish, is this: verbal noun + a (construction marker) + GWENEUTHUR (yet its incidence in Middle Welsh is sparse). In English, such constructions as *þi soule cnul ich wile do ringe*, not standard, appear even so in dialects. To conclude, the English don't speak Welsh because the Celtic peoples chose early on to speak the dominant language yet introduced grammatical patterns familiar to them. To go from hypothesis to proof faces hurdles enough.

Peter Schrijver revisits in "What Britons Spoke around 400 AD" (*Britons in Anglo-Saxon English*, ed. Higham, 165–171) the issues of bilingualism in the Celtic lowlands and highlands during the century of Germanic inroads. He proposes two theses: (1) Latin was predominant in the lowlands; (2) Lowland Brittonic had a greater affinity with varieties of Celtic in northern Gaul than the dialects spoken in the Highlands. He defends these theses with techniques of reconstruction and of language contact. His approach depends on the likelihood that Highland Brittonic actually evidences the influence of exiles from lowland speakers, who fled to the west from invading Germanic peoples. Thus language contact and reconstruction lead Schrijver to compare developments from Latin into early Romance with changes in Highland Brittonic. He sets out six sound correspondences: (1) qualitative differences in

vowels phonemically supplant length; (2) stress shifts ultimately to final syllables; (3) final nasals remain only in monosyllables; (4) postvocalic voiceless stops become voiced; (5) velar fricatives or stops (mainly) before /t/, /R/, or /n/ become /j/; (6) apocope and syncope. Change also applies to three types of morphosyntax: (1) loss of case system; (2) loss of neuter gender; (3) development of the pluperfect. The argument that these correspondences support contact between Highland Brittonic and early Romance relies on their sheer numerousness. Further evidence indicates that the contact finds Romance influencing Celtic, fully in the West, subsequently seen in Cornish and Breton. In these two languages, the influence of Romance affects a loss of aspiration on voiceless stops; a rounding of front vowels, a lowering of *e/_r > *a/_r, and a shift of *ŋg > ñ. Schrijver also asserts that these phonologic and morphosyntactic changes in Highland Brittonic occurred after the borrowing of many words from Latin (after the Romans left for the Continent). This structuring of linguistic events is due to Latin prestige, source of lexical borrowing, followed by exiled, lowland Celts, whose pronunciation affected Highland Brittonic. Turning to Lowland Britain, Schrijver finds evidence in its speakers' Latin of the diphthongs *ou* and *ua*, both derived from earlier Celtic *ō. These diphthongs also occur in late Gaulish Celtic, but not in Highland Brittonic. Furthermore, the late-spoken Latin of northern Gaul also had the same diphthongs. This phonetic parallel appears at a time of continued Roman prestige in northern Gaul and in lowland Briton. Since the evidence for the diphthongs *ou* and *ua* is slender, Schrijver underscores its speculative nature. But the remarkable conclusion that he derives for Germanic speakers is that on arrival they very likely found few in the lowlands speaking Brittonic rather than a form of Latin. And their Latin parallels a variety of Romance underlying Old French, the vowels of which had some influence on Old English.

Piotr Gąsiorowski takes his essay's title "A Shibboleth Upon Their Tongues: Early English /r/ Revisited," *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 42: 63-76, from Daniel Defoe's allusion to the Northumbrian burr. This allusion highlights Gąsiorowski's statement that /r/ was not an apical trill throughout early Germanic and OE, the received view, but manifested, maybe unexpectedly, a phonetic diversity. This perspective on the rhotic underlies the inference that it embodies no natural class, that it is a minimally specified sonorant without a determinable manner of articulation. To think of the rhotic as a semivowel is mistaken, for it has no association, as [j] and [w] do, with any specifiable vowel. For the most part, rhotics do not participate in phonemic

contrasts, yet may display considerable variation as allophones. This overview is followed by summaries on the rhotic expressed in English, from Ben Jonson on, none of them able to withstand scrutiny. Moreover, although the rhotic has long contributed to accounts of it as conditioning changes in vowels, its plasticity has mostly gone neglected. Instead, the common practice is to liken particular forms of modern rhotic pronunciation to that presumably characteristic of past times. The difficulty in using analogy is that historians of phonology adduce different forms of the rhotic to explain conditional change, their views exposing insoluble gaps in one another's arguments. Gąsiorowski's approach involves contrasting, phonologic developments in OE dialects. He begins with different outcomes of rhotics in West Saxon and Anglian before *i or *j in a following syllable. The pair WS *afyrran*, Angl. *afirran*, for example, developed from *io, which implies a difference in the quality of the rhotic in the two dialects. Since /y/ departs from *io more sharply than /i/, the rhotic sound in West Saxon, as opposed to that in Anglian, also contributed more sharply to the phonologic change. In WS as well the diphthong in *sweord* (other dialects *swurd*) is the combinative effect of u-coloring and of a retroflexive /r/. Farther north, Angl *iorre* < *irzija- (rr < *rz) implies a merging of different rhotic sounds, the first an inherited, anterior sound, the other posterior in quality. In Angl *ðwerh* (WS *ðweorh*), too, the rhotic sound did not block the monophthong from developing before a following velar /k, x, ɣ/. Angl *warþ* manifests a third effect, a retraction of the vowel from *æ, due to the initial labial as a catalyst and the possibly pharyngealized, tautosyllabic /r/. In Northumbrian the burr is very likely a feature of /r/. So alone in OE *e > o is the sequence /wer/+ a coronal or labial consonant, as in *werþa > *worþa. A further indication of the burr occurs in metathesized sequences (*berht* < *breht*), found sporadically in WS. This metathesis may also be regressive, but only in Northumbrian, e.g. *βrannjan > *bærnan*. A third possibility is the anaptyxis that separates the cluster /rx/, as in *uyrihta*. This development is possibly due to the uvular quality of Northumbrian /r/, difficult to pronounce before a velar. The supposition that the variant pronunciations of /r/ in OE are responsible for some contrasts in dialect finds further support in Gąsiorowski's noting of analogs for them in later English dialects consonant in area with those of OE.

EG

Syntax, etc.

Carole Hough and John Corbett's *Beginning Old English* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan) is designed

to introduce Old English to students with little or no linguistic background. One of the distinctive features of this textbook is its focus on the acquisition of key vocabulary to develop reading skills, with a minimum of grammar. For instance, instead of making a detailed grammatical description of nouns and pronouns with reference to familiar paradigms, which are hidden in the appendix at the end of the book, the authors show how Old English words change their forms according to number, gender and case to describe people and things. Each chapter is accompanied by simplified Old English texts to illustrate some grammatical points with four major texts in the second part for substantial reading: *Cynewulf and Cyneheard*, an extract from *Beowulf*, *The Battle of Maldon*, and *The Dream of the Rood*. The two chapters preceding this anthology discuss Old English poetry with reference to “rhythm and alliteration,” “compounds,” “formulas,” “variation,” etc. on the one hand, and explore issues of translating Old English verse texts by comparing various Modern English renderings of *Beowulf* on the other.

The year 2007 also saw the revision of two popular textbooks of Old English. Bruce Mitchell and Fred C. Robinson’s *Guide to Old English* (Oxford: Blackwell) has merited a seventh edition which adds two new texts, one in prose and the other in verse: *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos* and the Cotton Gnomes or Maxims. Minor revisions include addition of two appendices (“List of Linguistic Terms Used in this Book” and “The Moods of Old English”) and an update of the “Select Bibliography.” The second edition of Peter S. Baker’s *Introduction to Old English* (Oxford: Blackwell) has expanded its anthology section to include four new texts: Ælfric’s sermon on the Book of Job, the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle entry (1087) on William the Conqueror, the voyages of *Ohthere and Wulfstan* from the Old English *Orosius*, and *The Battle of Maldon*. In addition, the glossary has been made more user-friendly. Both the “Further Reading” and “References” have been updated, the former providing a new section (“On-line amusements”). On the other hand, this edition omits the on-line exercises attached at the end of each chapter of the previous version due to the outdated technology they depended on. Instead, instructors are encouraged to find exercises (to be downloaded and printed) at the author’s website.

In “The Old English Language” (*Beowulf and Other Stories: A New Introduction to Old English, Old Icelandic, and Anglo-Norman Literatures*, ed. Richard North and Joe Allard [Harlow: Pearson], 272–300), Peter S. Baker attempts to encourage beginners of Old English to study the language which, although it looks foreign

and difficult, is “recognisably English” (272), easy, and worth learning as well. To fulfill this purpose, Baker describes Old English primarily in terms of its resemblance to modern English, illustrating how accessible Old English can become when students know regular correspondences between Old and modern English spelling and how many words Old English and modern English share. Baker is, however, fair enough to deliver the bad news that Old English grammar is more complicated than that of modern English. To balance these difficulties, Baker explains some of the pleasures of reading Old English literature in the original, with reference to metaphorical/metonymic compounds (i.e. kennings) and poetic variation. Baker does not forget to remind students that many important words in Old English poetic texts (e.g. *wyrd* and *mod*) have no exact counterpart in modern English and therefore that Old English poetry cannot be fully understood only through translation. Baker concludes that “[t]he effort required to learn the language is not negligible, but reasonable and, for many students, enjoyable” (299).

In “Epilogue: The End of Old English?” (*Beowulf and Other Stories*, 489–498), David Crystal provides another readable introduction to Old English, which covers topics such as Old English dialects, vocabulary change (with special reference to borrowings from Latin and Old Norse), and grammatical change (with special reference to third-person plural pronouns, the verb *to be*, etc.). Although linguistic change during the eleventh and twelfth centuries was remarkable enough to assume a break between Old and Middle English, Crystal emphasizes that “it was still gradual, and we encounter texts that are amalgams of Old and Middle English and texts that fall ‘midway’ between Old and Middle English” (497).

In “On the Use of *ond*-clauses in the Old English Gospels,” *SN* 79: 119–132, Javier Calle-Martín and Antonio Miranda-García question the widespread view that in Old English coordinate clauses are verb-final (VF), demonstrating that most *ond*-clauses are associated with verb-second (V2) rather than VF position. Furthermore, the authors argue that two different types of coordinate clauses (i.e. coordinate main and subordinate clauses) should be distinguished: when containing the subject, for instance, coordinate subordinate clauses (e.g. *and gif, and for þām þe*) take VF position to a lesser extent than coordinate main clauses do. Calle-Martín and Miranda-García also show that coordinate clauses with subjects are more often marked with punctuation than those without. Another interesting finding is that word order in *ond*-clauses may be a function of authorship: in the West-Saxon Gospels, *Mark*, *Matthew* and

Luke present nearly the same rate of verb-first (V1), V2 and VF constructions; *John* differs significantly from the other gospels, which suggests that *John* may have been rendered by a different translator.

In "Noun-Adjective Compounds as a Poetic Type in Old English," *ES* 88: 447–464, Don Chapman and Ryan Christensen argue that Noun-Adjective compounds such as *lof-georn* 'praise-eager' and *hilde-hwate* 'battle-brave' are of proportionately more frequent use in Old English poetry than nominal compounds (i.e. Noun-Noun, Adjective-Noun, Numeral-Noun compounds). Since the first element of Noun-Adjective compounds is used not so much to define the second element as "to give additional colour or emotive feeling" (451), Chapman and Christensen ascribe the frequent use of compounds of this type in poetry to the non-referential (thereby emotional) nature of the first element, which makes Noun-Adjective compounds sound more poetic. A convenient list of Noun-Adjective compounds in Old English is given in the appendix at the end of the paper.

In "Function Words in Authorship Attribution Studies," *Literary and Linguistic Computing* 22: 49–66, Antonio Miranda García and Javier Calle Martín examine the use of function words as reliable identifiers of authorship. They begin by ranking the *West Saxon Gospels* and *Apollonius of Tyre* in terms of "functional density" (i.e. the ratio of function words to content words), demonstrating that *John* shows the greatest functional density (i.e. the highest ratio of function words against content words), followed by *Mark*, *Luke* and *Matthew*, with *Apollonius* having the lowest functional density. The authors then study the "score of function lemmas" (i.e. the occurrences of the most common function words), which shows the same ranking as obtained on the basis of functional density. The Delta scores (which are tools in author-attribution calculations) "also point to this direction insofar as *Mt* and *Lk* are estimated as the least unlike whereas *Mt* and *Jn* were taken as the most unlike" (59). These results lead García and Martín to "affirm that the translatorship of *The Gospel according to Saint Matthew* and that of *Saint John* cannot be assigned to the same person" (64).

In "Old English *agan to* Reconsidered," *N&Q* 54: 216–218, Michiko Ogura surveys the use of the *agan* (*to*) infinitive in the Old English corpus to find that OE *agan* does not take the *to*-infinitive so often whereas *agan* with bare infinitive is attested only twice. Due to the paucity of examples of *agan* + (*to*) infinitive by the end of the eleventh century, Ogura is dubious as to whether the semantic change from 'to have something' to 'to have something as an obligation' could have happened with *agan*. Ogura concludes that the

establishment of *ah to* 'ought to' as a modal auxiliary was "not only a matter of semantic expansion from possession to obligation but a matter of syntactic change in analysis from 'agan + *to*-infinitive' to 'agan *to* + infinitive'" (218).

In another article, "Old English Preverbal Elements with Adverbial Counterparts" *Beowulf and Beyond*, ed. Hans Sauer and Renate Bauer (Frankfurt: Peter Lang), 101–117, Ogura deals with the use of verbs with free-morpheme prefixes in three versions of the Old English Gospels—the *Lindisfarne* (*Li*), the *Rushworth* 1 and 2 (*Ru1* and *Ru2*) and the *West Saxon* version, MS CCC 140 (*WSCp*)—in comparison with those in the Old High German Tatian and in the Latin Vulgate. Her main concern is to "see if Old English renderings follow the basic patterns or if they faithfully follow the Latin order" (101). Ogura's findings are that *Li* most faithfully renders Latin prefixed verbs by the corresponding construction while the free translation *WSCp*, following the Old English patterns, resorts to verbs with postposed adverbs or verbs with a prepositional phrase. While *Ru2* is closer to *Li*, *Ru1* occasionally gives a free rendering with postposition. The Old High German Tatian is "somewhere in between *Ru1* and *WSCp*" (112).

Agnieszka Pysz's "The Usage of Demonstratives in the *Peterborough Chronicle* against the Background of the Old English Paradigm," *The Language of the Peterborough Chronicle*, ed. Alexander Bergs and Janne Skaffari (Frankfurt: Peter Lang), 57–75, examines the use of demonstratives in the *Peterborough Chronicle* (Bodleian MS. Laud Misc. 636), which, being written during the transition between Old English and Middle English, testifies to a number of innovative linguistic changes. The paper "seeks to establish, in quantitative terms, the degree to which the demonstrative forms appearing in the *Chronicle* depart from the 'classical' Old English model" (58). After describing the usage of demonstrative pronouns in "classical" Old English, Pysz analyzes the use of demonstratives in the three parts of the *Peterborough Chronicle*. In the earlier part known as the Old English Annals (or Copied Annals), the usage of demonstratives closely follows the Old English model with the highest frequency of agreement of demonstratives and nouns in both gender and case. The subsequent part (i.e. the First Continuation) and the last one (i.e. the Final Continuation), on the other hand, show decreasing occurrences of conservative forms while the latter demonstrates a dramatic increase in the number of demonstrative forms that are not attested in "classical" Old English. Pysz concludes that "[t]his sketch of the increasing innovation affecting the usage of demonstratives aligns neatly with the

chronological sequence of the three parts of the Chronicle” (73).

Michio Hosaka’s “Emergent Structure: The Rise and Fall of V-Movement in the History of English” (*Language and Beyond: A Festschrift for Hiroshi Yonekura on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, ed. Mayumi Sawada, Larry Walker and Shizuya Tara [Tokyo: Eichōsha], 209–227) takes up the following questions: why and how a subject in a sentence has become obligatory in the history of English; why and how V-to-I movement was triggered before the mid-16th century and lost around the mid-16th century; why and how the category of auxiliary verbs has appeared in the history of English. Hosaka argues that these three linguistic changes “are very closely related and can be given a unified explanation in terms of a new paradigm: *Emergence*” (210). Specifically, the emergence of a functional category (AgrP) eliminates subjectless construction while the emergence of another functional category (AuxP) leads to the rise of auxiliary verbs, which blocks V-to-I movement.

In her Matsunami Prize-winning article “Case-Forms and Prepositional Constructions in the Old English Translation of Bede’s *Historia Ecclesiastica*,” *Studies in Medieval English Language and Literature* 22: 27–49, Kiriko Sato demonstrates that a semantic factor often influences the choice between case-forms and prepositional constructions in *Bede*: the translator resorts to case-forms for the sense of manner but uses *mid* for the sense of instrumentality, the distinction being “particularly obvious in the use of *deap*, *stefn* and *word*” (38). Thus, the widely held assumption that Bede’s choice between two constructions is ‘unpredictable and accidental’ (cf. Dančev 1969) turns out to be not entirely true. Sato concludes the article by stating that while the *Bede* translator faithfully follows the Latin original, he is sometimes independent of the Latin source, employing, for instance, the case-forms with no corresponding Latin phrase.

In “Repeated Prepositions in the Twelfth-Century English Homilies” (*Language and Beyond*, 583–601), Sayo Yanagi focuses on relative constructions in which a preposition is repeated or occurs before the relative pronoun and before or after the verb of the clause. According to the author, this construction, perhaps being modeled after Latin, had been in use since Old English and followed by the twelfth-century compilers. The article aims to “trace back the process through which the construction in question might have been transmitted to the twelfth century” (583). On the basis of the data gathered from the manuscripts of the *Vercelli Homilies*, the *Blickling Homilies*, the *Catholic Homilies*,

and the *Lives of Saints*, Yanagi concludes that “the passages that include this construction [are] more closely related to Ælfric than anyone might have expected it to be” (596).

JT

In *Revista canaria de estudios Ingleses* 55: 85–97, Maria del Carmen Guarddon Anelo presents “The Metonymic Basis of Prepositional Polysemy in Old English: A Pragmatic Approach,” primarily focused on the properties of *on*. The metonymic basis identified for the use of *on* is an extension of space from concrete limits or arrangements to a mostly idealized scheme. In *The Old English Version of Bede’s Ecclesiastical History*, Anelo argues that the second preposition in the heading *Þætte Angelðeod wæs gelaðod fram Bryttum on Breotone* is metonymic. No spatial coordinates implied, the preposition *on*, recast into an idealized construct or scheme: *on Breotone* possesses a visual component that is metonymic, the Angles’ arrival postulated as somehow seen. The pragmatic approach taken by Anelo stems from the absence in her view of linguistic or semantic criteria that govern the use of the spatial prepositions *æt*, *in*, and *on*. Instead, the determining criterion is pragmatic: the relation of a speaker’s physical proximity to a setting. If close to the setting, familiar with its dimensions and attendant events, the speaker is likely to choose *in*. If removed from the setting, the spatial features of a place and the events associated with it distant, the speaker’s choice is *on*. So in *Þæt se arwurþa wer Swiðbyrht on Breotone, and Wilbrord æt Rome biscopas wæron Fresna ðeode gehalgode*, the utterance presupposes the speaker’s location as remote from the investiture. The pragmatics of *æt* remains unexplored, although Anelo comments that Bede uses this preposition in reference to cities. The essay offers readers few examples of these spatial prepositions in Bede’s utterances.

EG

The focus of Maria Dolores Perez Raja’s “The Anglo-Scandinavian Connection: Reading Between Lines and Layers,” *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses* 55: 47–67, is the influence of Old Norse on Old English during the Anglo-Saxon period. As Perez Raja notes, this is a large subject area, and she narrows her paper by examining loanwords during this period within the context of “non-written [language] sources” (49). While this phrasing initially seems paradoxical, Perez Raja’s use of archeological data in conjunction with social network theory leads her to construct a picture of the semantic movement of the Old Norse loan-word *kasta* (OE **cast*). She posits that, in a “micro-sociolinguistic” analysis,

this word, meaning 'cast metal', diffused through the lower or artisan classes from Norse settlers and into the Old and Middle English lexicon. The word is not attested in written English until centuries after the Old English period. Through various digressions into modern social networking theory and a detailed discussion of early medieval metalworking, Perez Raja concludes, among other things, that "The discovery of strips of lead used by moneyers as a trial piece for testing the coinages suggests that ON *cast* must have been involved in the process at some point, though in the spoken mode" (61) is both easily believable *and* a leap of reasoning. It is not a stretch to say that this word made its way into English via a Norse loan, and it is just as likely that this movement was via spoken interaction between these two language groups. However, this paper's intricate analysis of the self-confessed speculative nature of the exact loan process (64) seems to lead the reader to no major insights nor new understandings. A study that examined the Old English adoption of the third-person plural pronoun of Old Norse (a much rarer occurrence in language contact than the simple adoption of a loanword) would be a stronger test of her hypotheses that social networking theory could expand our understanding of language contact and change.

RSA

Works Not Seen:

- Artamonova, M. "Word Order Variation in Late Old English Texts: With Special Reference to the Evidence of Translations and Revisions." D.Phil. U of Oxford, 2007. *Index to Theses* 58 (2007): 5058.
- Bartnik, Artur. "Categorical Heterogeneity [*sic*]: Old English Determiners." *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 43 (2007): 75–96.
- Brinton, Laurel J. "The Development of *I Mean*: Implications for the Study of Historical Pragmatics." *Methods in Historical Pragmatics*. Ed. Fitzmaurice and Taavitsainen. pp. 37–79.
- Davis, Glenn. "Introducing HEL: Three Linguistic Concepts for the First Day of Class." *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Teaching* 14.1 (Spring 2007): 27–34.
- de Acosta, Diego A. "<Have + Perfect Participle> in Romance and English: Synchrony and Diachrony." Ph.D. Diss., Cornell Univ., 2006. *DAI* 67A (2007): no. 07.
- de Groot, Casper. "*The King is on Huntunge*: On the Relation between Progressive and Absentive in Old and Early Modern English." *Structural-Functional Studies in English Grammar: In Honour of Lachlan Mackenzie*. Ed. Mike Hannay and Gerard J. Steen. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2007. pp. 175–90.
- Esteban Segura, Laura, and Nadia Obegi Gallardo. "Absolute Constructions in the Old English Gospels: A Case-Study." *SELIM* 14 (2007): 87–105.
- Expósito González, María de la Cruz. "A Socio-Linguistic Evaluation of the Great Modal Shift: An Overview of the Female Approach." *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses* 55 (2007): 33–46.
- Fernández-Domínguez, Jesús. "A Diachronic-Synchronic Review of Gender in English." *Revista Aliantina de Estudios Ingleses* 20 (2007): 45–63.
- Fitzmaurice, Susan, and Irma Taavitsainen, eds. *Methods in Historical Pragmatics*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007.
- Gast, Volker. "*I Gave It Him*—On the Motivation of the 'Alternative Double Object Construction' in Varieties of British English." *Functions of Language* 14.2 (Fall 2007): 31–56.
- Gill, Paramjit S.; Tim B. Swartz, and Michael Treschow. "A Stylometric Analysis of King Alfred's Literary Works." *Jnl of Applied Statistics* 34 (2007): 1251–58.
- Guarddon, Anelo, Maria del Carmen. "The Metonymic Basis of Prepositional Polysemy in Old English: A Pragmatic Approach." *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses* 55 (2007): 85–97.
- Haerberli, Eric. "The Development of Subject-Verb Inversion in Middle English and the Role of Language Contact." *GG@G (Generative Grammar in Geneva)* 5 (2007): 15–33.
- Haerberli, Eric, and Richard Ingham. "The Position of Negation and Adverbs in Early Middle English." *Lingua* 117 (2007): 1–25.
- Heggelund, Øystein. "Old English Subordinate Clauses and the Shift to Verb-Medial Order in English." *ES* 88 (2007): 351–61.
- Hill, Eugen. "Proportionale Analogie, paradigmatischer Ausgleich und Formerweiterung: Ein Beitrag zur Typologie des morphologischen Wandels." *Diachronica* 24 (2007): 81–118.
- Huber, Dániel. "Velars in the History of Old English." *The Even Yearbook* (Budapest) 7 (2006): 1–20.
- Ingham, Richard. "NegP and Negated Constituent Movement in the History of English." *Trans. of the Philological Society* 105 (2007): 365–97.
- Ishiguro, Taro. "On the Exposition of Old English Strong Verbs of Class III." *Bulletin of Arts and Sciences, Meiji Univ.* 418 (March 2007): 1–11.
- Kaita, Kousuke. "The Historical Formation of English Auxiliary *ought to*—with Special Reference to Late OE and Early ME." *Studies on Humanities and Social Sciences at Chiba Univ.* 15 (2007): 108–16.
- _____. "The Use of OE/EME *āgan* and OHG *eigun* Compared with OE/EME *sculan* and *mōtan* and Their OHG/MHG Cognates." *Ever Onward* 1 (2007): 43–52.

- Kamińska, Anna. "The Word Order of Old English and Old High German Non-Conjoined Declarative Clauses in Different Text Types." *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 43 (2007): 49–73.
- Kamiya, Masaaki. "The Small Clause in Old English: Using the Brooklyn Corpus." *Jnl of the Toyota National College of Technology* 40 (2007): 119–28.
- Kohnen, Thomas. "Text Types and the Methodology of Diachronic Speech Act Analysis." *Methods in Historical Pragmatics*. Ed. Fitzmaurice and Taavitsainen. pp. 139–66.
- Lange, Claudia. *Reflexivity and Intensification in English: A Study of Texts and Contexts*. Arbeiten zur Sprachanalyse 46. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2007. xi, 202 pp. ill. [esp. ch. 5, "Reflexivity and Intensification in Old English," pp. 65–123]
- Lenker, Ursula. "Soplice, Forsoothe, Truly—Communicative Principles and Invited Inferences in the History of Truth-Intensifying Adverbs in English." *Methods in Historical Pragmatics*. Ed. Fitzmaurice and Taavitsainen. pp. 81–105.
- Lutz, Angelika. "Differences of Stress Orientation between English and Norse." *Language and Text*. Ed. Johnston et al. [see sec. 2] pp. 205–23.
- Martín Arista, Javier, and María Victoria Martín de la Rosa. "Old English Semantic Primes: Substantives, Determiners and Quantifiers." *Atlantis* 28.2 (December 2006): 9–28.
- Mokrowiecki, Tomasz. "The Pre-Verbal *i-* in Early Middle English: An Analysis of the Formal Parameters of the Prefixed Verbs." *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 43 (2007): 141–66.
- Molina, Clara, and Manuela Romano. "Old Texts in New Vessels: Teaching and Learning HEL Online." *SELIM* 14 (2007): 59–85.
- Moon, An-Nah. "Metathesis and Frequency Patterns of the Clusters in Old English." *Jnl of English Language and Literature* (Seoul) 51.5 (2005): 1081–1100.
- Mori, Motoo. "Old English Strong Verbs (IV)." *Bulletin of Nara Sangyo Univ.* 23 (2007): 59–68.* [in Japanese]
- Moskowich-Spiegel, Isabel, and Begoña Crespo-García, eds. *Bells Chiming from the Past: Cultural and Linguistic Studies on Early English*. Costerus n.s. 174. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, 2007. 279 pp.
- Nykiel, Joanna. "Resolution of Ellipsis: Evidence from Old English Sluicing." *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 43 (2007): 111–25.
- Pollington, Stephen. *Old English, Poems Prose and Lessons: Anglo-Saxon Language*. Pinner: Anglo-Saxon Books; Oakville: David Brown, 2007. 2 CD-ROMs.
- Pysz, Agnieszka. "The (Im)possibility of Stacking Adjectives in Early English." *Bells Chiming from the Past*. Ed. Moskowich-Spiegel and Crespo-García. pp. 15–35.
- Ronneberger-Sibold, Elke. "Typologically Motivated Over- vs. Underspecification of Gender in Germanic Languages." *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 60 (2007): 205–18.
- Schulte, Michael. "Präverbierung in den prosodischen Systemen des Altgermanischen." *NOWELE* 50/51 (2007): 5–41.
- Scragg, Donald. "Rewriting Eleventh-Century English Grammar and the Editing of Texts." *Bells Chiming from the Past*. Ed. Moskowich-Spiegel and Crespo-García. pp. 195–208.
- Sims, Lynn. "The Development of the English Progressive: A Felicitous Problem for the Teaching of HEL." *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Teaching* 14.1 (Spring 2007): 71–87.
- Sinar, Rebecca. "A History of English Reflexives: From Old English into Early Modern English." Ph.D. Diss., Univ. of York (UK), 2006. *DAI* 68C (2007): 648.
- Smith, K. Aaron. "The Development of the English Progressive: A Felicitous Problem for the Teaching of HEL." *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Teaching* 14.1 (Spring 2007): 71–87.
- Stevick, Robert D. "Diagramming Noun Phrases in Early English." *Language and Beyond*. Ed. Sawada et al. pp. 13–32.
- Stevick, Robert D. "Diagramming Old English Sentences." *Global Perspectives on Medieval English Literature*. Ed. Kaylor and Nokes. [see sec. 2] pp. 229–59.
- Suárez-Gómez, Cristina. *Relativization in Early English (950–1250): The Position of Relative Clauses*. Linguistic Insights: Studies in Language and Communication 49. Bern: Peter Lang, 2006. 149 pp.
- Taavitsainen, Irma, and Andreas H. Jucker. "Speech Act Verbs and Speech Acts in the History of English." *Methods in Historical Pragmatics*. Ed. Fitzmaurice and Taavitsainen. pp. 107–38.
- Tanaka, Tomoyuki. "The Rise of Lexical Subjects in English Infinitives." *Jnl of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 10 (2007): 25–67.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Close. "Old English Left-Dislocations: Their Structure and Information Status." *Folia Linguistica* 41 (2007): 405–41.
- van Gelderen, Elly. "The Definiteness Cycle in Germanic." *Jnl of Germanic Linguistics* 19 (2007): 275–308.
- van Kemenade, Ans. "Formal Syntax and Language Change: Developments and Outlook." *Diachronica* 24 (2007): 155–69.
- Welna, Jerzy. "Peculiar Vowel Levelling in the Sequences *weor/wyr/wor* in Early English." *Language and Text*. Ed. Johnston et al. [see sec. 2] pp. 411–26.

Wischer, Ilse. "Markers of Futurity in Old English and the Grammaticalization of *shall* and *will*." *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 42 (2006): 165–78.

Yanagi, Sayo. "Repeated Prepositions in the Twelfth-Century English Homilies." *Language and Beyond*. Ed. Sawada et al. [see sec. 2] pp. 583–601.

Yanagi, Tomohiro. "A Consideration of Clitics in Old English." *Boekihu: Chibu International Review* 2 (2007): 116–24. [in Japanese]

4. Literature

4a. General and Miscellaneous

Daniel Anlezark compares "Poisoned Places: The Avernian Tradition in Old English Poetry," *ASE* 36: 103–26, suggesting that the classical *topos* of a gloomy serpent-infested region influenced both the description of Grendel's mere in *Beowulf* (ll. 1357b–76b and 1408–32a) and that of a certain plain in *Solomon and Saturn II*, where an aggressive warrior, apparently named Wulf, is said to have killed twenty-five dragons before succumbing himself (ll. 198b–215). Avernus is described in Book 6 of Virgil's *Aeneid* as a cave and lake shunned by normal creatures, hence its name in Greek, *Aornos* 'the Birdless Place' (ll. 237–42). In describing Grendel's mere, Hrothgar tells Beowulf that a stag beset by hounds would rather give up his life on the bank rather than plunge into its evil waters. This reluctance may be especially significant in light of another classical tradition, observed by Lucretius in his *De rerum natura* 'On the Nature of Things' (first century BC) and Dracontius in his *De laudibus Dei* 'On Praises of God' (fifth century AD), that stags have power over poisonous snakes and with impunity can draw them from their holes by the breath of their nostrils. This motif was adduced by several Church Fathers in explicating the stag as an emblem of Christ. The toxic landscape of Avernus is also described in Lucan's first-century *Pharsalia* (Book 3, ll. 399–423) and the seventh-century *Etymologiae* of Isidore of Seville, which Latin texts, along with Virgil's *Aeneid*, were known in Anglo-Saxon England, both to the circle of Aldhelm at Malmesbury in the seventh century and to that of Alcuin at York in the eighth. Alcuin could have read Lucretius at the court of Charlemagne. Anlezark concludes that the use of Avernian imagery in *Beowulf* and *Solomon and Saturn II* provides some evidence that the study of Latin poetry was significant in the development of Old English vernacular epic.

CD

One of his three 2007 publications, Christopher Abram's "Aldhelm and the Two Cultures of Anglo-Saxon Poetry," *Literature Compass* 4/5: 1354–77, argues

that the traditional dichotomy of Old English vs. Anglo-Latin should be revised as two parts of the larger Anglo-Saxon culture. Modern Anglo-Saxon studies, he argues, suffer from arbitrary distinctions that privilege Old English and have "marginalized, denigrated and ignored" Anglo-Latin poetry (1355). The interaction of the two cultures of poetry might lead to "a more sophisticated understanding of their historical and literary contexts" (1358). Although the article in the main addresses the influence of Anglo-Latin upon Old English, Abram begins with an overview of vernacular characteristics, such as alliteration, in the Anglo-Latin poetry of Aldhelm and Æthilwald (1359–1364). The remainder of the article demonstrates the similarities between Anglo-Latin verse and the poems *Exodus* (1365–66), *Exeter Riddle* 35 (1366), and *The Ruin* (1366–68), as well as a more extensive comparison to the *Riming Poem* (1368–70) and the macaronic verse found in the *Latin-English Proverbs* and *Aldhelm* (1370–71). Abrams makes a strong case for the inclusion of more Anglo-Latin poetry into what constitutes Anglo-Saxon literature. One thinks of J.R.R. Tolkien's address "English and Welsh," which spins a quip attributable to C.S. Lewis that "English Philologists...who have no first-hand acquaintance with Welsh lack an experience necessary to their business." A multicultural approach, or in this case multi-lingual, is required to gain a sense of the multi-lingual/cultural Britain.

Frederick Biggs edits a volume that, as the foreword says, "brings up to date the entries on apocrypha first published in *Sources of Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture: A Trial Version*, edited by Biggs, Thomas D. Hill, and Paul E. Szarmach" from 1990. The 2007 update, *Sources of Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture: The Apocrypha*; *Instrumenta Anglistica Mediaevalia* 1 (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications) will be of invaluable service to generations of scholars by providing a catalogue of apocryphal biblical texts known to the Anglo-Saxons, manuscripts in which they occur, as well as other integral pieces of information. As editor and primary contributor, Biggs has included and compiled entries from various scholars, namely Mary Clayton, Thomas N.

Hall, Clare A. Lees, James H. Morey, Antonette diPaolo Healey, Michael W. Twomey, and Charles D. Wright. Given the nature of this work, a review of each entry would be neither feasible nor useful. SASLC Project Director, Thomas Hall, provides the foreword (ix–xi), and Biggs the *Guide for Readers* (xiii–xx). The organization of the entries follows seven categories of apocryphal texts: Old Testament Apocrypha, Apocrypha about Christ and Mary, Apocryphal Acts, Apocryphal Epistles, Apocryphal Apocalypses, and a category for Miscellaneous Apocrypha. Biggs provides introductory material for each category and lays out criteria for categorization in addition to other relevant information. Following the entries is a substantial bibliography, which accounts for more than 20% of the volume's pages. Standard information for each entry includes the specific manuscript in which an apocryphal text exists, any references to it in a booklist, a list of any Anglo-Saxon or Anglo-Latin translations, Anglo-Saxon citation or quotation of it, and any reference made to it in other Anglo-Saxon texts. More detailed information is provided in the body of the entry, with all cross-references within the volume highlighted in bold and/or capitalized headings. In addition to the cross-referencing of material within each entry, the reader can also make use of a general index and index of specific manuscripts.

Text and Transmission in Medieval Europe (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars), edited by Chris Bishop, collects essays on various topics related to the complicated web of text and document that constitutes the inherently interdisciplinary field of Medieval Studies. In addition to the introductory chapter which relates the genesis of the collection in a 2005 conference at Australian National University, the book contains eight essays on Irish saints, Greek history, Italian politics, Old English literature, twelfth-century Mariology, Iberian Jewish manuscripts, and the Middle English *Ballad of Twelfth Day*. Bishop's own contribution is reviewed below, and Robert DiNapoli's "Close to the Edge: *The Fortunes of Men and the Limits of Wisdom*" in section 4b, while the others do not touch on Old English studies *per se*.

Bishop's "The 'Lost' Literature of England: Text and Transmission in Tenth-Century Wessex," 76–126, accomplishes the almost Herculean task of summarizing the transmission of Old English vernacular poetry, while also commenting on the question of what texts possibly did not survive the period. It seeks to place the major manuscript sources of vernacular verse within a historical and paleographical context. Key to this article's point of view is the notion that tenth-century

Wessex, under the guidance of its clerical and secular leaders, is responsible for the transmission of the overwhelming majority of vernacular verse (77–78). Due to the scope of this piece, it is the single largest chapter in the collection. Most admirably, Bishop summarizes the history of *Beowulf* scholarship relating to the dating and provenance of the *Nowell Codex*. He is well aware of how daunting this task is, and acknowledges that he is able only to present uncontested issues and brief synopses of debates with regard to *Beowulf* (78). However, Bishop is not shy about voicing his belief that a tenth-century composition of the poem would answer a great number of problematic issues (90). Subsequent to discussion of the *Beowulf* manuscript, scholarship on each of the other three major codices is presented, along with the ASC and other minor poetic texts and fragments (90–108). After the overview of the major vernacular literary monuments, Bishop draws attention to the prominence of Latin learning (as well as its absence during periods predating the reign of Alfred) as an argument that perhaps most of the vernacular poetry that was committed to writing has survived. Survival of early Anglo-Latin poetry would suggest that we cannot blame the predations of Vikings or other calamities as the cause for a paucity of Anglo-Saxon literature. Bishop concludes his work with an overview of the decline of Latin literacy and the rise of the Benedictine renaissance, as well as a view of three important figures tied to increased literacy in the tenth century: Æthelwold, Oswald, and Dunstan (108–124). These three clerics, as Bishop sees it, could be responsible for what secular poetry was entrusted to writing (125).

Other essays in *Text and Transmission in Medieval Europe* which concern topics more tangential to Anglo-Saxon England, include Bridgette Slavin's "The Irish Birdman: Kingship and Liminality in *Buile Suibhne*," an early Irish tale preserved in seventeenth-century manuscripts presents a view of the hero of this tale as a blend of Christian biblical allusions and elements of the native Irish narrative tradition. The hero Suibhne Geilt, "Sweeney the Mad-man," is a figure standing at the edge of his Christian society, who reflects the biblical reign of Nebuchadnezzar as well as notions of Irish Kingship. John Martyn's "The Eunuch Narses" provides a thorough account of this sixth-century figure who in the service of Emperor Justinian fought and conquered the Gothic King Totila and obtained a position of wealth and power within the last years of the Roman Empire. Bronwen Neil's "The Politics of Hagiography in Ninth-Century Rome" covers the achievements of the ninth-century Anastasius Bibliothecarius in translating saints' lives from Greek to Latin with respect to

Frankish politics in Rome. Walter Kudrycz's "Perpetual Devotion: Interpreting Medieval Mariology" investigates the rise in twelfth-century worship of the Virgin Mary and raises the question of whether Mariology is an insight into medieval thought, and to what extent that the notion of Mariology is a post-medieval one. The complex interplay and contextualization required for reading an illuminated Jewish Iberian manuscript is the topic of Vanessa Crosby's "Illuminating Ritual Texts." Crosby argues that one must account for both textual and visual elements in order to properly approach the multifaceted aspects of the act of reading. Diane Speed's contribution "A *Ballad of Twelfth Night: Texts and Contexts*" concludes the collection in using this short poetic work as a means of viewing the process of manuscript production and the act of retelling biblical stories in a medieval context. This chapter is followed also by an edition of the text accompanied by a full translation and modest notes in Appendix I. Although most of the content of this volume does not concern Old English, it provides a reminder of the advantages of seeing topics in medieval textual studies in a multi-faceted, multi-national perspective.

John Black in "Tradition and Transformation in the Cult of St. Guthlac in Early Medieval England," *Heroic Age* 10: n.p., takes a diachronic approach to the saints' lives and graphic representations of Guthlac in pre- and post-Conquest England in order to delineate and explain their differences as well as the decline of the cult of St. Guthlac. These comparisons serve to elucidate the social, cultural, and historical significance of these changes" (§1). The earliest texts surveyed by Black are Felix's *Vita Sancti Guthlaci*, the Old English *Martyrology*, *Guthlac A* and *B* of the *Exeter Book*, the Old English prose *Life of St. Guthlac*, and the Guthlac homily in the Vercelli Codex. Common to these versions of the life of St. Guthlac is a wide-ranging appeal to an Anglo-Saxon audience, both noble and common, warrior and Christian (§17). In contrast, the post-Conquest texts center around Crowland Abbey and seem to have been a product of the abbey's land struggles in the High Middle Ages. Vitalis's account of Guthlac in his *Ecclesiastical History* and the visual records in the Guthlac Roll and stone carvings in Crowland Abbey serve to tie Guthlac to the locality, and bolster its claim to land privileges (§31). Latter treatments of Guthlac account for the decline in the Guthlac cult. The emphasis on Guthlac's local importance overspecialized the cult and prevented a wider spread of interest in the saint (§35).

Virginia Blanton's monograph, *Signs of Devotion: The Cult of St. Æthelthryth in Medieval England, 695–1615* (University Park: Pennsylvania State UP) is a collection

of studies of St. Æthelthryth during five distinct periods spanning nine centuries. Taking a semiotic approach, using both written and visual texts, Blanton applies synchronic and diachronic lenses to better understand the significance and changes in religious views related to the saint. There are three key focuses for the importance of this saint: the various roles filled by Æthelthryth (queen, virgin, wife, among others), the multifaceted roles leading to her wide appeal, the transformation of a local saint to one of national importance (7–11). The five chapters of the book are arranged chronologically, the first two concentrating on Anglo-Saxon England, the third on the period of the Norman conquest, and the remaining two in the Middle English period, chapter four centered on an Anglo-Norman vita. Chapter one, "*Cicatricis uestigia parerent: The Mark of Virginité in Bede's Ecclesiastical History* (ca. 630–ca. 731)," examines in detail the importance Bede places on Æthelthryth's retention of virginité despite marriage. The post-mortem healing of Æthelthryth's wounds reinforces the connection between the physical and spiritual (52). Chapter two, "*Æðeldryð wolde ða ealle woruld-þincg forlætan: The Ideology of Chastity and Monastic Reform* (ca. 970–ca. 998)," takes a look at the saint in works by Æthelwold's *Benedictional* and Ælfric's *Lives of Saints*. Whereas Bede emphasized the Æthelthryth's virginité, the Benedictine Reform seems to have generalized her chastity and sought to extend it to the male realm as well in its efforts to forge its vision of monasticism (128). The third chapter, "*Tota integra, tota incorrupta: The Involable Body and Ely's Monastic Identity* (1066–ca. 1133)," brings the study out of the Anglo-Saxon period *per se*. Here Æthelthryth's virginité takes on a metaphorical and political role in the context of the Norman Conquest. Standing in for pre-Conquest rights, the saint is used as a symbol for Ely's drive to remain untouched by the Normans. The *Liber Eliensis* becomes then a tool to preserve the monastery's rights to estates in the twelfth century off limits to encroachment (170–171). Continuing into the Norman era, Chapter Four, "*La gloriuse seint Audree / Une noble eglise a fundee: Chastity, Widowhood, and Aristocratic Patronage* (ca. 1189–1416)," reads the late twelfth- /early thirteenth-century *La Vie Sainte Audrée*. This avatar of the life of Æthelthryth is appropriated by female aristocrats. Blanton extends the readings of the Anglo-Norman poem with evidence from fifteenth-century charters in order to gain insight into the role noble women played in donations to the church. The fifth and final chapter, "*Abbesse heo was hir self imad after þe furste gere / And an holi couent inow heo nori-sede þere: Clerical Production, Vernacular Texts, and*

Lay Devotion (ca. 1325–ca. 1615)” continues the issues addressed in Chapter four, but draws on a variety of visual texts to complement the poetic and prose texts examined. The variety of approaches and objects of study Blanton employs matches the multifaceted and multivalent aspects of the cult of St. Æthelthryth. Despite the chronological breadth covered, or perhaps because of it, Blanton presents her insights not only to the cult of the saint, but also the uses and development of the devotees and their religious beliefs across time.

Eric Carlson’s dissertation “The Crisis of Violence: Warfare, Genetics, and Culture in Old English and Old Norse Texts” (Ph.D. Diss., Purdue University, 2006; *DAI* 67A, 3396) examines humanity’s struggle with violence and peace as represented in Anglo-Saxon and Old Norse literature. The focus of this study is based on notions that human beings are predisposed to engaging in violence so as to acquire greater position within in- vs. out-group struggles, while at the same time predisposed to seeking communal benefits through more peaceful means of interaction. Carlson takes an interdisciplinary approach to this endeavor, drawing on concepts not only from literary analysis, but also from anthropology, biology, and history (2). After establishing key concepts and criteria, most importantly the Girardian approach to mimesis, in chapter one, Carlson begins his study in Chapter two by approaching the key elements of medieval warfare among the Anglo-Saxons. In particular he establishes the differences between military units such as the *here* and the *fyrð*, provides a tactical analysis of *The Battle of Maldon*, and the roles played by specific weapons such as the sword and the spear. Chapter three approaches the feud, a point in Anglo-Saxon and medieval Scandinavian culture where choices between peace and violence make close contact, and the individual member must make a decision. Chapter four examines the Scandinavian side of the crisis of violence, with special attention to in- and out-group notions. Points of interest are those figures who stand on the edges of society, *berserks*, *úlfheðinar*, and shape-shifters. Chapter five concludes with an examination of the key topics with reference to *Beowulf*, where the in-group is represented by Beowulf, and the out-group by Grendel and his kin.

In “Concepts of Power in Anglo-Scandinavian Verse,” in *Aspects of Power and Authority in the Middle Ages*, ed. Bolton and Meek (see sec. 1), 217–33, Jayne Carroll examines and compares five poems from the time of King Æthelstan: *The Battle of Brunanburh*, *Carta dirige gressus*, *Rex pius Athelstan*, an acrostic by John the Old Saxon, and Egill Skallagrímsson’s *Aðalsteinsdrápa*. Rather than engaging in a comparative study to show

influence from one literary tradition upon another, as one often finds, Carroll seeks to probe the ways in which each poem emanates from and projects authority (220–21). In doing so, the role of power within each poem is better understood. After reviewing the ways in which power structures manifest themselves in skaldic poetry and the poems of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (222–21), Carroll contrasts the Anglo-Scandinavian “discourses of power” (224) with the Latin poems. In each case, however, power presents itself differently. In the *Carta dirige gressus*, Æthelstan is seen as a chosen man fulfilling his destiny set by God (226). Similarly in the acrostic poem composed possibly by John the Old Saxon, Æthelstan is presented as God’s champion fighting against *beliales* ‘demons’, likely standing in for the heathen Vikings of the day (228). Somewhat different is the *Rex pius Athelstan*, in which Æthelstan’s military prowess figures most prominently. The remains of *Aðalsteinsdrápa* could also be described as presenting the king in his militaristic qualities, though the conventions of skaldic verse guide the description to a certain extent (228–29). The last close reading is that of *The Battle of Brunanburh*. In comparison to the other works, Carroll sees *Brunanburh* as a legitimizing work, serving to promote the king and his brother Edmund (229–32). Carroll’s goal is, as she puts it, “to have shown that the Latin and Scandinavian verse has an important role to play in consideration of the literary history” of “Anglo-Scandinavian” England in the early tenth century.

In another publication, Jayne Carroll’s “*Engla Waldend, Rex Admirabilis*: Poetic Representations of King Edgar,” *RES* 58: 113–32, provides an intensely detailed reading of the three *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* poems on the death of Edgar as well as one Anglo-Latin version of the same composed by Æthelweard. These readings are put together in order to better situate the differences between the poems and how Latin and vernacular codes result in distinct representations of the same events. Despite the traditional view of the Chronicle poems as panegyrics or eulogies, it is evident from the Latin text, that Æthelweard did not hold the same view (117). Carroll comes to the conclusion that the vernacular poems represent kingship as dependent on God and, therefore, the church, intimating us to Edgar’s relationship with various houses. The Latin poem, on the other hand, is a more complete poem of praise, where Edgar is individualized, suggesting that the audience was perhaps more familiar with the one praised (132), here perhaps Matilda (131).

Susan L. Crane’s “Describing the World: Aldhelm’s *Enigmata* and the Exeter *Riddles* as Examples of Early Medieval Ekphrasis” (Ph.D. Diss., State Univ. of New

York at Stony Brook, 2006, *DAI* 68A, 182) examines the overlap in poetic techniques found in Aldhelm's riddles as well as those in the *Exeter Book*. The focal point in this dissertation is the use of *ekphrasis* or "vivid visual descriptions" (4), a characteristic of the riddles previously overlooked, which provides a reevaluation of riddles as a genre for passing the time to a genre which reveals the poetic capabilities of monastic Anglo-Saxons. Chapter one establishes *ekphrasis* as a literary term and the use of the device in the classical and modern world. The background receives further detail with an overview of Aldhelm's life and work as well as the of the *Exeter Book* riddles. This chapter concludes with a section on the role of names and naming as a characteristic which defines the *Enigmata* and sets them apart from the *Exeter Riddles* (6–34). The second chapter begins with the application of Quintillian's rhetorical treatises to set forth an idea of how Anglo-Saxon scribes, schooled in Latin rhetoric, would have read and understood *ekphrasis* as a literary device, embellishing language to make it more vivid (35–52). Crane then turns her attention to Aldhelm's knowledge of the works of Symphosius and his combination of the *enigma* with Christian theology as a mixture of genres which enables the riddle to rise from linguistic trifles to poetic and didactic texts (52–64). Building upon the foundation of the first two chapters, Crane analyzes Aldhelm's *Enigmata* 2, *Ventus* "Wind," alongside the *Exeter Riddles* with the solution "wind." Through comparison of the two texts on a common theme, Crane comes to the conclusion that both share many features of composition in terms of their use of *ekphrasis*, which lends both to being very descriptive and easy to solve. That these riddles are more obvious than others should lead one to suspect that their intended function was as a source of contemplation rather than a test of wit or entertainment (65–90). Continuing on the theme of God-created things, chapter three closes with an examination of the *Exeter Riddle* "tree" and Aldhelm's five *enigmata* (nos. 69, 76, 77, 91, and 94) concerning the trees yew, apple, fig, palm, and dwarf-elder. Each riddle and *enigma* is then provided a close reading of its form and structure with attention paid to the descriptive characteristics and *prosopopoeia* evident. A conclusion which drew a common thread for all the poems analyzed in the chapter would have been welcome. Whereas chapter three deals with God-created things, chapter four's focus is on the man-made. It first investigates the four "ship" riddles of the *Exeter Book* (nos. 19, 32, 36, and 64), which are characterized as giving attention to the "beauty, movement, composition and/or cargo" (127). The objects of Aldhelm's *Enigmata* discussed in

this chapter are the lighthouse, Colossus, Chrismal, organ, and book-chest. Aldhelm's approach to describing these objects create a "landscape of talking symbols that mnemonically reinforce the way the reader understands, or is meant to understand, the world" (147). The fifth chapter concerns itself with the mythical creatures described by Aldhelm, the Minotaur, the Unicorn, and the Scylla, of which there are no comparable riddles in the *Exeter Book*. Crane's dissertation offers a terse conclusion which argues that the Latin and English poetry of the Anglo-Saxon world possessed "a complex, multilayered, and frequently geometrical order that demonstrates a sophisticated knowledge of literary conventions and innovation" (161).

Robert Fulk addresses the use of metrical characteristics for the purposes of dating poetry in "Old English Meter and Oral Tradition: Three Issues Bearing on Poetic Chronology," *JEGP* 106: 306–324. The three issues addressed are metrical phenomena that link archaic phonological forms of Old English words and the formulaic system used by Anglo-Saxon poetics to compose verse at later dates in the period. Fulk begins with a presentation of Terasawa's Law and concludes with a defense of his use of Kaluza's Law in giving a relative dating for *Beowulf* vis-à-vis other poems in the corpus. Terasawa's Law, a term coined by Fulk in this article, describes the tendency in OE poetry to avoid compounds such as *hildefrecan*, where a resolvable sequence in the second compound element follows an unstressed syllable at the end of the first element (307–8). As such this tendency links metrical and morphological phenomena. Moreover, because Terasawa's Law is morphologically conditioned, it is useful in determining whether historically monosyllabic words with disyllabic spelling in manuscripts, e.g. *wæpen* < *wæpn* 'weapon' (words with "parasited" vowels), are to be scanned poetically with one or two syllables. In comparison of relatively late with relatively early poems it is clear that later poems use non-parasited forms of words almost exclusively in poetic compounds, not as simplexes, suggesting their authors connected non-parasiting with poetic diction (308–309), but only when the parasited form is also metrically well-formed (310–312). Part two of his article focuses again on parasitic vowels in compounds, though focusing here on elements with prefixes such as *ge-* following historical monosyllables, e.g. *Bwf.* 1326 *eaxlgestealla*, and whether such prefixes are metrical filler or semantic necessities. In the final portion of his article, Fulk defends his earlier work on the use of Kaluza's Law as a metrical criterion for dating *Beowulf* to no later than 725 if Mercian, or 825 if Northumbrian. The two main counterarguments presented

to Fulk's theory as found in *History of Old English Meter* are that the phenomena of Kaluza's Law were morphologized in later forms of the verse (Suzuki) or that these phenomena are better explained as relics present in formulaic diction (Hutcheson). Fulk supports his earlier claims on dating *Beowulf* by iterating that exceptions to Kaluza's Law in other works cited by Hutcheson need not gainsay *Beowulf*'s adherence to historically different vowel lengths in compounds, as these instances only indicate that the poets of works such as *Genesis A* did not adhere to the same usage as the *Beowulf* poet. It does not, however, explain why the *Beowulf* poet does not deviate from a pattern of vowel length not easily generalized, unless present in his language (317–19). A remaining question from Fulk is why, if the patterns of Kaluza's Law were formulaic, do other poems deviate from observing the Law to the extent that they do, but the *Beowulf* poet does not? If they are contemporaneous, then they have access to the same poetic tradition. Fulk concludes that the oral formulaic tradition of Old English verse as well as metrical phenomena are critical to understanding the chronology of the corpus of verse, especially when they overlap.

A collection of essays related to Anglo-Saxon, Celtic, German, and Scandinavian interests are brought together in *Myth in Early Northwest Europe*, ed. Stephen O. Glosecki (Tempe: ACMRS). Some of the essays are reviewed in more detail in other sections of *YWOES*, namely Glosecki's "Stranded Narratives: Myth, Metaphor, and the Metrical Charms," Marijane Osborne's "Manipulating Waterfalls: Mythic Places in *Beowulf* and *Grettissaga*, Lawrence and Purnell," Gale Owen-Crocker, "Beast Men: Eofor and Wulf and the Mythic Significance of Names," and Geoffrey Russom's "At the Center of *Beowulf*." Similarly contributions by John Niles, "True Stories and Other Lies," Craig Davis's "Theories of History in Traditional Plots," and John Hill, "Gods at the Borders," are reviewed separately in this section. Because they will be of interest to readers of *YWOES*, summaries of the other contributions to the volume are offered here. Glosecki's introductory essay (xiii–xli) to the volume does more than summarize and unite the contents. In addition to drawing out the mythical elements of the contributors' essays, Glosecki reviews some of the key trends and problems of the study of myth since the early nineteenth century. George Koziol's "Truth and Its Consequences: Why Carolingianists Don't Speak of Myth" seeks a better understanding of myth by examining what separates the Carolingian Christian *Weltanschauung* from the views held by their non-Christian neighbors and contemporaries. After reviewing what one understands as

"myth," and whether it existed for pre-Christian Germanic tribes (72–77), Koziol relates the matter-of-factness of Carolingian writers and the lack of myth in their works. From there the article turns to the notion of "truth" (82–93). In conclusion Koziol suggests that the lack of interest in myth is to be explained in the Carolingian self-identity as God's Chosen. (94). Michael Enright adds new and thoroughly interesting insight into the interpretation of plate VI of the Gundestrup Cauldron, which depicts numerous warriors and a giant figure placing a warrior in a vat. Departing from earlier readings of the giant figure as a Gaulish *Dían Cécht* or sacrificial drowning, Enright suggests that this scene depicts the initiation of young warriors through a process of tempering the initiates in the same manner that a blacksmith quenches hot iron in order to harden it. In coming to this conclusion Enright reviews characteristics of the Iron-Age *Männerbund*, as well as suitable interpretations of all figures on the plate. As such, the quenching serves to cool the hot-blooded nature of youthful warriors. A factor not addressed by Enright, which this reviewer finds this to be a suitable correlate to his interpretation, is the possibility that the Celtic source for the Proto-Germanic word **tsarn-* 'iron' might have its most likely etymology in Proto-Indo-European **h₁esh₂r* 'blood'. Following Enright's essay is a contribution by Josephy Nagy, "Hearing and Hunting in Medieval Celtic Tradition." This piece compares the Old/Middle Irish *Acallam* with the Middle Welsh *Culhwch and Olwen*, and examines the common motif of the search for traditional knowledge by hunting a mythic boar. In "*Homo necans borealis*: Fatherhood and Sacrifice in *Sonatorrek*," Joseph Harris examines Egill Skallagrímsson's well-known poem in light of the mythological connection of Odin and Baldr. Harris reviews instances of these and related motifs in Scandinavian and Germanic literature, pausing also on the Herebeald/Hæðcyn episode of *Beowulf* occasionally (162, 166). Harris approaches the hypothesis that the blood-sacrifice of a son by the father represents a "solidarity of the male line" (169). Reading *Sonatorrek* in this light may provide impetus for additional questions regarding early Norse kinship, gender, culture, and myth (170). Roberta Frank, in the aptly titled "The Lay of the Land in Skaldic Praise Poetry," examines the *double entendre* in skaldic verse where seizure of a country overlaps metaphorically with imagery of sexuality and rape. After providing an overview of instances of kenings based on the *hieros gamos* of Jörð in courtly praise poetry, Frank examines the extent to which one may find the *hieros gamos* in European and Middle Eastern mythology. The thirteenth essay in this collection,

Christina Lee's "Children of Darkness: Arminius/Siegfried in Germany," investigates the use of the Siegfried and Arminius legends in the formulation of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century German nationalism. This collection is finished off with Tom Shippey's overview of the use of mythology in literature, including important popular works in "Imagined Cathedrals: Retelling Myth in the Twentieth Century." This survey of works that adopt mythological themes serves to show that myths bring more beginnings than conclusions (329).

In the first chapter of the volume edited by Glosecki, *Myth in Early Northwest Europe*, John Niles explores the nature of myth and truth in an essay animated by delightfully peripatetic arguments, "True Stores and Other Lies" (1–30). As one of the first in this collection, the essay is focused on myth in a wider theoretical view, here, the question of what constitutes truth. One may quote Niles's convenient summation of the essay that "As a process of myth-making, storytelling in general fulfills a vital role for both individuals and social groups through its ability to tell the truth through lies" (2). I use the word peripatetic above because though Niles begins with a comparison of "truth" between modern forensics and Anglo-Saxon legal practice (3–6), the essay turns to variants of the "Prisoner's Dilemma" riddle (7–11), modal and aspectual grammatical categories (e.g. evidentials and subjunctive) in the world's languages (11–20), and comes to a conclusion via examination of a humorous tale of a Scottish storyteller (20–27). Despite the paucity of material directly related to Anglo-Saxon studies, the thoughts presented in the essay seem relevant reading to those who find themselves in a position to defend and explain Anglo-Saxon studies, or literary studies in general.

Craig Davis's "Theories of History in Traditional Plots" (31–45) fits nicely with Glosecki's essay, which immediately precedes it in *Myths in Early Northwest Europe* because both deal with myth in a more theoretical sense. Davis's focus is the interplay between tradition and plot, seeking to tease apart the driving forces for both. Surveying a variety of theories of plot, from Aristotle to Lévi-Strauss, Davis relates each to an understanding of *Beowulf* and an understanding that its plot-structure, though traditional, is not pre-determined by tradition (44).

John M. Hill's "Gods at the Borders: Northern Myth and Anglo-Saxon Story," in *Myth in Early Northern Europe*, ed. Glosecki, 241–56, explores the motif of the one-handed god of the *Eddas*, Týr, in Old English literature, with primary emphasis on *Beowulf*, but reference also *Judith*, *The Battle of Maldon*, *The Battle of Brunanburh*, and Bede's recounting of the death of King

Oswald. Key elements for Hill in his search for the Týr-like hero combine the heroic defense of one's own land/people in combination with bodily mutilation, preferably on the hand. Additional aspects sought by Hill for this topos also involve wordplay using OE *tír* 'glory, fame, light' and God's presence symbolized by the sun (244–45). Hill sees a clear example of the handless aspect of the Týr-topos in *Beowulf* in the loss of Handscio at Heorot, whereas the victory sanctioned by God is evident in the well-known instances of the "hero on the beach" motif (245–46). Handlessness is of course seen in the results of Beowulf's fight against Grendel (248–50) and in Wiglaf's wounding in the fight against the fire-dragon (252). Judith is also counted among the Týr-like warriors (251–53), though Hill does not point out exactly how Judith possesses the "hand-strength" one might look for (252). This is much clearer in Hill's reading of *Maldon*, where Byrhtnoth loses his arm and life in battle against wolfish Vikings (254). Hill's essay does much to initiate reflection on the Týr-qualities in the heroes of early Germanic literature, whose presence is overshadowed by more Odinic and Thorish aspects. Readers are likely to point out, however, that taking eddic narratives as representative of common-Germanic mythology is fraught with difficulty, all the more so when applied to non-Scandinavian literature predating the *Eddas*. Hill addresses this point with the assurance that there is enough indication that Anglo-Saxons would have known "some version (whether numinous, hypostatized, or otherwise involved) of Odin, Thor, Týr, perhaps Heimdal, along with Freyr, Frigg, and other fertility deities" (244). It seems also that Hill avoids bringing in other parallels that are closer linguistically and geographically, for example OE *Saxneat* and OS *Saxnôt*, the figure *Níadau* of Old Irish legend, and *Lludd* of the *Mabinogion*, the last two, like Týr, one-handed figures of kingship (one thinks of the classic essay on the topic, J.R.R. Tolkien's "The Name Nodens" (1932)). In addition, Hill refers to Týr's being a "god of war" (243) or "god of war as law," though without specific textual support. The concept of Týr as war-god seems to stem not so much from actual mythological narrative as much as it does from historians' *interpretatio Romana* and early Germanic equation of Lat. *dies Martis* = OE *Tiwes dæg* or Ger. *Dienstag* < *Dinges tag*. Equation of Mars and Tiw stem not so much from their both being gods of war but rather from their shared aspect of presiding over group assemblies and oaths (see, for example Jaan Puhvel, *Comparative Mythology* [Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1987], 149, 172–73, 192–93; D.H. Green, *Language and History in the Early Germanic World*, [Cambridge: CUP, 1998], 247–50). In mentioning the Dumézilian view of

Týr as “sky-god of war as law,” or in Hall’s terms “the sky god of luminously settled boundaries, of the binding of terror and the unbinding of reigns of terror” (245) one might also reconsider in broader Indo-European terms one of the base premises of Hall’s piece: *Týr*’s sacrifice of the hand as “a profoundly purposeful pledge, a potent and even sacral hand...” (244). While no one would argue with Hall that *Týr*’s hand-pledge was a demonstration of exceptional courage, what is perhaps overlooked in Hall’s essay is *Týr*’s perjury. The various reflexes of the Indo-European ‘Father Sky’ seem to have been overseers, maintainers and enforcers of oaths (for instance Mitra-Varuṇa, Mithra, Zeus, Jupiter, *inter al.*), the sacrifice made by *Týr* is arguably his perjury more than the loss of his hand.

Helen Gittos, in “Hallowing the Rood: Consecrating Crosses in Late Anglo-Saxon England,” *Cross and Culture in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Jolly et al. (see sec. 2), 242–75, reconstructs the rituals used in late tenth- and early eleventh-century churches for the installation of new crosses. Her article begins with a look at rituals described by later clergy in France and Ireland (243–46), and then turns to a quick survey of relevant late Anglo-Saxon manuscripts (246–56). Many of the later rites have slightly different prayers, hymns, and arrangements, which bespeak changing interests (256–62). One of the most significant alterations over time has been the focus given the material from which the cross was constructed (263–68). Gittos provides a table of comparisons for the various rituals, and closes with a listing of the prayers used within the rites (269–75).

In “Preaching the Cross: Texts and Contexts from the Benedictine Reform,” in *Cross and Culture*, 36–48, Joyce Hill compares two homilies written by Ælfric: the homily for the Feast of the Invention of the Cross and the homily for the Feast of Exaltation of the Cross. These two homilies by the same author invite explanation for their remarkably dissimilar characteristics. Ælfric’s homily for the Feast of Invention is terse and short on detail, with the effect of making this homily less known (37–40). The homily for the Feast of Exaltation, however, is replete with details (40–42). The intent of his *Catholic Homilies*, which contains the simpler homily, as a source for the laity and the *Lives of Saints* for a well-educated clerical audience partly explain the differences between their styles (44–45). Hill closes with speculation that the more detailed homily for the Exaltation is laced with more symbolism and detail for an audience that is more in tune not only with the scripture and doctrine, but also with other rituals such as the Veneration of the Cross from the *Regularis Concordia* (47–48).

Sarah Keefer ties ritual, poetry, and drama together in “The Performance of the Cross in Anglo-Saxon England,” *Cross and Culture*, 203–41. Beginning with a look at *The Dream of the Rood* alongside related texts and the wonder of the speaking cross, Keefer looks at this motif by analyzing the rituals followed during the *Regularis Concordia* synod of some time between 970 and 975 at Winchester. Keefer then details all aspects of the Veneration of the Cross during Good Friday in exacting detail and compares similar veneration rituals on the Continent from which the English church drew. Keefer is careful to note all *ordines* employed, the hymns and their texts as well as the order of the procession, antiphony, and additional dramatic elements of the veneration. There is marvelous significance, the essay concludes, that this synod’s ritual was preserved in manuscripts a century later but with added dramatic use of other offices. Furthermore, one might read *The Dream of the Rood* in a new light, given the context of Good Friday’s Veneration of the Cross (240–41).

In the same volume R.M. Liuzza brings a wealth of information and analysis to bear in “Prayers and/or Charms Addressed to the Cross,” *Cross and Culture*, 276–320. Liuzza devotes a full seven pages to identifying manuscripts containing prayers and/or charms; using this “mass of evidence” (289), Liuzza then discusses the relationships among the prayers, personal devotion, and public devotion. More problematic is the definition of a charm in comparison to a prayer. Rather than give in to the conventional either/or choice, Liuzza views the cline of prayer ~ charm as one dependent on the context of performance (293–98), and concludes that the close examination of these sorts of works provide unique insights into public and individual acts of devotion (320).

Malcolm Godden’s “Did King Alfred Write Anything?” *MÆ* 76: 1–23 is sure to provoke responses. As one may gauge from the article’s title, Godden examines the arguments for assume Alfred’s authorship of the works attributed to him as well as the arguments against. Godden leaves out his own view until the final paragraph—“Alfred did not ‘write’ anything” (18)—which allows for equivocation, but which prompts thoughts nonetheless. The quotation marks here reference a principal question posed earlier in the text, whether the Alfred-author in question was Alfred the individual or others whom he commissioned (3). The main arguments put forth in support of viewing Alfred as the individual author are: the statements of authorship in the prefaces (4–8), lexical and stylistic similarities among the texts (8–11), and references to kings or kingship mentioned by interpolated Old English

passages (11–12). Godden counters each of these propositions with an examination instances in eighth and ninth century texts where the same could be said, yet we know them not to be true. Godden proceeds then to examine arguments that Alfred was not the author. The key arguments are: information from Asser's *Life of King Alfred* (12–13), the differences in translation method and style between the texts (13), and the critique of kingship and abuses of power (13–14). As in the first half, arguments are brought forth which challenge the veracity of these claims. After having demonstrated that both positions are assailable and uncertain, Godden poses a final question, namely, “why does it matter whether Alfred personally composed” the texts ascribed to him? Godden's answer to this follows immediately, that “[i]t matters for our understanding of Alfred himself, and of questions of education, culture, and literacy in the period. But for the *Consolation* and *Soliloquies* at least it also matters because it frees interpretation to concentrate on the texts themselves” (18). Godden's article is likely to generate additional dialogue regarding the issue of authorship.

Antonina Harbus offers an informative and hortatory piece in “Anglo-Saxon Mentalities and Old English Literary Studies,” *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses* 55: 13–21, which describes the emerging field of Cognitive Literary Studies and its potential for Anglo-Saxon studies. The main focus in this article is a survey of the growing trend in interdisciplinary approaches to the study of Old English literature (15). Harbus begins with an informative background to cognitive literary studies, that is, the investigation of literary texts with concepts drawn from cognitive science, philosophy, psychology, and other related fields. Whereas the use of literary texts to support theories of cognitive science has been an established practice, the converse is relatively new (16). In addition to a survey of various cognitive approaches to literature, Harbus argues that there is new life to be brought into Old English studies through a novel approach to the interrelationship between the literary text and its historical and social context. In this manner, for example, one may view well-known Old English texts freshly by reexamining notions such as “mind” and “self” in light of what cognitive science has to offer. By doing so, our field of Old English studies can remain “relevant, interesting, and viable in our modern world and competitive academic context” (19).

Hugh Magennis' “Imagery of Light in Old English Poetry: Traditions and Appropriations,” *Anglia* 125: 181–204, provides an overview of two distinct traditions of imagery in Old English verse and concludes with two interesting suggestions for *Beowulf* and *Juliana*.

Magennis contrasts the use of light in Christian poems, where light is connected with God and the secular world is dark (183–93), with poems not primarily religious in topic, where light equates with this world and darkness with death (193–202). In each case, Magennis provides a close reading of instances of OE *leoht*, and some synonyms, along with the possibility that phrases containing a demonstrative + *leoht* can be understood as meaning ‘the world.’ With this in mind, Magennis also suggests that the defective verse 2251b in *Beowulf* be emended to *para ðe þis [leoht] ofgeaf* rather than the usual [*lif*] (201–202). In closing this article turns to a phrase in *Juliana*, *sciran gesceaft* which seems to combine the light imagery of both religious and secular poetry. Here, Magennis argues, one can appreciate the depth and complexity of Cynewulf's work (203–204).

In a note “The Nine Herbs Charm,” *Germanic Notes and Reviews* 38: 5–10, Marie Nelson and Caroline Dennis identify instances of personification, imperatives, and sound symbolism in the alliterative cluster *st-*. Scholars of the Old English *Metrical Charms* may find little new in this piece, which focuses on the instances of direct address to the herbs. In some instances the argument is hampered by minor mistranslations; however, the lack sufficient textual support is more problematic for the argument, e.g. that l. 21 *Fleoh þu nu attorlaðe...* “does have a proper ring of authority” (8), a claim not pursued any further. The piece concludes that it is “the personification that gives animate life to the herbs” but that the performative aspects of the charm and the sound symbolism they contain hold the key to its efficacy (9).

In “Joyous Play and Bitter Tears: the *Riddles* and the *Elegies*,” in *Beowulf & Other Stories*, ed. North and Allard (see sec. 4 under *Beowulf*), 130–59, Jennifer Neville presents an amusingly written introduction to these sets of Old English texts. These two sets of poems are well matched, not only in stemming predominantly from the *Exeter Book*, but also because they represent two contrasting aspects of human existence. Following the topic of “Jokes” in the *Riddles* (130–37), Neville examines in greater detail the *Riddles* with sexual connotations (137–345), with a humorous style sure to be well received by students. Her discussion of the elegies addresses *The Seafarer*, *The Wanderer*, *The Wife's Lament*, and *Wulf and Eadwacer*. As with other chapters in this collection, a list of suggested reading, texts, and translations is provided. This synopsis presents a picture of the Anglo-Saxons as more like us today than most students anticipate.

Richard North's “Is There More Like *Beowulf*? Old English Minor Heroic Poems,” in *Beowulf & Other*

Stories, 95–129, provides an introductory overview of the monuments of Old English heroic poetry. Following an introduction to oral formulaic poetry of northern Europe, North summarizes important aspects of the *Finnsburh Fragment* and episode, *Widsith*, *Deor*, and *Waldere*. This overview concludes with a presentation of the topics related to Christianization of literature and a helpful reading list. In each case cross-references are made to analogues and connected works in Scandinavian and continental literatures. This work will be of wide interest for those teaching surveys, or touching on the place of Old English literature among related traditions.

Andy Orchard's "Were All the Poets Monks? Monasteries and Courts: Alcuin and Offa," in *Beowulf & Other Stories*, 219–45, offers a literary-historical view of the Mercian domination of the eighth century, as well as a concise biography of Alcuin of York. In addition to the standard lists of translations and suggestions for further reading found in all contributions to this volume, Orchard's essay is assisted by two maps. Focusing on the achievements of Aldhelm (223–24) and Boniface (224–26) for the insular figures, Orchard complements these two scholars with an overview of Alcuin and the important role played by Anglo-Saxon scholars in the Latin Middle Ages (226–33), as well as the insight into Offa provided by Alcuin's writings and the relations between the insular and continental worlds during the Carolingian period (233–42).

DPAS

In "Cædmon the Cowherd and Old English Biblical Verse" (in *Beowulf and Other Stories*, ed. North and Allard [see sect 4b. *Beowulf*], 189–218), Bryan W. Wyly begins by reminding us of Bede's biography, suggesting reasons the Cædmon story may have appealed to him. He then moves to a discussion of the nature of poetic inspiration exemplified in Bede's account, reminding us that Bede himself "never explicitly passes judgement as to whether or not Cædmon's dream was a miracle" (192); it might have been, Wyly suggests, simply a matter of an illiterate who had internalized the forms and formulas of vernacular without being taught to sing. What astonishes Bede, then, isn't a miracle of divine inspiration but the remarkable initiative of Cædmon in developing poetic skill without training (194). That OE poetry may be oral-formulaic in nature supports his contention that Cædmon could have assimilated all the knowledge he needed without formal instruction. Perhaps the most surprising assertion Wyly makes is that, contrary to received tradition, Cædmon was not a menial servant of the monastery, but a mid-level

member of the warrior culture, someone who had "reached a rank high enough in worldly society to have something to lose, yet perhaps too high to afford publicly dabbling in experimental improvisation" (207); seen in this way, his refusal to sing is not about a lack of ability, but an unwillingness to court humiliation. Wyly then revisits the anonymous OE religious poetry once thought to be attributable to Cædmon and argues for possible Cædmonean influence if not authorship; the "evocative fragment [of the hymn] gives us a glimpse of what other scholars were doing," using the vernacular language and literary forms to further the spread of Christianity and strengthen the devotion of believers (218).

MKR

A number of items appeared in 2007 focusing on charms and supernatural creatures of Anglo-Saxon England. Karin Olsen's "The *Lacnunga* and its Sources: *The Nine Herbs Charm* and *Wið Færstice* Reconsidered," *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses* 55: 23–31, argues that one must approach these texts with their Christian, late Anglo-Saxon context in mind. Furthermore, the elves, *hægtessan*, and pagan gods encountered in these charms may have been used as representatives of "demonic, disease-inflicting beings that were being displaced by the true God" (24). After remarking on the analogues to Woden's role in the *Nine Herbs Charm* as well as briefly mentioning the textual difficulties, Olsen presents her interpretation. Here, Olsen views Woden not as a magical healer, but a pagan god who failed in his attempt, causing more harm than good. The striking of the snake and its split into nine pieces could be seen as a multiplication of the poisons. For Olsen, Christ's appearance in line 58 of the charm and his conquering of death juxtaposes Christ's overcoming of death against Woden's spreading of poison (24–25). It is unfortunate that Olsen gives what amounts to a close reading of only selected lines of the text. Cruces abound, and one must wonder, in the context of a Christ-Woden juxtaposition, how one is to interpret ll. 37–38: *þa wyrte gesceop / witig drihten, // halig on heofonum, / þa he hongode*; "The wise lord/Lord created the herbs then, the holy one in the heavens, when he hung" (ASPR edition, my trans.) Turning to *Wið Færstice*, Olsen argues that the appearance of elves, gods and witches in this charm are not to be taken as indicators of pre-Christian beliefs, but rather as representatives of "the devil's domain." The traditional interpretation has been that the allusions to spears and other projectiles indicate a belief system in which sudden sharp internal pains are caused by elfin attack. Olsen casts further aspersions

on this interpretation by focusing on the imprecision with which one can identify the antagonists. In addition to pointing out how the charm does not clearly identify who does what (for example, who rides over the land? the *mihltigan wif*? the *esa*?) Olsen questions the connection between elves and smithing in order to demonstrate that one cannot assume that the smiths of the charm are not necessarily elves. The Christian context of the charm provides reason to view the role of smiths as beings to be connected with hellfire (28–30). Although scholars are tempted to draw conclusions about the pre-Christian culture of the Anglo-Saxons, Olsen argues that the Christian background in which these charms were produced should lead us to view the roles played by Woden, elves, witches, and other supernatural creatures as representative of a good/evil dichotomy rather than as holdovers from a pagan era.

Christine B. Thijs, “Early Old English Translation: Practice before Theory?” *Neophilologus* 91: 149–73, examines the differences of the Alfredian translations with respect to issues in translation theory, and in the context of what translation meant during the classical and medieval periods. Thijs’s initial overview of the decline in Latin competence in England (150–153) is followed by a summary of how translation was viewed and what was expected in it, beginning with classical Europe and extending to early Anglo-Saxon England (153–57). The main distinctions to be made among the Alfredian translations are the simple, direct style of translation in the *Cura Pastoralis*, which stands in stark contrast to the freer and expansive style found in the *Soliloquies* and *Consolatio Philosophiae*. Thijs ascribes this difference to the necessity for modesty of Waerferth’s part for the *CP*, on the one hand (162), whereas Alfred’s goals for later translations included the need for greater explanation, and, therefore, interventions on the part of the translator (163). Although Thijs’s focus is on the translation of Latin to English, it would be an interesting contrast to examine the method of translation evidenced in *Genesis B* and its Old Saxon source in the *Vatican Genesis*, particularly as John the Saxon is cited by Alfred as a great influence on him.

In “The Revelations of Pseudo-Methodius and Scriptural Study at Salisbury in the Eleventh Century, in *Source of Wisdom*, ed. Wright et al. (see sec. 2), 370–86, Michael Twomey explains the prevalence of the second recension of Pseudo-Methodius texts in Britain, but also that scholars have previously not acknowledged the presence of a lone first recension text, Salisbury 165. Twomey’s lengthy presentation of manuscript variants and the history of the text (370–77), is followed by an argument that these texts were known in

Britain earlier than the dating of 1075 for Salisbury 165. Based on information only available in R₁ (recension one), Twomey suggests that the West-Saxon genealogies present in the late ninth century, as well as notes in the OE *Hexateuch* of BL MS Cotton Claudius B.iv (378–79), used Pseudo-Methodius as a source of supplemental information.

‡‡Lisa Weston’s “The Saintly Female Body and the Landscape of Foundation in Anglo-Saxon Barking,” *Medieval Feminist Forum* 43: 12–25, reads the geography of Barking and its Abbey in relation to the reference to Ethelburga and her role in establishing reference points to the region. Three texts are compared: a narrative from Bede’s *Ecclesiastical History* where Ethelburga’s brother sends her to Essex in order to establish an abbey, the *Hodilred Charter* (MS Cotton Augustus ii.29 of the British Library), and the relation of a miracle involving Ethelburga related also by Bede. In each of these texts, Ethelburga is defined by others, who in turn define Barking, yet in a different way for each narrative. In the first text, one sees Ethelburg defined and gendered in blood-relation by reference to Eorcenwald, her brother, and spiritually defined and gendered as the mother and nurturer of women devoted to God (13–14). The *Hodilred Charter*, on the other hand, sees Ethelburga defined not only in terms of blood-relation to her brothers Ethelred and Eorcenwald, but also in dynastic terms to their predecessors, as the landscape is defined politically (15–18). In neither of these first two texts is Ethelburga an active participant, whereas the third text, a *libellus* from the *Ecclesiastical History* is defined in terms of her female monastic charges, as well as the liminal space of a graveyard where a miraculous light engulfs them (19–21). Although male monks are present (dead and alive), this narrative is different, in that “Barking’s women claim the responsibility for producing both their own history and their own geography” (22). The common feature of these texts, despite their differences, is that they are anchored in and defined by the presence of Ethelburga (22).

DPAS

‡‡In “The Saintly Female Body and the Landscape of Foundation in Anglo-Saxon Barking,” *Medieval Feminist Forum* 43: 12–25, Lisa M.C. Weston offers a brief analysis of three texts related to the founding of Barking Abbey in late seventh-century Anglo-Saxon England, in which she identifies as a gendered difference in emphasis related to landscape. In particular, she examines the body of a noblewoman named Ethelburga, the institution’s founding saint, and how it is constructed in these three texts. In the first two she examines, Bede’s

account of the Abbey's founding in his *Historia Ecclesiastica* and the Hodilred Charter, Ethelburga is identified primarily by her kinship ties to her royal family or prominent bishops. According to Weston, the authors of these texts deploy Ethelburga's body as a colonizing force, using her as a representation of male dominance over the landscape physically and ecclesiastically. In contrast, the third text, a *libellus* of Ethelburga's miracles produced by the monastery itself "within a generation of her death" (19), creates through what Weston calls "acts of ritual" a much different sense of space and landscape. This text, she asserts, emphasizes Ethelburga's spiritual ties to the women of Barking and thus "transforms the landscape around it in a radically different way." (19). By looking at all three together, Weston concludes that "these three narratives of monastic foundation reveal the complexities of Barking's eighth-century East Saxon landscape and the saintly female body on which it depends" (22).

RSA

The collection of essays in *Foundations of Learning: The Transfer of Encyclopaedic Knowledge in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. Rolf H. Bremmer and Kees Dekker, *Storehouses of Wholesome Learning I* (Paris: Peeters) focuses in many instances on the kind of miscellaneous manuscripts often neglected by scholars. By its very nature, miscellaneous knowledge is usually disintegrated, and often anonymously compiled or authored. Rosamond McKitterick's introductory essay, "The Migration of Ideas in the Early Middle Ages: Ways and Means" (1–17), discusses the ways in which ideas might move and develop in the Carolingian world, sometimes by word of mouth in ways that are generally beyond recovery, but also through the movement of manuscripts and the copying of their texts, which leaves us with much more evidence. Early medieval booklists, however, while providing an insight into what that Franks thought of as a canon of knowledge could be rich, varied, and eclectic. Rolf Bremmer's chapter, "The Anglo-Saxon Continental Mission and the Transfer of Encyclopaedic Knowledge" (19–50) examines evidence for the kinds of books the Anglo-Saxon missionaries in Germany and the Low Countries owned, used, and copied. He discusses in particular the detailed (if fragmentary) record of the library of the nobleman Liudger, who became a follower of the missionaries. The more extensive account of the library of the cleric Gerward in ninth-century Gent also provides, at only a slight remove, the kind of reading bequeathed to the new church by its Anglo-Saxon founders. Beside the expected biblical, theological, and liturgical material

is a certain amount of encyclopedic reading. Bremmer provides an appendix listing surviving Anglo-Saxon manuscripts on the continent, which provide a witness to the eighth-century mission. Mariken Teeuwen offers a useful overview of the reception of Martianus Capella's *De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii* in the early Middle Ages, as well as a detailed exploration of how this work came to be used as a school text. Her "Martianus Capella's *De nuptiis*: A Pagan 'Storehouse' First Discovered by the Irish?" (51–62) argues that Insular knowledge of the work was limited, mostly to part of Book 3, while full knowledge and appreciation developed in continental schools in the mission areas. One of the most widely known and popular encyclopedic works of the Middle Ages was Isidore of Seville's *Etymologiae*. Loredana Lazari's essay "Isidore's *Etymologiae* in Anglo-Saxon Glossaries" (63–93) examines the ways in which the work influenced the activity of Anglo-Saxon glossators. Her close examination of a number of Anglo-Saxon manuscripts and their glosses leads her to three conclusions. First, the influence of the work on glossing practice is greater than previously realized; second, this influence begins in the earliest glossaries, but increases greatly in the tenth century; third, the great popularity of the *Etymologiae* in the Benedictine renewal confirmed this trend into the eleventh century. Another of Isidore's works is the subject of Claudia Di Sciaccia's chapter, "The Manuscript Tradition, Presentation and Glossing of Isidore's *Synonyma* in Anglo-Saxon England: The Case of CCC 448, Harley 110 and Cotton Tiberius A.iii" (95–124). Manuscript evidence suggests the *Synonyma* were studied early in the Anglo-Saxon period, and still considered an important text in Winchester and Canterbury in the tenth century. They seem to have been an important didactic tool in the teaching of Latin, though evidence for their use in the Anglo-Saxon classroom is inconclusive. Christine Rauer's "Usage of the *Old English Martyrology*" (125–46) discusses the place of this text in relation to the hagiographic tradition, but also the ways in which its diverse contents influenced and were influenced by encyclopedic works. There is scant evidence that the *Old English Martyrology* was used liturgically, and its content and format militate against such an understanding. Whatever its purpose, its readers appear to have been well-educated, and knowledge of the hagiographical collection widespread. Filippa Alcamesi discusses the diverse texts of a popular section from the Sibylline prophecies in her essay "The *Sibylline Acrostic* in Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: The Augustinian Translation and Other Versions" (147–73). The twenty-seven lines of verse were excerpted into and out of Augustine's *De Ciuitate Dei*, where Augustine

had provided a translation from the Greek. Her analysis of the transmission of the excerpted text reveals an interest in the original Greek and provides evidence of two lines of transmission in Anglo-Saxon England, both known in Canterbury from the ninth century. The acrostic poem's interest in the Day of Judgement is curiously paralleled in another poem which became a standard school text in late Anglo-Saxon England, the *Versus de die iudicii*, attributed to the Venerable Bede. In her chapter "The *Versus de die iudicii*: Its Circulation and Use in Late Anglo-Saxon England" (175–212), Patrizia Lendinara argues that the pedagogic interest moves well beyond the poem's thematic concern and is more likely attributable to its formal correctness, plain style, Christian rhetoric, and use of scriptural sources, as evidenced by its manuscript contents and glosses; an appendix describes surviving manuscripts of the text. Alan Griffiths discusses the uses and misuses of Hebrew in "The Canterbury Psalter's Alphabet Glosses: Eclectic but Incompetent?" (213–251). He examines in particular the treatment of Psalm CXVIII in the Canterbury (Vespasian) Psalter and its use of the Hebrew alphabet. An appendix places the glossator's efforts within the context of transmitted understandings of the Psalm's *tituli*. Concetta Giliberto edits, translates and discusses the *Old English Lapidary* in Cotton Tiberius A.iii in her "Stone Lore in Miscellany Manuscripts: The Old English Lapidary" (253–78). She outlines the origins of the tradition in the Canterbury school of Theodore, and the Old English texts development from a batch of *glossae collectae*. Kees Dekker's "Anglo-Saxon Encyclopaedic Notes: Tradition and Function" (279–315) edits another Anglo-Saxon work, a set of numerical notes found in manuscripts CCC 183, CCC 320, Royal 2 B. V, and Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale lat. 2825. Similar notes are found in England as early as the beginning of the ninth century, attesting to an enduring Anglo-Saxon tradition of finding meaning in the numerical patterning of creation. László Sándor Chardonnens chapter "Context, Language, Date and Origin of Anglo-Saxon Prognostics" (317–340) discusses various aspects of the transmission of Anglo-Saxon prognostics in Latin and Old English, whose popularity dates from the tenth century, and whose manuscript associations indicate a learned rather than folkloric origin and reception. Loredana Teresi's "Anglo-Saxon and Early Anglo-Norman *Mappaemundi*" (341–77) offers the first comprehensive study of these early maps with close attention to their manuscript contexts and traditions. This discussion is accompanied by color photographs of the maps. Many of the essays in this collection aim to bring to scholarly awareness a range of understudied

texts and manuscripts. A number also serve as valuable introductions to advanced students of Anglo-Saxon literature, history, and culture. [Editor's note: this volume and its essays were not included in the *OEN Bibliography* for 2007.]

The essays in the volume *Form and Content of Instruction in the Light of Contemporary Manuscript Evidence*, ed. Patrizia Lendinara, Loredana Lazzari, and Maria Amalia D'Aronco (Turnhout: Brepols) are the product of papers given at an International Conference at Udine in April 2006. They are grouped under three headings: Manuscripts; Texts and glosses; and Texts and contexts. Naturally enough, the papers themselves present a degree of overlap across these sections. Some of these are reviewed more fully in other sections of YWOES, especially 4c. Prose, 5. Anglo-Latin, and 6. Manuscripts. László Sándor Chardonnens describes in detail the contents and layout of British Library Harley 3271, an important witness to Ælfric's *Grammar*, and which also contains other texts important in the teaching of Latin in eleventh-century England. Maria Amalia D'Aronco studies closely the manuscript evidence for the transmission of medical knowledge in Anglo-Saxon England, and the innovations in medical learning that took place in the eleventh century (a group of essays in Section III develop this medical focus). Patrizia Lendinara provides a comprehensive survey of all Anglo-Saxon manuscripts that can be meaningfully identified as "instructional," though exactly how these books would have been used in teaching remains an area for further investigation. Alexander Rumble discusses a range of palaeographic clues that point to how Anglo-Saxon manuscripts were used, especially in the process of learning. Loredana Teresi discusses an image in Corpus Christi Cambridge 206 and its utility in teaching Aristotle's *Categories* by illustrating the complexities of the ideas of "above" and "below" for the reader of this book. In the first essay of the section "Texts and glosses," Filippa Alcamesi surveys the Anglo-Saxon manuscripts of the *Disticha Catonis* and their use of Remigius of Auxerre's commentary on this foundational school text. Maria Caterina de Bonis examines the way in which the glosses to the *Regula Sancti Benedicti* Cotton Tiberius A.iii could have served as an aide to learning Latin. Claudia di Sciacca edits an unpublished *ubi sunt* piece found in Corpus Christi Cambridge 190, Wulfstan's "Commonplace Book," which provides important evidence for the archbishop's knowledge and use of Isidore of Seville's *Synonyma*. Concetta Giliberto edits, translates, and discusses the textual relationships of a previously unpublished *De lapidibus* that circulated in late Anglo-Saxon England.

Joyce Hill discusses the unity and purpose of Ælfric's grammatical triad and its manuscript relationships. Loredana Lazzari provides an overview of the scholastic achievements of Æthelwold and his circle and their influence late Anglo-Saxon glossaries. Ignazio Mauro Mirto discusses the grammatical treatise *Beatus quid est* and the significance of the author's choice of the word *beatus* in the light of the influence of the *Ars minor* of Donatus. Hans Sauer examines the textual traditions of and relationships between the Old English *Prose Solomon and Saturn* trivia dialogue and the later medieval *Master of Oxford's Catechism*, and their possible translation from a common Latin source. Section III of the collection (which apart from one essay covers the topic of medicine) begins with an essay by Isabella Andorlini on how the practical and theoretical aspects of medicine were taught in Antiquity and the Byzantine world. This is followed by an essay in which Anne Van Arsdall considers the evidence for medical training in Anglo-Saxon England, with particular attention paid to Bald's *Leechbook*. The medical theme is continued in Luisa Bezzo's discussion of parallel recipes in versions of the Old English *Pharmacopia* and their specialist vocabulary. Michael Drouit posits the possible context of the Exeter wisdom poems in the Benedictine Reform, and their instructional use in a changing culture. Florence Eliza Glaze's essay returns the focus to medical teaching, with a discussion of Master-Student dialogues in Sloane 2839, which appear to have reached England rather later than elsewhere. Danielle Maion discusses another relatively late medical work, the *Practica Petrocelli Salernitani*.

‡‡László Sándor Chardonens edition, *Anglo-Saxon Prognostics, 900–1100: Study and Texts* (Brill's Texts and Sources in Medieval History 3. Leiden: Brill) represents a major contribution to this neglected area of Anglo-Saxon studies. One reason for this neglect has been the inaccessibility of these widely scattered texts, and the difficulty scholars have found in giving prognostics a meaningful place in the field. This book provides a comprehensive survey of all surviving Anglo-Saxon prognostics (in Latin and Old English), as well as an edition of them. The book's presentation makes it obvious that it is a revision of Chardonens' doctoral dissertation. Chapters begin with dictionary definitions of terms and literature surveys and do not always resolve the problems they set up. Much of this is forgivable, however, given the difficulty in defining terms such as "superstition" and even "magic," frequently deployed in discussions of prognostics. The idea that prognostics have anything to do with Germanic folklore is firmly dismissed—these texts appear in the major centers of

the Benedictine revival (primarily Canterbury and Winchester), predominantly in manuscripts of the tenth and eleventh centuries, though they continue to be copied into the twelfth. The contexts in which prognostics are found in their thirty-seven surviving Anglo-Saxon manuscripts are discussed in close detail in chapter 2. They are found with calendars, computus, medical works, and as isolated guest texts; one important contribution this study makes to wider scholarship on medieval prognostics is in its description of "prognostic sections," or groups of prognostic texts which appear to have enjoyed transmission as compilations in Anglo-Saxon England. As the helpful table on p. 66 shows, there is a strong bias towards their accompanying calendars and computus, or traveling in prognostic sections. Chapter 5 interrogates assumptions about the use of prognostic texts—once it has been established that they cannot simply be dismissed as superstitious attempts to know or control the future, careful consideration of the evidence of manuscript context comes into play. That many prognostics relate to blood-letting creates a learned link between medical practice and knowledge of the lunar cycle. The frequent concern with dog days and Egyptians days probably does represent an anxiety over which days are less lucky than others, but also provides a way of noting the passing of time with attention to the stars. The bulk of this volume contains editions of Anglo-Saxon prognostic texts (330 pages); this has been a complex task. Chardonens groups the texts according the theme and content; the reader can keep track of the various manuscript contexts by using the apparatus and appendices, which list all the manuscripts and their contents, and provide a handy concordance to the texts. The edition section on Apuleian Spheres helpfully provides facsimiles of those surviving from Anglo-Saxon England.

DA

‡‡One hardly knows where to begin in reviewing László Chardonens's massive and nearly exhaustive edition and discussion of *Anglo-Saxon Prognostics*, a revised version of a dissertation defended in 2006. Focused specifically on the record of prognostics from 900 to 1100, Chardonens very usefully reminds us of the hazards of labelling the prognostic materials as "folklore," noting the explicitly literary (and usually Latinate) tradition in which they are preserved, and tracing much of the tradition to the interests of that ever-widening cultural horizon we call "The Benedictine reform." Likewise, Chardonens usefully contrasts the Anglo-Saxon tradition (in which prognostic material most often circulates in computistical contexts)

with the continental tradition, in which medical texts provide the most frequent context. Such conclusions, I should probably note, are in part based upon Chardonnens's definition of prognostics, which is perfectly reasonable on its own—but it is a definition that ends up identifying calendar entries of dog days or Egyptian days as prognostic material. Certainly, they do fit the definition, but the nature, function, and frequency of Anglo-Saxon calendars (as separate from other computational textual items) may justify an analysis that goes beyond tabulation and counting: calendrical dog days, one suspects, may differ in function sufficiently from other prognostics to justify separate treatment. This may be an interpretive quibble: on the whole, the book and edition are replete with clear argument and expression, and Chardonnens has gathered the materials here together impressively and effectively. If nothing else, one is glad that someone has done this work, and doubly glad that the work has been done by someone so obviously intrigued by the material. Prognostics seem to occupy relatively little space in the minds of most practicing Anglo-Saxonists; this book reminds us that such texts may have occupied a much larger region of the mental landscape of the Anglo-Saxons we care most about.

The five essays in Antonette diPaolo Healey and Kevin Kiernan's *Making Sense: Constructing Meaning in Early English* (Publ. of the Dictionary of Old English 7 [Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies]) live up to the promise of the all-star status of the contributors to this slim volume. All five derive from a group of sessions at the nineteenth conference of the International Association of University Professors. ¶¶Roberta Frank leads off the collection with a discussion of "*F*-Words in *Beowulf*," 1–22, which pleasingly retains some of the charm that the paper's original delivery must have had; and when Frank notes that several of the words she discusses "reveal the *Beowulf* poet's characteristic restraint and lightness of touch" (13), one notes that the same characteristics apply to Frank's writing here. While it would be too much to list the *f*-words addressed, the essay is useful as a reminder that words themselves lie at the very heart of reading, and I, at least, find that a welcome reminder. [Also reviewed in section 4c, *Beowulf*]

Joyce Hill's contribution to the same volume, "Dialogues with the Dictionary: Five Case Studies," 23–39, also deals with a pair of *f*-words (here, *formellan* and *fridæg*), as well as with a couple of other examples. In the essay proper, Hill describes the lexicographical problems associated with her examples, and usefully portrays the kinds of scholarly dialogues that can lead

to elucidation of their meanings: the result reminds us how scholars remake the meanings of Old English words with the hope of some sort of eventual success. Allen Franzten follows up Hill's essay with a description of some of the problems to be encountered when working with the Anglo-Saxon penitentials in "Sin and Sense: Editing and Translating Anglo-Saxon Handbooks of Penance." Taking readers on a brief tour of both these works' manuscript contexts and their history in modern printed editions, Franzten's concluding claim "the intelligibility I pursue is not that of the texts but that of the manuscripts" could stand, I believe, as the rallying cry of a widespread trend in medieval studies.

¶¶Kevin Kiernan's own lengthy contribution, "Remodeling Alfred's *Boethius* with the *tol ond and-weorc* of Edition Production Technology (EPT)," 72–115, serves as an introduction to the software tool cited in the title, which he and his team have developed for dealing with the fire-ravaged Cotton Boethius manuscript. The essay is replete with screen-shots and a tool-by-tool account of the software package that also serves to recount the steps taken in the production of Kiernan's electronic edition of this manuscript. Kiernan, I suspect, is perhaps more enthusiastic about the software possibilities than I am (perhaps I have some Ludite tendencies): the ability to "reconstruct" a missing folio, down to the possible line breaks, is absolutely possible in Kiernan's EPT, but so it is without such technology, and the pedagogical value of the software remains somewhat uncertain to me, although the ease it apparently makes of producing a marked-up version of the text for electronic consumption is itself of obvious value. [Kiernan's essay is also reviewed in sec. 4c.] Malcolm Godden's contribution on "King Alfred and the *Boethius* Industry" continues the Boethian theme, and Godden very usefully presents a handful of examples of the tradition of Boethius glossing and its possible relationship to the Old English translation: the essay, in that sense, is an enticing foretaste of the new edition of the Old English Boethius. But to the degree that Godden also suggests that the Old English Boethius was an ambitious "literary imitation of the Latin text in English" (138), I think he makes a fascinating case for modern readers to rethink the nature of the Old English work, precisely because translation and imitation involve subtly differing implications.

TB

Allen Franzten's "Sin and Sense: Editing and Translating Anglo-Saxon Handbooks of Penance," in *Making Sense*, 40–71, demonstrates the editorial difficulties inherent

in penitential texts. Works under discussion here are the *Scriftboc*, the *Canons of Theodore*, the *Poenitentiali Pseudo-Ecgberti*, and the *OE Handbook*. In addition to the problematic transmission in early editions of these texts as well as Latin translations of OE works (42–51), Frantzen demonstrates how faulty understanding of Latin penitentials and challenges in translation (52–67) prevent modern textual critics from applying traditional editorial techniques to penitentials. In sum Frantzen shows that use of penitentials for gleaning historic or cultural information is fraught with difficulties (68), but also gives him a chance to point out why his method of editing the texts electronically finds new inroads to this family of manuscripts (70–71).

DPAS

Susan Deskis's contribution to the Tom Hill festschrift addresses "Echoes of Old English Alliterative Collocations in Middle English Alliterative Proverbs," *Source of Wisdom*, ed. Wright et al. [see sec. 2], 311–25. The focus on continuity of proverbial expression across the Old/Middle English boundary line is, I think, a useful and valuable one, but some examples, like the collocations of "micele" and "mara" (which Deskis identifies as a potential "proverbial template, a traditional phrasing with a stable core and variable particulars" 315) don't seem particularly illuminating. Yet the essay is useful in reminding us that proverbs may lurk behind literary texts in which they are transformed: not every alliterating collocation is equally proverbial, but Deskis does point out one mode in which we might start rethinking at least some Old English collocations that might have lived in proverbs that no longer survive.

Geoffrey Russom's essay on "The Evolution of the a-verse in English Alliterative Meter" in *Studies in the History of the English Language III*, ed. Cain and Russom (see sec. 3b), 63–87, tackles a problem that has long seemed intractable. The Old English content of the essay, it should be noted, lies almost entirely in providing a historical context for the assessment of a-line structures in poems like *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*; Russom also assesses analogues from Old Norse. Eventually, Russom posits that five principles labeled "poetic universals" allow the identification of a previously unnoticed "metrical asymmetry" in *Sir Gawain* that differentiates a-lines from b-lines: a-lines tend to be longer in terms of word count, with exceptions or counterexamples only appearing in small percentages. Significantly, however, Russom concludes "[i]n SGGK, as in *Beowulf*, metrical patterns seem to be definable only at the level of the verse" (82). Although the *Gawain* poet and Langland built their a-lines and

b-lines on different and asymmetric principles, specific metrical forms of a-lines never seem to have directly shaped their paired b-lines (nor vice versa, it seems). And as anyone who has worked on such a question can attest, any advances in our understanding of problem areas in meter are welcome additions to the ongoing discussion.

TB

John Niles's *Old English Heroic Poems and the Social Life of Texts* (Turnhout: Brepols) is largely a compilation of the author's previously published essays, here appended with some combination of "Responses," "Queries," "Footnotes," and "Excurses." Two chapters—three and nine—are wholly new, however, as is an Introduction. Rather than review all of the chapters in the essay, many of which have already been covered in previous editions of *YWOES*, I have chosen instead to focus on the new material. Niles has brought these essays together to show how works of Old English heroic poetry, primarily *The Battle of Maldon*, *Beowulf*, and *Widsith*, participate in the construction of a mythic consciousness in the politically unstable tenth-century (1). For Niles, poetry "embodies social thinking" (1), and further, "was the great collective medium through which the Anglo-Saxons conceived of their changing social world and made mental adjustments to it" (1). His primary method is to join cultural studies and philological inquiry, a critical union he laments he has not seen in sufficient concentration in recent work done on Old English literature. He also uses the Introduction to comment on some works of scholarship that have engaged older texts using a variety of poststructuralist approaches. For example, while Niles acknowledges that "research into gender and sexuality made great strides towards liberating academic research from some of its most deeply entrenched biases," he states that "writings of this orientation have also promoted a corresponding movement towards 'gender correctness' in the pursuit of meanings that, while by no means *idel ond unnyt*, have had the drawback of being resolutely predictable. Some of the more committed studies undertaken along these lines have even made one wonder, at times, if female chauvinism is indeed to be preferred to its male counterpart" (9).

The question that Niles wants to answer in chapter three, "Anglo-Saxon Heroic Geography: How (on Earth) Can It Be Mapped?" is "[h]ow did the Anglo-Saxons conceive of their heroic past?" (136). To that end, Niles focuses not on actual but heroic geography, which he defines as those "geographical ideas that, whatever their basis, are subsumed into a mode of seeing that

has a validity independent of the actual features of the physical world. Heroic geography tends to be radically ethnocentric, in that it affirms the greatness of one's own people relative to other peoples who are not so fortunate, wealthy, brave, handsome, or important" (123). This focus on the Anglo-Saxons' geographical consciousness, specifically regarding the positioning of the people whom Bede referred to as *Iuti* and who are variously identified as Jutes, Goths, and Geatas in other Old English texts, occupies the next section of the chapter (124). By that section's end, Niles has determined that the Jutes should not have a place on "a map that purports to illustrate Anglo-Saxon heroic geography" (127), arguing that their apparent mention in *Beowulf*—in the guise of *eotenas*—is a philological fiction that must be redressed. Geatish, Gothic, and Gautish people, however, still featured prominently in the Anglo-Saxon geographical imagination. In the last section of the chapter, titled "Mapping the Unmappable Continental Homeland of the English," Niles discusses the map of heroic geography he has constructed, which can be broken up into two primary areas: one made up of predominantly Christian Angles, Saxons, Frisians, Franks, and Danes in the southern portion, and pagan Norwegians and Swedes in the northern portion. This divide is important for a poem like *Beowulf*, which places its hero "directly in the liminal zone that lies between the 'civilized' region located towards the south-west and the wilder one extending to the north and east" (132). Niles concludes that "[t]hrough excessive reliance on philology as a guide to the Anglo-Saxon mythographic imagination, modern scholarship has generated its own closed system of vision, its own period-specific perceptions of the past, and it has even begun to elaborate upon that system with some insubstantial pseudo-history about Gautish migrations to Jutland, heaped upon the modern theory of the migration of Jutes to Friesland that has long plagued scholarly understanding of the Finnsburh episode of *Beowulf*" (136). This line of study must be replaced, he argues, by one that attempts to construct a historicist understanding of the Anglo-Saxons' own perception of their heroic geography.

Chapter nine, "Heaney's *Beowulf* Six Years Later," is a spirited defense of the translation published by the Nobel Prize winner in 2000. Niles tackles two of the main criticisms leveled against Heaney primarily by professional Anglo-Saxonists: first, that he does not have the requisite qualifications to undertake such a project, and second, that his use of words of Irish origin somehow betrays the Germanic foundation of the original text. To answer the first complaint, Niles

points to Heaney's educational background, and in particular his university degree in English philology, which included extensive work in the languages and literatures of medieval England (331). Niles also demonstrates how Heaney's *Beowulf* fits into a body of original poetry written between 1966 and 1999 that consistently expresses an interest in "northern themes" (331). During this time, "Heaney was making a serious effort to incorporate into his poetry themes relating to the early cultures of the British Isles and north-west Europe so as to set those themes into relation with present-day realities" (331–32). The world of the Anglo-Saxons figures prominently in several of the poems written during this period, and so Heaney "is scarcely to be regarded as some kind of interloper on Beowulfian turf" (336). Niles's defense of Heaney's use of Ulsterisms is two-fold. First, he argues that Heaney decided to use words of Irish origin is licensed because "anyone who is born into the English language...can claim as his or her heritage the great literature of early medieval England, including this poem" (341). But he also suggests that "the claim that *Beowulf* really is Irish in some way...is not as irresponsible as it may seem" (341). As evidence, Niles points to studies that have examined possible Celtic connections with the poem, finally concluding that he does "think it likely that a certain number of Celtic elements became mixed up at some point in the composite soil from which *Beowulf* arose" (341). Having established Heaney's credentials and addressed some of the biggest complaints made about his translation, Niles proceeds to look closely at several passages from the dragon episode, "that part of the poem where he is generally felt to find his stride as translator" (344).

GD

In "Anglo-Saxon Oral Tradition and *King Horn*," Ph.D. Diss., Univ. of Denver, 2006 (*DAI* 67A, 2007: 12), Sonya L. Veck reads the thirteenth century romance *King Horn* not as looking ahead to the more developed romance genre but as hearkening back to preserved features of Anglo-Saxon culture and literary ethos. She argues that a sense of Anglo-Saxon identity survived the Conquest longer and more completely in the Midlands than elsewhere, and that *King Horn* is the product of oral tradition handed down through generations. Her first chapter elucidates the particular features of Anglo-Saxon literature relevant to the study: a "contemplative, spiritual, personal tone" (3); a focus on Nature as spiritually significant; and an implicit reliance on the bonds of reciprocity and loyalty (the *comitatus*). In the first of three chapters, Veck expounds on the uniquely

“reflective and spiritual quality” (30) of Old English poetry. The “deeply elegiac mood” (31) is explored in *The Dream of the Rood* and *The Wanderer*, while the comitatus theme is brought out in the *Battle of Maldon*, *Beowulf*, and *The Wife’s Lament*. Chapter two argues that the Midlands resisted Norman innovations more than other regions of Norman England, and that a shared sense of the Anglo-Saxon past helped forge a sense of community in that region. The third chapter presents a close reading of *King Horn*, identifying themes and images in light of the features Veck characterizes as Anglo-Saxon. The deployment of the grieving woman motif, the focus on loyalty to lord and kingdom, the solemn tone, and the integration of Nature as imbued with spiritual meaning align King Horn, according to Veck, more with Old English epic and elegy than with other romances. Veck concludes that the *Horn* poet is a “very early self-conscious romancier who operates with Anglo-Saxon modes of thought and Anglo-Saxon values” (21), and that a place should be established for King Horn within Anglo-Saxon studies (187).

Michael Fox, in “Origins in the English Tradition” (chapter 3 in *The Oxford Handbook of English Literature and Theology*, ed. Andrew Hass, David Jasper, and Elisabeth Jay [Oxford: Oxford UP], 35–53) covers a few of the more prominent moments in which Old English literature draws from particularly Anglo-Saxon conceptions of spirituality. Fox draws attention especially to the earliest treasures of English literature, such as *Cædmon’s Hymn* and *The Dream of the Rood*. Of the latter’s delicate blending of triumph with suffering, and of its masterful interweaving of different cultural and literary traditions, Fox writes, “*The Dream of the Rood* remains the most compelling and unusual witness to the union of vernacular verse and Christian theology, perhaps in the history of English literature” (41). Although Ælfric and Wulfstan are only given a few sentences in the essay (in which their works are said to be “hardly devoted to issues of theological complexity,” 47), Fox devotes significant attention to *Beowulf*, and to the theological problems of *Genesis B* (such as the infamous *micel wundor* passage, line 595b). The reader should not expect an emphasis on academic theology, such as that associated with the court of Charlemagne (Rabanus Maurus, Radbertus, etc.), because (as the introductory chapter to the collection makes clear), the term “theology” is given considerable latitude in order to accommodate the particular literary cultures of the different periods covered. Fox thus focuses on how certain religious themes are incorporated in Old English literature, especially poetry. As the first historical essay in the *Handbook*, Fox’s contribution provides a

solid overview of the major passages and texts that have drawn the most attention from scholars and students.

Adam Miyashiro’s “Monstrosity and Ethnography in Medieval Europe: Britain, France, Iceland,” Ph.D. Diss., Pennsylvania State University, 2006 (DAI 67A [2007]: 8) traces an expansive trajectory of European perceptions of foreign, monstrous races, from Pliny to the later Middle Ages (with an interesting excursion bringing these themes to the present). Focusing largely on the Plinian races but also bringing in evidence from poetry, history, romance, and travel literature, Miyashiro argues that “the discourse of monstrosity (as it is shaped by classical antecedents) is among the medieval Europeans’ crucial modes of exploring racial, ethnic, and cultural difference” (11–12). For the Old English period, he devotes attention to the *Orosius* (especially the celebrated Ohthere and Wulfstan additions), unpacking the rhetoric of territorializing neighboring peoples and places, and of communal constructions of space and time. Miyashiro also discusses the *Physiologus*, the Exeter Book “Order of the World,” and the *Liber monstrorum* (or *Wonders of the East*) to further situate Anglo-Saxon perceptual categories of the other in the context of discursive tensions (natural vs. unnatural, normative vs. marginal, etc.). A section is devoted to Grendel and the Grendelkin in the context of early Germanic legal constructs of outlawry. Miyashiro concludes, “the language of monstrosity and the monster’s effects on language and history rewrite the boundaries of the monstrous: no longer only distant in time and space, the monstrous body provides a framework against which Anglo-Saxons could culturally perceive and delimit the margins of their imagined world” (54). Subsequent chapters treat Geoffrey of Monmouth and Britain’s founding myths, medieval romances and encyclopedic traditions, and the ideological appropriations of myths concerning the Vinland colony in Newfoundland that were propagated (and ideologically charged) well into the twentieth century. The author concludes, “the encyclopedic and literary imaginations in the early western European tradition share the common thread of delimiting other bodies as monstrous (malformed, diseased, black, or any other deviation from a European male norm) for the purposes of regulating social codes and justifying cultural or individual dominance, political authority, and colonization” (176).

Eleven essays on the theme of Creation appear in the volume edited by Sven Rune Havsteen, Nils Holger Petersen, Heinrich W. Schwab, and Eyolf Østrem, *Creations: Medieval Rituals, the Arts, and the Concept of Creation* (Turnhout: Brepols). This eclectic collection sweeps from classical Greece to Augustine of Hippo

to twentieth century symphonies to Derrida, bringing together contributors from Music, Comparative Literature, Art History, History, English, and Classics. Medievalists may be particularly interested in an essay on human vs. divine creation in late medieval philosophy, especially Nicholas of Cusa (Eyolf Østrem, "Deus artifex and Homo creator: Art between the Human and the Divine," 15–48); on the deployment of the muse in classical and early Christian poetry (Wim Verbaal, "Invocatio Musae: Inspired by the Muse, the Inescapable Reality," 49–64); on *creatio* in Irish Bardic poetry of the thirteenth through sixteenth centuries (Salvador Ryan, "Creation and Recreation in Irish Bardic Poetry," 65–85); on medieval perceptions of the liturgical experience, including a paragraph on the *Regularis Concordia* and a discussion of the Anglo-Norman Play of Adam (Nils Holger Petersen, "Ritual and Creation: Medieval Liturgy as Foreground and Background for Creation," 89–120); on notions of authorship in Chaucer, especially *Troilus and Criseyde* (Richard Utz, "Writing Alternative Worlds: Rituals of Authorship and Authority in Late Medieval Theological and Literary Discourse," 121–38); and on obscenities in Danish and Swedish churches of the fifteenth century (Hans Henrik Lohfert Jørgensen, "Anti-Ritual: Blasphemous Reactions to the Late Medieval Cult of Exposition in Scandinavian Mural Painting," 197–228).

PD

Dolores Fernández Martínez presents a theoretical framework for "A Critical Religious Approach to the Study of the Old English Text as a Strategic Heterogeneous Discourse Type," *NM* 108: 553–566. She argues for the thorough influence of Christianity in the production of OE texts, arising from the power of the Church to impose its ideology on discourse in diverse registers, religious and secular. To support this wide synthesis, Fernández offers a critical approach that is both interdisciplinary and intertextual. One facet of an interdisciplinary approach is to examine how Christian ideology assumes the aura of common sense even in apparently secular discourse. This aura of common sense, accepted as self-evident, is actually a technique for controlling the shape of discourse and the receptivity of Anglo-Saxon audiences. Since Christian ideology in Anglo-Saxon England has its source in biblical and Continental texts, the linkages between mostly Latin religious usage and OE expression are intertextual. This intertextuality, grounded in OE religious expression, resonates throughout Anglo-Saxon discourse, so that the range of linkages, formed largely from doctrinal sources, reaches outward to contemporaneous,

secular documents. Immersed in OE as a Christian language, Anglo-Saxon audiences are hard pressed to emerge unaffected. The integration of religious and profane discourse, moreover, promotes a sense of countermovement, making possible an analysis of OE as an interpenetration of both doctrinal and secular influences.

EG

Jorge Luis Bueno Alonso writes on *La Épica de la Inglaterra anglosajona: Historia y textos desde el auge de Mercia al declive de la monarquía (750–1016)* [*The Epic of Anglo-Saxon England: History and Texts from the Ascendancy of Mercia to the Decline of the Monarchy (750–1016)*], Monografías da Universidade de Vigo, Humanidades e ciencias xurídico-sociais 74 (Vigo: Universidade de Vigo, Servizo de Publicacións). The first "epic" in Bueno's title refers to a narrative summary of the history of Anglo-Saxon England during these centuries; the second is his translation into Spanish of several Old English texts from the period, many of them for the first time, including passages from the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, King Alfred's *Preface to Gregory's Pastoral Care*, *The Conquest of the Five Boroughs*, *The Coronation of Edgar*, *The Death of Edgar*, *The Battle of Brunanburh*, and Wulfstan's *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*. *Beowulf* is not included in Bueno's treatment of Anglo-Saxon "epic," presumably because it has already been translated into Castilian several times in the last half century, by Pérez (1962), Bravo (1981), Lerate and Lerate (1986), Cañete (1991), and Roa Vial (2007), as well as into Catalan by Campos (1998) and partially into Galician by Bueno Alonso himself (2005).

CRD

John Hines reviews "The Writing of English in Kent: Contexts and Influences from the Sixth to the Ninth Century," *NOWELE* 50–51: 63–92. The article breaks no new ground in this well-cultivated area, but makes a useful overview of the study of Kentish Old English, highlighting the historical evolution of the kingdom of Kent and the sorts of texts usually associated with Kentish in the Anglo-Saxon period. Kentish—insofar as one is willing to grant that the abstraction of a tiny amount of textual evidence constitutes a more or less homogenous language variety in southeastern Anglo-Saxon England—presents a puzzle in that its features have more in common with Anglian than with West Saxon, which seems at odds with the general sweep of English linguistic geography, in which major dialectal differences appear in graded transition along the north-south continuum that is shaped by the island's

geography. The kingdom of Kent, too, presents a puzzle, since its vital importance in tying England to the Continent, as Hines explains, seems at odds with the diminishing political importance of Kent after the seventh century, a role that relates to the kinds of texts and the forms of vernacular writing produced at major centers like Canterbury. Hines remarks that “[e]xternal influences in the form of written norms obscure the degree to which we can observe the probable spoken form of English in Kent in the Anglo-Saxon period” (83), an observation that discloses a terrible fact about the study of Old English dialects: we do not really know what we are talking about when we talk about the “dialects” of Old English. The evidence is so thin, so ambiguous that scholars routinely abuse the meaning of the term “dialect” (as contemporary dialectologists understand it) simply by employing its use without expansive qualification. In fairness, such qualification is often implicit in discussions of OE dialects (but far less often explicit, as in the case of Alistair Campbell’s famous declaration of agnosticism on the matter in his *Old English Grammar*, §256), and, as Hines points out, too, some forms of, especially, phonological and lexical variation seem best explained as reflexes of real linguistic variation. But the narrative of the OE dialects that has developed in scholarship exerts a profound influence on how scholars see variation in Old English texts, and Hines’s article does more to buttress the narrative than to query it, though it also expresses awareness of the inadequacies of the narrative. Hines concludes by reasserting that “[h]istorians of the language should not turn to the evidence of the historical circumstances merely to explain philological phenomena. The history of the language truly is a fundamental part of history itself” (87), but what is most needed is a careful reconsideration of the “philological phenomena” not simply in the context of regional history but in the context of textual history—vernacular and Latin—in ways that challenge the basic assumptions of the narrative of the Old English dialects.

In “Going Berserk: In Old Norse, Old Irish and Anglo-Saxon Literature,” *Amsterdamer Beiträge zur älteren Germanistik* 63: 43–65, Arwen van Zanten briefly surveys representations of Old Norse, Old Irish, and Old English literary figures that more-or-less conform to a set of criteria for a “berserker model” (43–44) set up by the author. The inherent circularity of such an exercise is obvious, but then, some berserker characteristics (such as, e.g., Zanten’s second criterion, “The berserker often has supernatural associations,” 44) are so common to heroic literatures that they are as easily met by (for example) the Moses of the Old English *Exodus* as they are by Beowulf. After surveying Odd, Ogmund,

and Svart from *Örvar Odds saga*, Cú Chulainn, the Old Irish *fianna* and *díberga*, and Beowulf and Grendel, and concluding in each case that the characters satisfy a number of criteria in the proposed berserker model, the author concedes that “[i]n some cases it is hard to determine whether a character is a berserker or just a ‘normal’ hero” (55). It is difficult to see what, if any, concrete findings this survey yields, even if it does provide a sort of beginner’s guide to one aspect of early medieval heroic literature. Zanten concludes the essay with a summary of four theories that would explain the occurrence of berserkers in these three northwest European vernacular literatures.

CC

Damian Fleming, “‘The Most Exalted Language’: Anglo-Saxon Perceptions of Hebrew,” Ph.D. Diss., U of Toronto, 2006, *DAI*67A, 2570, offers a careful study of the way that the Hebrew language was studied and imagined in Anglo-Saxon England. The writings of Jerome provided the impetus for scholars such as Bede to refer to Hebrew in his exegeses. The existence of numerous Hebrew alphabets in Anglo-Saxon manuscripts indicates to Fleming that the language was perceived as more accessible and appealing than has been thought by earlier scholars. Hebrew etymologies played a significant role in the writings of both Bede and, in the later period, Ælfric, first as exegetical tools, and then as providing material for loan-translations, such as the OE *hælend*. Fleming argues that certain elements of Hebrew syntax became incorporated into Old English, such as the phrase “King of kings.” He suggests that Cynewulf used such a Hebraic construction to characterize the language of Jews in *Elene*.

AA

Works Not Seen:

Snook, Benjamin J. “Æthilwulf: gidda gemyndig?” *Anglo-Saxon* (Aberdeen) 1 (2007): 181–200.*

Stanley, Eric. “*Stapol*: A Firm Foundation for Imagery.” *Text, Image, Interpretation*. Ed. Minnis and Roberts. [see sec. 2] pp. 319–32.

[Stacie Turner, “The Changing Hagiography of St. Æthelthryth,” *Heroic Age* 10, was withdrawn by the publishing journal]

4b. Individual poems

Andreas

In “The Old English *Andreas* and the Mermedonian Cityscape” (*Essays in Medieval Studies* 24: 53–63), Lori

Ann Garner argues that depictions of the villainous cannibals' city employ "certain phraseology and descriptive language applied in unambiguously positive contexts elsewhere in Old English verse" (53). In fact, "the specific architectural descriptions here discussed are all unprecedented in the Greek text" and speak "instead to the Anglo-Saxon experience, reflecting in part the architectural reality of early medieval England while drawing also from an oral poetics" (55). For example, in her analysis of the city's skyline, Garner notes that Mermedonia "sit[s] high on a hill where it is visible for a great distance—the kind of location that was highly valued in Anglo-Saxon poetry and construction alike" (55). Yet "this prized location is attributed to a largely fictionalized space, one where actual military advantage need not apply, and moreover to a city known for its inhabitants' ghastly and ignoble deeds" (56). The most important space in the poem is the prison, but its description "raises interesting issues...for an Anglo-Saxon audience, since dedicated prisons...would have been a relatively foreign concept" (58); perhaps this is why the poet describes the prison's characteristics rather than its structure. In this section of the article, Garner also analyzes the formula "under X-locan," which "evokes the context of confinement, isolation, and danger," as when Andrew stops to rest *under burglocan* after leaving the prison (58). Also noteworthy is the poet's depiction of the pillar, which differs radically from the source text; in the Greek version, the water flows from the mouth of a statue atop the pillar, but in the Old English poem, the water comes from the base of the column. In comparison to the elaborate sculpture in the Greek text, "the designs of Anglo-Saxon imposts and capitals were, in general, very simple," though Garner also notes that there is "more than sufficient evidence for a tradition of sentient and highly powerful objects that can aid heroes in battle," as in *The Dream of the Rood* and the Exeter Book riddles (60). The final space analyzed by Garner is the church built by the Mermedonians, which the poet refers to as both "temple" and "church," "evok[ing] an image that is both familiar and other, common and great" (60). "By the poem's close," she concludes, "we have unambiguously positive language, with increasing imagery of heroic Anglo-Saxon halls, to describe the city and the architectural structures within it" (61).

RN

Battle of Maldon

While Chris Altman, in "Making Use of the Terrain: Byrhtnoð's Strategy in 'The Battle of Maldon'" (*ANQ* 20: 3–8), acknowledges that "the actual historical event"

of the Battle of Maldon is "arguably filtered through poetic discourse," he maintains that reading the poem literally, as reporting events from the battlefield, provides valuable information about Anglo-Saxon military history (3). Altman focuses on three specific components of Byrhtnoð's strategy, "the shield wall, the bridge guardians, and the 'killing ground,'" which together demonstrate the Anglo-Saxon leader's understanding of how best to take advantage of the elevated causeway connecting Northey Island with the mainland (3). To account for the Anglo-Saxon loss, which came in spite of this advantage, Altman suggests that the Vikings, too, knew how to use the landscape to their benefit, such as when they *wodon...west ofer Pantan*, using the glare of the *scir wæter* as cover that "conceals the legs," thereby reducing the "vulnerable area per attacker by one to two square feet" (5). When considering what is likely the primary reason for the defeat of the Anglo-Saxons—Byrhtnoth's decision to allow the Vikings to cross the causeway—Altman suggests that it might have been "an attempt to raise the morale of his men" by giving them an opportunity to slaughter their enemies at close quarters, or "perhaps...to confirm his own sense of valor to himself in the face of the Vikings' taunts" (6).

Alice Jorgensen's "Power, Poetry, and Violence: 'The Battle of Maldon'" (in *Aspects of Power and Authority in the Middle Ages*, ed. Brenda M. Bolton and Christine E. Meek [Turnhout: Brepols], 235–49) examines the different modes of power at work in "The Battle of Maldon," focusing in particular on what she refers to as violent power and verbal power. "The first," she explains, "is coercive, destructive, and physical, the second cooperative, productive, and rhetorical" (244). Jorgensen recognizes Byrhtnoth's death, which occurs near the middle of the poem, as a turning point that marks, at least on the surface, a shift from the dominance of one brand of power to the other: "Before the death of Byrhtnoth...*The Battle of Maldon* focuses on the power that is demonstrated in and attained through violence: bodily control and the coercion of others. After Byrhtnoth's death the loyal thegns no longer expect to secure the compliance of their enemies to their will because they no longer expect to win the battle. Nonetheless, they continue to claim a kind of power, firstly by stressing their continued courage, the overplus of *mod* by which they make up for diminishing *mægen*, and secondly by redefining their aim. By agreeing to desire vengeance rather than victory, the thegns reassert their ability to have their will prevail" (243). Speeches, not physical attacks, become the primary currency of power in the second half of the poem, and through them the remaining thegns are able to recast their imminent defeat in

their own terms. Despite acknowledging that these two modes of power “contrast strikingly,” Jorgensen demonstrates how structural parallels in each half of the poem suggest that the poet is interested in exploring connections between them, not just in underscoring their differences (244). The essay concludes with a brief discussion of the relationship between words and deeds, which is recast here in terms of Jorgensen’s two modes of power: “It amounts to a reversal of the direction of power. In the first part, deeds authenticate words. Byrhtnoth promises to meet the Vikings with violence, and he does. In the second half, the thegns purport similarly to be fulfilling their words with actions; but in fact words authenticate deeds. It is only by explaining and defining what they are doing that the thegns give any meaning to their final, doomed charges against the enemy” (246).

GD

Cædmon’s Hymn

In the interest of keeping together all of the essays on Cædmon’s *Hymn* that appear in the same volume (see Frantzen and Hines, below), Bruce Holsinger’s “The Parable of Cædmon’s *Hymn*: Liturgical Invention and Literary Tradition” (*JEGP* 106: 149–75) appears here out of alphabetical order. Holsinger begins by reminding us of Bede’s account and reiterates that Cædmon remained in the monastery at Streanaeshalch (Whitby) composing vernacular poetry on the religious subjects explained to him, but there is no evidence of wider renown; his verse seems to have been confined to the monastery and his immediate audience was his brethren only. How, then, was this OE verse used? If sung or recited, by whom and to whom and for what purpose? Holsinger suggests that the most important question might be, “what institutional, aesthetic, and creative relations are we meant to envision between this enduringly famous Anglo-Saxon alliterative lyric we call Cædmon’s *Hymn* and the monastic foundation that welcomed the poem’s putative *auctor* into its existing liturgical community?” (151). He highlights the importance of Whitby in the history of the English Church, the exemplary life of Abbess Hild, and the ways these serve in some sense to validate Cædmon’s place in “a proud genealogy of visionary experience attesting to the privileged position of Whitby in the eyes of God”; the poem, then, functions as a relic, “the poetic proof of a miracle enshrined in the collective memory of an institution” (154). Unfortunately, scholarship has secularized Bede’s account to such an extent that it has lost sight of an important question: what were the monks of Whitby trying to understand

or explain through this miracle story? Holsinger suggests that the story of Cædmon “may be comprehensible less as the story of a man than as the work of a liturgical culture seeking to explain its unique character to a chronicler who promised to perpetuate its institutional memory,” to justify “the presence of vernacular poetry in active daily use within the walls of their monastery” (156). Bede tells us that following his admission into the monastery, Cædmon continued to make songs out of the biblical material that was explained to him; Holsinger argues that those explanations may have come in the form of instruction and/or liturgy, and his vernacular poetry may in turn have had a didactic or liturgical function that would not have been at odds with the Anglo-Saxon Church’s understanding of the bounds of liturgy; in this way, “Cædmon’s embodiment of this intimate affiliation between liturgy and poetic artistry capture in miniature Bede’s larger vision of the aesthetics and even the literariness of liturgical culture in seventh- and eighth-century England” (158). In the third section of the essay, Holsinger turns to the structure of the *Hymn*, remarking that both the content and the structure of the lines suggest a possible liturgical affiliation, especially in its subject matter (the act of creation) and its “metrical hybridity,” showing characteristics of both OE alliterative and formulaic verse and Latin trochaic rhythmical verse (171–3). “The hybrid metrical form of the written *Hymn* gives space both to four-stress Old English accentual verse as it was likely known in the eighth century and to the syllabic conventions of monastic octosyllabic verse; as such, the poem itself makes an eloquent argument for the creative possibilities of liturgical culture in the vernacular domain just as this domain is first being committed to writing” (175). Holsinger includes a justification of a formalist approach here, reminding us that formal features are just as culturally determined and determining as any other feature of the verse and therefore deserve more attention than an “antidisciplinary, late-historicist age” is likely to give them.

Each of the following essays appears in *Cædmon’s Hymn and Material Culture in the World of Bede*, ed. Allen J. Frantzen and John Hines (Morgantown: West Virginia UP). In their “Preface” (1–11), Frantzen and Hines explain that the essays collected in the volume use Cædmon’s *Hymn* as a lens to examine the world of Bede, both material and textual. “Each chapter begins with the hymn and moves from the text to the worlds of scientific thought, settlements and social hierarchy, monastic reform, ordinary things, and others,” which the editors regard as a sampling of the possible concerns raised by the poem (1). Although the approaches

cross disciplinary boundaries, “[r]ather than experiment with recent interdisciplinary theory, in its many varieties, contributors to this volume seek to advance cross-disciplinary dialogue by using a single text as a focus on Bede’s world and the operations of material culture within it. These essays show how multiple, integrated insights into the signs and operations of a single, familiar, textual core” (9). The editors then briefly describe each of the essays reviewed below.

Seeking to locate the story of Cædmon within Bede’s wider oeuvre in “Literary Contexts: Cædmon’s *Hymn* as a Center of Bede’s World” (*Cædmon’s Hymn*, 51–79), Scott DeGregorio discusses three related issues: Bede’s attitude toward the vernacular, his view of poetry, and “the alarm he felt over the deterioration of monastic institutions and the immediate effect he believed it would have on contemporary society” (52). In his letter to Egbert, Bede appeals to his former pupil to resolve the deficiencies of pastoral care within the church in Northumbria and emphasizes the need to use the vernacular in correcting these shortcomings (53–55). Another pupil, Cuthbert, tells of Bede’s own use of the vernacular, his mastery of “our poems,” and his zeal in translating Latin sources into OE (56–57). While Bede’s commitment to Latin is unswerving, DeGregorio suggests that “he did envisage some role for the vernacular in transmitting Christian truth” (58); in this connection, Cædmon’s use of OE to sing sacred history “stands as a litmus for progress, a sign that Anglo-Saxon Christianity has come so far that now the mother tongue itself may serve as a vessel for Christian expression” (59). In poetry as in theology, Bede remains committed to Latin, more specifically the Latin of scripture, which for him surpasses all other writings, including the classics (61); however, he “allows room for what he terms *saecularis eloquentia*. To be sure, Bede allows no room at all for studying the latter for its own sake; but neither does he advocate total exclusion if the proper Christian ends for secular eloquence may be found” (66–67). Crucially for DeGregorio, excerpting the story of Cædmon risks “occluding much that the story in its wider narrative context could potentially bring into view” (69). Given Bede’s increasing concern about the Northumbrian church’s failures and the decadence of monasticism in particular, his presentation of Cædmon evokes a glorious (though perhaps imagined) monastic past, for “the focus of the story is not the miracle of Cædmon’s spontaneous singing, but is rather his induction into the regular life and the impact his life as a monk has on those around him” (77). If Bede perceives around him “the secularization of monasticism by high-born aristocrats,” he counters that image with

its reverse in the story of Cædmon, who in Bede’s portrayal becomes a powerful foil for exposing the corruptions of contemporary monasticism, lacking as it does the discipline and zeal he attributes to his exemplary cowherd-turned-monk” (79).

Allen J. Frantzen’s essay, “All Created Things: Material Contexts for Bede’s story of Cædmon” (111–49), is reviewed in section 5.

At the beginning of “Material Differences: the Place of Cædmon’s Hymn in the History of Anglo-Saxon Vernacular Poetry” (*Cædmon’s Hymn*, 15–50), Daniel P. O’Donnell explains the structure of his metacritical analysis of Cædmon and his hymn in the context of its scholarly reception. First, he discusses analogues to Bede’s account, focusing on Mohammed’s Call as related in the Qur’an; the account of Aldhelm, who may himself have actually been the first recorded poet in Old English, and his improvisations at the bridge, where he composed vernacular songs of an increasingly religious nature in order to lead the people back to their former piety; and the nineteenth-century story from southern Africa of Ntsikana, whose gifts included composing, singing, dancing, and divining (16–30). He concludes that the differences are far more important than their similarities in understanding Cædmon’s significance to his biographer. For example, “Aldhelm’s actual performance of this new Christian verse differs from Cædmon’s in that it embraces, rather than eschews, the pre-Christian traditions. Where Cædmon distinguishes himself in Bede’s account by performing in a different location, to a different audience, and in a different style from his contemporaries in the beer-hall, Aldhelm is said by William to adopt the traditional garb, location, and, in the beginning at least, repertoire, of the professional minstrel in his attempts to lure his parishioners back to church” (35). Second, O’Donnell reevaluates modern assessments of Cædmon’s role in Anglo-Saxon literary history; specifically, although Cædmon is often seen as innovative, O’Donnell argues that “both the poem and Bede’s chapter suggest that he was in fact a very traditional poet who was valued primarily for his formal skill” (15–16). While Cædmon breaks with tradition in some ways, his adherence to it lies in his use of poetic diction and poetic formulas (38). This usage is significant because the poem is among the earliest verse in any Germanic language and because “[a]s a Christian poem, Cædmon’s hymn by definition transforms and adapts, rather than seamlessly continues, the pre-Christian tradition from which it presumably draws its vocabulary and formulas” (40). Turning to other OE poetry, O’Donnell discusses the song of creation in *Beowulf* and the *Dream of the Rood*,

comparing their use of traditional poetic language with Cædmon's hymn. He concludes: "Taken together, the evidence of the contrasts between Bede's account and the analogous stories proposed by modern scholars suggests that, for Bede at least, Cædmon was a superbly accomplished vernacular poet who broke with previous vernacular verse tradition," though "the evidence of the surviving poetic corpus and cognate languages does not suggest that he was, in practice, particularly innovative from an aesthetic point of view" (49); he was, however, a superb technician, "valued by his contemporaries for his skill as a versifier" (50).

The last essay from *Cædmon's Hymn and Material Culture* reviewed in this section is Faith Wallis's "Cædmon's Created World and the Monastic Encyclopedia" (80–110), which approaches Bede's (and Cædmon's) world from an historical point of view; specifically, Wallis explores how Cædmon might have understood the created world and how that understanding might have influenced his verse. She proposes that "[w]hat is salient about Bede's account of the hymn, from the perspective of early medieval science, is the reaction of Abbess Hild to Cædmon's gift: she admitted him forthwith to her monastery" (81)—for Bede the important part of the story is less the gift of poetry than Cædmon's identity as a monk: "Cædmon's life as a monk is of a piece with his poetic gift" (82). In fact, both the subject matter (the beginning of created things) and the poet's treatment of it show him destined to become a monk, at which calling he is a natural because he knows how to meditate (in the monastic sense of "ruminate") on scripture and express its meaning in his own prayer (82–84). For this reason, "Hild and her counselors viewed Cædmon's gift as a miraculous acquisition of the monastic craft of *meditation*, which is why they tested the gift by giving him a bit of *lectio divina* to meditate on" (86). But what would it mean to either Hild or to Bede to meditate on the creation? Wallis admits that such a question can't be answered simply or finally, but turns to Bede's own writing on the *principium creaturarum* in his commentary on Genesis, then to the Anglo-Saxon concept of the "world-hall" in *Beowulf* and elsewhere (89–94). From this, Wallis turns to Bede's computistical works, which "invite us to take a fresh look at the world-hall image in Cædmon's hymn" (95). "Bede's thinking about the cosmos suggests that he would not have read Cædmon's image [of the heavens as a roof] as merely a statement of the obvious—that the heavens are overhead. For Bede, cosmology, *computus*, and the Creator's provision for the "sons of men" converged in specifically architectural images of the world that placed special emphasis on the heaven-roof, including its

construction, its motion, and above all its permanence and stability" (95–96). Such images would resonate throughout Bede's understanding of nature and natural time, including the computistical *ratio* of Easter. Wallis's term, "monastic encyclopedia," encompasses exegesis and *computus* as facets of a single Christian program of knowledge; "[t]he process of *meditation* links the two together in the moral and symbolic act of 'edification'" (99); it is "a web of reference points in Scripture, liturgy, doctrine, and discipline, onto which elements of ancient profane learning, including scientific learning, could be hung" (100). Wallis then describes "how Bede works within the encyclopedia to elaborate the notion of the heaven-roof as both 'time' and 'stability,'" believing that "his emphasis on the power of Cædmon's poetry to 'edify' (which is, in the end, his principal message about Cædmon) rests on the meaning he attached to the architectural metaphor in the hymn" (101). "The hymn's world-hall image, to Bede, was proof that Cædmon would think within the monastic encyclopedia of Biblical allusions, ideas about cosmos and time, and meditative practice. This was one of the keys, perhaps *the* key, that opened the cloister to Cædmon, and Old English poetry to the cloister" (110).

MKR

Christ I

Christ I begins with an architectural metaphor: Christ as *se weallstan*. In "Ðu eart se weallstan": Architectural Metaphor and Christological Imagery in the Old English *Christ I* and the Book of Kells" (*Source of Wisdom*, ed. Charles D. Wright et al. [see sec. 2], 90–112), Johanna Kramer "reconsider[s] the lyric's dense Christological imagery in light of biblical and patristic exegesis on the *caput anguli* and the *lapis angularis*, a phrase taken from Paul's letter to the Ephesians that is also commonly used to designate the stone at the corner, the angular stone" (91). Alongside her reading of Lyric I, Kramer discusses this exegetical background thoroughly, with reference to Isaiah 28, Psalm 117, Ephesians 2, Jerome, Gregory the Great, Bede, and Ælfric. The motif also appears in the first book of Bede's *De templo* and Ælfric's Homily XL for the dedication of a church. Kramer then "compare[s] the poem's allusive spatial and architectural imagery with the illuminated page from the Book of Kells known as 'The Temptation of Christ' [fol. 202 v], which provides a striking visual analogue to the poem" (91) in "an iconographic attempt to express the same Christological paradoxes as Lyric I" (99). As Kramer explains, "Both works represent one subject on the surface—a poeticized Advent antiphon and the biblical Temptation scene—but both

also employ *Raummetaphorik* associated with the *caput anguli* and the church as Christ's mystical body in order to prompt meditation on broader theological and typological concerns" (102). In her analysis of the illumination, Kramer argues that "[Christ's] lower body *is*—quite literally—the temple building"; "Christ appears only as a bust" but this shape "geometrically completes the angle" of the roof, allowing him to literally serve as a joining stone "that unites the walls and perfects the church" (102). She concludes that "by extending our range of comparison to insular art... we can not only strengthen our understanding of one particular [Old English] poem, but we can also appreciate more fully the aesthetic and intellectual richness of early medieval insular culture in general" (104).

Christ II

In "The Metrical Pointing in *The Ascension*" (*Quaestio Insularis* 7: 22–56), Abdullah Alger analyzes an overlooked section of *Christ II*, the metrically punctuated passage at lines 42 to 117 (on folios 14v to 15r). Alger views medieval punctuation practices "as a tool that medieval scribes and readers used in order to disambiguate sentences, to elucidate sense, and to direct a reader to a particular interpretation of a text" (28); this variety of uses may account for its apparent inconsistency. Contrary to Katherine O'Brien O'Keeffe's total of forty-three points within the entire poem, Alger counts 272 (35), and within the passage in question, he counts 144 points, five scribal and 139 by a later reader (38), who made five mistakes (39). Regarding the content of this passage, Alger states, "The metrically punctuated selection is particularly important not only because it describes the moments before and after Christ's ascent and descent from heaven, but it is important for its instruction to preach and proclaim the gospel in order to save the souls of sinners" (43). He concludes that "the narrative of the passage, the textual anomalies [described in the essay], and the corrector's intervention within other parts of this poem, may suggest that it was used for both private reading and instructional purposes" (40). Alger has appended to the essay a chart of later punctuation in the poem (from lines 42 to 392), complete with words occurring before and after the point and a note on each point's position. Appendix B consists of eleven images from the Exeter Book.

Christ III

In "Of þam him aweaxed wynsum gefea': The Voyeuristic Appeal of *Christ III*" (*JEGP* 106: 428–46), Timothy

D. Arner and Paul D. Stegner "argue that *Christ III*'s representation of the blessed gazing upon the damned forwards its penitential aims by offering the gaze as voyeuristic pleasure and promising the reader that such pleasure, experienced through reading, will continue in heaven" (428). After reviewing the patristic treatment of the blessed's vision of the damned, Arner and Stegner explain that "the *Christ III* poet uses the Augustinian model in his depiction of the way the blessed see, but he models his description more directly on the interpretation set forth by Gregory the Great in his exegesis of the parable of Lazarus" (432). In the second section, they "demonstrate how the poem uses visual markers to communicate salvation and damnation during the events of the Last Judgment" (430); "the blessed's visual apprehension and interpretation of the signs on the bodies of the damned is figured in terms of the reader's engagement with the words of a text" (429). Then, Arner and Stegner argue that the poem's emphasis on vision as its primary appeal allows the reader to identify with the blessed and "formulate a subject position that corresponds to that of a soul in heaven" (439). "This subject position... is essential for the experience of both textual and voyeuristic pleasure through the fulfillment of the scopic drive and the recognition of one's individuality" (440). The passage that is most crucial to this argument revolves around the *preo tacen* that reward the blessed (lines 1221 to 1254). "By depicting the body of the wounded Christ and the suffering of the damned in Hell, the reader can enjoy these *tacen* in the poem just as the blessed and derive the same pleasure in Heaven. The poem fulfills the reader's scopic drive through textual representation of visual signs, offering the opportunity for participation in divine vision before Judgment" (445). *Christ III* thus represents "the pleasure of a text that offers a hermeneutic space for critical and exegetical inspection" (445) to a reader who will "enjoy this same visual and textual pleasure in Heaven" (446). In fact, according to Arner and Stegner, "[t]he key innovation of *Christ III* is the implication that the pleasure derived from the act of reading is continued in the afterlife" (429).

Christ and Satan

Susan Button explores the symbolism of light in "*Dystro ealle geondlyhte*: Illumination in *The Gospel of Nicodemus*, *The Phoenix*, and *Christ and Satan*" (*In Geardagum* 27: 55–66). Button first analyzes the harrowing of hell in *The Gospel of Nicodemus* and argues that "[l]ight manifested in the presence of Jesus at the gates of Hell brings hope to those souls awaiting release from hell

while trepidation and fear belong to those who will spend eternity in darkness” (56). Next, Button turns to *The Phoenix*: “The use of light provides a sense of glory to the poem and it calls to the pagan warriors to feel the warmth and peace of this light that surrounds a heavenly band and to turn from the cold and cruel world that surrounds the *comitatus*” (60). Finally, Button argues, “In *Christ and Satan* God’s power becomes the ultimate light for the Christian” (63). Yet “*Christ and Satan* also contains an equally strong demonstration of God’s power though the removal of light” as Satan “becomes loathsome in darkness and torment, even to himself—the *an-haga*” (65). Ultimately, Button concludes, “The use of light as a conquering weapon, as the consolation for those who were sitting in darkness, and as the religious hope of an eternal rest in the glorious light of God’s *rice*, provides us a glimpse into the beliefs of the Christian Anglo-Saxon poets. The view of light in this context enriches our comprehension of the struggle our ancestors faced against the darkness of their time” (66).

Descent into Hell

In “Two Remarks Concerning Folio 121 of the *Exeter Book*” (*N&Q* 54: 207–08), Mary R. Rambaran-Olm discusses her examination of the lacunae on the Exeter Book’s damaged folio 121. Regarding the lacuna at line 93: *bimengdes [...]gust ealra cyninga*, she suggests that the vowel in *-gust* is actually the letter *a* (207). “Although most of the bottom portion of the letter is visible on folio 121r, close examination of the letters from the reverse side of the page, that is folio 121v, reveals the vowel in the syllable to have a rounded top which curves to the left” (207). In response to Krapp and Dobie’s suggestion of [*modi*]gust or [*mod*]gust, Rambaran-Olm counters, “Since closer examination of the word via the reverse side of the folio seems to indicate that the letter is an *a* and not a *u*, the word *modgast* or *modigast* would be just as fitting in terms of context and alliteration” (208). Rambaran-Olm also confirms that the large lacuna on folio 121v contains the first three letters of *englum*: “upon close examination of the reverse side of the page, not only is the *e* evident, but the top of the *n* and much of its two shafts are clearly visible as well,” as is “more of the vertical stroke at the top of the *g*” (207). As Rambaran-Olm has demonstrated here, “closer examination of show-through around lacunae could aid in more accurate transcriptions of poems on folios within the Exeter Book that contain large holes” (208).

RN

Dream of the Rood

In “Trinitarian Language: Augustine, *The Dream of the Rood*, and Ælfric” (in *Source of Wisdom*, ed. Wright et al. [see sec. 2], 63–79), James W. Earl suggests that the notion of the Trinity was “more than a theological abstraction”; rather, it was “an encompassing truth, an omnipresent reality—not just a theory of everything but a structure—an experienced structure—of everything” (66). The question he pursues is the relation of the incarnate Word to the language we actually use; his first solution is that the Word “mediates between the Father’s transcendence and the Spirit’s immanence, as language mediates between the world of ideas and the world of experience. Seen in this way, language would be not just a tool for communication, but an active principle of reality, and a particularly creative one at that” (66). Earl examines Augustine’s *de Trinitate*, which insists that spoken language is not identical to the Word, but can serve as a sign and image of it. “Because the world of ideas and the world of things meet in language, each is revealed to the other as the Word, or words, in more than just a rhetorical or metaphorical sense. Language is the interface” (67); it is also, as Augustine describes it, knowledge animated by love. Earl beautifully describes this love relationship at some length, remarking Augustine’s is not a theory, but a theology, of language (69). With regard to the poem, “[w]hatever truth the...poet sees, he sees in language—not a language of utilitarian denotativeness, however, but the language of the heart, a language of vision, produced by love’s inward, not outward motion” (71). The poet’s Christian language “understands itself as incarnating the Word” (72); a further commentary on incarnation may be found in the fact that the cross is a *reordberend* ‘speechbearer,’ but Christ utters no words: “[t]he silence of Christ’s divinity...is perhaps an aspect of his ineffable transcendence. The closest we can come to his divine being is in *seeing* it, although we hear the words that flow in speech from his incarnated form, from the mouth of his flesh, represented in the poem by the Rood” (73). Earl remarks that if his reading of the poem is plausible, we would expect to find evidence of Augustine’s theology of language in other OE texts; he ends his essay with a discussion of Ælfric, who seems to avoid using the sections of *De Trinitate* that Earl has explained above. “In all his discussions of the Trinity, Ælfric identifies Christ as wisdom or understanding rather than the Word; he links them only in [a homily on the opening of John], and here only because the text of John 1:1 compels him” (75). Earl suggests that the absence of this facet of the Augustinian theology

of language isn't due to rejection but rather to the complete assimilation of the idea, such that "[w]hat began as a speculative philosophical inquiry six centuries earlier had gradually become internalized as a *mentalité* inhabited all but unconsciously in Ælfric's world. It might inform the use of language itself, in texts now as well-known and little understood as *The Dream of the Rood*, but it did not need to be belaboured or explained" (79).

Carole Hough's "Old English *fea* in *The Dream of the Rood* 115b and *The Paris Psalter* 134:18" (NM 108: 325–37), argues that "an interpretation [of *fea*] as an adjectival noun is linguistically and stylistically more appropriate" in both occurrences referenced in the title; that being the case, "[t]here is thus no evidence for an adverb *fea* in Old English" (325). The crux in both instances is whether *fea* should be construed as "few" or "little." Hough reviews current scholarship, including Marsden, Mitchell and Robinson, Baker, Bradley, and others, back to Sweet, whose *Anglo-Saxon Reader* "appears to intend this interpretation, as the glossary gives 'few' as the only definition of *fēa* (although without linking it directly to this line [115b])" (327). Because the *DOE* records over 400 uses of *fea* as an adjective or pronoun and only two (those in question here) as an adverb, the likelihood is that the adverbial usage has been misconstrued, especially since in both cases an adjectival noun produces a perfectly sensible reading that cannot be ruled out on other grounds (328). Hough considers possible objections to her theory, concluding that "there is no support for an adverb *fea* 'little' in Old English" and that both instances cited here "may more appropriately be understood as adjectival nouns representing instances of litotes. In *The Paris Psalter* 134:18, the preceding negative particle functions as an intensifier: *ne magon fea gangan* 'none at all are able to walk.' The sense is thus directly parallel to, and even slightly stronger than, the corresponding version in 113:15: *ne magon feala gangan* 'not many (i.e. none) are able to walk.' In *The Dream of the Rood* line 115b, the literal meaning 'few' has rightly been rejected by a majority of scholars. Taken to mean 'none,' on the other hand, it makes excellent sense in the context, and is again consistent with the use of litotes elsewhere in the same poem and in other OE literary texts" (337). Hough therefore reads lines 115–116 thus: "But they will be afraid, and few (i.e. none) will think of what they should begin to say to Christ" (337).

Sung-Il Lee begins "Repetition of the Same Phrases in *The Dream of the Rood* and What It Signifies" (*Medieval and Early Modern English Studies* 15: 255–70), by identifying the poem as a dream vision featuring prosopoeia and divided into three main sections (256). He

then discusses the repetition of certain phrases within the poem within the context of each of these three divisions. For example, "[t]he fact that the rather long phrase made up of eight words ('men ofer moldan, and eall þeos mære gesceaft') appears in two different stages of poetic development—once in the introductory part of the poem, in which the first-person narrator on the outermost layer, the poet, tells us how he encountered a vision, and again within the utterance of the personified cross in the poet's vision—makes us scrutinize on a possible link between the outer layer of the poem and the core of the work, the narration of the cross" (261). Such structural repetitions indicate the poet's coherent and cohesive stream of consciousness (266). "In a distinct way, *The Dream of the Rood* is a manifestation of what the modern literary theorists have termed 'meta-poetry.' It is a poem not only about the sublime moment of epiphany of the divine glory, but also about how a chain reaction is bound to occur when the process of telling a story and listening to it goes on—which is what literature is all about" (267).

In the spirit of returning us to our exegetical interpretive roots, J.W. Marchand discusses what for modern readers may be an unusual image of Christ, though it seems to have been commonplace in the Middle Ages. His essay, "The Leaps of Christ and *The Dream of the Rood*" (in *Source of Wisdom*, ed. Charles Wright et al. [see sec. 2], 80–9) begins by examining liturgical and scriptural Latin texts that portray Christ as leaping, whether down from heaven, across the mountains, or back to heaven at the Ascension. Such leaps are commonplace in Cynewulf's poem on the Ascension, *Christ II*, which features six leaps: the incarnation, the birth, the crucifixion, the burial, the harrowing of hell, and the ascension (82–3). The third of these leaps, the crucifixion, is the focal point of the *Dream of the Rood*, in which the Lord hastens to the cross and climbs (leaps) upon it; Marchand notes that the poet uses the same root verb *-stigan* as Cynewulf in describing the action (84). Christ here is the *Miles Christus*; he is also the hero, the *hæled*, the athlete or warrior of Wisdom 18: "[h]e undresses himself, to complete our picture of the athlete, the *gymnicus*, who, as we know, must fight naked" (85). For Marchand, the best translation is leap: "Christ does not intend to climb the tree, he intends to leap upon it, to embrace it. The action of the tree supports this reading. It has to brace itself to receive the hero, stand firm, though it does tremble when the young hero embraces ('ymbclyppan') it" (85–6).

How Christian is Old English Literature? Éamonn Ó Carragáin and Richard North set out to answer this question in "*The Dream of the Rood* and Anglo-Saxon

Northumbria" (Chapter 6 in *Beowulf & Other Stories*, ed. North and Allard [see below under *Beowulf*], 160–88). They begin by reminding us that the imagination of Anglo-Saxon poets from the seventh to the eleventh century "was fixated on the symbolism of the Christian mystery, which they presented in an often uncompromising heroic form" (160); in their analysis, *The Dream of the Rood* is the result of a collision between the Christian and the heroic, between love and duty (161). The authors discuss the MS context, pointing out that, having read the text immediately preceding *The Dream* in the Vercelli Book, a reader would need "to hear something cheerful at this point in the manuscript" (162); indeed, the compiler seems to have been at pains to alternate gloomy texts with more positive, in this case, "the best of dreams" (163). The poem puns on the word *treow* 'tree' and *treowe* 'pledge, assurance'; such punning both misleads and complicates/enriches the associations, one of which is the Tree of Life with the World Tree. "This Tree of Life... recalls Christ's own body as well as the Cross on which Christ died" (165). The authors examine the several incidences of chiasmus in the poem (165–7), as well as point out significant differences between the account of the rood in the poem and the gospel versions, most notably the heroic elements and the contradiction inherent in a lord commanding his thane to assist in his death. "This poem emphasises, in a way no other Christian poem does, past or present, English or other, the ambiguity of the role of the Cross and its complicity in Christ's death. *The Dream* makes the Cross uniquely an anti-hero rather than a hero. By doing this, the poem draws attention also to the strangeness of Christ's choice of death on the Cross," a choice that would make Christ himself a strange kind of hero, not interested in vengeance but willing to suffer both pain and mockery (169). Further, [t]he poem dramatises the precise moment when the old Anglian World-Tree became the Christian Rood": in the moment when the word used to describe it shifts from *beam* or *treow* to *rōd* (170–1). The Crucifixion is seen here as a stage in the battle against the powers of darkness, but also as an encounter between Christ and the Cross, between the lord and his loyal retainer (171). Such martial imagery was familiar to Anglo-Saxons through the writings of Gregory the Great, especially his account of the Annunciation. Because it is Christ's sacrifice that ultimately leads to victory, "it is just after his death that phrases asserting his power and divinity begin to flood the poem" (172). The second section of the chapter discusses Northumbrian Christianity in particular, as "there are various reasons to believe that *The Dream* was originally a Northumbrian

poem," composed in the late seventh century (174). The authors provide a sketch of the first seventy years of Christianity in that region to show the poet's "cosmopolitan background" (174), then turn to the fragments of *The Dream* on the Ruthwell Cross (178–84), remarking that the designer of the Cross may have been inspired by a version of *The Dream* to provide captions for the images, explaining "the new Christian significance of [the Tree of Life]: that is has become the rood on which Christ, dying heroically, brought life to the world" (179). They explain the relationship between the carved images and the runic and Latin texts, demonstrating that in the monument the "new English Crucifixion narrative places the ancient pagan image of the Tree of Life (an image common to the Roman world as well as to Germanic tribes) in an explicitly Christian setting" (183–4). The authors turn briefly to the Vercelli Book and to a version of the OE Crucifixion narrative (possibly from *The Dream* itself) on the Brussels Cross, then conclude, asserting that OE literature was driven by Christianity from the beginning to the end of its history and that the *Dream of the Rood* "shows that the earliest form of [Anglo-Saxon] Christianity was unusual for being a breathtakingly symbolic and fiercely imaginative kind.... In no other literature will we find such a heroic cast to Christ and his sacrifice on Calvary or to the Cross as the unwilling agent of Christ's death" (187). In it, OE heroism was redefined.

Fred Orton and Ian Wood, along with Clare A. Lees, delve into the relationship between the fragmentary runic inscriptions on the Ruthwell Cross and *The Dream of the Rood* in "The Ruthwell Runes and *The Dream of the Rood*" (chapter 7 in *Fragments of History: Rethinking the Ruthwell and Bewcastle Monuments* [Manchester, UK: Manchester UP], 144–69, 239–43). Throughout the book in which this chapter appears, the authors argue "for a history that refocuses critical attention on the conceptions of the fragmentary, the particular and the local—the bits and pieces of Anglo-Saxon culture that form the basis of the evidence," for the fragments *as* fragments offer (perhaps require) different ways of seeing and understanding the material (144). The chapter begins with a discussion of the Ruthwell Cross and its runic inscription, especially its three-dimensional quality, which "invites a relationship with the beholder that is visual and tactile, kinetic and temporal. The inscriptions, English and Latin, are surely there to be read, but the monument takes some time to see and 'read' and is marked by and incorporates various histories.... There is, crucially, no definite place from which to begin or end this process" (145). The authors attempt to show possible intended relationships between the

inhabited plant scroll and the inscriptions, noting the poetic strategies used (alliteration, apposition, verbs in initial position), which would “create thematic lines for the ear to follow, lines where silence features as strongly as sound” (147), features that become apparent only in reading the inscriptions aloud. Further, the only people with access to both the runic and Latin texts would be those literate in both languages and orthographies, perhaps casting an air of mystery over the words and the story they tell (148). Indeed, the ‘I’ of the inscriptions “is personified in the manner of a riddle” (151). In the second section, the authors consider the relationship between the stone cross and the poem in the Vercelli Book. “Like *Beowulf* and the Sutton Hoo burial, the monument inscriptions and manuscript poem make a rather ‘odd couple’ and, like *Beowulf* and the Sutton Hoo burial, their pairing is one that historians, art historians and literary critics are loath to split asunder” (151). Such a connection seems to offer coherence to OE literary history, but introduces as many problems as it seems to solve, most especially in suppressing the differences between the texts and insisting upon their correlations. The authors relate the history of scholarship connecting the two through their similarities, then focus instead on those differences, challenging us to read the Ruthwell inscriptions independently of the manuscript poem (152–55). The third section considers the “repetition of versions of the critical story about the relation of association between runic texts and manuscript poem” and how it puts pressures on how we approach these objects of study, closing off potential avenues of investigation. Finally, the authors turn the story around to explore the distinctive nature of the two artifacts, the differences inherent in the media and their context, and what those differences might signify. “A context can sometimes supplement and enrich understanding of texts but, because any ‘context’ is necessarily a ‘connection’ of several ‘texts,’ it always adds an additional layer of complexity to the process of interpretation and explanation” (160). In comparing the text of the inscriptions with the manuscript poem, the authors note several points. First, “the text inscribed on the monument relates only to that section of the later poem that deals most explicitly with the Crucifixion, largely voiced by the Cross” (161); second, the relationship between some of the lines on the monument and the manuscript poem seems to be one of “paraphrase,” “variation,” and, possibly, “quotation”; third, “some of the lines of the text on the monument are apparently deliberately metrically incomplete,” while others follow more conventional models; fourth, “there is a high proportion of hypermetrical lines in this section of the

manuscript poem and, apparently, in the runic text inscribed on the monument” (162). In comparing similarities, the authors look to aspects of context, language, theme, and genre. The authors conclude that “the most likely and most straightforward explanation of the affinities between the text inscribed on the eighth-century monument at Ruthwell, the text contained with *The Dream of the Rood* in the late tenth-century Vercelli Book and the text engraved on the eleventh-century Brussels Cross reliquary is that each makes use of a conventional, probably primarily spoken topos that was widely available as a resource in Anglo-Saxon culture for some considerable time, one that was subject of and to the whole process of history, movement and change, which determined its form, function and context of use” (166–7). They end by warning that to insist on one explanation to the exclusion of all others is to handicap discussion and discovery, to deny the process required to make sense of the artifact.

In “The Cross in *The Dream of the Rood*: Martyr, Patron and Image of Christ” (*Leeds Studies in English* 38: 1–15), Barbara C. Raw explores the various significations of the cross in the poem, comparing the poetic images elicited to visual representations known in the medieval period. She remarks at the outset that the poem reads like a riddle, beginning with an enigma that is not clarified and expanded until the end; Raw therefore explains the poem in reverse order, beginning with ll. 95–156. In these lines, the cross “claims that suffering alongside Christ is the means to salvation. The dreamer, on the other hand, concludes that salvation depends on devotion to the cross, which becomes his patron and protector, his *mundbyrd* who will lead him into heaven, where he will join his friends and all the saints at God’s banqueting table (ll. 122–56)” (2). This divine feast derives from the promise Christ made to the disciples in Luke’s gospel and is a common theme in Christian art, depicting the joy of the saints in heaven. The saints are also often portrayed as leading the dead into that heavenly celebration. In the poem, the role of those saints is occupied by the rood, “a detail which links the Old English poem to early Christian representations of the martyrs and to the cult of the saints” (3). Martyrs are frequently pictured as interceding for other Christians, sometimes standing next to the cross, which indicates that their sacrifice is modelled on Christ’s own. “Like the martyrs, the cross in [the poem] owes its power of intercession to its imitation of Christ, in sharing his death on the cross. Like Christ, it still bears the marks of the nails” (4). Taken down from Calvary and buried in the earth, also like Christ, the cross “enjoys a resurrection and glorification” (4).

However, Raw argues that the cross does not simply imitate Christ, but is a symbol of Christ himself (5). She then connects portrayals of Christ (and therefore the cross) as the Tree of Life, citing both textual and artistic representations, and asserting that the identification of Christ with the Tree of Life became the norm in the early medieval period. In this way, the cross of the opening lines of the poem represents the Tree of Life, the relics of the cross, encased in gold and jewels, and Christ himself. Raw remarks that the cross is also honored with garments, “which introduce a third symbol of Christ: the trophy which celebrates an imperial victory” (7). In 1970 Raw suggested that this description referred to a trophy-cross, but had at that point found no English evidence to substantiate this notion; since that time, she has discovered a ninth-century manuscript of Sedulius’s *Carmen paschale* that depicts a trophy-cross accompanied by symbols of the four evangelists (7). While the manuscript was written at Liège, it is thought to have been copied from an Anglo-Saxon manuscript of the eighth century. “But whereas the enthroned or jewelled crosses emphasize Christ’s royal and glorified status, the trophy-cross stresses his victory over death” (9). While Sedulius’s poem differs from *The Dream*, the two share a number of details; Raw suggests that it is possible that it contributed to the way the *Dream* poet approached the subject of Christ’s death, even though it is clearly not *The Dream*’s main source (10).

Paul E. Szarmach credits formalism with rescuing *The Dream of the Rood* from “the junkheap of literary history” (267). His present contribution to this rescue, “*The Dream of the Rood* as Ekphrasis” (in *Text, Image, Interpretation*, ed. Minnis and Roberts [see sec. 2], 267–88) “seeks to extend the significance of the poem by considering it as an example of ekphrasis, that is, the verbal representation of the visual” (267), with emphasis placed on “the ‘how’ of seeing and what ‘seeing’ quite means rather than on the content of the vision” (268). He begins with Anglo-Saxon art criticism, citing Ælfric of Eynsham’s explanation of how to read the miracles of the feeding of the five thousand with five loaves and two fishes in his homily *Dominica in media quadragesima*: “Ælfric’s intellectual contrast is between two ways of looking: what you see is what you get; what you read is what takes you to another level of understanding” (269). Szarmach offers a brief overview of the possible sources for this homily, whose ultimate source is Augustine’s *Tractate 24* on the Gospel of John; Augustine’s major conclusion, echoed by Ælfric, is that the viewer sees and praises, whereas the reader sees, praises, reads, and understands, thereby establishing the superiority of reading over mere viewing

(270–1). Following a discussion of images as types of text to be “read” by the illiterate, Szarmach explains that such reading is only possible if the viewer comes to the image with antecedent knowledge; in this way, the visual “cooperates with Christian preaching” (274). He then argues that this cooperation means that for Gregory the Great and Bede, “the stress is on pictures of ‘holy stories,’ not portraits or other kinds of representation, which serve not only to adorn a church but also to instruct those looking at them” (276). Szarmach cites Bede’s account of Benedict Biscop’s gifts of such artwork to the monastery, images that worshipers would immediately encounter upon entering the church and that would, because of their subject matter, remind the faithful to examine and amend their own lives. “The importance of memory is clear: the images join with what the faithful have otherwise heard or learned, and that is how the images teach by way of memory” (277). Elsewhere, Bede defines the Greek word *pictura* as *uiuua scriptura* (‘living writing’). “For Bede there would appear to be a special immediacy in a picture that makes it particularly effective in transmitting moral teaching and affective piety. What Bede is describing is essentially the experience of *The Dream of the Rood* where a living picture inspires the soul in tears to seek God” (278). Szarmach then turns to *Andreas*, wherein Christ disguises himself and takes Andrew and his men across the sea in a storm; here, the theme of seeing and looking becomes significant, as what “Andrew thinks he sees is not what is there” (280). In Christ’s second encounter with the Jewish elders, he examines statues of angels; the poet describes their beauty immediately before Christ performs a miracle, causing a statue, like the cross in *The Dream of the Rood*, to speak in witness to Christ’s identity (280–1). The elders, however, “see with their own eyes, just as the illiterate might, but cannot read the signs that were given to them” (281). The second example comes from *Beowulf*, where Hrothgar “reads” the runes on the sword hilt; Szarmach wonders “what cognitive act did Hrothgar perform when the hilt was in his hand?” (283), and asserts that Hrothgar “does see, praise, read, and understand them,” so that the hilt becomes “the medium or the occasion for moral teaching” (284). He then turns to *The Dream of the Rood*, remarking that “[t]he use of vision, which serves more to authorize the moral messages contained therein than to allow the suspension of realism (as earlier critics might have argued), invests the transformed Cross with a special beauty as the dreamer describes the gold and gems that adorn it” (285). “Ultimately, this paper suggests the triumph of art over criticism or, more sharply, ekphrasis and the experience of the

verbal description of the visual over the discursive formulation of any particular ekphrastic moment" (287).

Helena Tampierová's "The Dream of the Rood—a Blend of Christian and Pagan Values" (in *Dream, Imagination and Reality in Literature*, ed. Kamila Vránková and Christopher Koy [Ceské Budejovice: Editio Universitatis Bohemiae Meridionalis], 47–51) examines the spiritual continuity of the Germanic world through the archetypal image of the tree in *The Dream of the Rood*. She begins by remarking the ubiquity of religious tree imagery, attributing it to the symbol's "overwhelming semantic potential" (47). "The enormous spiritual charge of that poem is the result of the alternating identification of the narrator with the cross-rod—a Christian symbol par excellence—versus the Tree of Life or the *axis mundi* of the Germano-Celtic mythologies, emphasized by the context of the dreaming poet" (47). Tampierová refers to the four mythological traditions Joseph Campbell identifies as leading to the heroic tradition, then demonstrates how what she calls the Germano-Celtic substratum blends with the Christianity and how "both Celtic and Germanic forms of Christianity acquired in the early centuries of its existence some quite specific features and a rather pronounced pagan or heretic flavour" (48). Like other authors, she notes the resonance between the Cross and Yggdrasil, the Norse World Tree (49), as well as the distinction between the inscriptions on the Ruthwell Cross and the manuscript poem in the Vercelli Book (50).

MKR

Elene

In "Elene as an Agent of Torture: An Anglo-Saxon Depiction of Sanctity" (*Insights and Bearings*, ed. Brito et al. [see sec. 2], 221–32), María Beatriz Hernández Pérez examines "the inversion of the traditional gender pattern of female martyr lives in the account of the 'inventio crucis'" (223). Hernández Pérez sees Elene not as a wife, widow, nor peace-weaver, for "not even in her role as a mother does she possess the features of generosity and sacrifice" (224). Rather, "the narrator presents her in the fashion of a heroine, inspired by her son's commands and surrounded, like the leader of a war band, by the best of heroes" (224). Another new form of heroism in the poem is the experience of torture, "the basic passive attitude whereby the atoned person cannot react by means of his imprisoned body and must therefore resort to spiritual resilience and strength" (226). Although the female martyr's body was previously a privileged locus of torture in hagiography, "Here instead, the female body is the agent of torture; the mother's attributes, far from those of a submissive

woman, become those of an active instrument of conversion.... Elene changes the gender roles traditionally attributed to motherhood for an allegorical ecclesiastical model. Thus, this figural motherhood accounts for the symbolic birth of the male saint after a long 'gestation' in the well" (229). Yet Elene's torture of Judas also takes on a broader significance in that "the poem states the superiority of Christianity not only to Judaism—on intellectual grounds—but also to paganism—represented by the barbarian tribes—on the battleground. The author's account speaks the need for ecclesiastical torture in order to prevent the torture perpetrated by both the Jews and the barbarians. Christian violence is consequently justified, personified in the august figure of the queen mother who takes all responsibility for these men's destinies" (230).

Juan Camilo Conde-Silvestre examines the oral duels between saints and demons that take place in *Elene*, *Guthlac A*, and *Juliana* in his article "Verbal Confrontation and the Uses of Direct Speech in Some Old English Poetic Hagiographies" (*Bells Chiming from the Past*, ed. Moskowich-Spiegel and Crespo-García [see sec. 3b], 247–64). Conde-Silvestre says of his first example, "[T]he poem evinces that Guthlac's victory is completely based on his verbal ability, and that the most offensive discursive weapon at his disposal is the capacity to express the truth with suitable words" (253). He then compares Guthlac's ability to align his words with his actions to Beowulf's encounter with the coast guard (253). Elene's demonic adversary emerges in line 899 to grieve Judas's conversion to Christianity and his resurrection of a corpse. Here, Conde-Silvestre notes "that the exchange of accusations between both characters (*geflitu*, l. 953b) can be interpreted as a transference of the verbal duels (*flyting contests*) typical of heroic poetry" (255), for example between Beowulf and Unferth (256). Finally, "Juliana's antagonist is skilful in the use of words and his speeches show the oratorical capacity...of the saint: both express their ideas adequately, in well-balanced and prosodically well-constructed lines" (260). "Linguistic behaviour allows demons to tempt humans and lure them into destruction," Conde-Silvestre concludes, "and it helps saints to force their enemies to define themselves...and, by doing so, to give the clues on their location and elusive nature which may help their antagonists to defeat them" (262).

RN

Exodus

Alfred Bammesberger contributes a note on a difficult reading in *Exodus* in "Old English *læste near* (*Exodus*,

line 308b)” (*N&Q*: 357–59). Lines 299–309 present several problems of interpretation that neither Krapp’s nor Lucas’s editions resolve. First, Bammesberger suggests that *gestod* in l. 303a is an explanatory gloss on *astah* in 302b that a later copyist inserted into the poetic text, resulting in modern editors’ befuddlement in the subsequent lines, which appear to leave a missing half-line (after l. 305a *anes modes*). Bammesberger shows that emendation of the manuscript reading to remove *gestod* produces the reasonable verse lines with vocalic alliteration *Sæweall astah / uplong wið Isrehelum andægne fyrst* (“The wall of the sea rose up, and upright it stood a whole day’s time against the Israelites”). More problematic has been the meaning of l. 308b *læste near*, in which *læste* has been understood by editors like Lucas and lexicographers like Bosworth, Hall, Grein, and Holthausen as a *hapax legomenon* meaning “performance,” a meaning which makes a dog’s breakfast of the sense of the passage. Pointing out that reluctance to view *læste*, quite naturally, as the third person preterite singular of the weak verb *læstan* probably derives from scholars’ reluctance to position a finite verb in the first stressed position of an off-verse, Bammesberger shows that even the *Beowulf*-poet positioned finite-verb forms in the first lift of the off-verse. Certainly, the meaning of *læstan* in this passage makes much more sense as “follow, carry out, complete.” In his digital facsimile of the Junius manuscript, Bernard Muir appears to have read l. 308b *læste* as a form of *læstan* quite unselfconsciously because he provides a translation of the passage as “In no wise did they scorn their holy leader’s counsels as the time for deeds drew near” but still fails to provide a completely transparent rendering of the manuscript reading since there seems to be a confusion of *leofes leop* in l. 308a with *sweg* and *sances bland* in l. 309. Bammesberger’s persuasive case yields the elegant reading, “In no way did they contemn the teaching of the holy one; when the song of the beloved one drew nearer the clamour and the confusion of voices ceased” (359).

CC

Fortunes of Men

“Caring for the Dead in *The Fortunes of Men*” (*PQ* 86: 343–63) opens with a critique of the dominant “habit of reading *Fortunes* against the tradition of northern literature” (347) in an “effort to situate the poem within a (primarily Scandinavian) mythological context” (346). In his illuminating essay, Stefan Jurasinski focuses, rather, on the overlooked but peculiar tendency of the poem to “feature[] persons whose fate is not simply to die, but to be literally and figuratively consumed”;

“this is a poem that delights not simply in depicting death, but in seeing the living body as potential food either for animals or for destructive natural forces,” he observes (347). While Jurasinski admits that this same logic is at work in the beasts of battle motif, “it cannot have been irrelevant...that the dread of being consumed was a potent theme in the Christian literature of late antiquity” (348); for example, Jurasinski cites parallels in the *Legend of the Seven Sleepers*. The fate of the broken body is, moreover, “thematically tied to the denial of Christian burial” (355). The main thrust of the argument begins by entertaining “the notion that *sylfcwalu* here means what it does in prose: ‘suicide’” (351). After reviewing more traditional arguments for a quarrel in the mead hall as the cause of death, Jurasinski names Nicholas Howe as the only previous scholar to maintain this literal reading (352). He then convincingly adduces further circumstantial evidence (from Celtic penitentials, burial legislation, and execution cemeteries) in support of this interpretation, and ultimately argues that “all who die violently” were denied a Christian burial (355). “The presence of the suicide as the culminating figure in its catalog of fates” is therefore “unsurprising” (356). Yet “all of the figures mentioned in the catalog are presumably denied... burial in consecrated ground, and ultimately the prospect of being reunited with a body that had enjoyed some measure of protection,” he concludes (356).

RN

Robert DiNapoli begins his essay “Close to the Edge: *The Fortunes of Men* and the Limits of Wisdom Literature” (in *Text and Transmission in Medieval Europe*, ed. Chris Bishop [Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Press], 127–47) by acknowledging how most critics have marginalized wisdom literature, pushing it to the edges of the corpus of Old English poetry and calling upon it only in service of providing context for other, more well-known texts. DiNapoli first offers a thorough analysis of *The Fortunes of Men*—he close-reads the work in its entirety over the course of his study—to demonstrate its centrality, in particular the way it “adumbrates much of the heroic temper of Old English poetry” (147). Yet while the poem might invoke this heroic temper in recognizable ways, DiNapoli wants to make clear its inherent strangeness, too, especially the way that, even though in its first half it traffics heavily in imagery of death, disease, and exile—imagery that elsewhere in Old English literature is treated in explicitly moral or allegorical ways—the poem studiously avoids either moralization or allegorization: “Although

commonly understood as a didactic poem, it does not appear to be teaching the expected lesson" (130). Instead, *The Fortunes of Men* focuses on the "human dimension" (131) of these experiences, describing them in "wholly existential and experiential terms" (134) in order to underscore the importance of dealing with "necessity" (135), an idea that DiNapoli argues is central to understanding the poem. As such, he writes, *The Fortunes of Men* anticipates the work of William Blake, notably "Milton," which describes the horror due the body in the grave without providing any consolatory explanations. For DiNapoli, the poet of *The Fortunes of Men* is thus pointing "towards a nuanced uncovering of the underlying forces of existence, not through appeal to a metaphysical authority called in to explain away, justify or trump the less appetizing aspects of our experience as embodied selves, but through direct imaginative engagement with the processes themselves" (140). The second half of the poem responds to the first, offering ways for readers and listeners to respond to the harsh necessity showcased there. Unlike the hapless characters of the first half of the poem, who fall prey to a host of calamities for deserved or undeserved reasons, the characters in the second half are able to "address necessity, if not master it" (144) by engaging in two activities, harping and falconry: "The musician, mastering the matter and the moods of his instrument, stands at the farthest possible remove from the passive victims whose plights have been portrayed in the poem's first half" (145), while the trainer of the hawk "is an instance of necessity to the object of his skills, which exploit the bird's natural appetites and instincts to shape its behaviour to suit its use by other humans... The synergy between its wild will and the higher will of its trainer produces a greater good than nature could have achieved on its own" (146).

GD

Genesis A and B

Andy Orchard conducts a stylistic analysis of *Genesis A* in "Intoxication, Fornication, and Multiplication: The Burgeoning Text of *Genesis A*" (*Text, Image, Interpretation*, ed. Minnis and Roberts [see sec. 2], 333–54). He begins by focusing on passages that can be compared to the Vulgate, and to one another, "to assess the traditional techniques that the *Genesis A*-poet chose to use in transforming the Latin source" (335): God's commands to increase and multiply as addressed to Adam and Eve (Genesis 1.28) and Noah and his sons (Genesis 9.1 and 9.7). Orchard demonstrates that no two Old English renderings of the Latin 'increase and multiply' theme are entirely the same (338). Moreover, not only

do the iterations also become progressively shorter, but the third example also "forms a tight envelope pattern" that further demonstrates the poet's control over the material (338). Orchard also analyzes the poet's treatment of Noah's drunkenness (lines 1555–84a); the passage is significantly embellished, and the poet has added "clear verbal parallels without warrant in the Latin source that extend both backwards, to his version of the expulsion of Adam and Eve from Paradise, and forwards, to his likewise embellished narrative of the taking of Sarah from Abraham by Abimelech" (342). Finally, Orchard assesses which Old English poems may be indebted to *Genesis A*; the essay includes two appendices that document unique and rare compounds in over 300 lines shared between *Genesis A* and other poems, and parallels found between *Genesis A* and *Judith*. "The clear thematic connection between the biblical account of Abimelech's attempted seduction of Sarah in *Genesis A*, where...the Old English poet has added to his biblical source the traditional vernacular theme of 'sleeping after the feast', and the drunken post-prandial attempted seduction of Judith by Holofernes makes the notion of the direct influence of *Genesis A* on *Judith* an attractive possibility," he concludes (347).

In her introduction to "All about Eve: Memory and Re-Collection in Junius 11's Epic Poems *Genesis* and *Christ and Satan*" (*Women and Medieval Epic: Gender, Genre, and the Limits of Epic Masculinity*, ed. Sara S. Poor and Jana K. Schulman [New York: Palgrave Macmillan], 137–58), Lisabeth C. Buchelt acknowledges that although scholars reading *Genesis B* have been right to focus on language play, transmission problems, and the centrality of Eve, her "approach takes this argument a step further in showing this to be the case in the manuscript as a whole," for she argues not only that "the poetic *Genesis* should be read as a whole text" but that "Junius 11 should be read as a single narrative with four chapters rather than as a compilation of four different and self-contained short stories" (141). "By bringing together three different, yet consistent, poetic visions [in *Genesis A*, *Genesis B*, and *Christ and Satan*], the compiler/s of Junius 11 have created a 'perfect storm' discussion about theoretical language and transmission problems, the eye of which is the character of Eve," she asserts (142). The purpose of Buchelt's essay is to "look at the ways in which the temptation scene in *Genesis* (*Gen*) evokes the final poem in the codex, *Christ and Satan* (*XST*)" (143). For example, "Eve's intimate relationship to language in *Genesis*, to the creation of mortal language through her breaking of the words of the Word, is purposefully recalled in the Eve that appears in *Christ and Satan*," as she evokes readers' memories of

the rebel angels, the harrowing of hell, and “‘native’ epic poetic traditions” (143). The body of the essay, however, primarily focuses on Buchelt’s reading of *Genesis*. The passage from *Christ and Satan* to which Buchelt attends most closely is Christ and Eve’s meeting during the Harrowing of Hell (lines 420–40). Because both poets prefer “an Eve who is a mix of good intentions, which have had apparently bad outcomes,” the two Eves share “strong maternal instincts and a sense of family ties” (152). According to Buchelt, “Eve is heroic, and indeed worthy of admiration, because of her ability to move out of the epic timeframe in which she precipitated humanity’s Fall and into an eternal present—a spiritual and emotional translation that Adam, or for that matter Satan, cannot bring himself to make” (154). Thus, she concludes, “perhaps we are to read her in terms of the Prodigal Son archetype: great wisdom comes to those who question the most, and their return to the fold is cause for the greatest celebration” (155).

In “Abraham and the Northmen in *Genesis A*: Alfredian Translations and Ninth-Century Politics” (*Medievalia et Humanistica* 33: 1–13), Heide Estes analyzes the adaptation of Genesis 14 in lines 1960–2164 of the poem. “Whereas the biblical text of the chapter emphasizes names, places, and geography, the corresponding passage in the Old English poem focuses on burdensome taxation, rebellion, and the details of battle in ways that evoke English payments of tribute to attacking Danes,” she observes (1). This leads her “to locate a version of *Genesis A* in the milieu of King Alfred and the program of translation and textual transmission that he encouraged” (2), a hypothesis that is argued convincingly and with a thorough review of previous scholarship. She then explains how the poet “lingers over the two scenes of battle, describing them using language drawn from the word-hoard of Old English poetry” (4). Estes also notes that “the detail that the kings go to war over the payment of tribute is added to and emphasized in the Old English poetic account of the battle but not present in the biblical account; a ninth-century Anglo-Saxon aware of payments to the ravaging Danes might be expected to listen with approbation to the account about Abraham’s ‘gift’ of sword and spear point rather than gold and silver to the hostile armies” (6). She then analyzes the use of ‘northmen’ and ‘southmen’ in the corpus to argue that the chronicle’s “description of Guthrum as ‘the northern king’ recalls the association in *Genesis B* between Satan and the north” at lines 272b to 276a and 666b to 671a (6). Ultimately, Estes concludes, “The resonances of the poem with events of the late ninth century involving payment of tribute, and the fact that the term ‘northmen’ is used so many times

both in *Genesis* and in manuscripts associated with the Alfredian program of manuscript creation, suggest the possibility that the poetic version of *Genesis* was copied and adapted in Alfred’s circle, with specific details in the language of the poem echoing contemporary events” (10).

P.S. Langeslag begins “Doctrine and Paradigm: Two Functions of the Innovations in *Genesis B*” (*SN* 79: 113–18), with a thorough review of the scholarship on the exoneration of Eve, from Sievers to the present. Langeslag then focuses on the apologetic passage in lines 708–723a to argue that the poet emphasizes the unintentional nature of Eve’s sin and the subtlety of the temptation she faced. Readers “will have understood the call of loyalty...and sympathized to some extent with her dutiful response,” but the poet also “stresses the gravity of the consequences of Eve’s mistake” (116). “The subtlety of the temptation makes clear how easily the man may fall if his attention slackens in the slightest, which consideration is a lesson for the audience to apply in their personal lives; but the ease with which one may fall in no way diminishes the irrevocable and grave nature of that fall” (116). Langeslag also notes that “Eve’s subordinate position as a woman appears to be no obstruction to the male audience’s identification with her” (116); this helps to explain why the poet “could not place much emphasis on the essential differences between man and woman” (117). He further argues that “this leveling out of the differences between the sexes appears to be a by-product of the poet’s Christianization of the Fall narrative” in that the couple had to demonstrate intense contrition immediately after Adam’s consumption of the fruit in order to be forgiven for their sins (117). Thus, they serve as “a warning against sin and a paradigm of penitence, in effect a handbook of prevention and cure” (117).

Guthlac A and B

In “Constructing Anglo-Saxon Sanctity: Tradition, Innovation and Saint Guthlac” (*Images of Medieval Sanctity: Essays in Honour of Gary Dickson*, ed. Debra Higgs Strickland, Visualising the Middle Ages 1 [Leiden: Brill], 207–35), Alaric Hall argues that *Guthlac A* “affords insights into Anglo-Saxon constructions of sanctity which are not usually available from the Latin material; most notably it illuminates ways in which tensions between traditional and Christian notions of ideal male behaviour were constructed and played out in Anglo-Saxon Christian discourses” (207). He focuses on differences between the poem and Felix’s *Vita* to argue that “*Guthlac A* drew on traditional vernacular

poetic models"; these models are inferred primarily from *Beowulf* and *The Wife's Lament*, with occasional forays into "the English material's medieval Scandinavian analogues" (210). "This allows us not only to infer how *Guthlac A* utilized traditional paradigms, but also to see how it subverted them in order to emphasize the power of Guthlac's Christianity over traditional modes of existence," a flexible strategy that makes for an interesting reading of the poem (210). For example, Guthlac's youth as a warrior seems to have been sanitized by Felix, while the poet may have been influenced by "literary models deriving from Old English poetic narratives" such as *Beowulf* (212). Hall remarks that "[w]hereas for Felix, a saint with an unpromising start to his career posed a serious literary problem, for the *Guthlac A* poet it may have been a bonus" (213). Likewise, for Felix, the demons are "an accidental outcome of Guthlac's search for a hermitage," but in *Guthlac A*, "the demons comprise almost the whole poem" (214); this may be because "stories of heroes making their reputation by entering burial mounds and fighting their inhabitant(s) were traditional in Anglo-Saxon England" (219). The section on "Mound-breaking and monster-fighting" concludes by drawing further parallels between *Guthlac A* and *Beowulf*'s dragon fight. "*Guthlac A* and *Beowulf*... can be seen as two sides of the same coin" (222); "[o]ne is a saint's life which manipulates its traditional medium to contrast the power of the saint as a monster-fighter with the lesser capacity of traditional heroes. The other depicts the pagan, heroic past, using—amongst other things—allusion to saints' lives to show its inferiority to the Christian present" (223). The final part of the essay compares the *beorg* to the setting of *The Wife's Lament*, a pairing that "suggests that Guthlac's hermitage had stronger connotations of exile and abandonment than has hitherto been realized" (223).

RN

Juliana

In "Drama and Dialogue in Old English Poetry: The Scene of Cynewulf's *Juliana*" (*Theatre Survey* 48: 99–119), Allen J. Frantzen sets out to show that OE narrative poems rich in dramatic dialogue meant for public performance have a place in theater history because they meet criteria that Jody Enders and Carol Symes use to describe "dramatic practice" and "dramatic activity" that is not self-identified as text for performance; he then demonstrates how *Beowulf* and *Juliana* exemplify these criteria, which include "a speaker and an audience; dialogue that requires impersonation; gestures and words that knit the speaker's world to that of

the onlookers; the creation of social communication and exchanges of meaning; and a text that establishes a standard of repetition but allows for each realization to manifest unique qualities" (99). Using a semiotic approach, begins by surveying previous assessments of drama in OE literature "before looking beyond the theoretical limitations of those assessments to the relationship of semiotics to narrative and oral performance"; he then analyzes two OE poems "to show why the performative world to which these narratives belong itself belongs to our idea of medieval drama" (100). While the Anglo-Saxons may have had no knowledge of theater as defined by earlier critics, Frantzen argues that they certainly understood and utilized performative elements: "the *scop* was indeed an actor" (104). For Frantzen, "[a] semiotic conception of performance invites us to examine not only the *scop* and his or her text but also attend to creative activity at the other end of the communication axis, that of the audience.... The text enacted before the audience—whether poem or homily, liturgy or play—is always incomplete; spectators must step in and cocreate it" (105). He imagines performances of *Beowulf* in which the *scop* acts out the action of the narrative using gesture, different voices, and other theatrical techniques to dramatize the story, though he concedes that the *Beowulf* manuscript is not marked to indicate the use of such devices (109); he suggests, however, that the visual divisions in the manuscript of *Juliana* and the use of punctuation noted by Katherine O'Brien O'Keeffe could be keys to performance and that the unusually high proportion of dialogue may strengthen that conjecture (109–10). Interestingly, Frantzen draws parallels between scenes in *Juliana* and Anglo-Saxon penitentials, which "contained dialogues for written with the intention of performance," though in the private sphere of confession rather than public production (112). Because of the performative nature of texts such as *Juliana*, he suggests that the scope of theater history should be broadened to include public performance of Old English verse, "specifically indexed by the texts' use of dialogue" (114). Such an expansion would allow for a deeper understanding and appreciation of the dramatic nature of Old English narrative verse that more rigid categories based on representational theater have hitherto tended to occlude.

See also Juan Camilo Conde-Silvestre above under *Elene*.

MKR

Judgment Day II

Patrizia Lendinara's impressive study of the transformation of the 154-line Latin *De die iudicii* into the

306-line Old English *Judgment Day II*, “Translating Doomsday: *De die iudicii* and its Old English Translation (*Judgment Day II*)” (in *Beowulf and Beyond*, ed. Sauer and Bauer [see below under *Beowulf*], 17–67), challenges the notion that the vernacular version is simply “a close expanded translation” of the original, as others have claimed (18). In doing so, Lendinara undertakes a comprehensive analysis of the various methods and techniques employed by the Anglo-Saxon translator. She begins by debunking the commonly held belief that Old English translations of Latin poetry follow “a rigid and mechanical technique of ‘two-for-one,’ insofar as two Old English lines translate one Latin hexameter” (19). While this ratio is indeed the most prominent found in the poem, there are numerous instances of other ratios at work, as well. And even the function of the two-for-one method needs fine tuning. It is not, as most critics have argued, simply the case that the translator of *De die iudicii* “would fit a hexameter into a pair of first half-lines, filling out the second halves with alliterating synonyms” (20). In some cases, Lendinara notes, additional material occupies the a-line, though this material tends to add meaning to the poem, where additional material found in the b-line is usually “mere filler” (20). (Lendinara includes two appendices with specific information about the additions made to the poem and the various ratios of Latin to English poetic lines.) Lendinara also explores possible motivations for the amplification of the Old English version, which she suggests “originate from a desire to expand on the source with a swarm of vivid details, comments, personal asides, and addresses to the audience,” changes that together clarify and underscore the major thematic ideas of the original (23). While both versions, for example, work to impress upon their audience the stark difference between “life and afterlife, Heaven and Hell” in part by using locative and temporal adverbs, *JDay II* includes many more than its Latin source (23). The author also notes a proliferation of near-synonymous word pairs—a common feature found in Old English translations of Latin verse—that similarly serve to amplify the thematic resonance of the original. Another class of additions was made to accommodate differences between Latin and Old English morphology, or to clarify grammatical relationships in the text, which include the introduction of prepositions, demonstrative pronouns, and personal pronouns. Changes to verbs were made for similar reasons. In her discussion of the lexicon of *JDay II*, Lendinara notes two important features: one, the large number of *hapax legomena*, and two, the fact that the “Old English poem employs words which otherwise occur

prevalently or exclusively in prose,” a feature she suggests is due to the relative youth of the work (33). After her thorough analysis of the translation and its relation to its source (and to several Old English prose versions), Lendinara concludes that “[t]he penitential and educational potentiality of the [*De die iudicii*] was understood and it fostered a brilliant recast which was meant to be enjoyed as well as studied and meditated” (40).

GD

Menologium

Kazutomo Karasawa published two essays this year on the verse *Menologium*. Karasawa begins the first essay, “The Structure of the *Menologium* and Its Computistical Background” (*Studies in English Literature* [Tokyo] 84: 123–43), by surveying the various ways that those few modern editors, critics, and translators who have studied the poem in any detail have determined its structure. Karasawa argues that the poem should be understood as having four parts, a scheme that corresponds to the scribe’s own, and thus “may very well be based on the nearly contemporary reading of the poem” (126–27). While Karasawa’s understanding of the structure of the poem might not constitute new knowledge—two other scholars have come to the same conclusion—his rationale does: “The poem is divided according to a way of dividing the year based on certain basic computistical knowledge known to the Anglo-Saxons; the poet refers to the solstices and the equinoxes as dividing points, forming four sections” (130). The method of division found in the *Menologium* is corroborated by a similar scheme found in the prose *Menologium* that survives in two eleventh-century manuscripts, and also, importantly, in Bede’s *De temporum ratione*. In this way, the verse *Menologium* differs from “Latin metrical calendars, which have often been mentioned as models or Latin correspondents of the *Menologium*,” since these calendars focus on the calendar dates of feast days and other religious holidays (133). The *Menologium*, by contrast, reveals the “essence” of the Church calendar, but not its specifics (133). Karasawa concludes with an examination of the vocabulary of the poem, which also supports the idea that the poet had an “awareness of the computistical background of the year” and a “presupposition of the audience’s computistical knowledge” (137).

In a shorter work, “A Note on the Old English Poem *Menologium* 3b on *þy eahteodan dæg*” (*NQ* 54: 211–15), Karasawa tackles a thorny counting issue in the *Menologium*: the relevance of the phrase on *þy eahteodan dæg* to the calculation of the date of the Circumcision. All other date calculations in the poem are exclusive. Yet

following that practice in this case would have the event in question fall on a date that flouts the well-established biblical custom that circumcision must occur eight days after birth, inclusive. Karasawa accounts for this apparent anomaly by stating that “[t]he ‘Menologium’ poet must have simply followed such a tradition widely known to the learned Anglo-Saxons, refraining from counting the number of days on his own according to his own way,” and as such, he demonstrates “not only... his own conversance with the conventional way of expression but also presupposes the knowledge of this sort on the part of his audience” (214). In this instance, it seems, convention trumps mathematics.

GD

Meters of Boethius

Michiko Ogura's question becomes the title of his article, “*The Paris Psalter and The Metres of Boethius: Are They Formulaic as Anglo-Saxon Verses?*” (*SELIM* 14: 7–36). The assumption that Ogura reconsiders through this analysis is that “[m]ost Old English prose texts are more or less Latin-based” while most verse texts “are supposed to be Germanic” (7). He concludes that “the authors of each text must have had sufficient knowledge of alliterative poetry so as to use the same formulas or similar expressions found somewhere in extant poems” (13). In total, 19.3 percent of the half-lines in the verse portion of the *Paris Psalter* are formulaic, versus 36.9 percent of the half-lines in the *Meters* (23). Ample evidence is given to support these calculations. Tables 1 and 2 state a percentage for each individual psalm or meter, and Appendix 2 lists all the half-lines considered formulaic in both texts. Appendix 1 consists of two highly formulaic Old English specimen texts—Psalm 53 (52.8 percent formulaic) and Meter 6 (55.9 percent formulaic)—together with their Latin sources. Ogura also documents the twelve formulaic expressions shared only by these two texts, the twenty formulas found both here and elsewhere, and twenty-nine pairs or triplets consisting of less exact matches, or formulaic systems including reverse formulas. Finally, he separately considers a key feature of each text: the use of biblical set-phrases and one-line formulas in the *Paris Psalter*, and the sharing of formulas between the *Meters* and other poems.

RN

Paris Palter

Ogura, Michiko. See above under *Meters of Boethius*.

Metrical Charm

Stephen O. Glosecki (“Stranded Narrative: Myth, Metaphor, and the Metrical Charm,” in *Myth in Early Northwest Europe*, ed. Glosecki [see sec. 4a], 47–70) argues that Germanic metrical charms, despite their marginal status in today's critical landscape, “represent what must have been a vast preliterate corpus of practical poetry known across the castes of ancient Germanic Europe” (47–48). And further, since they “tend to incorporate strands of mythic narrative” and “were once widely disseminated across social classes, they make a logical starting point for mythographic inquiry” (48). Following the work of philosopher Ernst Cassirer, Glosecki puts forth a pair of analogies he finds useful in describing the related roles of myth and metaphor in culture: “myth: narrative” and “metaphor: language” (49). The Germanic metrical charms, in the way that they give voice to an amalgam of belief systems, words, gestures, and actions, provide a means to test Glosecki's analogies. The charms are “stranded narratives” that stand in for “much more elaborate episodes, probably traditional tales that were common knowledge to practitioner and patient (or their ancestors)” (62). Glosecki demonstrates how charms function in this regard in a close analysis of *The Nine Herbs Charm*, which invokes the god Woden as defeater of the “loathsome worm” with his nine *wuldortanas* (“wonder-twigs”), followed closely by lines praising Christ for “creating medicinal herbs” (64). Glosecki explains the collocation of Woden and Christ as follows: “Gods both hanged on trees exert sympathetic power over the little trees, the charm's healing herbs; the leech who manipulates ‘wonder-twig’ wands while invoking such deities thus enhances his power to heal” (65). As for the connection between metaphor and language, Glosecki writes that we can “compare charm symbols with kennings: both are vehicles freed from implied tenors. Thus the little spear exorcised in *Færstice* becomes an apt vehicle for the shooting pain targeted by the charm; and the offending valkyries are the mythic source of this metaphoric spear. If these valkyries in turn are the loud riders mentioned at the outset of the charm—disease-riders associated with Woden and the wild hunt of Germanic folklore—then they are also the likely referent of the evil foes who fare through the land in the *Nine Herbs* charm, too” (66).

GD

The Panther

See under “Seafarer”

Physiologus

The Old English *Physiologus* is traditionally said to consist of three poems: *The Panther*, *The Whale*, and *The Partridge*, which consists of two fragments: one and a half lines about a bird, and a homiletic fragment that may or may not be related. In “The Partridge’ Is a Phoenix: Revising the Exeter Book *Physiologus*” (*Neophilologus* 91: 487–503), Michael D. C. Drout argues convincingly that this third poem is actually about the phoenix, and he speculates as to whether the so-called “Homiletic Fragment III” may in fact be the conclusion to both the bird poem and the *Physiologus* cycle. First, Drout debunks the identification of the bird as a partridge, a weak argument based on the order of the Bern *Physiologus* (488), and one that renders the three-poem series “inharmonious” (491). Rather, “if the phoenix is the bird in the third poem, the sequence can be seen as: god, devil, and either man or Christ” (491). Moreover, “Replacing the partridge with the phoenix would also allow the four traditional elements—earth, air, fire, water—to be included in the earth, sea, sky categories,” a series initiated by the land-dwelling panther and water-borne whale, and concluded by a creature of both air and fire, the two elements “that are traditionally conflated when it is necessary to compress the four elements into a three-part categorization” (491). “A *Physiologus* with a three-fold allegorical structure of Descent, Hell, and Rebirth” also mirrors the structure of the *Christ*-poems that begin the Exeter Book, he notes (491). Drout then considers characteristics shared by the panther, whale, and phoenix, namely their solitary habits and wonderful smells. He then considers the significance of turning in the homiletic fragment (*hweorfan* appears in line 6 and *cyrran* in line 8) and wonders whether *The Phoenix* reflects analogical connections with turning in lines 499 to 503a and 519 to 522a. Admittedly, another mythical bird, the charadrius, “seems to fit the sense of the homiletic lines even more closely” (500), but only “[t]he phoenix has both a marvelous smell and, at least according to [*The Phoenix*], is characterized by turning” (500).

RN

Rhyming Poem

Christopher Abram’s “The Errors in *The Rhyming Poem*” (*RES* 58: 1–9), unsurprisingly begins by establishing that are in fact errors in the poem. Abram, along with several other scholars, notes that in several places the poem “fails to conform to its own standards” of rhyme and meter (2). He restricts himself to surveying those

mistakes deemed “mechanical errors of copying: those instances where the text is corrupt not due to dialectal variance but to a scribe’s carelessness” (2). Abram’s catalogue of presumed errors focuses in particular on cases of dittography, several of which occur at the ends of b-verses at various points throughout the poem. To motivate this apparent predilection for line-end dittography, Abram postulates a missing exemplar that does not use the full line of the manuscript, as is customary for Old English verse, but instead would have “given each full line of verse a separate line on the page, just as modern editions of Old English poems do” (5–6). While such a situation would not have been common for vernacular poems, Abram notes that “[t]he practice of devoting a line on the page to a single line of verse was standard practice for scribes copying Latin texts” (6). And since scholars have previously noted “stylistic similarities between *The Rhyming Poem* and certain early Anglo-Latin poems,” his hypothesis is not so far-fetched (6). If Abram’s hypothesis indeed proves viable, *The Rhyming Poem* is a rare example of a poem that “clearly bridges the gap between the two poetic cultures of Anglo-Saxon England” (8). It also, he notes, challenges Katherine O’Brien O’Keeffe’s assertion, paraphrased here by Abram, that “no Old English poem was ever copied out line by line” (9).

GD

Riddles

In “A ‘Double Solution’ for Exeter Book Riddle 51, ‘Pen and Three Fingers’” (*N&Q* 54: 16–19), Scott Gwara and Barbara L. Bolt suggest that we add another solution to Riddle 51 in addition to the one in the title of their article, which is accepted by most scholars. Through a careful reading of the last three lines of the riddle, Gwara and Bolt argue that the riddle also describes a priest performing mass. *Feower* in line 7b varies *wega* in their solution, and thus makes reference to the four ways of the Gospel. *Ofer fæted gold* in 7a can then be read as referring to a gilded manuscript page, a feature found in several Gospel books, or, more likely, since *fæted* appears most often in conjunction with metal objects and not manuscripts, as a synecdochic reference to the cup used to celebrate the Eucharist. The *winnende wiga* in line 6a refers to the priest himself. The heroic language used there—not an obvious choice for a member of the clergy—designates a religious figure as it designated a scribe according to the accepted, single solution: “If a scribe can be described as a ‘fighting warrior’ who ‘suffers restlessly’ when writing a book, a priest may likewise do as much in fighting sin or the devil among his flock” (18). Interpreted

as such, Riddle 51 joins several other riddles that have been recognized as supporting two solutions, including Riddle 47 (“book-moth” and, via Geoffrey Russom, “mutability”) and Riddle 57 (“swifts” and, after Audrey L. Meaney, “demons”).

Melanie Heyworth takes on one of the most pernicious problems in the study of the Exeter Book Riddles: the solution of Riddle 4. In “The Devils in the Detail: A New Solution to Exeter Book Riddle 4” (*Neophilologus* 91: 175–96), Heyworth proposes that the answer is a devil (distinct from Satan). The first half of the essay undertakes a close study of the many lexical ambiguities of the riddle, which Heyworth argues are central to any understanding of the text as a whole. Several of these ambiguities demonstrate the poet’s interest in revealing ways that social norms, especially the relationship between master and thegn, could become perverted, a preoccupation of many other works of Old English secular and religious literature. The ambiguities also point to the importance of penance and salvation, and to the need for constant vigilance against physical and spiritual temptation, which Heyworth notes are concerns found consistently throughout the Exeter Book. Heyworth thus asserts that “[t]he solution [a devil] and the way in which to read Riddle 4 are suggested through its carefully chosen language,” noting in particular “the repeated implication of evil” (184). In the second half of the article, the author offers a line-by-line exposition of her solution that culminates in a new translation that indeed seems plausible: “[Now] long-afflicted and condemned in chains, I must readily obey my ‘master,’ violate my religious service, and noisily confess that the Lord bound my neck in chains. Weary, never sleeping, I am often approached by man or maiden. I, cold as winter, give an answer to those grim-hearted ones: [as a result] adultery sometimes violates their marital obligations; this, however, is pleasing to my servant, a stupid man, and to myself, if I know anything and can tell my tale with effect” (190). And in the end, the relentless ambiguity of Riddle 4 itself becomes a possible source of temptation. Heyworth argues that it is equally possible to read the text as “a superficially cheerful, innocent and tantalising” riddle without its religious import, as many critics have done (190).

Two of the *double-entendre* riddles—Riddles 20 and 61—are the focus of the second of Melanie Heyworth’s essays published this year, “Perceptions of Marriage in Exeter Book Riddles 20 and 61” (*SN* 79: 171–84). Heyworth takes issue with those critics who, in their description of this group of riddles, which she labels the sexual riddles, have either explicitly or implicitly valued the non-sexual solution over the sexual one.

Heyworth suggests that “rather than eschewing the sexual connotations of the riddles, it is possible to confront their sexual dimension and to engage with the suggestions which this sexual inclusion implies” (172). Understood as such, the sexual riddles provide a rare opportunity to examine Anglo-Saxon ideas about sexuality, specifically within heterosexual marriage: “Since marriage was the primary social institution in Anglo-Saxon England in which men and women related on both a sexual and an emotional level, the construction of an ideal marriage in the sexual riddles provides us with new insights into approved heterosexual sexual and emotional interaction” (173). Lines 27b to 28a of Riddle 20 (“Sword”) refer directly to marriage: “Ic wiþ bride ne mot / hæmed habban.” Heyworth notes that *hæmed* “is regularly used to indicate both sexual activity and marriage,” which is “unsurprising, since Christian Anglo-Saxon society designated marriage as the only socially permissible relationship in which a sexual union could take place” (175). The same semantic confluence can be found in *hagosteald*, in line 31a, which suggests that “the riddler may have deliberately chosen words with a dual marital-sexual meaning in order to emphasise both the sexual element of marriage, and the marital obligation for sexual activity” (175). The importance of sexual compatibility in marriage is evident in other Anglo-Saxon texts, as well, including a provision in the *Penitential of Theodore* that appears to allow the dissolution of a marriage if the husband is found impotent, and also in *Beowulf*, when “the narrator chooses to show us a picture of marital union, companionship and support” in the depiction of Hrothgar, as *wigfruma*, seeking out Wealhtheow’s bed (178). For Heyworth, Riddle 61 (“Helmet”) supports the ideas reflected Riddle 20 and in *Beowulf* by also “constructing the marital relationship as a union of sexual companionship” (179). In this riddle, the wife “sexually entrusts herself into the marital relationship with her husband, as she has been entrusted to him by the marriage act” (179). The riddle establishes a set of conditions that must be met for the husband to be found worthy of enjoying the full emotional and sexual spectrum of his relationship with his wife. Heyworth finds an analogue for the idealized relationship described here in *Maxims I*, which similarly describes marriage as having “its foundations in love and devotion” (180). Like *Maxims I*, Riddle 61 serves to “prescribe behaviour, to urge its audience to similar conduct to that of the riddle-wife and her husband” (180). The wife’s apparent subservience to the husband is only fitting if he fulfills his “duties and responsibilities to his wife in return” (180). Finally, “[i]n his idealisation of marriage, characterised by sexual relations and wifely

obedience, the riddler is doctrinally correct and reiterating biblical morality” (181).

In “Oppression and Voice in Anglo-Saxon Riddle Poems” (*CEA Critic: An Official Journal of the College English Association* 70: 35–47), Jerry Denno argues that Old English riddles, since they participate in a “discourse of servitude” that is marked by a focus on “coercion and impulsion,” reveal important evidence about slavery in Anglo-Saxon England, a subject all but obscured in a corpus dominated by heroic poetry and religious works (35). Denno shows that “[b]y sifting the language and imagery of bondage in these poetic texts, one discovers a preoccupation with servitude in Old English riddle poems, often surrounding the issue of voice” (36), and further, that “the riddle form itself is a sort of enigmatic trap the solution to which represents a freeing of the riddled thing from its declined state—its material exile; and, thus, that riddles may be read as a sort of linguistic figuration of the same vocal suppression of the enslaved” (37). This essay includes discussions of several riddles that explore the condition of servitude, notably Riddles 12 (“Leather”), 19 (“Plow”), and 51 (“Battering Ram”). While Denno’s observations have merit, he would have done well to consider other studies of these riddles, such as John W. Tanke’s analysis of Riddle 12 (“‘Wonfeax wale’: Ideology and Figuration in the Sexual Riddles of the Exeter Book” in *Class and Gender in Early English Literature: Intersections*, ed. Britton J. Harwood and Gillian R. Overing [Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994], 21–42). Denno concludes as follows: “First-person Riddles, like the reed pen and plow riddles, and like the speaking rood, because they include represented voices of the enslaved, offer us a distant, poeticized resonance of those otherwise suppressed voices. Third-person views of servitude in the battering ram, oxhide, and flail riddles demonstrate a kind of double-consciousness, or a desire to experience bondage imaginatively, along with a clear familiarity with a discourse of slavery that has become idiomatic” (46).

In “Fostering the Cuckoo: Exeter Book Riddle 9” (*RES* 58: 431–46), Jennifer Neville underscores the importance of the afterlife of riddles. Solving them is the prelude to a series of possible interpretive games that, among other things, reveal how the solved riddle participates in both “social commentary and spiritual allegory” (431). Regarding the social commentary inherent in Riddle 9, Neville notes in particular how the final lines of the riddle, which construct a causal link between the presence of the interloping bird and the death of the foster-mother’s biological offspring through use of the conjunction *þy*, can be understood

as registering anxiety about the practice of fostering in the human world, a theme raised in several works of Old English literature, notably *Beowulf*. Yet “Beowulf is not a cuckoo chick,” Neville explains, since he scrupulously avoids behaviors that would in any way harm his own foster family (438). But the intense focus of the poet on his actions in this regard points to the fact that he is “unique...in this respect,” and that there is still a robust anxiety about fostering, as indicated by works of Celtic, Old Norse, and Old Icelandic literature (438). In the second half of her essay, Neville turns from discussion of social commentary to the involvement of the solved riddle in spiritual allegory, “in which the material world is read to reveal Christian doctrine” (439–40). Neville readily acknowledges that she does not “intend to argue that the allegorical interpretation...is the correct and final response to the riddle” (440). Nevertheless, she presents a convincing argument for reading the events of the riddle as an allegory for the stages of damnation: “the adult cuckoo represents the devil, the mother-bird the soul, the nest the heart, and the egg a sinful thought” (441). In her conclusion, Neville hints at the explanatory power of her argument: that examining the afterlife of Riddle 9 should prompt a reconsideration of “the idea of the *Exeter Book* riddles themselves, specifically in light of the Anglo-Latin tradition of riddling” (445). Neville is here referring to the fact that those riddles provided the solution along with the text, which suggests that solving the riddle should not be considered the primary task. Read as such, “Riddle 9 initiates a process of interpretation that continues past its solution. Recognising the cuckoo is merely the beginning of the story” (446).

Patrick J. Murphy advances new—and more nuanced—solutions to two riddles in a pair of essays published this year. The first, “Leo ond Beo: Exeter Book Riddle 17 as Samson’s Lion” (*English Studies* 88: 371–87), starts by acknowledging the importance of the contrasting elements of the described object’s belly: things that are spear-like and that also constitute a noble treasure. The solution “bee-hive,” proposed in 1981 by Peter Bierbaumer and Elke Wannagat, and refined in 2006 in separate articles by Wim Tigges and Marijane Osborne, seems most plausible, but Murphy argues that more study is still required, specifically regarding “a group of related metaphors concerning bees, honey, and their hives, a set of associations well-known to the Anglo-Saxons” (373). He also sets out to establish a more satisfying understanding of the relationship between the text of Riddle 17 and the two runes that accompany it (*lagu* and *beorc*). In so doing, Murphy proposes that the riddle’s speaker is Samson’s lion, “the most famous of

riddle-creatures known to the Anglo-Saxons," whose story is found in Judges 14 (374). Murphy states that "it is easy to see that Riddle 17 describes with uncanny precision the lion which Samson tears apart and later revisits to find swarming with bees and dripping with honey" (375). He proceeds to demonstrate how various descriptors of the objects inhabiting the riddle's speaker—bees, according to Murphy's proposed solution—are especially appropriate: they are *sweartum* and *brunum beadoweapnum*, two adjectives that he finds "apt for bees" because of their glossy exoskeletons (377); and they exhibit diurnal behavior, which corresponds to the adverb *dægtidum* in line 3b. He then dedicates a substantial section of the essay to examination of the challenging phrase *eodorwirum fæst* (line 2a), which he translates as "firmly attached to lordly wires": "[a] better reading of Riddle 17's opening lines, then, emphasizes the parallels set up between *eodorwir* 'lordly wires or ornaments' and *dryhtgestreona* 'lordly treasures'. The speaker is *fæst* 'attached to' lordly trappings and *innan gefylled* 'filled inside' with lordly treasures. I suggest that both these treasures and trappings both refer to the bright, clinging, and precious contents comprising the speaker's *wlitig wombhord* 'beautiful belly-hoard': that is, the golden honey in the lion's belly" (380). Murphy notes that honey is elsewhere in the Old English corpus referred to as a "golden treasure" (380). Murphy also shows how his solution accounts for the fact "that people *remember* what comes from the creature's mouth" (381), a reference to the final line of the riddle: "men gemunan / þæt me þurh muþ fareð." The imagery his solution proposes sufficiently explains this line since "bees, honey, and hives figure prominently in a set of common medieval metaphors for the faculty of memory" (382). In the end, Murphy formally names his solution: *leo ond beo* "lion and bee," which not only accounts for the text of the riddle, but also fits with the two runes that accompany it, *L* and *B*.

Murphy's second essay, "Bocstafas: a Literal Reading of Exeter Book Riddle 57" (PQ 84: 139–60), addresses critics' interest in determining the precise species of flying creature depicted in the text. Rather than approach this problem literally, however, Murphy suggests that we do so, at least in part, metaphorically: "It is time, perhaps, that we thought of this text in terms of metaphor. And yet here is the riddle of my argument: We need to understand the strange characters of Riddle 57 in a less, yet more, literal way" (140). Murphy recounts the current conversation about possible solutions to the riddle, and ultimately determines that, if a species-specific answer must be found, that John D. Niles' entry, *crawan* ("crows"), is best, since it accounts for

the onomatopoeic hint in the final half-line: *Nemnað hy sylfe* ("They name themselves"). But this part of the discussion is really just a starting point for Murphy's argument, which proceeds to show how Riddle 57 differs from all other bird riddles in the collection in its lack of specificity, and also in its isolation from these other riddles in the manuscript, which tend to group together. For those reasons, identifying a particular species should not be the intent of the solver, and perhaps instead "it is worth considering what a less literal solution to Riddle 57 might look like" (142). Murphy then offers his solution: *bocstafas*, or letter forms. He is careful to historicize his use of the term, and walks his readers through a brief history of linguistic study—with a focus on Ælfric's *Grammar*—to determine how an Anglo-Saxon might have understood the concept of letters, which were recognized as having three distinct but related properties: "*nomen* 'name,' *figura* 'shape, written form,' and *potestas* 'sound value'" (143). "Riddle 57," he asserts, "... is organized primarily around these three properties of the letter" (144). In the final pages of his essay, Murphy addresses "the one section of Riddle 57 that does not seem explicable in light of these three properties of the letter. That is, the statement that the creatures 'tredað bearonæssas, / hwilum burgsalo / nipþa bearna' (tread the wooded headlands, at times the town houses of the sons of men)" (149). Described in these lines are not just spoken words, but also written words, which can indeed, once committed to parchment, be transmitted across great distances. In the end, Murphy argues that his solution "allows us to see the creatures at once as the smallest units of speech, borne aloft in the air, and yet also as dark marks, flocking on the parchment page. Liberal of song, these creatures sing loudly only when gathering together. And, like many birds, they name themselves" (152).

The first line of the Preface to the second edition of Michael Alexander's *Old English Riddles from the Exeter Book* (London: Anvil Press Poetry) states that "[t]hese riddle translations, though they are faithful, are offered as play rather than as scholarship" (7). Alexander's second edition includes a translation of fifty-six of the riddles and is largely faithful to the first, though with a few notable changes. First, Alexander has revisited Riddles 73 and 75 based on correspondence with readers of the earlier edition. The new edition solves them as "snow" and "mirror," respectively, and Alexander's translations reflect his evolving thought on these two texts. He has also expanded the Introduction to provide a brief account of the motivation behind those changes. Finally, he has added the first seventy-seven lines of his translation of *The Dream of the Rood* to

the collection, since “[t]he first part of this poem takes the form of a riddle” (7). Alexander uses W. S. Mackie’s 1934 edition of the Riddles as the source text for his work, and of Mackie’s ninety-four riddles, he explains that “twenty are too inaccessible to be worth translating here. Another eighteen are set aside” because of corruption in the manuscript, because they are “unsolved or obscure,” or because they “duplicate the subjects of riddles which are included” (7). In his Introduction, Alexander expresses his satisfaction in the Exeter Book scribe’s decision not to include solutions to the riddles along with each text, as they appear in Symphosius’s collection: “to advertise a riddle’s solution in a headline spoils the game. What is a present without a parcel? The place for solutions is at the back of a book” (12). That is where they appear in this edition. One wonders how Jennifer Neville would respond to this assertion. Finally, I must take issue with Alexander’s decision to render the final word of Riddle 47 (“book-worm”), *swealg*, as relevant to speech, ‘mumbled’, rather than consumption, ‘swallowed’.

GD

Elena Afros asks “Is *cyssað* in Exeter Book *Riddle 30a*: 6b an Instance of Morphological Levelling?” (*Amsterdamer Beiträge zur älteren Germanistik* 63: 21–28), and concludes in the affirmative. Afros compares the form *cyssað* as mentioned in the title with the form *gecyssað* in *Riddle 30b*, l. 6 and takes the variation to indicate a modernizing Exeter scribe who omitted the perfective prefix by analogy to, in this case, every other recorded instance of *cyssan* in a finite form in the immediate textual vicinity, for *gecyssað* is, as Afros points out, a *hapax legomenon* in the manuscripts associated with the Exeter Book. The author cites a similar case from *Azarias* (l. 73 *Bletsige*) and *Daniel* (l. 362 *gebletsige*) and also mentions the variation between *mec* in *Soul and Body II*, ll. 42b, 44a in the Exeter Book and *me* in *Soul and Body I*, ll. 45b, 47a in the Vercelli Book. The tautness of this brief article, usually a virtue, leaves me somewhat uncertain of its precise point since it is left to the reader’s interpretation. If the author is suggesting that the fairly consistent treatment of the sorts of variations mentioned here is evidence that the scribes who recorded our Old English verse texts consciously altered the language in some limited ways that reflect the scribes’ language, then the article’s muted point is explainable since this is a completely uncontroversial basic view of manuscript transmission—there is abundant evidence that scribes copying verse texts in the late Anglo-Saxon period modernized the language wherever such substitutions would not disrupt the meter.

But the author concludes by saying that the “Exeter corpus suggests that morphological leveling might have been part and parcel of scribal contract” (26), a generalization that seems blind to the ways in which scribal behavior in the copying of verse texts was primarily conditioned by the requirements of the meter. And, perhaps, this shortcoming is understandable, too, for the three examples that this article picks out are meter-neutral (in each case, neither variation affects the meter). What actually seems to have been “part and parcel of scribal contract” was modernization within the limits of a form of verse-craft for which the overall complexion was linguistically conservative.

CC

Seafarer

In “The Solitary Journey: Aloneness and Community in *The Seafarer*” (*Text, Image, Interpretation*, ed. Minnis and Roberts [see sec. 2], 303–18), Hugh Magennis argues, “The movement of *The Seafarer* overall is from a preoccupation with the individual physical and mental experience of the speaker, endured alone, to an image of spiritual community in heaven” (307). The individual physical dimension is foregrounded in lines 44–46, for example, “in the description of the personal discomfort endured by the seafarer in the opening lines” (306), or in “the chilling image of the coming of death later on (lines 94–96)” (306), which “presents death as the extinguishing of individually experienced pleasure and pain” (311). Yet unlike some other elegies, “Aloneness in *The Seafarer* is not a personal misfortune but an existential fact” (309). “Above all,” Magennis observes, “the emphasis on individual experience is highlighted by the insistent use of the first person singular pronoun, forms of which occur five times in the first nine lines and are sprinkled throughout the first half of the poem, but do not reappear after line 66” (307). The speaker begins to generalize from his individual experience after the transition passage in lines 33 to 38, and after line 66, experience is presented “as both individual—something undergone by people ‘singularly’, one at a time—and also common to everyone” (310). “Despite its rejection of ideas of community, therefore, *The Seafarer* is itself in its urgent address an expression of community,” for in communicating the solitary experience of the seafarer and using it to teach others, “the speaker engages in a communal act” (310). Finally, in the closing lines, the poem shifts to the first person plural of homiletic discourse, and thus “constructs a new idea of community on earth, in which the speaker invites his audience to participate, which indeed can be seen as foreshadowing the blessed community of heaven” (314).

In the conclusion of the essay, Magennis makes two important claims for the significance of his reading of *The Seafarer*. First, he suggests that *The Seafarer*, *The Wanderer*, and *The Riming Poem* belong to a particular literary sub-genre that moves “from an account of personal experience, evoked in lyrical terms, to a general homiletic message” which “is given direct expression in the use of the first person plural at the end of the texts” (315). Ultimately, Magennis also problematizes reductive views of the discovery of the individual, a discussion that, he notes, has largely excluded Old English literature. “Though coming from an age in which identity was characteristically constructed in communal terms, this poem bases its homiletic message on a recognition of the essential separateness of individuals from each other, focusing in particular at a key moment in the text on the fact of death as a distillation of physical individual experience. This would be a powerful message in any age; in the Anglo-Saxon period it is remarkable,” he concludes (318).

Helena Znojemska puts *The Seafarer* in dialogue with the Old English *Physiologus*. In the first half of “Sailing the Dangerous Waters: Images of Land and Sea in *The Seafarer*, *The Panther* and *The Whale*” (*Prague Studies in English* 24: 87–105), Znojemska argues that “the characteristics and values which the native poetic tradition associated with the familiar world of human settlement and its natural environment found an especially effective expression in the opposed images of hall and storm (and related climatic phenomena)” (96). For example, she compares the description of the blessed plain in *The Phoenix* (lines 14b–27) to its Latin source and finds that the Old English poet has “greatly augment[ed] the list of opposed elements in landscape and weather” and “links the former to the condition of the human world” (91). The three poems that are the focus of the essay’s second half “relate to yet another version of the same basic dichotomy, one that associates the respective spheres of familiar and alien, ordered and chaotic, with the land and the sea” (97). *The Seafarer* and *The Panther* “construe a virtually identical image of the sea which stresses the aspects of wildness and irregularity” (100). However, Znojemska goes on to argue, “*The Seafarer* makes an implicit equation between the insecurity of the sea-journey and the incomprehensibility of God’s intentions with respect to man,” while *The Panther* “juxtaposes the image of the boundless sea with an account of the sheer immensity and incomprehensibility of God’s creation” (101). As for *The Whale*, “while the sea with its insecurity forms the necessary stage for all the events narrated in the first part of the text ..., it is nowhere explicitly

characterized” (102). “The whole development present in *The Seafarer* in the repeated confrontations of actual sea- and land-scenes...is here condensed into the single core image of the whale—the false *ealond/unlond* [‘island’/‘non-land’]—and into the confrontation of its apparent qualities perceived by the trusting sailors with its real nature revealed by the narrator” (103). “It is only through the intertextual link with other poems considered here that this network of concepts surrounding the sea/land motif can emerge,” she concludes (104).

RN

Seasons for Fasting

Mary P. Richards examines the use of homiletic sources in *Seasons for Fasting* in “Old Wine in a New Bottle: Recycled Instructional Materials in *Seasons for Fasting*” (*The Old English Homily: Precedent, Practice, and Appropriation*, ed. Kleist [see sec. 4d], 345–364). This late poem “embodies many of the themes, compositional methods, and sources found throughout late Anglo-Saxon writing” (346). The poet’s “working methods resemble those of composite homilists, who drew on materials from Ælfric, Wulfstan, and others to address the occasion or topic at hand” (347). Richards examines the sources of the poem and the poet’s process of digesting and recycling previous homiletic material. The poet “resembles contemporary prose writers, the composite homilists, in his choice of topical and hortatory materials at the nexus of law and homily” (347). She traces the poem’s connections to various manuscript compilations, including Wulfstan’s commonplace book and the general homiletic tradition, as well as Byrhtferth of Ramsey’s *Enchiridion* and the computus tradition: “The poet moves from more technical sources treating the dates of Ember fasts, to an array of Lenten sermons, and finally to regulatory texts about the proper conduct and duties of priests” (362). This late Anglo-Saxon reworking of traditional materials speaks to the historical context of the poem: “by the eleventh century, instructional materials could be packaged quite differently from their original contexts and used in the service of current debates” (362). Richards links the poem to sources that center around Worcester and suggests a possible connection of the poem to Wulfstan’s circle through that center; this reuse of various sources is original and innovative: “the urgency of his topic, the poetic form, or both somehow freed the poet to expand the conventions of composite homilists and to create a new type of work from traditional methods and materials. This innovation, as we have seen, involved the integration of topical materials

with computational and hortatory elements, resulting in a new stanzaic mode of composition" (364).

APS

Solomon and Saturn II

In "Shining Swords and Heavenly Walls: In Search of Wisdom in *Solomon and Saturn II*" (*Calliope's Classroom: Studies in Didactic Poetry from Antiquity to the Renaissance*, ed. Annette Harder, Alasdair A. MacDonald, and Gerrit J. Reinink [Paris: Peeters], 203–19), Karin E. Olsen analyzes the didactic function of the obscure myth of the *weallende wulf* (lines 213–24). She begins by reconsidering past scholarship, including identifications of the *wulf* as Og, Bel, or Marcolf, and Menner's intriguing but problematic identification of the whole passage as a confused account of the Babylonian creation myth. It seems that previous explanations viewed the *wulf* passage in isolation, but the contribution of this essay is to examine the passage in light of the poem as a whole. Olsen argues that Saturn is indeed wise and in fact to some extent virtuous, but his knowledge is inferior, worldly, experiential, and temporal. "Saturn's lack of spiritual awareness is clearly shown in the *weallende wulf* passage" (211) for "he cannot see beyond the glorious exploit and resulting fame of his hero...nor does he ever question the wisdom of the deed" (213); in short, his admiration for the protagonist is "misguided" (214). Meanwhile, Solomon introduces "the theme of proud and foolish behavior and its eventual punishment" in lines 204 to 211 (213). Olsen takes his criticism of Saturn at lines 225 to 229 "as a comment on those who try God with their foolish enterprises. Solomon implies that the *wulf's* over-confident action was doomed to fail because...he was unable to see his own limits" (215). Solomon's next question (lines 230–7) "introduces two symbols of true brilliance, the heavenly Jerusalem and the Cross" (215) and reveals the full significance of "the sword shining over the graves as an emblem of man's pride and mortality" (215). At the end of the poem, Saturn comes to understand Solomon's profound wisdom, "realizing that we should accept hardship on earth and not pursue worldly glory as the *weallende wulf* once did with such disastrous consequences" (217).

Wanderer

Thomas D. Hill continues to influence current scholarship on *The Wanderer*. Alice Sheppard contributes an essay on that poem to Hill's festschrift, "A Word to the Wise: Thinking, Knowledge, and Wisdom in *The Wanderer*" (*Source of Wisdom*, ed. Wright et al. [see sec. 2], 130–44). She reads the poem as a "narrative *gyd*" (130).

Because Sheppard focuses on "the process of exchanging proverbs and not on the content of their wisdom," she argues that "the act of reciting proverbs may be a stronger indicator of wisdom than the knowledge the sayings transmit" (135). This approach overturns traditional readings of some of the poem's key passages. For example, in lines 37 to 44, "The speaker desires the lord's teachings, but the lord's absence seems to obscure the fact that he already has access to the lord's wisdom: he has just recited some proverbs" (136). And in the dream sequence (lines 50b–55a), "The conventions of the *cwidegyd* are more important to an understanding of the poem than the factual advice of any single *gyd*" (137). From the second half of the poem, Sheppard highlights three passages (lines 58–60, 73–4, and 88–90) in which "the speaker's metacomment about his ability to think through demonstrates his newly found knowledge, whereas previously, in the first half of the poem, he might have been drawn to the content" (138). Thus, "At the end of the poem, the speaker's apparently pain-free existence is not so much a function of what he has learned from the individual proverbs as it is a marker of his ability to acknowledge the importance of thinking through and beyond proverbs, without necessarily applying their specific teachings," Sheppard asserts (131). Ultimately, "Reading the poem as a *gyd*... explains the poem's place as a fulcrum for the Exeter Book," between "the poems that celebrate the mysteries of Christianity" at the manuscript's beginning and "those that ponder the mundanities of human existence" in its second half (141).

Scott Gwara responds to Hill's 2004 essay on *The Wanderer* in "Forht and fægen in *The Wanderer* and Related Literary Contexts of Anglo-Saxon Warrior Wisdom" (*MS 69*: 255–98). "Rather than posit a non-Germanic source for the philosophy that Hill connects to [Stoic] *apatheia*," Gwara explains, "I relate it to a native heroic pretense, a definition of courage regulated by warrior 'wisdom'" (257). Gwara begins by reinterpreting the meaning of Old English *to* in negated adverbials. He states that "there is a point beyond which one's reactions become 'in excess of that which is considered proper and right'. However, only the immoderate reaction is negative: rejecting an excessive reaction does not mean rejecting the entire behavior, only the improper magnitude" (261). The evidence cited includes Beccel's sorrow in *Guthlac B* (1076b–77b), Wulfstan's homilies, and Hrothgar's sermon. Gwara argues that "[OE] *forht* means either 'afraid, fearful' or 'intimidating, formidable, never 'sad'" (270). Therefore, the wanderer "establish[es] antitheses between excessive uncertainty and its opposite, not between the alleged Stoic contrasts

of joy and misery" (270). In *The Wanderer*, "the warrior is meant to cultivate the appropriate attitude between excessive caution and wanton ambition," for "'expectancy' in this Germanic philosophy of courage precipitates ruinous action by encouraging objectionable risk" (275). Next, Gwara analyzes the phrase *cunnan gearwe* (in line 69b), and concludes that *The Wanderer* "does not suggest that a warrior can be 'too fain,' 'too greedy,' or 'too despairing' after he has thought about his situation, but that he should not be any more 'fain,' 'greedy,' or 'despairing' than he can help being until he has thought about it" (279). Thus, "the 'darkening mind' described in [*The Wanderer*] portrays an agonizing despair, which the *eardstapa* concludes is naive or unjustified because his future on earth and in an afterlife remains uncertain" (283). In the final section of the essay, Gwara explores other texts that validate his claim that "the experience of suffering constitutes the source of warrior wisdom" (287), including Alfred's Meter 5, *Gifts of Men* (lines 18a–26b and 97a–103b), Saxo's *Gesta Danorum*, Hrothgar's sermon, Nebuchadnezzar in *Daniel*, and Byrhtnoth's *ofermod*, but especially *Waldere* (lines 8a–22a). "These texts emplot the wanderer's heroic tradition that wisdom derives from pain or loss, and that the lack of adversity makes for rash behavior because one does not expect setbacks," he concludes; "[b]eing 'too fain' characterizes undefeated warriors or kings who are more likely to take risks beyond what is *gemet* or 'appropriate'" (298). Because such action would endanger oneself or one's group, "the Germanic warrior expresses not Stoic *apatheia* but fatalistic practicality" (298).

RN

The Whale

See under "Seafarer"

Widsith

In "A Scop among Scribes: A Reading in the Manuscript Context of *Widsið*" (*Litteraria Pragensia* 16: 36–64), Helena Znojemska suggests that the poem "epitomizes the central problem of the Exeter Book: how could this environment [of religious reform], given its radicalizing attitudes, produce a collection which accords certain space, however limited, to voices that speak for the secular aristocratic culture and its poetic tradition, reflecting the world of the *comitatus* and its order?" (36). If, as is widely accepted, the secular ideal of heroic authority was seen by the Church as an inferior, perhaps dangerous, rival to religious models of kingship based on biblical tradition, how are we to understand

the inclusion of a poem like *Widsith* in the Exeter Book, especially if "the scribes aimed to replace the *scops* as the authority that controls the society's memory and the order that it respects" (37). As she remarks, other poems, such as *The Wanderer* and *Deor*, show the "problematic aspects and inbuilt fragility" of the *comitatus* culture, but *Widsith* seems to show that culture in a "positive and uncomplicated" light (38). Znojemska's explanation is that the "superscop" *Widsith*'s account is contextualized in such a way as to call into question both the veracity and the value of the story he tells. On the one hand, "[t]he poem can simultaneously be seen to provide a weighty indication that Germanic legends and traditions continued to be valued as a matter worth preserving alongside biblical narratives, saints' lives and learned allegories of Christian living" (38); on the other, however, Znojemska suggests, in opposition to Kemp Malone's contention in an article from 1962 that the narrator shows himself to be unreliable and "the presence of an unreliable narrator...poses important questions regarding the reception of the poem" (42). Echoing Joyce Hill (*NM* 85: 305–15), she also suggests that scholars must abandon the reconstructed poem and return to the text as recorded in the Exeter Book, "the only real *Widsið* we have" (43), poem that presents a number of puzzling inconsistencies, as, for example, the portrayal of Ermanaric (45–7). Such disparities problematize the poem's ostensible celebration of heroic culture, though they do not in themselves suggest an alternative reading; however, the poem's manuscript context may help to warrant such a reading. For example, the homiletic ending of *The Seafarer* might "help to shift the tone of *Widsið* from a jubilant record of memorable personages and their heroic achievements closer to a testimony of the inevitable fragility of all earthly glory" (50). However, Znojemska suggests that *Vainglory*, which immediately precedes *Widsið* in the Exeter Book, might have far more radically influenced the way the poem was understood. The narrator of *Widsið* claims personal experience as his authority, while *Vainglory* looks to literary, especially biblical, tradition; for the monastic compilers of the Exeter Book, "it seems reasonable to presume that from the two texts thus juxtaposed, *Vainglory* would be—almost automatically—perceived as presenting the more reliable and valuable information" (52), thereby to some extent marginalizing both *Widsið* and the heroic culture it represents. Further, "if the integrity of *Widsið*'s character and motives is challenged...then also the veracity of his claims and, by extension, the values he professes become open to some doubt" (57). As an appendix, Znojemska provides an edition of the MS text of the

poem alongside Malone's reconstruction (58–60), followed by a translation (60–62); she also includes a parallel edition of *Vainglory* with translation (63–64).

Wife's Lament

Taking up the question of the sex of the speaker in “The Wife's Lament,” Sung-Il Lee suggests that the use of feminine grammatical inflection in the early lines of the poem need not indicate that the speaker of the lament section is necessarily a woman; indeed, such an assumption would violate the sense of the rest of the poem (“The Identity of the ‘Geong Mon’ [Line 42] in ‘The Wife's Lament’ [or, ‘The Lament of an Outcast’]” in *Global Perspectives on Medieval English Literature*, ed. Kaylor and Nokes [see sec. 2], 175–93). Among his reasons for rejecting the notion of a female speaker is his contention that “one can hardly expect to encounter a poem in Old English supposedly delivered in female voice” (177). He explains the efforts of other scholars to account for the grammatical disparity by adducing scribal error or the possible fragmentary nature of the poem; he rejects a review of scholarship as irrelevant (178) and sets out to give his impressions of the poem. The crux of his argument is that “[t]he most plausible interpretation...is that the speaker of the lament—apparently a woman, in voice—is a metaphorical figure that stands for a man excluded from the group in his lord's favor” (180). Further, Lee argues that the lament ends with line forty-one and that the following lines are “a sort of afterthought that the poet utters in his own voice” (184). “Having figuratively shown the sadness of a young retainer estranged from his ring-giver by borrowing mournful utterances of a banished wife, the poet now releases his audience from the fictional situation he has set up and moralizes [ll. 42–53] on the predicament that men must face when *comitatus*, the foundation of human interaction in the male-oriented Anglo-Saxon society, is broken” (187). Lee then draws a parallel between “The Wife's Lament” and a Korean poem, *Song of Longing* (*Sa-mi-in-gok*), written by a known sixteenth-century exile, Chōng Ch'ōl (189): “in each work the speaker's voice is that of a woman, and in each work the speaker laments her present forlorn state, while remembering the happy days when she and her lord used to swear that only death would separate them” (191). Lee ends by asserting that because the archetype of longing is that of a woman for a man, both poets use the metaphor of a broken relationship between a man and a woman to reiterate the severity of the longing the speaker (a male) experiences; the female persona is a role only (192).

Focusing on the temporal disjunctions that characterize *The Wife's Lament*, Sachi Shimomura argues that the poem “manipulates time, memory, and repetition” (113). “Remembering in Circles: *The Wife's Lament*, *Conversatio*, and the Community of Memory” (in *Source of Wisdom*, ed. Wright et al. [see sec. 2], 113–29) tackles a central question regarding the speaker's narrative in the poem: are we to understand it as the individualized story of a particular life or as a composite account of exile and grief? Shimomura begins by examining the Anglo-Saxon concept of social time in the use of the Latin term *conversatio* and its OE equivalents *drohtop/droht(n)ung* in Bede's *Historia*, in OE translation practice, and in *Beowulf*. In each of the examples cited, Shimomura demonstrates that within every life certain repetitions of action and of speech suggest that time—or the life lived in time—can be judged productive or unproductive based on whether those temporal repetitions allow the individual to move into (or within) the social order or exclude him from it (117). This understanding of social time also shapes *The Wife's Lament*: “in this poem, a moment of lyric consciousness expands and reiterates itself until it is resolved by social intervention.... The moment when the lyric speaker steps back from her memories and grief and into gnomic wisdom is also the moment when she accepts her inclusion in a society whose established customs and traditions reorder repetition into something more meaningful to her than her individual experiences alone.” In this way, “society, as well as time, reorders memory” (117). The separations the speaker has endured in her life, which she rehearses in the poem, trap her in the grief of reenacted estrangements, an emotional claustrophobia elicited in the poem by images of being hedged round and cut off from others. Towards the end, the speaker “transcends private emotional responses to reach a more gnomic and universal understanding” (119); to Shimomura, this gnomic voice suggests that the voice of the speaker exists as a conversation with her society, a transformation that “allows her to reenter human conversation: to become a speaker no longer defined only by exclusion” and to rejoin society “through her participation in the social constructions of a life worth living” (120). In this way, “memory no longer enforces stasis (as her memory of lovers at dawn did), but offers a more productive conversation between past and present” (121). By contrast, an outcast from society like Grendel can only repeat his isolation and reenact his estrangement from the community; for him, there is no sense of participation in a larger narrative of grief beyond himself that might give his suffering social significance. This move from the particular to the more general experience also

drives both *The Seafarer* and *The Wanderer* 123). Shiomura concludes that “time, treated as social process, enables repetitions to define inclusion in or exclusion from society. Progress here is, paradoxically, circular; it entails a return to society, just as at the beginning of the *Rule of St. Benedict* it is a return to God: a circular route where the past converses with the present.... [T]he temporal context of *The Wife's Lament* displays how the meaning of the past must be processed as a conversation with the present in a way that generates understanding and social consciousness, precisely because of the unrecoverability of the specific past” (125).

MKR

Works Not Seen:

- Bammesberger, Alfred. “Sechs Anmerkungen zum Text von *Genesis B*.” *Language and Text*. Ed. Johnston et al. [see sec. 2], 17–31.
- Boryslawski, Rafał. *The Old English Riddles and the Riddlic Elements of Old English Poetry*. Studies in English Medieval Language and Literature 9. Frankfurt am Main and New York: Peter Lang, 2004. 223 pp.
- Bueno Alonso, Jorge Luis. “Actitudes anglosajonas acia el humor: la caracterización del humor obsceno y sexual en los acertijos de Exeter Book.” *Cuadernos del CEMYR* 12 (2004): 17–36.
- Carruthers, Leo. “Poesie, sculpture et reliques chrétiennes dans la tradition anglo-saxonne.” *Poetes et artistes*. Ed. Cassagne-Brouquet et al. pp. 135–50.
- Dubois, Marguerite-Marie. “La légende de Weland, célébrée dans le poème vieil-anglais du *Deor* et gravée sur le Coffret d'Auzon.” *Poètes et artistes*. Ed. Cassagnes-Brouquet et al. [see sec. 4]. pp. 17–23.
- Frederick, Jill. “At Cross Purposes: Six Riddles in the Exeter Book.” *Cross and Culture in Anglo-Saxon England*. Ed. Jolly et al. [see sec. 2]. pp. 49–76.
- Harada, Hideko. “To Choose the Harder Path: Reactions of Byrhtnoð's Retainers in *The Battle of Maldon*.” *Studies in Language and Literature: Bulletin du CELL* 7 (2007): 23–31. [in Japanese]
- Irvine, Susan. “Rewriting Women in the Old English *Boethius*.” *New Windows on a Woman's World: Essays for Jocelyn Harris*. Ed. Colin Gibson and Lisa Marr. Dunedin: Dept. of English, Univ. of Otago, 2005. pp. 488–501.
- Johnston, Andrew James. “The Riddle of *Deor* and the Performance of Fiction.” *Language and Text*. Ed. Johnston et al. [see sec. 2]. pp. 133–50.
- Nyugaku, Naoya. “Enjambed Alliteration in *The Battle of Maldon*.” *Taisei Gakuin Univ. Bulletin* 9.26 (March 2007): 125–50. [in Japanese]
- Obermeyer, Denis J. “The Relationship of Theology and Literary Form in *The Dream of the Rood*.” Ph.D. Diss., Catholic Univ. of America, DAI.
- Sato, Shuji. “Interpreting Old English Poetry: The Integrity of the Manuscript and the Text.” *Jnl of the Faculty of Letters, Chuo Univ.* 100 (March 2007): 1–15. [in Japanese]
- Shimonaga, Yuki. “A Note on *wæd* in the Old English poem *The Dream of the Rood*.” *Lingua* 18 (2007): 101–11. [In Japanese.]
- Shirai, Naoko. “The Structural Effect of Sympathetic Resonance in *The Wife's Lament*.” *Text, Language, and Interpretation*. Ed. Yoshiyuki Nakao et al. pp. 101–09.
- Sorrell, Paul. “A Bee in my Bonnet: Solving Riddle 17 of the Exeter Book.” *New Windows on a Woman's World: Essays for Jocelyn Harris*. Ed. Colin Gibson and Lisa Marr. Dunedin: Dept. of English, Univ. of Otago, 2005. pp. 544–53.
- Ueno, Seiji. “Notes on the Old English Poem *The Dream of the Rood*.” *Gaduen Ronshu: The Jnl of Hokkai-Gakuen Univ.* 132 (2007): 95–106. [In Japanese.]

4c. Beowulf

The 3,182 verses of this poem survive in a single manuscript copied around the year 1000: London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius A.xv. No one knows when, where, by whom, or for whom *Beowulf* was first composed during the previous half millennium, or the degree to which it reflects earlier oral traditions from the migration period or later literary art influenced by new tales learned from Danish vikings. The story is set not in Anglo-Saxon England, which 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 its two anonymous scribes, we know of no Anglo-Saxon reader or listener for *Beowulf*. It disappeared for centuries, unread and soon virtually unreadable, only resurfacing in the hands of antiquarian book collectors in the sixteenth century after Henry VIII dissolved the monasteries. It came within inches of being destroyed by fire at Ashburnham House in 1731 and is scorched around its edges, from which at least 2,000 letters have been lost. This damaged and long-forgotten text would itself seem to illustrate the fate it depicts for all human achievements.

Yet, since it was first read carefully in the nineteenth century, *Beowulf* has inspired as many studies as the combined tragedies of Shakespeare. It is the first great long 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 twenty-first century—a thousand years after the Cotton Vitellius text was copied—*Beowulf* should finally come into its own as a work of art and imagination, finding itself more compelling to poets, scholars, translators, writers, movie-makers, musical composers, and other interpreters than at any other time of its existence. In 1999 Seamus Heaney offered a celebrated and controversial rendering that has ushered in a decade of responses to *Beowulf*, including more translations, illustrated children's versions, graphic novels, feature-length films, operas, oral performances, television reenactments, and at least one ice-dance extravaganza. Many publishers have caught the *Beowulf* wave as well, dusting off older translations and sending them out into an international market hungry for versions of the poem, which have also appeared in Finnish, French, German, Japanese, Portuguese, and Spanish—both Castilian and Galician. 2007 saw over a hundred studies of some aspect of *Beowulf*, its sources and analogues, its relation to recent archeological discoveries, and its retellings in film and other media.

Text, Language, Meter

After examining the Cotton Vitellius text in the British Library in London, Frederick M. Biggs describes “Folio 179 of the *Beowulf* Manuscript,” in *Source of Wisdom*, ed. Wright, Biggs, and Hall, (see sec. 2), 52–59. This seriously damaged folio has been explained by Kiernan (1981 and 1996) as an imperfect erasure and rewriting of the text—a palimpsest—undertaken by the second of the two scribes of the poem, “perhaps some twenty years after he had first completed the manuscript, in order to record a smoother transition between what had been before his efforts two independent poems about the hero” (52), the first about Beowulf’s youthful exploits against Grendel and his mother, the second on the death of the old king against the dragon. Berkhout (2002) proposed an alternative suggestion, that the second scribe erased the folio when he realized he had skipped a clause of several verses after *syððan* in line 2207a, but then never got around to recopying the passage, leaving the faded page eventually to be refreshed by a sixteenth-century antiquarian, most likely Laurence Nowell. Biggs opts for a simpler explanation, that “much of the damage to this folio” was “accidental” (52), possibly, following Boyle (1981), due to its exposure for a period of time on a windowsill, “compounded by the touching up of individual words or letters and by attempts to recover faded readings through the use of chemical reagents” (55). Biggs concludes that, however

damaged this folio may be, it represents not the interventions of scribes or antiquarians, but our best surviving record of the poet’s own intention for this important passage connecting the two parts of the poem.

J. R. Hall consults Thorkelin’s two transcripts of the *Beowulf* MS and that scholar’s 1815 edition of the poem to help restore a word now largely missing from the text at “*Beowulf* 2009a: *f...bifongen*,” *JEGP* 106: 417–27. Thorkelin A reads *fæ*, while Thorkelin B reads *fer*. In his edition, Thorkelin combined these witnesses to produce *fær*, a reading that Hall would render more grammatically as *fære* with the addition of a dative singular inflectional suffix *-e*. The half-line should thus read *fære bifongen* ‘ensnared in danger, entrapped in terror’, the latter of which rendering Hall prefers as more effectively capturing the hero’s sense of poetic justice in his account to his uncle Hygelac of the vengeance he took upon Grendel (and then his mother) for the years of terror that the monster had inflicted on the Danes: “I avenged all that, so not any of Grendel’s kinsmen over the earth, not he who lives longest of the hostile race, entrapped in terror, need boast of that night-clash” (ll. 2005b–09a).

In “The Textual Criticism of Frederick Klaeber’s *Beowulf*,” in *Constructing Nations, Reconstructing Myth*, ed. Andrew Wawn et al. (see sec. 2), 131–53, Robert D. Fulk describes the editorial policies he developed with Robert E. Bjork and John D. Niles in their preparation of the fourth edition of what many scholars have considered to be the standard edition of the poem since it first appeared in 1922. Fulk begins by explaining Klaeber’s own original aim in his work, which was to make available to English-speaking students of *Beowulf* the vast amount of textual, philological, metrical, and other scholarship that had been done on the poem during the prior century in Germany and Scandinavia. Klaeber himself, however, never offered a full statement of his editorial priorities, though he did provide an appendix entitled, “Textual Criticism (Grammatical and Metrical Notes),” which appears on pages 274–82 of his third edition (1936, reprinted with supplements in 1941 and 1950). Fulk finds that Klaeber’s views on editing the sole extant text of the poem shifted somewhat during the course of his career, in part as a result of two major works published by Hoops in 1932, which urged even greater restraint than Klaeber had yet shown in emending the text on metrical grounds without “corroborating evidence of textual corruption” (143). This new attitude is revealed in the thoroughly revised 1936 third edition, which contains eighty references to Hoops, left essentially unchanged through its two supplemented reprintings, except for a few second (or third) guesses,

as in the case of *ungedefelice* 'unfittingly' in line 2435b. In the first two editions of 1922 and 1928, the adverbial suffix *-lice* '-ly' had been deleted for metrical reasons. Klaeber restored this ending in the third edition of 1936, but then removed it again in the second supplement to the third edition of 1950, not from the printed text of the poem, but in a list of *corrigena* on page 470. Fulk describes Klaeber's early reliance upon, but later doubts about, Sievers's metrical analyses of 1885 and 1893, but notes that "the fundamental organizing principle" of Sievers's system, "the assumption of four metrical positions to the verse" (140), has become so widely accepted after a century of significant challenge that the current editors—Fulk, Bjork, and Niles—have decided cautiously to restore Klaeber's "faltering trust in" Sievers's metrics (143). They thus hope to honor the competing principles of textual editing that Klaeber himself wrestled with in making his editorial decisions, "if not all of his specific readings based on those principles" (144). Rather than laying down hard-and-fast rules "to determine every conceivable editorial decision" (151) in their revised text, they have preferred to follow five general "guidelines" based upon Klaeber's own developing practice: (1) changes from the Cotton Vitellius text "must be clearly marked," unless missing letters can confidently be supplied from the two Thorkelin transcripts of the later eighteenth century; (2) the text should remain unchanged, "unless there is sufficient reason to believe that the scribe (or an earlier copyist in the line of descent) has made a substantive error," whether by carelessness, misapprehension of the reading in his exemplar, or intentionally, that is, by faulty or hypercorrection; (3) "emendations should not be effected solely on metrical grounds, except in those few instances licensed" by Klaeber (n.b.: in the case of *ungedefelice* in line 2435b, mentioned above, Klaeber's "vacillation" is indicated by retaining the *-lice* of the MS as in the third edition, but marking its questionable meter by a point beneath each of the four letters); (4) verses clearly missing from the text should not be reconstructed "if they substantially affect the meaning," but are "permissible" if they do not (151–53). Finally, perhaps on the model of the Hippocratic oath to "Do no harm," the editors instruct themselves: (5) "Do not emend unnecessarily, but do not assume that non-emendation is always preferable. Each instance must be judged on its own merits, according to the grammatical, semantic, alliterative, metrical, narrative, and paleographic probabilities involved" (153). Fulk acknowledges that the three editors do not agree in all cases of editorial decision, but reports that "every choice to emend or not to emend represents a majority opinion" (153).

More specifically, then, Fulk proposes "Some Emendations and Non-Emendations in *Beowulf* (Verses 600a, 976a, 1585b, 1663b, 1740a, 2525b, 2771a, and 3060a)," *SP* 104: 159–74. These are eight in number, in which Fulk approves, disapproves, or hopes to improve upon Klaeber's own editorial decisions. (1) In the second supplement to his third edition, Klaeber recants his emendation in line 600a of MS *sendep* '[Grendel] sends forth, dispatches' to *snedep* '[Grendel] cuts, slices'. Fulk approves this return to the MS reading. He himself, however, would treat the preceding word *ond* not as a conjunction "and," but rather as a rare spelling of the intensifying or directional prefix *on-* 'on, onward,' yielding for the whole half-line *swefed, ondsenedep* '[Grendel] puts to sleep, sends on,' that is, he 'kills, destroys,' even though this reading would produce the poem's only asyndetic or "conjunctionless" collocation of parallel verbs in a single verse. (2) The MS at line 976a reads *in mid gripe* 'in with its grip' with reference to the terrible wound that has opened in Grendel's shoulder. The phrase has redundant prepositions, so Klaeber emends it to *in nidgripe* 'in a coercive grip' by canceling as erroneous one minim or short vertical stroke in a series of seven in a row in the MS. However, since this particular spelling of the first element of the compound, *nyd-* or *ned-* 'necessity, constraint,' is never found in verse, as well as the fact that *d* and *ð* were so often confused by scribes, Fulk suggests a further emendation to *in niðgripe* 'in a hostile grip,' which he feels makes even better sense in the context of the parallel varying phrase in the next half-line 977a, *balwon bendum* '[in] its pernicious bonds'. (3) Klaeber understands lines 1584b–87a as follows: *He him þæs lean forgeald, / reþe cempe, to ðæs þe he on ræste geseah / guðwerigne Grendel licgan, / aldor-leasne* 'He [Beowulf], the fierce champion, had paid him [Grendel] recompense for that [killing of Danes], so that he [now] saw war-weary Grendel lying in repose, lifeless.' However, this reading gives an unattested causative force to the phrase *to ðæs þe* 'so that' in line 1585b, which is always elsewhere used with a verb of motion to mean "to the place where." Fulk suggests canceling *to* from the phrase, yielding simply *ðæs þe* 'after, inasmuch as, when.' More importantly, he would translate the finite verb *forgeald* in line 1584b as a simple preterite rather than a pluperfect, thus making Beowulf's upcoming decapitation of the dead Grendel at the bottom of the mere, rather than his earlier "dis-arming" of the monster, the "repayment" for past crimes referred to: Beowulf paid Grendel back for those crimes "after" he saw him lying there dead, that is, he cut off his head. (4) In Beowulf's report to Hrothgar about his fight with Grendel's mother, Fulk would emend the superlative

adverb *oftost* ‘most often’ in line 1663b to the noun *ofost* ‘haste’ as the subject of the verb *wisode* ‘guided’ in that b-verse, turning the hero’s comment in lines 1663b–64a from an unidiomatic gnomic parenthesis in the past perfect—[*ylða Waldend*] *oftost wisode / winigea leasum* ‘[the Ruler of men] has very often guided the friendless man’—to a descriptive remark: *ofost wisode / winigea leasum* ‘[the need for] haste prompted a man without comrades,’ says Beowulf of himself, quickly to pull down the giants’ sword. (5) Fulk approves Klaeber’s analysis of *oð þæt* in line 1740a as a preposition plus relative conjunction meaning “until the time that,” signaling the coming completion of a psychological process that Hrothgar has been describing in his “sermon.” Some editors have been bothered by the fact that the construction begins a new fitt (XXV) in the middle of a sentence. They take *oð þæt* as an adverb or adverbial phrase beginning a new sentence, meaning “And then” or “At length.” Fulk suggests, to the contrary, that *oð þæt* serves to flag an ironic reversal which the poet or scribe might very well have seen as an appropriate place to mark the beginning a new passage. (6) In line 2525b Klaeber supplies the adverb *furður* ‘forward, further on’ to satisfy a prosodic expectation raised by the double alliteration on *f* in the preceding a-verse, choosing this particular term on the basis of its apparent formulaic use in a similar construction in *The Battle of Maldon*: *ic heonon nelle / fleon fotes trym, ac wille furðor gan* ‘I will not flee from here / a foot’s pace, but will go forward’ (ll. 246b–47). Here Fulk disagrees with Klaeber, preferring Bugge’s suggestion (1887) that the noun *feohte* ‘fight’ should be supplied as the subject of the compound verb *sceal...weorðan* ‘must turn out’ in lines 2525b–26a, both to complete the alliteration of line 2525 on *f* and to prepare for a more idiomatic construction of the relative clause following *swa* in line 2526b: *swa unc wyrd geteoð*. Since the verb *geteon* ‘to allot’ in that line is normally transitive, the noun *wyrd* ‘fate’ should be construed as its direct object rather than its subject, yielding for lines 2524b–27a: *Nelle ic beorges weard / oferfleon fotes trem, ac unc [feohte] sceal / weorðan æt wealle, swa unc wyrd geteoð / metod manna gehwæs* ‘I will not flee a foot’s pace from the guardian of the barrow, but the fight will turn out for us both at the wall just as the Ruler of every man confers fate upon us’ (7 and 8). In both lines 2771a and 3060a, Scribe B of the poem has written *wræce* ‘revenge’ rather the expected *wræte* ‘treasures,’ which Klaeber accordingly corrects. This is a common enough error, since *c* and *t* may have been difficult for the scribe to distinguish in the old-fashioned hand of his exemplar, which Michael Lapidge (2000) suggests was in Anglo-Saxon set minuscule. Fulk accepts this

possibility, but insists that a further emendation to *wrætte* is “phonologically necessary” (173) because after a stressed vowel we would expect gemination of the consonant to be retained before a vocalic ending. However, as Fulk himself notes, the degemination of consonants after unstressed vowels may simply have been a normal late West-Saxon spelling practice, so that it is not completely clear why he believes this trend could not have begun to include the simplification of double consonants after stressed vowels as well.

In “Old English *þa* ‘now that’ and the Integrity of *Beowulf*,” *ES* 88: 623–31, Fulk notes that the temporal conjunction *þa* ‘then’ can also “mark the causal connection between two clauses,” meaning “because, since, as” (623). He cites two instances of this causal usage in *Genesis A*: (1) *þa hie gielpsceaþan ofgifen hæfdon* ‘now that the boastful destroyers had abandoned [the noble dwellings and sky-bright halls]’ (l. 96); and (2) *noðe gladu æfre / under salwed bord...syððan ætywān...þa hire þearf ne wæs* ‘[the dove] would never again gladly appear aboard the tar-blackened planks... now that there was no constraint upon her’ (ll. 1480b–82b). Fulk finds “now, now that” an especially felicitous translation of *þa* in these cases, since it captures both the temporal and causative force of the adverb in the description of past action, parallel to the frequent use of *nu* ‘now, now that’ in a similar sense when describing present action. In *Beowulf*, *þa* is used in this temporal/causative sense at line 2978b—*þa his broðor læg* ‘now that his brother lay [wounded]’—and at line 2372b: *ða wæs Hygelac dead* ‘now that Hygelac was dead.’ Fulk finds comparable instances at lines 201b, 467b, 733b, 1293b, 1539b, 1621b, and 2550b, along with quite a few other examples which might best be analyzed as similarly causal or which may not be “primarily causal but might still profitably be rendered ‘now that’” (627). Fulk then summarizes the other ways in which the *Beowulf* poet’s usage or vocabulary has been seen as distinctive throughout the poem and concludes that “the use of *þa* in the causal sense ‘now that,’ identifiable with any certainty elsewhere only in *Genesis A*, also speaks for the integrity of the composition of *Beowulf*” as a complete poem by a single poet (629).

In “Understanding Hrothgar’s Humiliation: *Beowulf* Lines 144–74 in Context,” in *Text, Image, Interpretation*, ed. Minnis and Roberts (see sec. 2), 355–67, Jane Roberts argues that the internal narrative structure of fitt II in the Cotton Vitellius text (ll. 115–88) indicates that it was artfully composed as a complete thematic unit by the author of the poem rather than merely demarcated as a convenient subdivision of the text by a subsequent copyist. Roberts finds three movements within this

larger passage, marked in the manuscript by two capital letters beginning *Swa* 'So' in line 144a and *Hwilum* 'Sometimes' in line 175a. The fitt's first movement (ll. 115–43) describes Grendel's initial attacks upon Heorot. Its second movement, signaled by the capital *s* of *Swa* in line 144a and continuing through line 174, describes the demoralizing effect of these attacks over twelve long years of constant persecution, rhetorically intensified by a second *Swa* 'so' in line 164a which further stresses the contrast between Grendel's power and Hrothgar's weakness. Roberts notes that in this passage the monster is "overwhelmingly...the subject position in verb phrases that denote action or decision," while the king is portrayed as "powerless to act" in any way (359). She takes the masculine singular personal pronoun *he* in the famous crux of line 168a to refer not to Grendel, as it is usually interpreted, but to Hrothgar himself. It is the king who cannot approach *þone gifstol* 'that noble seat' in line 168a or his *maþðum* 'treasure' in line 169a because of Grendel's occupation of his hall at night. The capitalized *h* of *Hwilum* 'sometimes' in line 175a marks the beginning of the third movement of the fitt, culminating in the abject desperation of the Danes who are driven to pray for deliverance to the demonic false gods that are the ultimate source of their distress. The next fitt opens with yet another *Swa* in line 189a, beginning a new episode of the narrative, pivoting from the contrast between an abject Hrothgar and a triumphant Grendel to that between the helpless old king and the potent young hero.

Yasuharu Eto distinguishes between "*Hearg* and *weoh* in *Beowulf*, ll. 175–8a," *The Bulletin of the Japanese Association for Studies in the History of the English Language*: 15–17. Eto accepts David Wilson's 1992 differentiation between *hearg*, a prominent site of pre-Christian communal worship on high ground used in the poem as the first element of the compound *hærgtrafu* 'heathen sanctuaries' in line 175b, and *weoh*, a smaller shrine attended by individuals and wayfarers, which appears as the prototheme of *wigweorbunge* 'shrine-honorings, honor to idols', usually understood to mean "sacrifices," in line 176a. Eto suggests that the Danes in this passage should be seen as gathering at some high place sacred to a pagan divinity to pray for relief from Grendel's attacks, in return for which they vow "idol-worshipping" of various sorts to be fulfilled at private local shrines.

Jun Terasawa asks, "Is Beowulf a Spy? A Note on *Beowulf* 253a," in *Text, Language and Interpretation*, ed. Nakao et al. (see sec. 2), 79–91. The author reexamines *leasceaweras*, the compound term comprising this half-line, which is normally understood to mean "deceitful

observers," where the masculine plural of the nominalizing suffix *-eras* '-ers' has been added to the root of the infinitive *sceaw-ian* 'to look, study, observe', creating *sceaweras* 'lookers, observers', a term that appears in prose texts. The addition of the adjective *leas* 'false, unfaithful' as the first element of the compound yields *leas-sceaweras* 'lying lookers, disingenuous observers', that is, "spies." However, Terasawa finds both rhetorically jarring and thus "semantically dubious" the otherwise polite Danish coastguard's use of such an unfriendly *hapax legomenon* to describe Beowulf and his fourteen companions. He also finds the term "problematic on morphological and metrical grounds," citing his prior study (2001) on the rarity of the suffix *-ere* '-er' in Old English poetic texts, which construction appears nowhere else in *Beowulf* or *Judith*. Furthermore, line 253a belongs to a subclass of Sievers's metrical Type D, which is found in *Beowulf* only in b-verses with Class II weak verbs, as in *feond treddode* 'the enemy stepped' (l. 725b) and *wæl reafode* 'despoiled the slain' (l. 3027b). And finally, in folio 137 verso of the MS itself, Terasawa observes a space between *scea* and *weras* "as wide as those found between words or between compound elements," suggesting that the plural masculine noun *-weras* 'men' is the correct final component of the compound and that the meaningless *scea-* is an error. Terasawa partially reconstructs the authorial reading as *leas[e] ****-weras* 'loose...men', which he interprets to mean strangers with no known ancestry or other bonafides on the possible model of Old Norse *lausamaðr* 'unattached man' (I was unable to find this exact term in Cleasby-Vigfusson [1957], but did find the Old Norse plural *lausir menn* 'free men', as opposed to *bændir menn* 'bondmen, servants'). Terasawa recalls Frank's observation (1981) of another possible Nordicism in the Danish coastguard's speech at line 316a, where the terse construction, *mæl is me to feran* 'time for me to go', has several direct parallels in Old Norse eddic poetry. Terasawa finds a workable substitute for the first element of *scea-weras* in the plural redundant compound *leod-weras* 'men', which appears twice elsewhere in Old English poetry at line 1833b of *Genesis A* and line 110a of *Exodus*. This compound would support the alliterative linkage between the a- and b-verses of line 253 on *l*, yielding *leas[e] leod-weras / on land Dena* 'unauthorized men in the land of the Danes'. Beowulf is not a spy nor is perceived to be one. The Danish coastguard is simply saying: "Now I must know your lineage, before you travel on from here as unauthorized men deeper into the land of the Danes" (ll. 251b–54a). Terasawa admits, however, that the scribal substitution of MS *scea* for authorial *leod* still requires "a paleographical

explanation.” He supplies an appendix listing various readings of line 253a in 40 editions and textual studies since the nineteenth century.

Alfred Bammesberger offers “A Note on *Beowulf*, Lines 642–51a,” *N&Q* 54: 359–61, setting out to clarify the number, case, and referent of the phrase *þæm ahlæcan* in line 646b, which he takes to be the antecedent of the third person plural personal pronoun *hie* ‘they’ in line 648a. He suggests that *þæm ahlæcan* is an instrumental or dative of agency in which the older plural ending *-um* has weakened to *-an*, referring collectively to Grendel and Beowulf as “ferocious ones,” just as the nominative plural *ða aglæcean* later indicates both Beowulf and the dragon as equivalently “fierce assailants” at line 2592a. Lines 646b–48 should thus be rendered: “[Hrothgar] knew that a battle at the high hall was firmly pledged by the two ferocious ones, ever since they [Beowulf and Grendel] could see the light of the sun.”

Bammesberger also reconsiders the puzzling half-line “*Ealond utan at Beowulf*, Line 2334a,” *N&Q* 54: 361–64, which literally means “island from outside,” mentioned among those things that were completely destroyed by the flames of the *ligdraca* ‘fire-dragon’ (l. 2333a), including the *leoda fæsten* ‘people’s stronghold’ in line 2333b and *eorðweard ðone* ‘that earth-guardian’ or fortified enclosure in line 2334b. Bammesberger revives the suggestion of Eliason (1953), adopted by Mitchell and Robinson (1998), that the verse conjoins two adverbs *eal ond utan* ‘entirely and round about’ in a formulaic-sounding phrase. However, since this construction appears nowhere else, Bammesberger suggests that *eal* is an error for the authorial reading *innan*, yielding the familiar formula *innan ond utan* ‘from within and from without,’ meaning “thoroughly, completely, in every respect,” and thus indicating that the dragon’s flames had completely destroyed Beowulf’s royal hall and its defensive enclosures, but not a neighboring *ealond* ‘island, foreshore, seaboard’ as well.

In “Grendel Enters Heorot,” *N&Q* 54: 119–20, Bammesberger reanalyzes lines 721b–24a, noting that *onbræd*, the contracted third person sg. past form of the compound verb *onbregdan* ‘to rise up, get up, start up’ (l. 723a), is only reliably attested elsewhere in an intransitive sense. Restricting this verb to intransitive use would mean that the *recedes muban* ‘mouth of the hall’ in line 724a should not be construed as its direct object, but rather as a dative of location, yielding for the whole sentence: “The door strong with bars forged by fire opened immediately when [Grendel] touched it with his hands; intent on evil, enraged as he was, he started up [= charged forth] at the entrance of the hall’ (120).

In a posthumously published essay, “The Restoration of *Beowulf* 2221b: *Wyrmhorda cræft* and the Identity of the Thief,” *In Geardagum* 27: 67–92, Raymond P. Tripp, Jr., reprises his arguments of 1981, 1983, 1999, 2001, 2002, and 2005, that it is no ordinary *þeof* ‘thief’ (l. 2219a) in the present of the poem’s action whom we should understand provokes the dragon’s wrath with the trivial theft of a cup, but rather that the dragon itself stole the treasure in its hoard long before as a human being later transformed into a dragon by greed. This dragon’s attack upon Beowulf’s realm after fifty years of successful rule is thus unprovoked, like Grendel’s upon Hrothgar’s kingdom after a reign of comparable happiness and duration. The dragon is first introduced in line 2210b with the phrase *oð ðæt an ongan* ‘until one began,’ the identical formula used to describe the first attack by Grendel on Heorot in line 100b. As part of his argument Tripp affirms the MS reading of verse 2221b as *wyrmhorda cræft*, which he understands as denoting the dragon’s own “cleverness in secreting its serpent treasures”—no mean feat, since it was the stolen wealth of an entire nation (73). The clause in which this phrase appears has no verb, however, and so is usually emended to include one as in *wyrmhord abrac* ‘[the thief] broke into the serpent’s hoard’ (Klaeber 1950) or *wyrmhord atræd* ‘[the thief] stepped into the serpent’s hoard’ (Mitchell and Robinson 1998). Tripp does not supply a translation of the whole sentence, but seems to suggest the following: “Not at all voluntarily, by his own will, [was there] cleverness in his secreting his serpent’s treasures—he who harmed him [Beowulf] sorely—but in his dire need I know not what kind of servant of the sons of men fled angry reprisals in need of a dwelling, and found his way in there, a crime-beset creature” (ll. 2221–26a). For those who still feel the need of a stated verb in the main clause of this sentence, Tripp offers a reanalysis of *wyrmhorda cræft*, detaching the genitive plural ending *-a* from the *wyrmhord-* and applying it as a prefix to *-cræft*, to which he adds the third person singular past inflectional ending *-e* of *acræftan* ‘to devise,’ yielding *wyrmhord acraeft[e]* ‘[Not at all voluntarily] did he fashion a serpent’s hoardings’ (l. 2221), again taking the dragon-thief as the subject who was driven by his crime to hide both himself and his stolen treasures from enemies. The article concludes with a briefly annotated bibliography of Tripp’s studies of the poem on this and other topics.

Thomas Klein reconsiders the meaning of “*Stonc ða æfter stane* (*Beowulf*, l. 2288a): Philology, Narrative Context, and the Waking Dragon,” *JEGP* 106: 22–44, concluding that the traditional interpretation of this half-line is best after all. The questionable verb *stincan*

had not yet acquired the meaning “to give off an odor, stink,” as Tripp argued (1999), but should rather be interpreted as a prefix-less variant of the attested *gestincan* ‘to perceive a smell, sniff’, hence, “[the dragon] sniffed then along the stone,” discovering in the process the foot-trace of his enemy, the thief who stole the cup.

Patrick V. Stiles addresses “Consumer Issues: *Beowulf* 3115a and Germanic ‘Bison,’” in *Indo-European Perspectives*, ed. Penney (see sec. 2), 461–73. This half-line has been thought to obtrude an awkward parenthesis, separating subject and verb from direct object, into Wiglaf’s statement about Beowulf’s funeral pyre: *Nu scealgled fretan / (weaxan wonna leg) wigena strengel* ‘Now shall fire devour (the dark flame grow) the leader of warriors’ (ll. 3114b–15). Holthausen (1929) proposed emending *weaxan* to the unattested **weasan* as a variant of **we(o)san* ‘to consume, devour, eat voraciously’. This infinitive verb can be derived from a transitive Indo-European root **wes-* ‘to feed, pasture, tend (livestock)’ (Benveniste 1962), which acquired a secondary intransitive sense in Gothic *wisan* ‘to feast’ and Old High German *firwesan* ‘to consume, squander’. OE *wesa* ‘glutton’ and *oferwesness* ‘excess (in feasting)’ both presuppose a verb **we(o)san* ‘to consume, devour’, as does OE *wesand/weosend* ‘bison’, which can be analyzed as a nominalized present participle of the same hypothetical verb, meaning “eating one” or “big-eater.” Stiles thus supports Holthausen’s emendation of *weaxan* to *weasan*, construing line 1115a as syntactically parallel to 1114b: “Now shall fire devour, the dark flame consume, the leader of warriors.”

Using the *f*-fascicle of the *Dictionary of Old English* CD-ROM covering A-F (2003), Roberta Frank considers “*F*-Words in *Beowulf*,” in *Making Sense*, ed. Healey and Kiernan, (see sec. 4.a), 1–22. Of the 3,016 entries beginning with *f* in DOE none includes an extant Old English form of the vulgar verb, noun, and interjection teasingly alluded to in Frank’s title. However, over 300 other *f*-words appear in *Beowulf* in 857 inflected forms. Frank selects thirteen of these for closer scrutiny as to their precise meaning and connotations. For instance, she discovers that the noun *fær*, used in many different senses in prose—“journey, way, way of life, concourse of people, etc.”—appears only twice in poetry, where it refers specifically to an ancient legendary ship: Scyld’s funerary boat in *Beowulf* (l. 33b) and Noah’s ark in *Genesis A* (five times), in which latter vessel Scyld’s father Scaef is also reported to have been born as a fourth son of Noah, according to the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* composed around the year 892. Another *f*-word is the *folcscaru* ‘folk-share’ of line 73a, which Hrothgar will not give away in the newly built Heorot among the other

gifts he distributes among his retainers. From the parallel use of this term in other poems, it seems indeed to refer to ancestral tribal territory as described by Tacitus in his *Germania* (AD 98), a suggestion first offered by Kemble (1837), followed by Müller (1914), Klaeber (1950), and Wrenn (1953), but recently challenged by Jurasinski (2006). Frank believes that this *f*-word serves in *Beowulf* “as a ‘ye olde’ sign, highlighting the virtue of a distant northern past in which even the most powerful of kings could not transfer hallowed kin-lands to members of his war-band” (9). She concludes: “So many *f*-words in *Beowulf* evoke the remote past: the multiple compounds with *fyrn-* ‘ancient of days’...; adverbs such as *feor* and *feorran* ‘from far back,’ ‘from long ago,’ *fram* or *forþ* ‘away’; nouns such as *fruma* ‘beginning’ (*frumcyn*, *frumsceaft* ‘origin, beginning’); adjectives such as *forma* ‘first,’ *frod* ‘old’; and an army of verbs with the negative *for-* prefix, all denoting destruction, disappearance, dispatching, sweeping off...” (22). Frank sees the cumulative force of these *f*-words as confirmation of her view that *Beowulf* was not composed early in the Anglo-Saxon period, preserving an authentic recollection of ancient times, but rather that it offers a vision of the past as it was imagined by a later poet who consistently employs various techniques of verbal antiquing to render poignant and compelling his re-creation of the days of yore. [This article is also reviewed in section 4a.]

R.D. Fulk sharply disagrees with this view of the “Archaisms and Neologisms in the Language of *Beowulf*,” in *Studies in the History of the English Language III*, ed. Cain and Russom, (see sec. 3b), 267–87. While admitting that the poem may conceivably be a late composition, as Frank believes, Fulk argues that the verbal forms and prosody of *Beowulf* retain genuine features of an archaic stage in the development of Old English language and poetry. Rather than the deliberately archaizing diction of a particular poet working ca. 900 or later, he believes the poem represents a traditional “poetic *koine*” (269) which was formed some time before the early ninth century. The fact “that nearly all the non-West Saxon spelling features of Old English verse are found also in poems known to have been composed in the South, as well as in many non-Anglian prose texts,” shows that the mixed regional linguistic features of the Cotton Vitellius *Beowulf* are not the result of repeated copying over time by scribes speaking different forms of Old English, but rather the work of a single poet who was “steeped in” the antique language of traditional verse (269), which had already combined features of the Northumbrian, Mercian, Kentish, and West Saxon dialects to form its own distinctive poetic

idiom at least two centuries before the Cotton Vitellius copy of the poem. Fulk concludes that linguists are thus quite right to treat the language of *Beowulf* as authentically “archaic in nature” (278), but admits that this position is not yet a positively established “fact,” merely a “probability in a high degree” (277), especially when one disregards “the obvious and superficial effects of scribal modernization” (278) introduced from the late West Saxon dialect of Old English by the two copyists of the Cotton Vitellius text ca. 1000.

John Harkness offers “Some Observations on Apposition in *Beowulf*” in *Indo-European Perspectives*, ed. Southern (see sec. 3a), 79–88. Harkness defines this rhetorical and syntactic device rather strictly as “[t]wo lexical noun phrases with the same referent, in the same clause, in the same case, performing the same grammatical role in the clause, but not conjoined” (80). While he notes that apposition can sometimes occur across several lines of verse, Harkness further restricts his examples to those that appear within two consecutive long lines and excludes any that contain pronouns, substantive adjectives, parallel clauses, predicate nominatives, double accusatives, and lists or other forms of multiple apposition. The author finds 275 examples of such apposition in *Beowulf*, 200 of which (or seventy-three percent, according to this reviewer’s calculation) present the first apposed element in the b-verse, the second in the a-verse of the following line. Much less frequently, fifty appositions (or eighteen percent) appear in successive a-verses, while only fifteen (or five percent) appear in successive b-verses. Rarely, the two apposed elements appear in the a- and b-verses of the same line: ten (or four percent), eight of which express the formula “NAME *mathelode* (son of) NAME” (83), in which the second apposed element is the patronymic of the subject of the verb, as in *Beowulf mathelode, bearn Ecgþeowes* ‘Beowulf spoke, son of Ecgtheow’ (l. 529). The two other cases of a > b apposition in the same line are *gromheort guma, Godes andsaca* ‘the hostile-hearted man, God’s enemy’ (l. 1682) and *eaforum Ecgwelan, Ar-Scyldingum* ‘toward the offspring of Ecgwela, [toward] the Honor-Scyldings’ (l. 1710), both of which lines Harkness and others have found problematic for different reasons. Given the proportional frequency of these appositional patterns, Harkness proposes four “rules” governing apposition, which he lists in order of decreasing force: (1) “Because the [alliterative long] line is the domain over which the poetic function [following Roman Jakobson’s use of this term (1987)] operates on the level of *phonology*, the line is blocked from being the domain over which the poetic function operates on the level of *syntax* or rhetoric, namely for apposition”

(author’s bold italics, 85): this constraint mitigates strongly against apposition in the same long line; (2) “A pause of at least the weight of a line break is needed between the elements of appositions”; (3) “Optimally, a line break is placed immediately before the second element of an apposition”; and (4) “Elements of appositions are optimally placed in immediately contiguous half-lines” (86). Harkness further notes that apposition is a technique of emphasis, which is “why the first element in apposition is so often in the most salient metrical position in the Old English line—the third lift (the first stressed element in the second half-line)” (87). Following Paetzel (1913), the author suggests that the *Beowulf* poet’s observation of these principles reflects a more archaic style of oral composition, revealed also in *Genesis A* and *B* and the Old Saxon *Heliand*, as opposed to more obviously literary compositions like the *Juliana* and *Elene* of Cynewulf. Harkness thus hopes that these proposed appositional strictures will contribute to “the much sought after ‘test of style’...so carefully and thoroughly investigated” (85) by Donoghue in his study of the use of the auxiliary (1987).

In “Stressed and Spaced Out: Manuscript Evidence for Beowulfian Prosody,” *Anglo-Saxon* 1: 201–20, Megan E. Hartman studies the frequency with which the two scribes of *Beowulf* separate as discrete words in the Cotton Vitellius text true compounds like *ban-hus*, which is comprised of two semantically independent morphemes that combine to create a new word—‘bone’ + ‘house’ or ‘houses’ = “body”—and quasi-compounds like *æþel-ing* ‘prince, descendant of nobility’, which is formed “with a bound rather than a free morpheme as its second element, a suffix which does not retain its full semantic force” as an independent word (201). Hartman’s purpose is to determine the presence of “tertiary stress,” also called “half-stress” or an “intermediate degree of stress” (201), on this second element or deuterotherme of quasi-compounds, like the *-ing* of *æþel-ing*. To this end, she compiles a statistical “Distribution of Word-Division in the Manuscripts,” supplied as an appendix, recording totals and percentages of scribal division versus non-division of (1) true compounds, (2) quasi-compounds (itemized by their various component suffixes or prefixes), and (3) dithematic names of individuals or groups of people. Hartman also provides a breakdown of figures for the first and second scribes of *Beowulf*, as well as for that second scribe’s text of *Judith*, and for the poems of both the *Exeter Book* and the *Junius Manuscript*. These various texts reveal some differences in the treatment of individual compounds, quasi-compounds, or names, but yield generally similar results to those for *Beowulf* as

a whole. Hartman's assumption is that divided quasi-compounds imply that in those circumstances both elements are relevant to the signification of the whole word and thus individually receive more emphasis than in those situations in which they are not so divided. She discovers that the scribes of *Beowulf* separate the components of true compounds in 92.6 percent of cases, compared with the separation of quasi-compounds at 23.7 percent. Dithematic personal names are divided in 55.2 percent of cases, as opposed to only 8.6 percent for the names of population groups ending in *-ing* or *-ingas*. *Hroð-gar* 'Victory-Spear' is the most frequently divided personal name, at 80.5 percent of occurrences, whereas *Beo-wulf*, the independent form and meaning of whose prototheme is obscure (see the summary of Fulk's article in the same volume in *Sources and Analogues* below) is divided only 37.3 percent of the time. These findings lead Hartman to conclude (1) that the copyists of *Beowulf* tend to divide quasi-compounds in contexts where the individual components are felt "logically" to require more emphasis in order to express the meaning of the whole word, and (2) that while the deuterothermes of quasi-compounds obviously receive less (and less frequent) stress than the second elements of true compounds, they can still receive tertiary stress (indicated by separation) in some metrical situations where they might be expected to receive no stress at all. This result, Hartman believes, reveals a flexible prosody on the part of the *Beowulf* and other Old English poets who, "like modern poets, could vary their treatment of some words in order to adapt to the combined requirements of metre and narrative" (218).

Yasuko Suzuki offers a three-part metrical study of the poem, beginning with "The Sixth Type of Germanic Alliterative Verse: The Case of Old English *Beowulf* (Part I)," *Journal of Inquiry and Research* (Osaka, Japan) 84 (September 2006): 39-56. Articles with the same title (with the designation Part II and Part III) appear in subsequent volumes 85 (March 2007): 37-54 and 86 (September 2007): 39-56, respectively. In the first part, Suzuki summarizes Sievers's analysis of traditional Germanic meter (1885 and 1893), noting five basic metrical types of half-line based upon two strong (S) and two weak (W) positions per verse: (1) SWSW, (2) WSWS, (3) WSSW, (4) SSWW, and (5) SWWS. Suzuki also considers variations in the number of metrical positions, the presence of extra weak positions, verses with only one lift, hypermetrical verses, those with only three syllables, etc. In part two, Suzuki proposes adding to this inventory of metrical types the sixth combination logically suggested by Sievers's scheme, WWSS, of which the author finds two kinds of example in *Beowulf*: (1)

verses with two unstressed positions followed by a disyllabic compound filling two lifts, as in *me þone waltræs* '[rewarded] me for that deadly attack (l. 2101a); and (2) verses with two unstressed positions followed by two lifts, the second of which contains a long "contracted" vowel, as in *swa sceal man don* 'so must a man do' (l. 1534b), where *dōn* 'to do' is contracted from a disyllabic **dōan*. Part three considers other verses that might be seen to exemplify this WWSS pattern and concludes with an Appendix that lists all verses of this sixth type in the two categories already noted: twenty-six half-lines with a disyllabic compound filling the two final lifts and twenty-four half-lines with a "contracted" vowel as the second and final lift, which totals include five verses that fall into both categories respectively (ll. 16b, 112b, 629b, 1934b, and 2076a).

CD

Yasuhiro Miki considers "The Non-Alliterating Compound *ærdæge* in *Beowulf* 1311b and 2942b," in *Text, Language and Interpretation*, ed. Nakao et al. (see sec. 2), 92-100 (in Japanese). Miki examines this dative singular form of *ærdæg* 'daybreak, first light', the prototheme of which, *ær-*, occupies the second lift of these two b-verses after the same preposition *samod/somod* 'about, around' in long lines alliterating on *s*. Even though syllables in this fourth stressed position of the long line do not normally alliterate, Miki finds the non-alliterating use of a nominal compound here somewhat problematic because most such compounds in the poem take part in alliteration. In fact, *ærdæge* itself alliterates elsewhere in *Beowulf* at line 126b, where *ær-* occupies the third lift, as well as alliterating in *Andreas*, *Elene*, and *Exodus*. Miki does not regard the non-alliteration of *ærdæge* as accidental in these two verses, however. They both occur in urgent situations, which stress imminent action or the fortuitous arrival of helping forces rather than the particular time of day the activity took place, thus de-emphasizing the significance of the temporal compound in these circumstances. Miki also discusses the non-alliterating use of other nominal compounds in *Beowulf*, such as *mancynnes* 'of mankind' in line 164b and *ealowæge* 'ale-cup' in line 495b.

JT

Sources and Analogues

In "The Name 'Merovingian' and the Dating of *Beowulf*," ASE 36: 93-101, Walter Goffart counters Shippey's view (2005) that the poet's familiar use of the dynastic name *Merewioingas* 'Merovingians' in line 2921a as a synecdoche for the Franks indicates an early date for the

composition of the poem in the first half of the eighth century, since the later Carolingians sought to suppress all mention of their predecessors in a deliberate policy of *damnatio memoriae* or public amnesia. Goffart argues that far from consigning the memory of the first ruling family of the Franks to oblivion, the Carolingians “took pains to affirm continuity with their predecessors,” whose “name was well known in the ninth century and occurs repeatedly in later historiography” (93). With regard to Shippey’s linguistic argument that the original form of the dynastic founder’s name can be reconstructed as **Mero-wech*, spelled *Merewi(o)h* in the Northumbrian dialect of Old English, yielding *Merewioingas* with the addition of the plural patronymic suffix in the poem, Goffart simply quotes Eric Stanley (1981): “Some single, odd, ancient-looking spelling provides no firm basis for early dating” (101).

Paul Acker introduces “Part I: ‘Fragments of Danish History’ (*Skjöldunga saga*),” *ANQ* 20: 3–33. This saga, still extant in the later sixteenth century, was epitomized in Latin by the Icelandic historian Arngrímur Jónsson as chapters one to fourteen of his *Rerum Danicarum Fragmenta* ‘Fragments of Danish History’ (1596), fully translated here for first time by Clarence Miller (9–22). Acker observes that this text “preserves much that is of interest for a comparative reading with *Beowulf*” (4), offering a character-by-character, episode-by-episode summary of the parallels and divergences between the poem’s account and Arngrímur’s précis of Scylding/Skjöldung legend, along with various other accounts of the early kings of Denmark, including the Anglo-Saxon and Scandinavian royal genealogies, Snorri Sturluson’s *Ynglinga saga* ‘Saga of the Ynglings’ (ca. 1230), and *Hrólfs saga Kraka* ‘The Saga of Hrolf Kraki’ (fourteenth century) (3–9). Miller’s rendering is based on Bjarni Guðnason’s 1982 Icelandic edition of the Latin text, supplemented by Arngrímur’s “title, chapter headings, scholarly excurses...and a portion of chapter 15” edited by Jakob Benediktsson in 1950 (4). Sif Rikhardsdóttir translates Bjarni’s Icelandic notes into English, to which Acker adds further information of his own (22–31).

In this same issue of *ANQ*, Marijane Osborn introduces further variants of the Scylding legend in “Part II: Beyond the Mere: Other Versions of Beowulfian Stories” (33–35), beginning with “‘Skjöld’: A Song by N. F. S. Grundtvig,” which she translates and comments on with the help of Bent Christensen (35–42). Osborn discusses “Monsters of Fjord and Fen” (42–43), different stories of which are translated by Stephen A. Mitchell in “Yuletide Beasts at Lejre (from the *Bjarkarímur*)” (43–46); Tom Shippey in “Juchen Knoop (a Ditmarsh

tale)” (46–49); and John Lindow in “Trolls in Isefjord (a Danish folktale)” (49–52). R. Mark Scowcroft translates “The Story of Bran and Sceolang (an Irish tale)” (52–61) and Yvette Kisor renders “Harthgrepa (from Saxo Grammaticus, *Gesta Danorum*, Book I)” (61–63). Paul Acker introduces narratives of “Three Dragons” (63–65), translating himself “The Dragon Episode in [the Icelandic MS] *Morkinskinna*” (65–68), while Julian Meldon D’Arcy translates both “The Dragon from an Eagle’s Egg (an Icelandic folktale)” and “The Dragon from Ragnarök (from *Völuspá*)” (68–69). Osborn introduces two “Later Adventures of the Skjöldung Heroes” (69–70), with Stephen Mitchell translating “The Battle on the Ice (from the *Bjarkarímur*)” (70–74) and Janice Hawes concluding this collection of Norse analogues to *Beowulf* with a translation and “Afterword, Amlæd (Hamlet) (from two Scandinavian chronicles)” (74–77).

Robert Fulk reviews various analyses of “The Etymology and Significance of Beowulf’s Name,” *Anglo-Saxon* 1: 109–36, beginning with Jacob Grimm’s *bēo-wulf* ‘bee-wolf’, which compound that scholar first understood as a kenning for “woodpecker” based upon classical analogies (1835), but later changed to the honey-loving “bear” (1854). Panzer (1910) and Chambers (1932) secured widespread acceptance of this interpretation of the hero’s name to the present day by observing parallels between *Beowulf* and the “Bear’s Son” folktale of later Scandinavian sources. In addition, the ninth-century Northumbrian *Liber Vitae Ecclesiae Dunelmensis* lists a *Biuwulf*, which is apparently equivalent to West Saxon *Beowulf* (so spelled forty times in the Cotton Vitellius text) or *Biowulf* (a variant spelling used fifteen times by Scribe B in the latter part of the poem). This name can plausibly be analyzed as *bīu-/bīo-/bēo-* ‘bee’ (from common Germanic **bī-ōn-*) + *wulf* ‘wolf’, with the spelling of the diphthong *ēo* in the prototheme reflecting assimilation of the long front vowel *i* to the velar semi-vowel *w* + back vowel *u* of *wulf*. The name also appears in Old Norse *Bjólfr* and Old High German *Biulfus* and *Piholf*. However, Joseph Harris (1999) and Fulk himself (2002) have offered an alternative analysis, *Bēow-wulf* ‘wolf of (the god) Bēow’, on the model of other lupine names like *Tiuwulf* ‘Wolf of (the god) Tiw’ in Old English or *Þorólfr* ‘Wolf of (the god) Thor’ in Old Norse. A Latinized form of the name *Bēow* or *Bēowi* appears as *Bēowius* in the West Saxon royal genealogy, a dynastic ancestor cognate with *Byggvir* in the Old Norse eddic poem *Lokasenna*, where this divinity is depicted as a barley god associated with Freyr. Fulk notes in support of this theophoric interpretation that the insect “bee” is nowhere else attested as an element in Old English personal names, but that it was a very common practice

among Germanic-speaking peoples to use the names or titles of divinities as the first element in dithematic names for royal and aristocratic humans.

Gale R. Owen-Crocker considers other "Beast Men: Eofor and Wulf and the Mythic Significance of Names in *Beowulf*," in *Myth in Early Northwest Europe*, ed. Glosecki (see sec. 4.a), 257–80. Beowulf himself introduces the first character Eofor in the latter part of the poem, when as an old king he sits and contemplates the troubled past of his people before calling out the dragon (ll. 2484–89). *Eofor* 'Boar' is the name of the Geatish warrior who had killed Ongentheow, king of the Swedes, in Hygelac's retaliation for the slaying of his brother Hæthcyn. After Beowulf dies, the anonymous messenger to the Geatish army once again recalls the story of Ongentheow's slaying, this time including a much fuller account of how Eofor's brother *Wulf* 'Wolf' was the first to injure Ongentheow in the head, then was wounded himself when the Swedish king struck back, but was avenged immediately afterwards when Eofor came up to finish off the old king (ll. 2961–98). The ferocity of the two Geatish warriors is indicated, Owen-Crocker believes, by their simple monothematic animal names. She notes that the deadly combat between the Ongentheow and his two Geatish assailants is recounted just before and after Beowulf's own death against the dragon. The story thus serves to dramatize the depth of Swedish grievance against the Geats and to presage ever the more potently the coming eruption of similarly savage hostilities between the two peoples once the hero's death becomes known to his enemies. In addition, Owen-Crocker accepts the analysis of Beowulf's own name as a theriophoric compound, "Bee-Wolf" meaning 'Bear' (discussed above), suggesting for the hero certain "mythic" ursine qualities, like a placid demeanor, immense power, and the capacity for sudden deadly violence. The author herself has observed the "deceptive languor" of live bears in Switzerland, noting the hero's quiet manner so masked his fighting power that he was once considered *sleac* 'slow, unaggressive' as a youth (l. 2187b). The poet thus draws upon traditional animal "personalities" to help characterize his hero and other figures in the poem.

Stefan Jurasinski discusses "The Feminine Name *Wealhtheow* and the Problem of *Beowulfian* Anthroponymy," *Neophilologus* 91: 701–15, observing that while a literal translation of the queen's name as "foreign or Welsh slave" may seem "inharmonious" with her royal dignity, names "appearing to denote servitude or captivity were not unknown to Germanic royalty of both genders," often without any indication of servile status for the person so named (714). Jurasinski cites

Cecily Clark (1992) that a number of Anglo-Saxon royal names have *wealh* 'Briton, foreigner, slave' as one element in a dithematic name, such as *Æðelwealh* 'Noble Briton' of Sussex, *Cenwealh* 'Brave Briton' of Wessex, *Merewealh* 'Sea Briton' of the Magonsæte, and a Sussex king's thegn called *Wealhhere* 'Battle Briton'. Since names in a royal or aristocratic clan were commonly chosen for their alliterative consonance with those of other members of the family, it is possible that the protheme *Wealh-* was selected to chime with the initial *w-* of the name of the queen's people, the *Wylfingas*. She is called *ðeodnes dohtor* 'a prince's daughter' (l. 2174a) and *ides Helminga* 'lady of the Helmings' (l. 620b). Since *Helm [weold] Wylfingas* 'Helm ruled the Wylfings' in line twenty-nine of *Widsith*, it is assumed that *Wealhtheow* is a princess of the Helming dynasty of this people. The deutertheme *-þeow* 'servant, slave' is also attested in heroic names, like that of Beowulf's own father *Ecgþeow* and the Swedish king *Ongenþeow* in the poem, *Icganþeow* in *Widsith*, and *Angelþeow* in the Mercian royal genealogies, though it is found nowhere else in the name of a woman. However, this element is semantically comparable to *gisl* 'hostage, pledge', Jurasinski suggests, which appears as the uncompounded Frankish feminine name *Gisela/Giselle* or the masculine names *Gisla* in Old English and *Gísli* in Old Norse. Jurasinski believes that the name elements *gisl* and *þeow* may originally have implied the condition of a royal hostage or spouse sent to former or potential enemies as a guarantor of good faith at the conclusion of a treaty or alliance. *Wealhtheow* herself is described as *friðusibb folca* 'peace-pledge between peoples' in line 2017a. The "problem with *Beowulfian* anthroponymy," however, is that names in the poem do not necessarily bear thematic significance for the persons they identify, since many royal and aristocratic names in Germanic and other Indo-European traditions simply reflect a pattern of stylistic variation among a repertoire of constituent themes that were chosen for their divine and heroic connotations, as well as for alliterative consonance, without necessarily denoting any specific character traits or social identities for the individual so named. Jurasinski thus suspects that *Wealhþeow* may be a fresh coinage on the part of the *Beowulf* poet, in which he artistically joined two resonant themes from the traditional lexicon of heroic name elements in order to create a distinctive appellation for this important character, without calling attention to her personal situation or thematic function in the poem. It should be noted, however, that the Old High German equivalent name appears as the masculine *Walah-tiu(-s)*, which would suggest that the whole compound may

have been available to the poet for adaptation as the personal name of a noble princess (cf. Förstemann, *Altdeutsches Namenbuch* [1901–16] and E. V. Gordon, “Wealhþeow and Related Names,” *MÆ* 4 [1935]). [Editor’s note: this item was listed under this section and section 8. Names in the OEN *Bibliography*, and it is reviewed separately in each place.]

Joseph Harris examines “Beasts of Battle, South and North,” in *Source of Wisdom*, ed. Wright, Biggs, and Hall (see sec. 2), 3–25. Harris notes that in the “southern” tradition of Anglo-Saxon England, there are fourteen passages in eight Old English poems which associate the wolf, the eagle, and especially the raven with imminent carnage. The “northern sister literature” in Old Norse is even more “thickly populated” with these creatures, where they are also associated with battle, but less frequently in an anticipatory or predictive role (5). Jacob Grimm (1840) saw this motif complex as part of a common Germanic poetic heritage, while Roberta Frank (1987) argued for the more particular influence of Old Norse skaldic poetry upon Old English verse. Harris accepts skaldic influence upon the Viking Age *Battle of Brunanburh*, composed in the tenth century, but supports Grimm’s contention that the “beasts of battle” package belongs to a deeper Germanic substrate, adding several further continental examples in Middle High German to the list of relevant passages compiled by Grimm. The most complex use of raven imagery in this tradition can be found in *Beowulf* at lines 1799–1803a and 3021b–27. In the first passage, Beowulf sleeps in on the morning after his victory over Grendel’s mother “until the black raven, blithe-hearted, announced the joy of heaven.” In the second passage, the bird rejoices in the morning not at the coming of day *per se*, but in anticipation of a feast on slain warriors during it. This scenario is imagined by the Geatish messenger after Beowulf’s death, who describes men roused from sleep by the sound of “the dark raven, eager for doomed men, [one who] will have much to say to the eagle about how he fared at the feasting while ravaging corpses with the wolf.” Harris traces this motif complex ultimately to archaic Celtic belief, a tradition rich in “avian-form war goddesses” (15).

John William Sutton compares the figures of “Beowulf and Holofernes” in chapter two of his *Death and Violence in Old and Middle English Literature* (Lewiston: Edwin Mellon), 45–73. In particular, Sutton notes that *Beowulf* and *Judith*, the two final poems in the Nowell Codex of Cotton Vitellius A.xv, present as their “climactic moment a long, elaborate depiction of a warrior’s death” (45). Sutton argues that the Geatish king’s fight against the dragon is not a reckless or foolish expression

of hubris, “a tragic miscalculation,” but rather “a deliberate decision to face the inevitability of death on his own terms—not to fade away like Hrothgar, but to die as a hero should” (60–61). This assertion of “personal agency” in the face of death is different from arrogant pride. The poet conveys that his character has chosen a “good death” (55) by allowing him the knowledge that he dies with his *lof* ‘good reputation’ intact, a prize more precious to him than life (cf. line 3182b, where the hero is said to be *lofgeornost* ‘most eager for *lof*'). Beowulf’s end is thus personally “triumphant” (45), in spite of the fact that his long protection of his people will now tragically “be undone” by the Geats themselves, who fail “to heed his wishes,” that is, to use the dragon’s wealth to purchase peace and friendship with their enemies (72). In contrast to Beowulf, Holofernes in *Judith* is shown to have lost control of his passions, his reputation and his life. The Hebrew heroine decapitates Holofernes while he is passively lying in a drunken stupor, which Sutton, following Olsen (1982), finds to be “a symbolic rape” (66–67) and “arguably the most humiliating death” in all of medieval English literature (45). He concludes that the Anglo-Saxon poets of *Beowulf* and *Judith* both have similar views of heroism, but in subsequent chapters Sutton goes on to explore how later Middle English poets stage the death of great warriors like King Arthur “ultimately to raise questions about the very nature of the heroic ethos itself” (72–73).

William Sayers explores the symbolic affinity between “Grendel’s Mother (*Beowulf*) and the Celtic Sovereignty Goddess,” *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 35: 31–52. He argues that Grendel and his mother should be seen as “marshals of the Otherworld” (48), who represent those supernatural powers embodied in the land that reward just kingship with peace and prosperity but alternatively bring terror and destruction to a country governed by a weak, unjust, or otherwise illegitimate monarch. Hrothgar is just such a corrupt king, Sayers argues. He has so sinned against the land he rules that it rises against him in a “monstrous hyperphagy” (46), manifested as a male son who is cognate with the Man of the Woods or Lord of the Beasts in Welsh and Irish narratives, and an earth-mother or sovereignty goddess who is an embodiment of the land and “true arbiter of royal adequacy” in archaic Celtic tradition (45). She manifests herself in various hostile forms as the *Morrígan* ‘Great Queen,’ *Badb* ‘Scald Crow,’ or *Nemain* ‘Panic, Terror.’ Even the hero Beowulf cannot provide more than temporary relief from this double nemesis that Hrothgar’s own royal inadequacy has precipitated. Indeed, the legitimacy of Beowulf’s own later accession to the throne of the Geats as maternal

cousin to Hygelac's son Heardred is similarly dubious, Sayers believes. Beowulf's fifty years of kingship is casually quantified and dismissed in a single half-line (2209a). According to Sayers, his rule is so weak and fragile that it takes only the theft of a single cup by a random thief to provoke the "telluric force" that resides in the earth, which then performs yet another salutary cleansing, this time in the shape a fire-breathing dragon who incinerates the corrupt king's hall and destroys him personally, thus enabling a new beginning to arise from the ashes of his pyre.

Dennis Cronan considers "*Beowulf*, the Gaels, and the Recovery of the Pre-Conversion Past," *Anglo-Saxon* 1: 137–80. He adduces a number of Irish texts from the late seventh through the early ninth century that illustrate techniques of coordinating pre-Christian native tradition with biblical history, especially the Old Testament, and of rehabilitating pagan heroes for a medieval Christian audience. The first part of this process in *Beowulf* is seen in Hrothgar's scop's account of God's creation of the world, the poet's identification of Grendel and his mother as descendents of Cain, and allusions to a great Flood—all references to the Book of Genesis. For his second point, Cronan follows Donahue (1949–51 and 1965) in seeing Hrothgar and Beowulf as "virtuous monotheists who recognize and acknowledge [the Christian] God, much as the early Patriarchs did, and who honour and thank God—just as, according to Paul [in Romans 1:19–20], the Gentiles who perceive His presence through His Creation should do" (179). This characterization of Hrothgar and Beowulf parallels depictions of several pre-Christian Irish kings in the *Lebor na hUidre* 'Book of the Dun Cow' (compiled 1106), who find faith in the one true God through their observation of the natural world. For instance, well before the coming of St. Patrick to Ireland, Cormac mac Airt is made to say "that he would not worship stones or trees but would worship the one who had made them and was lord behind every creature, namely the one mighty Lord God who had fashioned creation, it is in him he would believe" (translated McCone [1990], quoted 145). While the Irish texts are somewhat more explicit than *Beowulf* in affirming the spiritual salvation of these pre-Conversion figures, Cronan believes that the Old English poem "comes close to asserting that these monotheists are saved, although the issue is treated with a discretion which stops short of overt assertion" (179). For example, the hero's soul at death departs from his breast to seek *sodfæstra dom* (line 2820b), a controversial phrase that Cronan would render "the glory of the righteous," which to him clearly indicates the salvation of the hero. Cronan notes, in

addition, that the *Beowulf* poet seems especially concerned to suggest this kind of retroactive beatitude for ancestral kings like Scyld of the Danes, who is said to pass at death *on Frean wære* 'into the Lord's protection' (l. 27b), and Hrethel of the Geats, who *Godes leoht geceas* 'chose God's light' (l. 2469b). Cronan accepts Thomas Hill's explanation (1988) that the *Beowulf* poet proffers these positive but inexplicit "metaphysical" asseverations, the truth of which he cannot claim to know for certain, in order to affirm divine approval for the kind of traditional dynastic kingship that figures like Scyld and Hrethel represent for him (178). The poet wishes to intimate "something like salvation" for good kings who are "under the special protection of God" as a reward for furthering his political will on earth (178). In "a poem which stresses reciprocity as much as this one does, there can be no doubt that those who have served God well, as both Beowulf and Scyld have, will be served by God in turn and maintained in his keeping, however we choose to imagine such a state" (177). Cronan believes these strategies of assimilating important figures from the pagan past to the Christian view of history may have been communicated from Ireland to Anglo-Saxon England either orally or through Hiberno-Latin texts.

In *Myth in Early Northwest Europe*, ed. Glosecki (see sec. 4a), 197–224, Marijane Osborn writes on "Manipulating Waterfalls: Mythic Places in *Beowulf* and *Grettissaga*," Lawrence and Purnell." She suggests that the "possible relationship" between the Old English poem and the Icelandic saga can be illustrated by the "provable relationship" between the two modern English narratives: D. H. Lawrence's "The Woman Who Rode Away" (1924) and Idella Purnell's *The Forbidden City* (1932). Purnell's novel is a direct response to Lawrence's short story, in which she adapts that author's scene of a cave behind a waterfall, based on a site he actually knew in New Mexico, to her own otherwise realistic description of a Mexican landscape in which there was no subterranean waterfall "in reality" (199). Similarly, Osborn believes that a common folktale motif in the "two-troll" variant of Aarne-Thompson's tale type 301 influenced the scenes of falling water in both *Beowulf* and *Grettissaga*. In the latter we find a cave behind a waterfall flowing into a gorge, while in the former the *topos* is conceived as "a mountain-stream that departs under the mists of promontories down under the earth" (ll. 1359b–61), a conception confirmed when Beowulf reports to king Hygelac that the body of Hrothgar's thegn Æschere had been dragged *under firgenstream* 'under a mountain-stream' (l. 2128b). Osborn sees the *Beowulf* poet's manipulation of this topography as a

“balancing act” between invoking the generic troll home of pre-Christian tradition and his desire to associate the monster’s lair “with the Christian Hell” (213). The authors of the two medieval works adapt a traditional “place”—the troll cave under or behind flowing water—to their respective audience’s generic expectations, just as the two modern authors manipulate waterfall settings to their own artistic agendas.

Frederick M. Biggs discusses “*The Dream of the Rood* and *Guthlac B* as a Literary Context for the Monsters in *Beowulf*” in *Text, Image, Interpretation*, ed. Minnis and Roberts (see sec. 2), 289–301. He argues that in each work the poet uses levels of discourse that an original audience of monastic readers would have immediately recognized as purely symbolic, even though the concepts embodied in the monsters of *Beowulf* are more political than the religious personifications of the other two poems. In *The Dream of the Rood*, for instance, the poem has at its center the obvious poetic fiction of an inanimate character, the Cross, who presents to the Dreamer its personal autobiography. In addition, when the Cross is buried for three hundred years, but then exhumed and glorified, a Christian monk would have readily seen in this event an allegorical reference to the three-day burial and resurrection of Christ. Biggs finds a similar kind of allegory in *Guthlac B*, in which the saint’s servant and sister remain nameless, “suggesting that they represent concepts rather than people” (295). After Guthlac’s death, his grieving servant personifies the saint’s cast-off body longing for its soul, while the hopeful sister figures Guthlac’s faith that body and soul will someday be reunited at the Resurrection. In just this way, Biggs believes Grendel and his mother would have been seen as symbolic projections of the fratricide and vengeance they illustrate, respectively, in the narrative. He thus challenges Orchard’s view (2003) that some descendants of Cain survived the Flood because they were aquatic or amphibious, arguing that the *Beowulf* poet must certainly have known Genesis 7:22 in which God is said explicitly to destroy all of mankind, except for Noah and his family in the Ark. Grendel is “like Cain” in spirit, rather than physically descended from him (299), a figural representation of the kind of kindred violence the poet associates with a Germanic system of ætheling competition that plagues the Danish royal family. Grendel’s mother, figures the revenge imperative *per se*, another danger lying in wait for the Scylding dynasty with the renewal of violence by Hrothgar’s son-in-law Ingeld. The lone dragon, on the other hand, is a monster that personifies the weaknesses of the newer system of primogeniture when a king is without an heir. The “dragon’s threat is its

singleness, a counterpart for the solitary king unable to provide a successor” (301).

Following Earl Anderson (1981), Hagop Gulludjian writes “On Armenian Parallels to *Beowulf*,” *Journal of the Society for Armenian Studies* 16: 73–87, comparing particular works like the anonymous epic *Sasma Dzerer* and Grigor Narekats’i’s tenth-century *Matean Oghbergut’ean* to the Old English poem. Gulludjian does not claim a direct connection between the two traditions, but rather undertakes a point-for-point comparison for the purpose of mutual illumination on matters such as audience, orality, techniques of narration, lexical originality, use of speeches and humor, the symbolic function of weapons, and typological reflections of pagan divinities in human heroes, to mention just a few of the categories he addresses. Gulludjian notes, for instance, that *Beowulf* confronts challenges of increasing difficulty throughout the poem, whereas the relative strength of Armenian heroes tends increase throughout their careers, though arguably at “the expense of their prudence and good judgment” (78). Most significantly, however, both poems conclude with a poignant end of an era: *Beowulf*’s death intimates the ultimate demise of the Geats and of the old world of pre-Christian heroic values; Mher, the last hero of *Sasma Dzerer*, “is locked in a cave because the world cannot endure the weight of a giant-hero anymore” (86). But Mher’s imprisonment contains a germ of hope: it may mark the end of an age, but retains the promise of “future liberation” and “potentiality” (86) that reflects an optimistic “Armenian ethos,” which has inspired the “stubborn and strange survival” of that people since their “country’s division in the 4th century” (87).

In *NM* 108: 151–79, Matti Rissanen introduces a reprinting of Tauno F. Mustanoja’s 1967 “The Unnamed Woman’s Song of Mourning over *Beowulf* and the Tradition of Ritual Lamentation.” Rissanen neatly summarizes the range of possibilities that have been suggested for the identity or function of this character presented in lines 3150–3155a of the poem: is she “*Beowulf*’s widow? King Hygelac’s widow Hygd? *Beowulf*’s concubine? A young maiden to be ceremonially burnt with *Beowulf*’s body, or a woman assisting in this sacrificial ceremony? A professional mourner performing ritual lamentations in funerals?” (151). Mustanoja pressed this last possibility based upon his acquaintance with a tradition of ritual mourning surviving into twentieth-century eastern European lands in the person of Elmi Tsokkinen, a famous Finnish funeral singer from Karelia who died in 1979.

Robin Norris considers “Mourning Rites: *Beowulf*, the *Iliad*, and the War in Iraq,” *Journal of Narrative*

Theory 37: 276–95, arguing that one function of heroic poetry is to help “process the magnitude of the loss of human life entailed in war” (276). The poets of the *Iliad* and *Beowulf* create a community of shared mourning, both among the characters within the poems and with members of the poems’ audience. For instance, we are led to empathize with Achilles over the death of Patroclus in the *Iliad* and for the Geatish “woman who bemoans her fate at Beowulf’s pyre” in the Old English poem (277). In Freudian terms, this focused lamentation serves to release or “decathect” feelings for a person who has died in order to release the mourner from a fixation on the past in which the deceased was still living to return him or her to a life in the present where these loved ones are gone. Warriors like Beowulf or Achilles care less about the dead past than about their glorious future, especially their own heroic reputation that will live on in the memories of those survivors who mourn them. Following Rosenblatt (1976), Norris understands Beowulf’s funeral to last twenty days, which functions as a substantial ceremonial decathexis for the Geats, setting a limit on the grieving process and forcing the survivors to face their current situation without their king. This kind of formal mourning is absolutely necessary, Norris believes—a “right” as well as a “rite”—but one which can be disrupted by enemies like Grendel’s mother, who not only kills Æschere, but also drags away his corpse in order to rob Hrothgar of his ability to mourn his old companion. In the *Iliad*, Achilles similarly refuses proper burial to Hector, doing even greater damage to the Trojans than killing their champion. Norris finds a parallel impulse in the protests intended to disrupt military funerals for American soldiers fallen in Iraq; she compares the twelve warriors who ride their horses around Beowulf’s barrow to the Patriot Guard Riders, military veterans who encircle the mourners of the Iraq war dead on their motorcycles in order to protect them from protestors of the war. Both encircling groups secure an adequate completion of the mourning process.

CD

Toshiyuki Takamiya looks “Beyond the Medieval Period and Medievalism,” *The Rising Generation* 153: 358–63 (in Japanese), describing how the English scholar Frederick York Powell (1850–1904) came to notice similarities between *Beowulf* and the Japanese epic, *Expedition of Watanabe-no-Tsuna*. Powell would have become acquainted with this latter narrative through the *ukiyo*e or woodblock prints and paintings of Katsushika Hokusai (1760–1849), which depict the subjugation of an ogre by the legendary samurai

Watanabe-no-Tsuna, who lived from 953 to 1025. Takamiya notes that in *Crossing the Bridge* (2000), Barbara Stevenson and Cynthia Ho compare women writers from medieval Europe and the Heian period of Japan (traditionally dated between 794 and 1185), but include no contribution by Japanese medievalists. Takamiya thus argues the need for more such comparative studies among Japanese scholars of medieval literature.

JT

Criticism

In the published version of her April 13th presidential address to the Medieval Academy, Roberta Frank memorializes “A Scandal in Toronto: *The Dating of ‘Beowulf’* a Quarter Century On,” *Speculum* 82: 843–64. She refers to a conference on the date of the poem’s composition held at the University of Toronto from April 20th to 23rd 1980, whose proceedings were edited by Colin Chase (1981; rpt. 1997). Frank describes the disruption wrought by the linguistic, literary, and historical forensics of the conference participants, of whom she was one, on what had generally come to be the received dating of *Beowulf* to the “Age of Bede” in the later seventh or earlier eighth centuries. The Toronto conference re-opened a full range of possibilities from the seventh to the earlier eleventh centuries, so that there is now no scholarly consensus as to when this poem was first composed during almost half a millennium in Anglo-Saxon England. Frank fears, however, that there is a movement afoot to restore something of the earlier orthodoxy on metrical and linguistic grounds, led by Robert D. Fulk, one of the editors of the new revised edition of *Klaeber’s ‘Beowulf’* (2008) and the author of several related articles summarized above. Alluding to Arthur Conan Doyle’s *A Scandal in Bohemia* (1891) and casting herself as a plodding but sensible Dr. Watson to an ingenious but theory-driven Sherlock Holmes, Frank urges that our current uncertainty over the date of the poem’s composition, however uncomfortable, is not an unfortunate embarrassment to *Beowulf* scholarship that undermines further productive work on the poem. Rather, she insists that the “1981 scandal in Toronto got us down and dirty at the exposed coal-face of our field, tapping at its precarious foundations, doing work that needed to be done and that continues to be worth doing,” even as the poem resists the efforts of our combined “intelligence quite successfully” (864).

John Hill surveys “General Trends in *Beowulf* Studies,” for Blackwell’s *Literature Compass* 4: 66–88 (online), describing the various kinds of poem *Beowulf*

is perceived to be through the lenses of different contemporary literary theories. There is (1) “the archaic *Beowulf*,” which sees in the poem a “social world from an anthropologically remote time and place”; (2) “the feminist *Beowulf*,” which examines the role and autonomy of female characters in the poem, or lack thereof; (3) “the psychological *Beowulf*,” where characters and events are interpreted as reflecting stages of personal growth or projections of inner states of mind; (4) “a monster-studies *Beowulf*,” where the symbolic resonance of the evil creatures is explored in great detail; (5) an “oral-traditional *Beowulf*,” which examines these vernacular tales of ancestral peoples for their relevance to developing political identities in Anglo-Saxon England; (6) “the moral *Beowulf*,” which focuses on the social values being promoted or critiqued by the poet; (7) “the comical *Beowulf*,” which attends to the humor latent in the poem’s various ironies and laconic understatements; and (8) “the dragon-inhabited *Beowulf*” (a sub-class of the “monster-studies *Beowulf*”), in which the literary and folkloric context of the poem’s treatment of this mythical creature is examined. Hill’s review concludes with an approach currently underway by himself and some others, like David Howlett (1995/1997), based on the surmise that *Beowulf* “may in fact be formed deeply according to some arithmetical or geometrical scheme,” in accordance with an early medieval insular numerical aesthetic.

Geoffrey Russom looks at “The Center of *Beowulf*,” in *Myth in Early Northwest Europe*, ed. Glosecki (see sec. 4.a), 225–40. Following Tolkien (1936), Taylor (1966), and Dronke (1969), the author sees the trajectory of the poem’s plot as parallel to that of “Norse mythic history” in which “the traditional center” of the narrative is “a long-lasting feud with otherworldly creatures that threaten” the “middle-enclosure” or central habitation of human beings, called *Miðgarðr* in Old Norse and *middangeard* in Old English, encompassed on all sides by the ocean (226). The hero’s fight with Grendel’s mother takes place below the bottom of this *mere* ‘sea,’ which meaning Russom prefers to its usual rendering as a “mere, pool, or lake” set in high country, which was offered by Klaeber in his Glossary (1950). Russom believes Klaeber misunderstood the associated topographical term *firgen* in its various spellings as “mountain.” In his view, Grendel’s *mere* is not located below a *firgenstream* ‘mountain-stream, waterfall’ (l. 1359b), but below the shore-cliffs of *middangeard* under the “ocean, ocean current,’ which is the normal meaning of *firgenstream* everywhere else in Old English poetry. Russom thus proposes that the Grendel-kin are imagined physically to live in a subaqueous hell into which all

the rivers of middle-earth discharge their waters. This underworld is very similar to that imagined by Norse and indeed some classical writers, as well as the Anglo-Saxon author of the seventeenth Blicking homily, whose depiction of hell Russom admits may have been influenced by *Beowulf* itself. Grendel is thus “quite literally a *fēond on helle* ‘fiend in hell’ (l. 101b); a *helrūne* ‘one versed in the mysteries of hell’ (l. 163a); a *helle hæft* ‘slave of hell’ (line 788a); and a *helle gāst* ‘spirit of hell’ (line 1274a),” that is, an actual demon from the infernal world who roams forth on earth as a *fēond mancynnes* ‘enemy of mankind’ (l. 164b *et passim*; p. 232).

In the same collection, Craig R. Davis (the present reviewer) considers “Theories of History in Traditional Plots,” 31–45, with special attention to the way the *Beowulf* poet adduces and tests competing explanations of the way the world works through time. Davis begins with Aristotle’s idea that the deep structure of epic and tragic plots formulate true historical processes, whatever the truth or falsehood of their particular claims about past events. Davis next recruits modern anthropologists and theorists of oral narrative to show that far from being universal, as Aristotle thought, these “patterns of eventuality” are quite specific to individual traditions of narration: “Different cultures, different historicities,” observes Marshall Sahlins of the narrative traditions of various island groups in early modern Polynesia [1985, p. x],” that is, “different formulations of what constitutes a credible and significant narrative” (34). But oral storytellers and poets are not passive purveyors of tradition, but rather actively scrutinize and rethink the validity of the stories they retell: “The seeing eye is the organ of tradition,” argues Franz Boas of Kwakiutl storytellers in the Pacific Northwest of America (quoted 36): “a performer’s own intelligence of the world is the instrument through which traditional narrative is exercised and expressed” (36). Davis argues that the plots preserved in *Beowulf*, which were generated in a late pagan ideological milieu, are adapted by the poet whenever possible to a Christian interpretation of how and why things happen in the poem. But in concluding his story, Davis believes that the *Beowulf* poet “simply ignores a biblical explanation of national disaster”: “The Geats themselves do not deserve destruction, however poor a show they made of standing by their king. But they do not *not* deserve destruction either . . . The Geats will suffer neither the just punishment of the wicked nor the stern correction of the elect. Instead, the poet deliberately ambiguates the rights and wrongs of the Geatish-Swedish feud through multiple moral equivalencies: faults on both sides, we are made to realize. He thus de-moralizes our attitude toward the

doomed Geats as he forces us to contemplate, through the lament of the Geatish woman by Beowulf's pyre, what is store for them now: invasion, slaughter, terror, humiliation, captivity—death as a nation (lines 3150–55a)...This is what happens to all peoples eventually, the poet implies, to all *people*. This is just the way things always turn out in the traditional plot of history" (author's emphasis, 43). Davis concludes that the "theory of history invoked in the death of Beowulf, and in the imminent demise of his people, is thus neither a tired reflex of an archaic Germanic fatalism nor a particularly cogent assimilation of that tradition to Christian principles of eventuality. It is instead the product of hard thought and active choice on the part of the poet. The *Beowulf* poet chose this ending among competing possibilities because he thought it showed the way the world really works, even for the strongest, bravest and best-hearted of heroes" (43–44).

Alexander M. Bruce asks whether we can interpret "*Beowulf* 1366a: *Fyr on flode* ['Fire on the water'] as the *aurora borealis* ['northern dawn']?" *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen* 159: 105–09. He notes the usually negative or portentous significance of the Northern Lights in Scandinavian and other sub-Arctic traditions, and assumes that this natural phenomenon, which is never explicitly mentioned in Anglo-Saxon sources, must have held a similar dire purport for Old English poets. He suggests that this *niðwundor* 'dreadful marvel' (l. 1365b), which flames over the waters of Grendel's mere by night, marks the frontier between *middangeard*—the world of human habitation—and a watery Otherworld or Outerworld inhabited by hostile monsters.

Oren Falk sees a similar frontier between worlds in the meaning of two terms, *hwil dæg* 'space of a day, part of a day' and *grundwong* 'ground-plain, (level) place on the ground, bottom' in "Beowulf's Longest Day: The Amphibious Hero in His Element (*Beowulf*, ll. 1495b–96)," *JEGP* 106: 1–21. In particular, Falk addresses the hero's apparent ability to hold his breath under water for much longer than might plausibly be imagined even of the greatest of human champions: "Then it was the space of a day/part of a day [*hwil dæg*] before he could see the bottom [*grundwong*] (of the mere)." Falk's solution is that the hero should not be thought of as swimming underwater, but rather that he has left the physical realm of earth altogether on a journey to an infernal Otherworld. *Grundwong* in this sense would simply be a general poetic locution for his "destination" or the "place" he was seeking. The compound only appears twice elsewhere in this poem, the next time in the dragon-fight (l. 2588a), where it is used

to indicate both the hero's "position on the ground" in front of the dragon's barrow from which he has vowed not to flee *fotes trem* 'a foot's step' (l. 2525a), but more importantly as a synecdoche for his "place on earth" as a live human being from which he must now "against his will take up his dwelling elsewhere, as must everyone leave behind his loaned days" (ll. 2589–91a). The third and final use of *grundwong* in *Beowulf* occurs at line 2770a, referring to the interior of the dragon's barrow where, Falk argues, it "emblemizes" not an Otherworld destination as in the mere episode, but rather the contrary, that is, the temporal realm of living men in *middangeard*, signifying "Beowulf's last contribution to the expansion of Geatish territory" on earth (15).

Benjamin Slade joins Russom and Bruce in seeing a pre-Christian conceptual scheme underlying the poet's adaptation of biblical story, which he explains in light of Vedic religious tradition in "*Untydras ealle*: Grendel, Cain, and Vrtra: Indo-European *sruti* and Christian *smrti* in *Beowulf*," *In Geardagum* 27: 1–32. Slade reprises his argument of 2004 in which he introduces two terms from Sanskrit to differentiate registers of archaic tradition: (1) *sruti* 'what is heard', that is, atemporal myths of religious truth revealed in the *Vedas* and *Upanishads*, and (2) *smrti* 'what is remembered', or legends of the past recounted in poems like the *Mahabharata* and *Ramayana*. These epic narratives, recounted by legendary human poets—Vyasa and Valmiki, respectively—are thought to be contingent upon human memory and individual expression, and thus of secondary authority: they may be elaborated or adapted in any number of variant versions by different "singers of tales." Slade suggests that the *Beowulf* poet viewed the biblical stories he learned from the Old Testament as just this kind of plausible *smrti*, a version of traditional historical information that he sought to coordinate with the truly sacred narratives or *sruti* of ancient pre-Christian mythology. In particular, the story of a great Flood in the poem, Slade argues, ultimately derives not from Genesis 6, but is rather a pagan cosmogonic myth reflected also in the slaying of Ymir in Snorri's *Edda* or of Vrtra in the *Rig Veda*, an event in which *untydras ealle* 'all the misbegotten' creatures of a race of giants (l. 111) are destroyed in a violent flood of blood (becoming seawater) that nonetheless spares one family of monstrous survivors. The *Beowulf* poet conflates this Indo-European *sruti* with the Christian *smrti* of Noah's Flood as a kind of learned rationalization.

In "Winter in Heorot: Looking at Anglo-Saxon Perceptions of Age and Kingship through the Character of Hrothgar," in *Old Age in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance: Interdisciplinary Approaches to a*

Neglected Topic, ed. Albrecht Classen, *Fundamentals of Medieval and Early Modern Culture 2* (Berlin: de Gruyter), 103–20, Britt C. L. Rothausser proposes that many modern critics of *Beowulf* have misinterpreted the Danish king's failure to protect his people against Grendel as the result of political weakness, personal lassitude, or worse. Rothausser argues, to the contrary, that Grendel's twelve-year success against Hrothgar is a pure accident of timing. According to the seventh-century *Etymologiae* of Isidore of Seville, the maturity or fifth age of man ranges from his fiftieth to his seventieth year, during which decades his physical strength steadily declines until he enters his "sixth" or "old age," which concludes indeterminately with decrepitude and death. In his eighth-century *De Temporum Ratione*, Bede invokes a seasonal version of the classical theory of humors to assert that the hot, dry cholers of summer predominate in young people, making them bold and active, while the cold, moist phlegms of winter prevail in old people, making them "sluggish, sleepy, and forgetful" (quoted 106). The *Beowulf* poet accepts this tiredness of the aged as a natural and inevitable process, the *atol ylđo* 'terrifying old age' (l. 1756a) which Hrothgar himself lists among the evils that will separate the hero from his strength. The poet thus does not blame Hrothgar for his infirmity, but concludes about this character that he was *an cyning / æghwæs orleahrtre, oþ þæt hine ylđo benam / mægenes wynnum, se þe oft manegum scod* 'a king blameless in every way until old age, which has harmed so many, robbed him of the joys of his strength' (1885b–87).

CD

Tsunenori Karibe asks, "What Is the Intention of 'Hrothgar's Sermon' in *Beowulf*?" in the *Bulletin of Niigata Univ. of International and Information Studies* 10: 9–16 (in Japanese), re-examining lines 1700–84, where the king urges upon Beowulf the dangers of pride soon after the hero has returned victorious from the monster-mere. Karibe argues that the long didactic homily provides a way for Hrothgar to reassert his dignity as king, which has been undermined by the hero's victory over Grendel and his mother. The author supplies a facing line-by-line translation into Japanese of the relevant passage.

JT

Following Edward B. Irving, Jr., *Rereading Beowulf* (1989), Horace Jeffery Hodges finds a heterodox theological suggestion in the poet's treatment of "Cain's Fratricide: Original Violence as 'Original Sin' in *Beowulf*," *Medieval and Early Modern English Studies* 15: 31–56.

Hodges suggests that in order to stress the sanctity of kinship and the evil of kin-slaying the poet chooses to ignore Adam and Eve's eating of the fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil in his frequent allusions to the Book of Genesis. Instead, Cain's killing of Abel is presented as the beginning of evil on earth, parallel to similar constructions of this primordial sin in *Genesis A and B*, and *Maxims I*.

In "The Fates of Men in *Beowulf*," included in the festschrift for Tom Hill cited above, 26–51, James H. Morey plays upon the title of the gnomic poem known familiarly as "The Fates" or "Fortunes of Men" in *The Exeter Book*. Here, Morey lists the fates or manner of death—stated, implied, or unspecified—of every holder of a royal throne in *Beowulf* (figure 1, p. 27). He discovers that Swedish and Geatish monarchs generally "meet violent ends," whereas the way Danish kings die, except for Scyld and Heremod, is usually left unstated (26). One reason for this discrepancy in the case of the Geats, Morey suggests, is that the poet is anxious to assert both the quality of his hero's character and the legitimacy of his claim to the Geatish throne. Direct father-to-son primogeniture is early established as the ideal kind of succession in *Beowulf*, as when God grants to Scyld Scefing an heir of his body in lines twelve to twenty-five; it is also found in the expression of the hope, disappointed in the unworthy Heremod, that a "prince's son should prosper, receive his father's rank, rule his people" (ll. 910–11). The poet troubles to demonstrate Beowulf's respect for primogeniture after Hygelac's death when he declines the throne offered him by the queen Hygd, mother of his cousin Heardred. The poet further describes in detail the deaths of every other ætheling of the Geatish royal family—Hrethel, Herebeald, Hæthcyn, Hygelac, and Heardred—in order to make it absolutely clear that there is no other legitimate pretender of his line left but Beowulf to rule. Hrothgar, on the other hand, takes over the throne of Denmark from his older brother Heorogar at the expense of his nephew Heoroweward, neither of whose fates is described. Yet, the hero Beowulf is made explicitly to accuse Hrothgar's *ðyle* 'spokesman' of fratricide in lines 587–89, a charge later repeated by the poet himself in lines 1167b–68a, confirming that this minister of the Danish king "had not been merciful to his kinsman at the sword-play." In the manuscript the name of this character is spelled *Hunferth*, in which aspirated form it alliterates with that of æthelings of the Scylding royal family: Healfdene, Heorogar, Hrothgar, Halga, Heoroweward, Hrothulf, Hrethric, and Hrothmund. Morey believes that *Hunferth*, too, must belong to this ruling clan and notes his special intimacy with Hrothgar and Hrothulf,

revealed by his seat of honor at their feet. While Morey does not believe Hrothgar should be seen as personally complicit in his older brother's death, the king is nonetheless the direct beneficiary of both Heorogar's unexplained demise and the disappearance of his nephew Heorowearð from the expected line of succession. Morey's conclusion is that we should understand Hunferth as having preemptively paved the way for his lord and kinsman Hrothgar to take the throne by removing other members of the royal family who had precedence over him. How can we otherwise account for the deep confidence Hrothgar places in the courage and loyalty of this acknowledged fratricide? What else can explain Grendel's successful haunting of Hrothgar's kingdom, a continuing affliction for which Beowulf himself holds Hunferth personally responsible in lines 590 to 601a? "The answer," Morey proposes, is that Hrothgar owes "his kingship to the kin-slayer who sits at his feet" (43). By accepting Hunferth's murderous service, Hrothgar has brought down a curse upon his house, manifested in the depredations of a demonic revenant descended from the primordial kin-slayer Cain. This supernatural visitation reveals "the magnitude of the crime" through which the king has come to power (43).

In "Hrothulf: A Richard III, or an Alfred the Great?" *SP* 104: 175–98, William Cooke challenges the "received dogma" that certain allusions to the future of the Scylding dynasty imply that Hrothulf and Hrothgar quarreled or "that Hrothulf usurped the Danish throne after his uncle Hrothgar's death and either killed Hrothgar's sons or drove them into exile" (175). Cooke argues that these scenarios "have no good foundation in the text, contradict the Scandinavian traditions that give us our only recourse for elucidating it, and flow from ignorance of succession customs in Anglo-Saxon England and old Germanic kingdoms in general" (175). Even *Widsith*, our only other Old English source for these characters, merely states that "Hrothwulf [= Hrothulf] and Hrothgar, paternal kinsmen, observed their friendship together for the longest time, after they drove off the raiding people and crushed Ingeld's attack, cut down at Heorot the force of the Heathobeards" (ll. 45–49). Icelandic sources show a good King Hrólfr (= Hrothulf) peacefully succeeding Hróarr (= Hrothgar) without any conflict with his sons. Saxo Grammaticus reports that a sonless Rolf (= Hrothulf) was killed by another cousin Hiarwartus (= Heorowearð), who was himself soon dispatched by one of Rolf's loyal retainers and succeeded "peacefully" by the uninvolved and famously generous king Hrærekr (= Hrethric). Cooke suggests that it is his cousin Heorowearð's later attack on the legitimate king Hrothulf to which the *Beowulf*

poet alludes, when he says that the Scylding royals had not yet committed *facenstafas* 'treacherous deeds' (ll. 1018b–19). In addition, Cooke believes the poet is referring not to Hrothulf and Hrothgar, but to Hrothulf and Wealhtheow when he says, *þa gyt wæs hiera sib ætgædere, æghwylc oðrum trywe*, "at that time their friendship was still close, each true to the other" (ll. 1164b–65a). Following Davis (1996), Cooke sees the queen as dangerously pressing the claims of her sons, "the only person whom the poet depicts as actually disturbing the joy and concord at the feast in Heorot" (182). In this reading, Wealhtheow has seized upon Hrothgar's apparent "adoption" of the hero in lines 949b–950 as a pretext, which Cooke believes she could not be taking seriously, in order to recruit Beowulf's support for her sons against the senior ætheling and heir apparent Hrothulf, who is shown already "presiding jointly with Hrothgar" (178): "in the only two places where he appears in *Beowulf* [ll. 1014b–17a and 1163b–64a] the poet gives [Hrothulf] nothing but praise, so we have no secure grounds for doubting that the poet shared his northern counterparts' esteem for" Hrothgar's successor on the throne of Denmark (196). Hrothulf is thus not at all "the Richard III of the Heroic Age" (183), but more like King Alfred, a senior male paternal relative, who came to throne of the West Saxons peacefully and legitimately after the death of his brother Æthelred in 871 in the traditional manner of Germanic ætheling succession.

In the essay following Cooke's in *SP* 104: 199–226, Michael D.C. Drout analyzes the competing criteria for determining royal succession in "Blood and Deeds: The Inheritance Systems in *Beowulf*." The most important criterion for the inheritance of wealth and kingship, of course, is a direct blood relationship between the potential heir and a departed parent or very close kinsman; the second criterion is publicly demonstrated ability or achieved status, imagined in its most extreme form in the *niwe sibbe* 'new kinship' (l. 949a) which Hrothgar offers to Beowulf for killing Grendel, stating: "There will be no lack to you of the desirable things in the world that I have in my possession" (ll. 949b–50). One of those desirable things, of course, is royal authority as king of the Danes. Such "inheritance by deeds is the transfer of goods, power, or identity across generational boundaries in which the transfer is based not on the genetic relationship of two individuals but upon the performance of certain culturally valued behaviors" (207). Drout believes Wealhtheow finds this new notional kinship a threat to the inheritance prospects of her sons Hrethric and Hrothmund (ll. 1175–80a). She is not just pretending to be worried, as Cooke suggests,

but seriously alarmed. On the other hand, Drout does not find Wealhtheow challenging the claims of Hrothgar's blood-nephew Hrothulf over those of the junior æthelings, her sons. Rather, she wisely calculates that Hrothulf's friendly protection of his younger cousins is their best chance for future prosperity, recognizing that blood ties, while necessary for inheritance, are simply "not enough" (201) to secure the kingship when it can be claimed both by blood and superior competence or priority. The poet thus offers a hybrid system of inheritance as the strongest and most promising for stable succession, where the legitimacy bestowed by blood relationship is confirmed by individual capacity as demonstrated by worthy deeds. This system is magnificently illustrated when the wise champion Beowulf succeeds his less effective maternal cousin Heardred as king of the Geats and rules successfully for fifty years. Yet, in the end, the *Beowulf* poet shows that even a system based upon both blood descent and personal merit must still ultimately fail through individual mortality and lack of appropriate kinsmen, as does the Hrethling dynasty of the Geats at the inevitable death of the sonless Beowulf, whether "the dragon [or] old age or some other foe would have ended his reign" (226).

Nicola Zocco cross-examines the characters in "The Episode of Finn in *Beowulf*: Discharging Hengest," *Linguistica e Filologia* 24: 65–83, that is, discharging Hengest from any guilt he might be seen to incur from his behavior toward Finn in the tale that Hrothgar's *scop* recounts in lines 1063 to 1159a. Zocco observes that Hengest only promised to observe the peace compact under very specific conditions, but never offered fealty to Finn himself. She suggests that Guthlaf and Osulf were not present at the agreement nor occupants of Finn's hall during the winter Hengest was forced to spend in Frisia, but that they arrived in the spring after a sea-journey from Denmark, "proclaiming their grief" in public and "blaming" Finn for "their share of sorrows" in his slaying of their lord Hnæf and his companions (ll. 1149–50a). Zocco argues that Hengest, who had been brooding vengefully on his predicament and contemplating ways to get out of his vow in lines 1137b–41, "wanted and created [this situation] on purpose," allowing the two newcomers to provoke Finn into breaking his part of the deal first. She takes Finn rather than Hengest to be subject of the compound verb in lines 1150b–51a: *ne meahte wæfre mod / forhabban in hreþre* '[Finn] could not restrain the quivering anger in his heart'. The Frisian king, she imagines, has been incited to respond publicly to insulting accusations in his own hall, thus violating his own condition of silence in the matter and bringing upon himself the

renewal of hostilities he had earlier stipulated in lines 1104–06. "Hengest is no traitor at all," Zocco concludes: he does keep his word, but seizes the first opportunity to avenge his lord when Finn is provoked into breaking his (80).

William Cooke explores "Who Cursed Whom, and When? The Cursing of the Hoard and Beowulf's Fate," *MÆ* 76: 207–24. He argues that this curse was not put on the treasure in the distant past by those who had first buried it in the ground, but rather that the Geats themselves, who plunder the dragon's hoard with impunity, place this anathema upon the gold which they subsequently inter with their dead king in his barrow. This dire proscription is mentioned in two separate passages, which Cooke would translate as follows: (1) "Then was that relic fashioned with (such) great skill, the gold of men of long ago, surrounded with a spell, in order that none of mankind might be allowed to reach the chamber of rings unless God himself, the true King of victories (He is the protector of men), granted it to whom He would to open the hoard, even to whatever one seemed fit to Him" (ll. 3051–57); and (2) "So the renowned chieftains who set that [treasure] there decreed it solemnly till the day of doom that the man should be guilty of crimes, shut up in devil's haunts, fast in bonds of hell, punished with evils, who might plunder the spot, unless the one eager for gold had first quite clearly respected the Ruler's favour" (ll. 3069–75). When the poet describes the hoard in lines 2216a and 2276b as "heathen," Cooke believes that the adjective "can only mean that the men who had originally fashioned and gathered the treasures were heathens," since "[e]lsewhere the poet applies 'hæþen' only to Grendel and the faction among Hrothgar's retinue who resorted to sacrificing to idols to avert the ogre's depredations...never to those of his characters who acknowledge the true God" (219). Cooke believes the surviving Geats belong to this latter category and are thus piously anathematizing all those who would disturb their beloved lord's burial chamber without the Christian God's approval.

In "Evil Twins? The Role of the Monsters in *Beowulf*," *Medieval Forum* 6 (January, online), Alexander M. Bruce asks whether the poet imagines the three supernatural creatures in the poem as projections of his hero's darker alter-ego, that is, as externalized embodiments of the evil latent within all human beings. Bruce suggests that the poet intentionally juxtaposes the hero with the monsters in order to suggest a subliminal affinity between them. He argues that "it takes a monster to kill a monster." In particular, Bruce notes that the monstrous strength of both Grendel and Beowulf is equated as that of thirty men; the hero ironically

employs one of the giants' own swords to dispatch Grendel's mother; and Beowulf's fifty-year reign over the Geats corresponds to the dragon's fifty-foot length with which it encompassed and "ruled" its hoard. In addition, as has often been noted before, men and monsters are identified by some of the same terms, the most striking of which is *aglæcean* in line 2592a (and elsewhere with variant spellings), equating both kinds of combatant—monster and hero—as comparable in ferocity (see the summary of Bammesberger, "A Note on *Beowulf*, Lines 642-51A," above). In the specific case of the dragon, both monster and human king respond with equivalent vengefulness to the violation of their "halls." The "victor" Beowulf rejoices in having won the dragon's gold for himself and his people, but they reject this "useless" treasure by reburying it with their dead king in his own barrow. According to Bruce, the hero is thus shown symbolically to supplant as the "owner" of the subterranean hoard the very monster he has just slain, with no obvious benefit to the people he was supposedly trying to protect, since his death leaves them even more vulnerable to their foes than before. Who, then, should be considered the more evil of the twins in the poem, the monsters or the humans? The poet shows that "Grendel can terrorize Heorot and Hrothgar but he does not destroy the hall nor kill Hrothgar: Heorot awaits destruction...that will come in the feud between Hrothgar and his son-in-law Ingeld." Similarly, the dragon "does not destroy the Geats"; that will be the work of their human enemies. "The real monsters—the ones completely beyond our power and control—are the people," Bruce concludes: "the desire of men to kill each other...and a social system which encourages such destruction is more frightening" than any monster the *Beowulf* poet can imagine.

Elizabeth Howard offers a similar point in "The Clothes Make the Man: Transgressive Disrobing and Disarming in *Beowulf*," in *Styling Texts: Dress and Fashion in Literature*, ed. Cynthia Kuhn and Cindy Carlson (Youngstown, NY: Cambria Press), 13-32. She argues that the hero is progressively feminized and "monsterized" during the course of the poem, finally relinquishing not only his masculine weapons and armor, "but also the traits and habits that distinguish humans from other creatures" (14). This process begins when Beowulf renounces fighting Grendel with weapons and other war-gear, lowering "himself to Grendel's monstrous status; he becomes less than human" (19). Below the bottom of the mere, Beowulf's borrowed sword Hrunting, a symbol of his own masculine potency, is completely ineffectual against Grendel's mother. They tussle in a "sexualized" embrace in which she becomes

the real *homo sapiens* or "knowing man," assuming the dominant male penetrative position on top. She thus not only un-mans the hero, "she outmaneuvers Beowulf, out-thinks him, and, frankly, 'out-humans' him" (25). Though Beowulf eventually prevails, it is at the price of his own figurative rape, an emasculation foreshadowed by the loss of Grendel's arm, which signifies both the male monster's and his own "castration" by a dominant female. Beowulf thus proves "impotent as a king" of the Geats (26), one who cannot sire an heir of his body or even command the loyalty of thegns who abandon him as the effeminate "monster he truly has become" (27). Beowulf dies a sterile eunuch leaving behind "no children, no heirs, no legacy, nothing" (30).

Renée R. Trilling observes in "Beyond Abjection: The Problem with Grendel's Mother Again," *Parergon* 24: 1-20, that this figure "transgresses" conventional moral, social, and gender categories—protective mother/murderous monster, just avenger/evil ruler, weaker feminine vessel/fierce masculine warrior. This protean creature reveals the anarchy at the core of human identity, the factiousness and often self-contradiction of social roles, and the ultimate incoherence of all systems of signification. She is thus a semiotic monster, representing "that which exceeds representation" (20) and far more dangerous than Grendel "to the life and well-being of Heorot's inhabitants," since she is "ambiguity incarnate" and "threatens...the very structure of the society Heorot is founded on" (19). The poet in line 1260a refers to this female character with the masculine nominative singular demonstrative pronoun *se* 'that man, the one, he,' parallel to the masculine nominative singular personal pronoun *he* 'he' used by the hero himself of this woman in lines 1392b and 1394b. This semantic slippage suggests to Trilling male anxiety over "female agency" (14), an attempt, especially on the part of the hero, to appropriate the very memory of the menace posed by this woman to the masculinist value system of which he is champion. Beowulf's determined "abjection" of the threat posed to traditional gender norms by Grendel's mother is most clearly revealed not when he swipes off her head with the ancient sword of the giants, but when he seeks out and cuts off the head of her long-dead *male* son as a trophy, rather than simply taking the head of the *woman* who has just come so much closer to killing him: "Were the head of Grendel's mother to adorn the walls of Heorot, the Danes would face a daily reminder of her disruptive power; the trophy would signify, not Beowulf's victory, but the terrifying...possibility of signification outside the symbolic order, of agency beyond masculinity... Leaving Grendel's mother's head behind consigns her

to infamy rather than legend, denying her status as adversary and replacing the memory of her attack with the more acceptable reminder of Grendel's" (18). Trilling notes that in his account to king Hrothgar, the hero glosses over the slippery power of Grendel's mother, even as admits he barely escaped with his life (ll. 1655–58). (Trilling herself ignores Beowulf's more detailed description of his encounter with this woman in his later report to Hygelac, where he again emphasizes how close he came to perishing at her hands). In any case, the author senses a deep-seated masculine anxiety in the poem's depiction of this subversive female character, a desire to suppress even acknowledgment of the threat she presents to our most cherished and fragile of cultural myths, that of a stable, coherent human identity, neatly bifurcated into appropriate male and female roles. Trilling believes that Grendel's mother retains her "power to horrify" (20) even modern readers because she so effectively deconstructs the façade of consistent social values and gender identities, revealing the primordial chaos at the heart of our anxious constructions of what it means to be human, male or female.

J.D. Thayer explores a general principle of extreme negation in the poem which he associates with the intensifying adverbial contraction "*Nealles*: The 'Not at all' of Experimental Elegy in *Beowulf*," *In Geardagum* 27: 33–53. He analyzes three laments from the last third of the poem—"The Lay of the Last Survivor" (ll. 2244–62a), "The Lament of the Father" (ll. 2444–62), and "The Messenger's Speech" (ll. 2900–3027), only the last of which actually employs the *nealles* formula itself. In the first elegy, the negation is twofold: "Hold now, earth, now that men / may not, the possessions of warriors" (ll. 2247–48a). On the one hand, men have died and disappeared, no longer able to enjoy their treasures; on the other, the earth now holds the hoard and will not release or share it, a nullification compounded in its later appropriation by a dragon who possessively guards the treasure without benefit to itself or others (ll. 2270a–77). In "The Lament of the Father," the reader/listener is swept suddenly from Beowulf's memory of Hrethel's sorrow over the slaying of his son into an epic simile of an old man watching his son hang on the gallows. Thayer believes Beowulf is imagining his grandfather fantasizing that he has executed his living son Hæthcyn for having killed his other son Herebeald, rendering all the more poignant the old king's final realization that he can never find such satisfaction for the grief to which he then surrenders himself. In the last "elegy," the Geatish messenger is not merely lamenting the death of Beowulf, but bemoaning the imminent demise of his people as a whole. The

messenger concludes with the *nealles* formula: "Not at all will a warrior put on treasures for remembrance, nor a bright maiden wear a ring-ornament around her neck, but sad-hearted, stripped of gold, not just once but ever, she will seek a land of exile, now that the battle-leader has laid aside laughter, his happiness and joy" (ll. 3015b–21a). Thayer concludes that in each of these three laments, the poet is playing with a different kind of dire scenario. In the first, one speaker—the last survivor—mourns "the absent many" of his people; in the second, a solitary King Hrethel mourns "the absent one," his son Herebeald; and in the last, a single Geatish speaker mourns the soon to be absent many, of whom he himself is one (53). These experimental permutations of the elegiac mode in *Beowulf* capture with singular intensity its repeated expression of unmitigated loss, unleavened by the intimations of hope or consolation offered in other Old English examples of the genre, such as "The Wanderer" or "The Seafarer."

In his collection on *Old English Heroic Poems and the Social Life of Texts* (see sec. 4a), John D. Niles reprints his article "Locating *Beowulf* in Literary History" (1993), adding a new "Footnote: Recent Work on Mythmaking and Ethnogenesis, with Some Thoughts on the Normative," 59–63, in which he summarizes and responds to more recent arguments by John Hill (1995), Craig Davis (1996/1999/2001), Harald Kleinschmidt (2001), and Stephen Harris (2003). To Hill's contention that *Beowulf* offers a coherent view of the past whose cultural world was to be received in almost all essentials as "normative" to its contemporary audience, Niles replies that such a past certainly had "exemplary force" in its illustration of some shared cultural values, both positive and negative, but that "it was scarcely" a template of normal or appropriate behavior for Christian Anglo-Saxons (63). Quoting from his own recent *Old English Enigmatic Poems* (2006), Niles suggests that the audience of the poem was "fascinated by stories of their grander and more brutal ancestors," tales which offered "a heady mixture of history, nostalgia, escapism, moral philosophy, and genealogical pride, as well as a sense of their own enlightened spirituality when measuring themselves against the people of former times" (63, n. 14). On the other hand, Niles disagrees with Davis that "the myth of ethnogenesis that is implied in the narrative of *Beowulf* is a marginal one that had no lasting influence among the Anglo-Saxons" (60). Instead, Niles sees the poem "as one component of a vernacular myth of ethnic origins that was emerging, not retreating, during the period of nation-building that extended from the reign of Alfred [at the end of the ninth century] to the reign of Æthelred [at the end of the tenth]" (60–61).

Niles appends a further "Query: How Real are the Geats? And Why Does this English Poem Never Mention the English?" (65–71). In answer to his first question, Niles rejects Jane Leake's 1967 denial of any historicity to the *Geatas* of *Beowulf* at all. He regards them instead as a poetic memory of the historically attested *Gautar* of southern Sweden, suspecting that the poet's depiction of this obscure people is the product of his own imagination working upon whatever legends about them he may have encountered, so that his account is of indeterminate but probably very minimal historical accuracy. In answer to his second question on the absence of Anglo-Saxons from *Beowulf*, Niles responds with a parallel query: why do Old English poets who retell Old Testament stories never mention the English? The answer in this latter case seems obvious: by their very subject matter these poems are set long ago in lands distant from England, so that any mention of Anglo-Saxons therein would be blatantly anachronistic and thus upset the narrative decorum of the genre. The *Beowulf* poet, like that of *Widsith*, does not need to refer explicitly to England, since he can assume that the ancestral peoples mentioned in his poem will be of interest and importance to his Anglo-Saxon audience, who comprise an implicit "us" against which all the tribes and kings and heroes of northern yesteryears are measured" (70). These hero peoples, Niles concludes, are much admired for their ferocity and valor, even as the more troublesome aspects of their violence and unbelief can be safely relegated to a distant time and place. As one particularly telling example, Niles notes that the poet selects the Finnsburh lay "from among all other possibilities" at his disposal for the celebration within Heorot of Beowulf's victory over Grendel. The hero of this "song within a song," Niles argues, would have been immediately recognized by an Anglo-Saxon audience as the very same Hengest who founded the kingdom of Kent, a leader whose "Jutish" followers, according to translators of the Old English Bede and Orosius, were eventually understood to have originated among the Geats, ambiguously located in either northern Jutland or nearby southwestern Sweden. The poet includes the "Song of Finn and Hengest," as Niles chooses to re-title the lay, in order to construct an honorific parallel within the poem: the song is intended to celebrate the visiting Geats who under Beowulf have once more avenged crimes against the Danes, just as long before a Jutish (that is, Geatish) hero Hengest once loyally avenged his Danish lord Hnæf upon the treacherous Finn before migrating to Kent. For the Anglo-Saxon audience of *Beowulf*, this scene would thus

supply a gratifying double celebration of the staunch virtues of their own old ancestors.

Harold Bloom has issued an "updated edition" of his 1987 collection of essays on *Beowulf* (New York: Chelsea House), vii, 280 pp. While Bloom's Introduction remains virtually the same as that of the earlier edition (1–5), he has completely replaced the critical studies of the poem he has chosen to include, most, but not all of them, appearing since the publication of the first edition. Instead of six essays by J.R.R. Tolkien (1936), T.A. Shippey (1978), Roberta Frank (1982), Raymond P. Tripp (1983), Fred C. Robinson (1985), and Ian Duncan (1987), Bloom now offers eleven by Arthur Gilchrist Brodeur, "The Structure and Unity of *Beowulf*" (1959); Richard J. Schrader, "Succession and Glory in *Beowulf*" (1991); John D. Niles, "Locating *Beowulf* in Literary History" (1993); Seth Lehrer, "Grendel's Glove" (1994); Andy Orchard, "Psychology and Physicality: The Monsters of *Beowulf*" (1995); Edward B. Irving, Jr., "Christian and Pagan Elements" (1998); John D. Niles, "Myth and History" (1998); Scott DeGregorio, "Theorizing Irony in *Beowulf*: The Case of Hrothgar" (1999); Phyllis R. Brown, "Cycles and Change in *Beowulf*" (2000); Gale R. Owen-Crocker, "The Fourth Funeral: Beowulf's Complex Obsequies" (2000); and Judy King, "Launching the Hero: The Case of Scyld and Beowulf" (2003). The volume concludes with a Chronology of Anglo-Saxon England, a Chronology of Events and Characters in the Poem, an outdated and somewhat inaccurate set of notes on contributors, a partially updated bibliography, and a new index.

In *Beowulf and Other Stories: A New Introduction to Old English, Old Icelandic, and Anglo-Norman Literatures* (Harlow, England: Pearson), the editors Richard North and Joe Allard wish to show readers "how good the poem *Beowulf* really is and how interesting the other stories in Old English, Old Icelandic or Anglo-Norman literatures really are" (ix). Andy Orchard is delegated to present the case for *Beowulf*, which he does by asking, "Is violence what Old English literature is about? *Beowulf* and Other Battlers: An Introduction to *Beowulf*," 63–94. He offers a general description of the poem and its context, reminding us that violence is scarcely an evil the human race has figured out how to overcome in our own time. Far from a celebration of brutality, he suggests, readers will find in Old English poetry a sophisticated and thoughtful "literature that faces up to our human problem with courage, style and unblinking honesty" (93).

'Beowulf' and Material Culture

In "Beowulf's Roman Rites: Roman Ritual and Germanic Tradition," *JEGP* 106: 325–35, Thomas D. Hill suggests that the funeral obsequies in honor of the hero during which he is cremated on a pyre with weapons and armor, then buried in a mound with treasure, after which mounted warriors ride around the barrow singing songs in praise of their fallen king, may not be a purely native Germanic or barbarian custom of the kind some scholars have seen also reflected in the Hunnic funeral of Attila as described by Jordanes in his *Getica* of the mid-sixth century. Instead, following Javier Arce (2000) on Attila's funeral itself, Hill argues that Beowulf's, too, may be modeled ultimately on much earlier and better-documented Roman military practices on the Rhine and Danube frontiers, though these themselves may have been influenced to some extent by Germanic customs. Hill discounts the notion that the *Beowulf* poet may have acquired his knowledge of these funerary rituals from reading Jordanes or other authors, but rather suspects that a poet who knew about Scandinavian and Merovingian kings in the early sixth century, when Hygelac's raid upon the Franks took place, could also be imagined to have known of such customs preserved in living memory and possibly still continued in neighboring countries during his own lifetime. Hill also suggests the possibility that the poet may have seen depictions of such funerary rituals on Roman or Romano-British sarcophagi.

In *'Beowulf' and Lejre*, Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies 323 (Tempe: ACMRS), the editors John D. Niles and Marijane Osborn offer a series of reports and interpretive essays on the recent excavations at Gammel Lejre near the end of Roskilde Fjord on the island of Zealand, traditional seat of the Scylding or Skjöldung rulers of the Old English poem and Scandinavian legend, respectively. Niles and Osborn include in their volume the work of various archeologists, as well as literary and cultural historians, most importantly an English translation of the book *Lejre: Syn og Sagn [Fact and Fable]* by Tom Christensen (1991), leading excavator from 1986 to 1988 of a site at Myselshøjgård, which revealed a large hall—48.5 meters in length, 11.5 meters in width at its center—that was raised about AD 660 and occupied through several rebuildings until ca. 1000. Christensen also directed the more recent excavation from 2004 to 2005 of an Iron Age hall at nearby Fredshøjgård—first erected about 550 and occupied until about 650—which he describes here for the first time in a report in English for this volume. He writes: "The house on the hill at Fredshøjgård was

at least forty-five meters long, more likely forty-seven meters, and it therefore must be classed among the very largest buildings known from the sixth century in Denmark. With its stout posts, as evidenced by the holes they left, and its situation on the top of this prominence with a broad view across the surrounding landscape, this building was large, high, and broad-gabled" (122), just like the great hall described in *Beowulf* at lines 81a to 82b. This interesting parallel has led Niles to propose that the Iron Age hall at Fredshøjgård may be the poet's model for Heorot, not in the sense that it was necessarily still standing when he composed it, but that he knew of its existence and large size, and believed it to be the home of the legendary figures he imagines inhabiting it. Niles suggests that the later rulers of the Viking Age halls at Myselshøjgård fixed their desire for illustrious ancestors upon the remains or memories of this earlier hall, which had been abandoned, perhaps after some ruinous dynastic conflict, in the mid-seventh century. Such rulers might have encouraged a tradition about the great hall's noble occupants *in geardagum* 'in the old days' (l. 1b) of whom they themselves claimed to be the heirs. As he himself notes, Niles is thus in the paradoxical position of seeing one of the central *places* of *Beowulf* as based upon an actual sixth-century building, at the same that he suspects the *people* of the poem are the product of fictive dynastic legend and the poet's own imagination. In addition, Niles describes to the west of these halls a rough, forested, hummocky landscape of post-glacial debris, a "dead ice" zone perforated with melt pockets from the last Ice Age, now small pools or tarns overhung by woods. These are very reminiscent of the description of Grendel's mere in *Beowulf*. There are also many ancient barrows in the area, including Øm Jættestue, a prominent megalithic chamber scarcely a mile from Gammel Lejre, which may have supplied the inspiration for the dragon's barrow. A stone ship setting also stands nearby (the last of many in the area now lost), which recalls the ship funeral of Scyld Scefing in the introductory section of the poem. Niles believes the poet must have known about the physical environs of the Lejre halls and used that knowledge in his creation of the *fiſelcynnes eard* 'land of the monster-race' (l. 104b), which he describes as being not far from Heorot.

Marijane Osborn reviews "The Lejre Connection in *Beowulf* Scholarship," 287–93, and the editors offer alternative views by other scholars, most significantly, Tom Shippey in a substantial Afterword to the whole volume. Shippey expresses doubt that even the mid-sixth-century hall at Fredshøjgård is early enough to have served as the actual setting of the Danish part

of the poem, since the one dateable historical event recounted in *Beowulf* occurs later in the hero's career. This death of Chlochilaicus or Hygelac around 525 would place the earlier action at Heorot "at least a generation too early" (472) for a hall built about 550. Contrary to Niles's view that the figures of the poem are the product of dynastic legend, however, Shippey suspects that many of them may be based upon actual historical persons. He thus places himself in the opposite position of the one proposed by Niles: it is the *people* of the poem, or some of them, who are real; the *actual place* in which the *Beowulf* poet sets much of his story in the first part of the poem is the product of his own imagination or was modeled on an even earlier hall yet to be discovered. In support of this last suggestion, Shippey points out that only a very small portion of the site complex at Gammel Lejre has yet been excavated. He concludes that "for Scandinavia in the Age of Migrations [*Beowulf*] could be the nearest thing to a contemporary document that we possess" (470), one which supplements but never seriously contradicts the bits of historical information we can glean from Frankish or Anglo-Saxon sources in Latin. At the very least, Shippey argues, *Beowulf* offers a neat poetic summary of the process by which the early kings of Denmark "integrated Zealand and Funen and the Danish archipelago, from an early origin in Scania," even as they entertained "ambitions in the Jutland peninsula, still in the process of being realized" in the poem (474). The main value of the recent archeological investigations at Lejre, Shippey concludes, is that they have confirmed that it "was indeed an important, even a dominating site, just as the 'legend of Lejre' [in *Beowulf* and other sources] has long insisted" (477). For the competing Anglo-Saxon and Scandinavian versions of this legend, Shippey suggests that one or more defeated factions in the dynastic and tribal wars of the migration period brought the Skjölding story to England. These refugees and their descendants would have had their own partisan versions of earlier events, which may account for what many scholars have seen as a negative bias in the characterization of Hrothulf in *Beowulf* compared with that of his noble counterpart Hrólfr Kraki in Scandinavian sources (but cf. above, the summary of Cooke, "Hrothulf: A Richard III, or an Alfred the Great?"). In particular, Shippey reminds us of Newton's suggestion (1993) that a "Skjöldung loser-group" may have made its way to East Anglia in the sixth century, as well as that a "Geatish loser-group" may have become the "Geatlings" of North Yorkshire, and that yet another group associated with the figure of Hengest—"not quite a loser, but certainly someone in serious trouble"—may possibly

have followed this leader to found the kingdom of Kent (477–78). Niles is less explicit about how he thinks the legend of Lejre came to the attention of the *Beowulf* poet in a later age, but assumes that this knowledge must have resulted from extended contact between Anglo-Saxons and Danes during and following the viking settlement of the Danelaw in the ninth century.

A third possibility not explicitly broached by the contributors to this volume combines key elements of both scenarios. The Viking Age purveyors of the legend of Lejre, of whom the *Beowulf* poet could be one, may or may not have known about the earlier hall at Fredshøjgård. It may have completely deteriorated or become otherwise obscured from sight and lost to knowledge. Instead, the poet might simply have modeled his conception of Heorot upon halls he knew or knew of, including one of those standing at Mysselhøjgård, which happened to be roughly comparable in size and impressiveness to the earlier hall at Fredshøjgård. On the other hand, some legends transferred to England by exiles and raiders during the migration period might have survived in some form to be challenged, revived or reformulated in response to Danish traditions in a later age. In other words, the *Beowulf* poet may have drawn upon multiple resources of information—biblical, historiographical, older English, and newer Norse—to create the unique vision of the legendary past he presents in his poem. There is, in fact, no archeological evidence yet discovered from the late fifth or early sixth centuries to indicate anything like the kind of political hegemony imagined for the Scylding monarchs in *Beowulf* at that time. Magnificent gold deposits at Gudme on Funen indicate some concentration of commerce and cult worship there in the fifth century; the great hall at Fredshøjgård suggests a seat of political power on Zealand in the mid-sixth century, possibly including control of the Øresund. But it is with the impressive Danevirke at the narrowing of the Jutland peninsula in Schleswig, begun in 737 and extended in 808 with subsequent additions, that we get our first real evidence in the ground for an effective "national" authority in Denmark capable of projecting its power to exact service and tribute *ofer hronrade* 'over the whale-road' (l. 10a). Sometime in the later eighth or ninth century, then, is a more likely period for the invention or refurbishment of a dynastic legend that would give moral force to the territorial claims of the Danish kings. Shippey may thus be quite right that some of the figures in the poem were actual historical leaders of an earlier age, whose stories were appropriated and adapted to a new tradition. This tradition was apparently communicated to King Alfred by the end of

the ninth century, whence it makes its first surviving documentary appearance in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (*sub anno* 855 = 857), which proudly traces the West Saxon royal genealogy back to Scyld and Scaef.

Beowulf and *Lejre* contains over 200 maps, diagrams, photos, and other illustrations—forty-eight in color—that strongly aid the reader in visualizing the physical and cultural landscape of this site at various periods in its history. Also included are translations from the Latin, Old Icelandic, and Danish sources of the legend of Lejre as it developed through the Middle Ages and beyond. The editors open their volume with a bold but compelling claim which they proceed to demonstrate; that is, that the discovery of large halls matching in many ways the poet's description of the great hall in *Beowulf*, in the midst of a landscape markedly similar to the one described in the poem, constitutes “the most important new material development in *Beowulf* studies to have taken place since the poem was first published in a reliable modern edition [that of John Kemble] in 1833” (1). The Lejre halls thus have a significance comparable to Schliemann's discovery of Troy in the nineteenth century for Homer studies. The excavation of the ship burial at Sutton Hoo during the last century has certainly had a similar impact upon the study and interpretation of *Beowulf*, as will perhaps the recently announced Staffordshire Hoard and even longer, sixty-meter Viking Age hall at Lejre, but readers can be very grateful for the generous exposition and thoughtful preliminary analyses offered by the contributors to this volume.

Karl P. Wentersdorf agrees that “The *Beowulf*-Poet's Vision of Heorot,” *SP* 104: 409–26, is “based on familiarity with...traditional Germanic royal halls” (409), like the one at Mysselhøjgård described by Christensen (1991). He notes that such halls were frequently destroyed by fire, as at Yeavinger in Northumbria and Cheddar in Wessex, so that the poet could have drawn upon various accounts of hall-burnings to imagine the similar destruction of Heorot. In addition, he notes that the wooden beams of the building are said to be firmly joined *innan ond utan irenbendum / searopuncum besmiþod* “within and without by skillfully wrought iron clamps” (ll. 774–75a, also mentioned in l. 998b). Wentersdorf does not cite how many such clamps have been found in excavations of these halls, but accepts their presence in the poem as a realistic detail. On the other hand, he finds the several descriptions of Heorot as shining with gold or treasure at lines 308a, 716a, 927a, and 997a, to be less plausible, since there is no archeological evidence for buildings with gold plating or gilded tiles in Anglo-Saxon, Scandinavian, or

continental Germanic halls. Wentersdorf suggests, in fact, that we have better evidence for the historical plausibility of fiery flying dragons to the audience of the poem than of this decorative feature, since the former (perhaps meteor sightings) are “solemnly” recorded in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* for the year 793 (413, n. 6). In seeking a source for the golden roof of Heorot, then, Wentersdorf compiles references in early Germanic literature to similarly gleaming structures, most often to Valhalla or other dwellings of the gods. Next he turns his attention to Roman architecture, in which important buildings sometimes featured bronze roof tiles and gold-plated doors. In Roman literature *tecta aurata* ‘golden roofs’ appear in Virgil's *Aeneid*, Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, the Elder Seneca's *Controversiae*, the Younger Seneca's *Thyestes*, Pliny's *Historia Naturalis*, among others texts (421–22). The author concludes that the *Beowulf* poet introduced this “exotic element” (424) from classical sources for a particular thematic purpose. The buildings of Rome were symbols of power and authority, but also of “the ruthless greed that had... failed signally to save the empire from destructive elements without and within” (424). The shining golden roof of Heorot thus signifies the instability of such wealth and power, demonstrated at the very end of the poem when Beowulf's courage and generosity as a king comes to nothing after his thanes abandon him during his fight against the dragon and then rebury its treasure in his barrow, where the poet says it lies *swa unnyt swa hit æror wæs* ‘as useless as it was before’ (l. 3168). Wentersdorf suggests that this attitude toward treasure is revealed in the double image of Heorot's roof, in which its glowing gold anticipates the *lað lig* ‘hateful flame’ (l. 83a), which the poet says will destroy the building at a rekindling of hostilities between Hrothgar and Ingeld.

Stéphane Lebecq offers a comparative study of “Imma, Yeavinger, Beowulf: Remarques sur la formation d'une culture aulique dans l'Angleterre du VII^e siècle [Observations on the Formation of a Courtly Culture in Seventh-Century England],” in *Romans d'antiquité et littérature du Nord: Mélanges offerts à Aimé Petit*, ed. S. Baudelle-Michels, M.-M. Castellani, P. Logié, and E. Poulain-Gautret (Paris: Honoré Champion), 497–513. Lebecq adduces the anecdote of the young Northumbrian *miles* ‘warrior’ named Imma who, according to Bede (*EH* 4.19–20), attempted to disguise himself as a *pauper rusticus* ‘poor countryman’, only to be recognized as a member of the nobility and thegn of the king by his *vultus* ‘appearance’, *habitus* ‘manners’, and *sermones* ‘way of speaking’. Imma's inability to mask his social identity suggests that a marked degree of class differentiation had come to develop at Northumbrian

royal courts by the seventh century. Lebecq finds confirmation of this new courtly culture in the first known royal residence in Anglo-Saxon England excavated at Yeavinger, which flourished in the earlier part of the seventh century, and by the depiction of the wealth, elegance, entertainment, and formal protocols of Hrothgar's court in *Beowulf*, which Lebecq believes quite possibly recalls the same cultural milieu, even though composed in a subsequent century.

Dissertations and Theses

Karen Lynn Bollermann writes on "The Long Arm of Variation: The Poetics of Concept-Patterning in *Beowulf*," Ph.D. Diss., Arizona State U, 2006, *DAI* 67, no. 11A (2006): 4177. Following Clark (1995), Bollermann notes that this stylistic feature of OE poetry—formulaic repetition with significant difference—needs further definition as a critical concept. She thus attempts to establish the criteria for determining the presence of variation, its different species and levels of operation from specific compounds and phrases to longer verse paragraphs. She identifies "several patterns basic to variation events" and shows how these interact with each other and with the narrative context in which they appear.

Carolyn J. Cruce writes on "Adapting *Beowulf*: The Generic Transformation of a Privileged Text," Ph.D. Diss., Univ. of Mississippi, 2006, *DAI* 68, no. 04A (2006): 1452. Cruce describes her effort to create a screenplay of the poem, beginning with a fresh translation in which she retains "as many of the rhetorical devices and tropes from the Anglo-Saxon version as possible." The script developed from this translation necessarily strayed to some extent from standard principles of screenwriting in its reliance upon flashbacks and narrators. However, since so much of *Beowulf* "is ruminative rather than narrative, and time jumps forwards and backwards, the use of flashbacks seemed the only rational way of explaining the scene shifts. The narrator is another device that most experienced screenwriters consider trite and expedient; however, because the text contains so much beautiful language that cannot be rendered adequately through visual imagery, rather than lose it, some of it has been awarded to a narrator."

Gary John Bodie considers "A New Kind of *Beowulf*: Text, Translation and Technology," Ph.D. Diss., Univ. of Oregon, 2007, *DAI* 68, no. 12A: 5063. Bodie applies two new computer programs, *Crawdad* and *In-Spire*, which use versions of Principal Components Analysis, to a translation of *Beowulf* into Modern English, as well as to the OE text in various forms: the whole poem, the

text divided into its component fitts, the text separated into main narrative and "digressive" sequences, and the poem broken into thirty-two segments of about one hundred lines apiece. For comparison, the author also analyzes in a similar way *Genesis A and B*, *Guthlac A and B*, *Andreas*, *Elene*, *Judith*, *Exodus*, *Phoenix*, *Christ and Satan*, and other poems. Bodie finds that the clustering patterns of words and phrases support the standard temporal assignment of Old English poetic texts into early, middle and later periods of Anglo-Saxon England, but at the same time make difficult "the appropriate placement of *Beowulf* within those periods."

In "Two scenes from *Beowulf* and selections from *The Tesseræ/Tesseract Cycle*" (Original composition), Ph.D. Diss., Univ. of California, San Diego, 2007, *DAI* 68, no. 09A: 3658, Nathan Louis Brock offers five musical "compositions that are parts of two ongoing projects. One of these projects is the oratorio *Beowulf*, for vocal soloists, chorus, chamber orchestra, and percussion ensemble," offering two scenes from the end of the poem, with a libretto based on Heaney's translation and "gestural" and other techniques adapted "from late Romantic and early Modern music."

Anthony Sanders, in "*Beowulf*: A Work of Cultural Transition in England and Its Literature," M.A. Thesis, California State U, Dominguez Hills, 2006, *MAI* 45 (2006): 78, reviews the way the poem negotiates pagan and Christian traditions, while reflecting a complementary change from oral to literate modes of narration. In addition, the poet conceives a moment of transition between the identity of individuals as constructed in small face-to-face communities and identity that reflects their place in larger, more complexly organized groups. Sanders concludes, "the pagan elements of the plot combined with the voice of the Christian author make the poem inseparably Christian and pagan."

Dawn E. Crouse offers "A Jungian Analysis of *Beowulf*," M.A. Thesis, California State University, Dominguez Hills, 2007, *MAI*, 46: 92. She describes the hero's development "from childhood to old age" as "a quest for individuation," according to a narrative pattern or "monomyth" of heroic quest described by Joseph Campbell (1949).

In "Slouching towards Extimacy: Symbolic Exchange and Monstrous Appetites in *Beowulf*," M.A. Thesis, U of South Alabama, 2007, *MAI* 45: 1750, Karma Naomi de Gruy invokes William Butler Yeats's "The Second Coming" as well as a term used by Jacques Lacan, *extimité* 'extimacy' (1959–60), as an antonym to Freud's earlier concept of *intimité* 'intimacy'. The author observes that the monsters of the poem, especially Grendel, transgress the social norms of reciprocity by internalizing,

that is, literally ingesting the bodies of other people into their own, without providing adequate compensation for the lives they have appropriated. This is what makes a monster rather than a human. Beowulf, too, takes the lives and body parts of Others without repayment, however, so that the hero also begins inextricably to incorporate into his own the very identity of the monsters he despoils: he becomes a “monster-slayer” in both senses of the term. In this way, the hero “slouches towards extimacy,” a process by which Lacan suggests the Other ironically becomes an intimate part the Self as a result of its appropriative rejection, an inseparable component of one’s own core identity. By the end of the poem, Beowulf has become “very close kin” to his victims.

Matthew R. Bardowell looks “Through the Eyes of the Scop: The Poetic Figure of the Anglo-Saxon Oral Poet in *Beowulf*,” M.A. Thesis, Florida Atlantic U, 2007, *MAI* 46: 92. He reminds us that the oral poets depicted in *Beowulf* are “idealized poetic devices,” literary “reconstructions of the Anglo-Saxons’ Germanic past.” The *Beowulf* poet sets the scop apart from other “members of his society by granting him a broader perspective,” enabling him to pass judgment on characters in the poem and to stimulate “reflection in the characters for whom the bard sang and to point these characters toward the proper moral path.”

Peter William van der Woude examines three works of the Northern Irish poet he nicknames “Translating Heaney: A Study of *Sweeney Astray*, *The Cure at Troy*, and *Beowulf*,” M. A. Thesis, Rhodes Univ., 2007. The author notes how Heaney uses translation as a way of reflecting on the contemporary political circumstances of his country. In the three works listed respectively in van der Woude’s title, Heaney’s renders into Modern English the anonymous Gaelic poem *Buile Suibhne* ‘Sweeney Astray’, Sophocles’s Greek *Philoctetes*, and the Old English epic *Beowulf*. The author agrees with Niles and Wood (see below) that the poet’s use of Irish words in his *Beowulf* is effective in accurately conveying the beauty and meaning of the Anglo-Saxon poem, as well as in commenting on international politics in general and those of Northern Ireland in particular.

In “*Beowulf* in Blank Verse,” M.A. Thesis, San Jose State Univ., 2007, *MAI*, 46: 92, Robert Andrew Swart offers a new version of the poem in unrhymed iambic pentameter. He renders the first eleven lines of the poem as follows:

I speak.
We have ere heard about the might,
In former days, of Spear-Danes’ nation-kings,

Of how those noblemen did courageous deeds.
How often Scyld Shafing, the terror of earls,
Had stripped the mead-benches from throngs of
scathers,
From many people after he first rose
A foundling wretch: he bided his relief.
He waxed beneath the welkin, throve because
Of worthy thoughts, until all border-dwellers
Across the whale-road had to heed his words
And pay him tribute. That was a good king!

Translations and Translation Studies

In *Beowulf: A New Translation for Oral Delivery* (Indianapolis/Cambridge: Hackett), Dick Ringler provides the text of his performance of the poem in Modern English verse with other speakers which was released last year in a three-CD set, the first eleven lines of which were reported from aural transcription in *YWOES* 2006. Ringler’s introduction outlines the story by manuscript fitt, supplying a map and several contextual and interpretive essays on “Oral and Written *Beowulfs*,” “Legend and Lore,” “Narrative Strategies and Structures,” “The Hero,” “Christianity and the Problem of Violence,” “The Poet,” and “The Meter of the Translation.” In this last category, Ringler’s rendering attempts a “simulacrum” of Old English prosody, in most respects as it was analyzed by Sievers (1893) and modified by Bliss (1962). One innovation in this printed version is that Ringler organizes the half-lines or short verses of the poem into a single vertical column, rather than as alliterative long lines parted by a caesura. This arrangement is designed to reveal the rhythmic freedom of each short verse, easily smothered in performance by too much stress, Ringler believes, on the interlocking alliteration of the a- and b-lines. This arrangement yields 6,364 lines for the poem as a whole. By manipulating the left margin, Ringler enables the reader to “distinguish at a glance among the three different kinds of verses” (ci)—normal, light, and heavy—all of which contain two to ten syllables, and most three to seven. Normal verses have two heavily stressed syllables; light verses, which are indented, contain only one. Heavy verses have three heavily stressed syllables when they are odd-numbered (that is, conventional a-lines) and two such stresses when they are even-numbered (conventional b-lines) but with “a greater number of anacrusis (i.e., lightly stressed introductory syllables) than are permitted in normal verses” (civ). These heavy verses are marked by their extension beyond the left margin of normal verses. Ringler does not attempt to replicate the exact distribution of light and normal verses in the original poem,

but does reproduce the twenty-three heavy verses just where he finds them in the Old English text. The typographical distinction between normal and light verses is illustrated in the translation of lines 642–44a of the poem:

And now, once again,
noise mounted
in the meadhall
mirth and revelry,
and proud boasting... (ll. 1283–87)

Normal and heavy verses alternate in lines 2991 to 98, rendered by Ringler as follows:

...the king of the Geats,
the heir of Hrethel,
gave Eofor and Wulf
unwonted wealth
to reward their valor: ...
farmsteads of fabulous value;
nor could he be faulted for that largesse,
idly censured by others,
since they had earned it in battle;
and Eofor got the king's
only daughter
as a prize for his hearth
and a pledge of favor.

Ringler hopes that this single verse format will encourage “a more fluent and fast-moving reading of the text than the line-by-line layout (which can sometimes suggest to readers today that Old English was uniformly leisurely and stately—even sluggish—like a good deal of inferior blank verse in Modern English)” (cii). He includes a guide to the “People and Places in *Beowulf*”; translations of “The Fight at Finnsburg,” “The Wanderer” (retitled “A Meditation”), and “Deor”; and “Suggestions for Further Reading.”

Michael Walton offers *The Book of Beowulf, with The Fight at Finnsburg, Widsið, Deor, Cædmon's Hymn, Waldere, and the Battle of Maldon in Modern English Verse Translations* (Cayuga, Ont.: Walton Family Farm Books). The illustrations are maps and line drawings by Gary Strong, with several photographs of objects and people, including costumed warriors from the English reenactment group Regia Anglorum. The translator maintains two lifts per half-line, separated by a caesura, frequently but not always linked by alliteration between the a- and b-verses. The stressed words “carry the gist of the [poem's] message,” whereas “the lightly

stressed words, although necessary for clear syntax and grammatical precision, can be dropped without drastically affecting the main message carried by the stressed words... This might be advantageous for poetry performed in a hall full of boisterous warriors!” (9). Walton thus imagines the *scop* opening his poem with a vigorous, attention-getting exclamation:

HEY! WE'VE HEARD how in days of yore
the tribal kings of the Spear-Dane people
did brave things that brought them glory!
Often Scyld Sheaf-child scattered his enemies,
captured their mead-halls and cowed their leaders.
After he first was found as an orphan
he survived to see much better days;
he throve under heaven, earned such honour
that all those peoples around his borders
over the whale-road had to obey him,
pay him tribute. Now that's a good king! (1–11)

Facing the opening page of the poem is an interesting topographical map looking south from southern Scandinavia to the Alps rising above the curve of the horizon, marking tribal homelands, rivers, lakes, prevailing sea currents, relevant archeological sites, and other useful information. In addition to an introduction and notes for each of the poems translated, the translator also includes appendices on the Germanic tribes, a chronology of events, a note on hypermetric verses, study questions, and a generous select bibliography of editions and other translations, critical studies and websites.

André Crépin offers *Beowulf: Édition revue, nouvelle traduction, introduction et notes* (Paris: Le Livre de Poche), with a line-by-line facing-page translation into resonant French prose, as an improvement over his effort in 1991: “La traduction y est moins nerveuse et moins exacte que la présente traduction...: toute entreprise de traduction est un dialogue sans fin avec l'original [That translation is less energetic and less precise than the present translation... every effort at translation is an endless conversation with the original]” (25). Each page of translated text in this little volume, running about twenty to thirty lines each, is given its own subject heading, such as “Funérailles de Scyld,” “Le palais de roi Hrothgar,” “Rage et raids de l'ogre Grendel,” etc. Crépin supplies a list of proper names, genealogical charts, and a historical chronology, rendering the first eleven lines as follows:

Donc—nous dirons des Danois-à-la-lance aux
jours d'autrefois,

de rois souverains la gloire telle que nous l'avons
reçue,
comment alors les princes firent prouesse.
Que de fois Scyld de la lignée de Scef
arracha à nombre d'ennemis les trônes du festin!
Il terrifia le guerrier après s'être jadis
trouvé sans rien—salutaire revirement.
Il vit croître sa puissance, s'affirmer son prestige
au point que tous les peuples d'alentour,
riverains des mers aux baleines, durent lui obéir
et lui verser tribut. Ce fut un grand roi!

Erick Ramalho also offered a similar edition and facing-page translation of the poem into Portuguese verse in *Beowulf: Edição Bilingüe* (Belo Horizonte, Brazil: Tessitura Editora), with an introduction, genealogical charts, map, and notes. Ramalho translates the opening of the poem:

Co'efeito, conhecemos, cá, os feitos
dos louvados reis dos Danos de Lanças
e a glória do povo em tempos antigos.
Scyld Scefing, chefe dos Danos, cessou
os bródios com hydromel dos bandos
rivais, cujos varões, de várias raças,
ruíram pelo medo. Medrou Scyld:
privações experimentara (pobre
criança, crescera sob céu de nuvens),
mas lograra honra e glória, para, logo,
ver, além do mar, via de baleias,
povos prestar-lhe preito. Foi bom rei!

In his collection on *Old English Heroic Poems and the Social Life of Texts* (see sec. 4a), John D. Niles reconsiders “Heaney’s *Beowulf* Six Years Later,” 325–53. In response to the many criticisms of this prize-winning verse translation that have appeared since its first publication in 1999—in particular, of the Northern Irish poet’s use of peculiar dialectal forms of Hiberno-English and his occasional mistranslations of the Old English text, as well as of some passages described by critics as uninspired, flat or “flaccid”—Niles offers his enthusiastic opinion that Heaney’s translation “is the most successful presentation that has yet been made of an Old English poem in the form of a modern English verse translation” (326–27). It is “a stunningly artful work of the literary imagination” (330), less a translation of *Beowulf* than “a transfiguration of that earlier poem” (352). “No mere shadow of the original text,” Niles writes, “Heaney’s *Beowulf* brings out the vatic eloquence, the emotional depths, the ethical force, and the sensual magnetism of that Old English poem more

persuasively than any other modern English translation has done” (352). Niles offers these superlatives to counter what he believes has become “something of a consensus position among Anglo-Saxonists,” expressed most fully and effectively by Chickering (2002), “that there is nothing better or worse about this verse translation than about many others” (quoted 330, n. 11). To the contrary, Niles argues, Heaney’s *Beowulf* “will have a place in future histories of English literature when myriad other translations of that poem are forgotten” (330), so that “it is perhaps time that a clear and reasoned statement should be given of its merits” (353). To this end, Niles selects eight passages from the final third of the poem, the dragon fight, where he feels, following critics Shippey (1999) and Howe (2000), that Heaney really finds “his stride as translator” (344). One of these is “The Father’s Lament” (ll. 2446b–62a), an epic simile in which King Hrethel’s grief over the killing of one son by another is compared to that of an old man who must watch his son hang on the gallows:

He begins to keen
and weep for his boy [...].
He gazes sorrowfully at his son’s dwelling,
the banquet hall bereft of all delight,
the windswept hearthstone; the horsemen are
sleeping,
the warriors under ground; what was is no more.
No tunes from the harp, no cheer raised in the yard.
Alone with his longing, he lies down on his bed
and sings a lament; everything seems too large,
the steadings and the fields.

Niles describes the felicities he finds in this rendering as follows, sticking up for particular points that have been criticized by others: “The landscape...of this imagined scene includes Irish ‘steadings’ rather than English ‘villages’ or more neutral ‘settlements.’ It echoes with the sound of Irish ‘keening’ rather than English ‘lamentation.’ A father’s grief at the death of his son thereby leaps over a thousand years and, paradoxically, becomes timeless by being linked to the contemporary world. Hard-won simplicity is the rule in this passage, as is often true of Heaney’s translation despite the extravagant diction sometimes employed. One has a sense of the presentness of death, of the inexplicable character of officially sanctioned killings, of huge emotions kept barely under control. The style here is reminiscent of Yeats at his best, and yet the modern English lines are directly expressive of the Old English text and are imitative of its style as well. As throughout Heaney’s translation, every line is linked by alliteration

in a manner reminiscent of the original verse form. The single apparent exception to this rule, the fourth line from the bottom ('No tunes from the harp, no cheer raised from the yard') can be seen to be no exception at all when one reads the word 'tunes' with an Irish intonation—that is, with an initial affricate...as in 'church' (346).

Jolie Wood agrees with this positive evaluation of the poet-translator's achievement in "Seamus Heaney's Ulster-Saxon *Beowulf*," *Valley Voices: A Literary Review* (Mississippi Valley State Univ.) 7: 53–61, suggesting that the Northern Irish poet enriched his own native version of spoken Hiberno-English from various other linguistic resources to create a unique "dialect" for his translation. Wood calls this invented language "Ulster-Saxon," which is opposed to Anglo-Saxon, this latter term being used in an idiosyncratic sense not to mean Old English, the language of the poem, but rather the variety of standard Modern English chosen by the American translators E. Talbot Donaldson and R. M. Liuzza in their respective prose and verse renderings of *Beowulf* in 1975 and 1999. Wood believes the superiority of Heaney's translation is most readily apparent in the audio versions the poet recorded in his own voice, "giving his readers an accent and dialect through which to hear his poetic choices" (54). Rather than keeping strictly to the formal requirements of Old English alliterative measure, however, where the first and/or second stressed syllable of a four-stress line must alliterate with the third stressed syllable, Heaney opts for the more flexible prosody of traditional poetry in Old Irish, which "allows for more internal alliteration off the stress" (54). This flexibility appears in Heaney's rendering of the first line of the poem: "So. The **Spear-Danes** / in **days** gone by," where the four stresses of the traditional Old English long line, as scanned by Wood, are marked in bold. Heaney, however, chooses to link the two half lines on the unstressed syllable "Danes" in the a-verse, which alliterates with the third stressed syllable "days" in the b-verse, yielding: "So. The Spear-Danes / in days gone by." The link between the two half-lines is further underscored by a vocalic chime on the long "a" of "Danes" and "days," echoing the internal assonance of *gar-* and *gear-* in the original verse: *Hwæt. We Gardena / in geardagum*. The poet-translator thus captures much more of the complex verbal play of the Old English verse than his competitors, Wood shows, and creates a unique "space" for himself "between the Old English *scop* and the Old Irish *fili*" (53), terms for traditional oral poets in those two languages. Wood's phraseology is reminiscent here of Homi Bhabha's "third space of discourse" (1994 and 1996), in which colonized peoples

are said to create a new way of expressing and thinking about themselves by appropriating for their own purposes the language and literary forms of their conquerors, in this case, what Heaney claims is his linguistic "voice-right" as a native speaker of English (quoted 53). Wood demonstrates Heaney's development of a unique "Ulster-Saxon" dialect for his translation with a glossary of forty-five "strange or odd" words that the poet-translator borrowed from Ulster Scots, Irish Gaelic, colloquial Hiberno-English, Anglo-Norman French, Old Norse, and Old and Middle English, including some of Heaney's own Modern English coinages and special turns of phrase from the poet's previously published work. Wood agrees with Niles that this lexical *mélange* enables Heaney more effectively to convey the commonality of human experience described by the poet of *Beowulf*, allowing him to draw upon divergent but parallel ethnic traditions from past and present, and thus to transcend the barriers of time and national antagonism in finding a more universal mode of utterance.

In "Putting a Bawn into *Beowulf*," in *Seamus Heaney: Poet, Critic, Translator*, ed. Ashby Bland Crowder and Jason David Hall (Basingstoke, England: Palgrave Macmillan), 136–54, Alison Finlay offers a more qualified assessment of Heaney's lexical experimentation. Mossbawn is the name of Heaney's family farm, the second element of which had once meant a small defensive tower surrounded by a fortified cattle-pen. Finlay accepts this term as a reasonable approximation for the royal compounds of *Beowulf*, "since standard English offers few options," beyond the high medieval stone "castle," for the less elaborate early medieval structure that served as "both a fortress and a home" (136). But Finlay is less happy with Heaney's general attempt to stress the universality of *Beowulf* through his self-conscious use of such anachronisms and dialectal forms, believing that these intrusions only obscure "what is specific and characteristic to the social context" in which the poem was originally imagined (148). Finlay also finds that Heaney flattens the poet's deliberate ambiguation of monsters and humans in his poem, offering instead a kind of "comic-book horror" in describing the monsters' attacks and ignoring the very human feelings that motivate them, especially Grendel's mother (150). For instance, the translator substitutes his own invented compound "hell-dam" for the simple third person singular feminine pronoun *heo* 'she' in line 1292a, dismissing by this epithet the motivation of a character whose maternal outrage over the mutilation of her only son every reader of the poem can be expected immediately, perhaps even sympathetically, to understand (151).

In the festschrift for Tom Shippey noted above, John Hill considers “*Beowulf* Editions for the Ancestors: Cultural Genealogy and Power in the Claims of Nineteenth-Century English and American Editors and Translators,” 53–69. He sharply qualifies Frantzen’s claim (1990) that Old English studies in the nineteenth century were essentially motivated by a “self-congratulatory” national chauvinism that sought the origins of “Anglo-Saxon” (that is, English and American) superiority in the ethnic heritage of England and the United States (54). Hill agrees that the interest of these scholars in the culture of their ancestors was deeply influenced by contemporary values and preconceptions, but he also finds a wide range of individual responses to the poem. For instance, John Kemble found moral inspiration in *Beowulf*, remarking in his 1833 edition that “these echoes from the deserted temples of the past” express timeless virtues that will “strengthen” and “purify” the reader’s heart (quoted 60). In addition, Kemble brought a more scientific and ethnographic attention to the customs and religious practices depicted in *Beowulf*, perceiving a linguistic and cultural unity among “the various Teutonic tribes” that he saw as consolidated by the Goths’ resistance to the Hunnic invasions and eventually producing “the might and majesty of modern Europe” (quoted 61–62). Benjamin Thorpe (1855) makes no such generous claims for the world revealed by the poem, theorizing that it is a Christian verse paraphrase of a old pagan prose saga from southwest Sweden brought to England in the eleventh century during the reign of Cnut. The poem’s value is primarily historical in its vivid preservation of ancient customs and institutions. Thomas Arnold’s 1876 translation takes yet a different view, seeing *Beowulf* as the “lively, stirring” work of a devout Christian priest, reflecting the translator’s own religious struggles and sentiments (64). Earle (1892) offered yet another reading of the poem as a manual of advice and moral philosophy for princes, identifying its possible author as the Mercian poet and scholar, Higeberht, writing for Offa of Mercia’s son Ecgerth. Sedgfield (1910) stresses the connection between our values in the present and those of the past, imagining the author as a kind of Edwardian gentleman or “country house poet,” writing for a local abbot or royal patron, in the latter case most likely a princess and her attendants due to the “fantastical material” he felt such women would be inclined to admire (66). Sedgfield gentrified and domesticated *Beowulf*, “making it an entertaining treasure both reflective of and reinforcing the noble sophistication of its patrons then and now” (66). The self-conscious refinement of this characterization stands in stark contrast to Morris’s 1895 view

of the poem, which appropriates it for “a new, socialist reality” that hoped to bring political empowerment to ordinary people (67). Child (1904), however, again stresses the hero’s moral example, demonstrating the virtues of bravery, generosity, and consideration both in speech and action, projecting an Edwardian ideal of “manliness” onto the Anglo-Saxon past. In spite of their diversity, all of these examples demonstrate a deep longing for a connection to the past, one that conjures into the present what are imagined as “pure, ancestral virtues and thus power” (69).

Ernst Hellgardt asks and answers himself rhetorically, “*Beowulf* Again? Of Course!” *Anglia* 125: 304–28, in a review essay on the proliferation of new books on the poem, including translations. Hellgardt claims that a new publication on *Beowulf* appears virtually every week on average. This is hyperbole, to be sure, but one with which this reviewer feels a certain wan sympathy. To give a sense of the range of materials recently available, the author selects for consideration introductions for beginners, like Ewald Standop’s revision of Lehner’s 1967 pocket-sized edition of selected passages in *Beowulf: Eine Textauswahl mit Einleitung, Übersetzung, Kommentar und Glossar* [Edition with Introduction, Translation, Commentary, and Glossary] (2005); collections of studies, like Shippey and Haarder’s *Beowulf: The Critical Heritage* (1998); previously unknown drafts of Tolkien’s famous British Academy lecture on “*Beowulf: The Monsters and the Critics*” (1936), edited by Drout (2002); handbooks, like those of Bjork and Niles (1996) and Orchard (2003); individual studies, like Clark’s monograph on irony in *Beowulf* (2003), Köberl’s on indeterminacy (2002), and Stoclet’s comparative study of eighth-century depictions of throne-worthiness (2005); and finally conference proceedings, represented by Corazzo Dolcetti and Gendre’s collection of papers (2005).

Oral and Musical Performances; Film, Graphic, and Other Adaptations

Jonathan Aaron and Charlie Morrow have produced a DVD of Benjamin Bagby performing lines 1 to 1062 of *Beowulf* with “voice and Anglo-Saxon harp,” recorded live at Dunkers Kulturhus, Helsingborg, Sweden, in January 2006 (Port Washington, NY: Koch Entertainment), ninety-eight minutes. Stellan Olsson directed the filming of Bagby’s expressive performance against a blue backdrop, interspersed with pans of the audience and various seascapes, sunsets, clouds, and one early shot of the artist walking to the Kulturhus with his harp case. In two segments totaling thirty-four

“bonus” minutes in all, Bagby discusses his musical interpretation of the poem and participates in a round-table conversation with *Beowulf* scholars Mark Amodio, Thomas Cable, and John Miles Foley about the poem's oral and literary art.

A major Hollywood release *Beowulf* appeared on November 16th written by Neil Gaiman and Roger Avery, and directed by Robert Zemeckis. Angelina Jolie stars as Grendel's mother, Anthony Hopkins as Hrothgar, Ray Winstone as Beowulf, and John Malkovich as Unferth. This partially animated version has a certain mythic grandeur, but also more blatant allegory than most medieval poems, certainly than the Old English original, with a gloss on the text provided by the promotional poster: “Pride is the Curse.” Grendel's mother seems obscurely large and scaly when submerged partially off-camera, but slinks from the waters as a nubile human female in a golden PG-13 body suit sporting Angelina's trademark pillow lips, a long serpentine braid, and amusingly anachronistic high-heeled feet. She embodies the wet dream of glory, but also spawns the evil offspring—variant personifications of pride—that incubate in the dark recesses of heroes' souls. Hrothgar is revealed as the father of Grendel, a moronic rotting corpse-boy with sensitive eardrums, who craves the attention of his daddy. Grendel manifests the pathetic monster that Hrothgar himself has become, a smashed bare-assed fornicator, drunk on gold, who pours out mead and scatters coins to buy another roar of acclaim from his boorish thanes, all the while slobbering unwelcome affections upon his stoical young queen. The hero, too, turns out to be something of a glory slut. After encountering denizens of the deep in the Breca episode, Beowulf drops his sword open-mouthed at the sight of a cute mermaid and then lies about having “slain” sea-monsters. He makes similar goo-goo eyes at Wealhtheow, taking her to his bed only two days after killing Grendel and sleeping with Grendel's mother. To make this new marriage possible, Hrothgar conveniently offs himself by jumping out a window, which self-demolition may seem unmotivated, but confirms the linkage between the old king and the just-slain monster of his inner self. Years later, as invincible king of the Danes, Beowulf must confront his own filial demon, a golden dragon, whose power and ferocity accurately mirrors the ruthless monster he has become—at least in his own eyes. Beowulf just can't be beaten, so that, as in an American western, he becomes the target for every two-bit Frisian sword-slinger wanting to make a name for himself. The king lets one of these assailants go with a gold coin, saying: “You can't kill me because I died a long time ago.” Beowulf's fight

with the dragon in air and water is startlingly effective, though the hero finishes the job by himself, without the help of Wiglaf, here a stout old retainer rather than an untried youth. (The new animation technology works less well for fights on land: since there is no terrestrial gravity in these scenes, figures hop about acrobatically like fleas or video game fighters.) The Geatish “maiden” at the end of the poem is the king's embarrassed young concubine, whom an aging Wealhtheow sympathetically tolerates. When the girl asks the queen what went wrong in the marriage, she replies, “Too many secrets.” But neither one of the king's women thinks Beowulf is a phony or a “monster.” In fact, it is their faith in him as a hero that prompts him to defend them from the dragon he has begotten and, in some sense, become. These are moving moments, none more than when the king's burning funeral ship sinks into the sea and the dragon-horn cup of fame washes out of the sand at Wiglaf's feet. The king's old retainer is truly sad, never having aspired to so much glory himself, just the honor of serving his noble lord. He has no desire to drink from this golden vessel. But then Angelina emerges silkily from the waters and Wiglaf's grief turns into something else as he contemplates her quiet offer.

Novelistic and cinematic depictions of Grendel's mother are reviewed by Karen Emanuelson in “Head-Hunting Witch Doctor, Blood-sucking Porn Star (and Other Portrayals of Grendel's Mother),” in *The Image of Violence in Literature, Media, and Society II* (Pueblo, CO: Society for the Interdisciplinary Study of Social Imagery, Colorado State University-Pueblo), 267–72. The “head-hunting witch-doctor” is the “mother” of a tribe of cannibalistic savages in Michael Crichton's novel, *Eaters of the Dead* (1978), filmed as the *Thirteenth Warrior* (1999). In the Graham Baker's *Beowulf* (1999), starring Christopher Lambert, a twenty-four-year-old former Playboy Bunny, Layla Roberts, plays the female monster “in a post-apocalyptic futuristic dystopic Scandinavia” (271). This “blood-sucking porn star” conceives Grendel with Hrothgar, going on to seduce Beowulf himself in resentment against that king. She describes her taste for blood in luscious detail before morphing into a creature that is part sex kitten and part jumbo Alaskan king crab. Emanuelson also covers the 2006 independent film *Beowulf & Grendel*, in which the troll's mother is simply “a fearsome Sea-hag who is less human than her son” and more “like Grendel's mother in John Gardner's *Grendel* [1971], only capable of dim-witted, non-verbal savagery” (271). Emanuelson concludes: “If only one of these movies had portrayed Grendel's mother with the humanity of the character played by the porn-star in the post-modern *Beowulf*,

but with the menace of the character in *Thirteenth Warrior* and maybe, just maybe, with the surprising strength of Wealhtheow in the excellent Icelandic film *Beowulf & Grendel*, [t]hen, perhaps we'd see Grendel's mother as she really was in the original oral tale" (271).

Kathleen Forni responds less favorably to Baker's treatment of the poem in "Graham Baker's *Beowulf*: Intersections between High and Low Culture," *Literature Film Quarterly* 35: 244–49. She notes that this "twenty-million dollar science-fiction fantasy *Beowulf* is, by popular and critical consensus, a bad film...marked by an utter lack of respect for its precursor text, capturing neither the letter nor the spirit of the original poem" (244).

Jorge Luis Bueno Alonso discusses "*Leodum liðost ond lofgeornost*: La Poesía Épica de *Beowulf* en Nuevos Formatos Gráficos y Visuales [“Kindest to his people and most eager for fame”: The Epic Poem *Beowulf* in New Graphic and Visual Formats],” *ES: Revista de Filología Inglesa* 28 (2007-08): 47–72. Bueno notes that modern technologies for the transmission of cultural products through images have transformed the ways we can convey the classic literature of the past, sometimes enabling a vehicle that is in some ways truer to the original context of popular performance. For instance, *Beowulf* was most likely intended to entertain an audience in a drinking hall: “It was the best seller of the day, the successful potboiler movie of Anglo-Saxon England,” Bueno suggests by way of analogy (47). Graphic artists like Michael Uslan and Ricardo Villamonte (1975–76), Jerry Bingham (1984), Astrid Anand and Bill Carroll (1987), and Gareth Hinds (2003), have all restored the poem to its popular appeal, creating a new kind of “visual orality” in the formulaic tradition of pulp comics (author's emphasis, 47). Bueno especially admires the archaic elegance of the script Hinds has created to imitate the scribal hands of Cotton Vitellius A.xv in his *Collected Beowulf*, as well as his dramatic replication of the poem's essential plot and themes, and the accuracy of his depiction of Anglo-Saxon material artifacts like armor, weapons, and jewelry, which he believes very effectively convey the story of *Beowulf* to a new generation.

María José Gómez Calderón also discusses “*Beowulf* and the Comic Book: Contemporary Readings,” *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses* 55: 107–27. She shows how various modern graphic artists have revisited the poem from Enrico Basari's Italian *Beowulf: Leggenda cristiana della antica Danimarca* [A Christian Legend about Ancient Denmark] (1940–41) to Brian Augustyn's *Beowulf: Gods and Monsters* (2005), where the hero Wulf fights troll-like monsters in modern Manhattan

while standing guard against some unspecified apocalyptic disaster yet to come. Gómez Calderón notes that the comic book became established as a genre at the same time *Beowulf* was canonized as a classic of the English literary tradition after Tolkien's famous British Academy lecture of 1936. She suggests that graphic artists seized upon *Beowulf* in part for the glamour of its new cultural status, though with very different degrees of concern for replicating its own literary qualities for a popular audience. She agrees with Bueno that Hinds's treatment is more sophisticated than that of other comics in the artist's respect for the original poem and its context, and that his *Collected Beowulf* is designed to appeal to a more “mature” audience “with a deeper degree of familiarity with the Old English poem and early medieval, Germanic material culture” (121). Nonetheless, Gómez Calderón sees an irony in the fact that recognition of *Beowulf* as a classic has been part of its commodification for a mass market, a process by which products of “high culture” are appropriated and made “saleable” to consumers of low culture because of their very association with elite taste (127).

Michael Morpurgo retells and Michael Foreman illustrates *Beowulf* (Somerville, MA: Candlewick Press, 2006), n.p.; Nicky Raven retells and John Howe illustrates *Beowulf: The Legend of a Hero* (Dorking, Surrey: Templar Publishing), n. p.; James Rumford both adapts and illustrates *Beowulf: A Hero's Tale Retold* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin), n.p.; and Gareth Hinds illustrated *Beowulf* for Candlewick Press (Somerville, MA), following the out-of-copyright prose translation by A. J. Church (1904).

The Collage Dance Theatre performed an ice-skating interpretation, “My *Beowulf*,” directed by Heidi Duckler on March 2nd at a rink called Iceland in Van Nuys, CA, some clips of which can be found at www.youtube.com/watch?v=BJDIZiL1UxA, which includes the comic voice-over of two American sportscasters in commentary on the action.

Teaching ‘*Beowulf*’

Haruko Momma and Michael Powell consider “Death and Nostalgia: The Future of *Beowulf* in the Post-National Discipline of English,” *Literature Compass* 4/5: 1345–53. The authors adopt the roles of *Historia* and *Poesis*, continuing Tolkien's use of this figure in his 1936 essay on the monsters of *Beowulf*. The former figure reviews the history of *Beowulf* studies since the nineteenth century, particularly as they were inspired by the political search for a heroic national past; the latter believes the future study of the poem will be motivated

by a more personal desire for the kind of self-discovery and intellectual awareness promoted by new trends in literary criticism and theory as currently practiced in departments of English. Both authors agree that the poem's evocation of a lost past will continue to offer students a compelling imaginative world in which to explore feelings of loss and desire.

Robin Norris argues for the salutary benefits of reconceiving courses in the British literary canon as stretching "From *Beowulf* to 'Heaneywulf': Bookending the British Literature Survey," *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Teaching* 14: 57–69. Seamus Heaney's translation of *Beowulf* in the seventh edition of the *Norton Anthology of English Literature* (2000) provides a perfect opportunity, the author finds, to open up a dialogue between Old English scholars and contemporary "poets, post-colonialists, and other non-medievalist colleagues with whom we suddenly share a common text" (58). The author even hopes reading the poem in this translation will mean that it can be discussed twice in the course, once at the beginning "as a product of Anglo-Saxon culture" and then again at the end "as a product of contemporary culture" (67). Norris's own experience suggests that this double perspective on the poem "actually results in a richer understanding of *Beowulf* qua Anglo-Saxon text" (67).

In "Swords, Sex, and Revenge: Teaching *Beowulf* and *Judith* with Tarantino's *Kill Bill*," *Studies in Medieval and Renaissance Teaching* 14: 41–55, Christina M. Fitzgerald argues that Tarantino's two-part film (2003–2004), which features the character Vince Rhames promising to "get medieval on your ass," can be used to help teach Old English poems like *Beowulf* and *Judith* to general education students for whom the course in which these poems are read may be their only exposure to serious literary study and critical interpretation in their undergraduate careers. Fitzgerald notes that a film which depicts a female protagonist in multiple roles as servant, bride, mother, and deadly warrior helps prepare students to see that Wealhtheow's cup-passing in the hall is a far from servile role for women in the world of *Beowulf* and that Grendel's mother is an intelligent and comprehensibly motivated human female, as well as a fierce avenging fury. By watching the movie before reading the poem, students are prepared to observe that Grendel's mother's revenge is not blind malice, but "a willful, planned, human act," an expression of grief and outrage over the mutilation of her only son (47). In fact, Fitzgerald argues, both *Beowulf* and *Kill Bill* reveal the same anxiety and ambivalence in their depiction of vengeance. While both seem to glorify "the cathartic violence of retributive justice," they "also offer ample,

if subtle, critiques of the feuds they detail and the vengeance they dole out, often through the juxtaposition of similar actions arbitrarily justified and condemned... [W]hile the narratives ask us to identify and root for *Beowulf* and *The Bride*, they also offer moments where we might find some sympathy for their opponents or with the indirect victims of feud and revenge" (49). Fitzgerald concludes that the complexity of the characters in *Beowulf* and *Judith* becomes clearer when they are compared with the violent but sympathetic mother of *Kill Bill*.

Manfred Malzahn and Muhammad Abu al-Fadl Badran write on "*Beowulf* in Arabia: Teaching Heroic Poetry in a Post-Heroic Age," in *Beowulf and Beyond*, ed. Hans Sauer and Renate Bauer, *Studies in English Medieval Language and Literature* 18 (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang), 1–15. The authors argue for *Beowulf*'s importance in "English curricula especially in Arab countries, where the discussion of Old English literature can be integrated very well into a contemporary cultural debate" (1). The authors believe that the Western way of life both attracts and repels Arab students, while lacking what "Arab-Islamic culture preserves: namely, traditional values and forms of social organization based primarily on the bonds of kinship, and on the notion of the family or clan as the all-important social unit" (2). In addition, the heroic ideals expressed in Old English poetry are not as remote to young Arabs, because the authors believe that the United Arab Emirates have only recently emerged into what they call a "post-heroic age" (2). Malzahn and al-Fadl Badran compare the relationship between Hrothgar and his retainers to that of a sheikh and his followers. They observe that "clan loyalties and boundaries are well-marked, and blood money, locally known as *diyya*, is paid to the victims of accidental and deliberate killings, in the manner of the Anglo-Saxon *wergild*" (2). One of the differences the authors find between traditional heroic poems in Arabic and the Old English epic is that in the former the narration tends to be in the first person, with the poet adopting the persona of the hero as a "singer of his own deeds" (5). *Beowulf*, with its third person point of view, thus lacks some of the intimacy an Arab audience finds in experiencing the hero's emotions first hand, though the hero (it might be recalled) does describe his sea-contest with Breca (ll. 530–606) and his adventure in Denmark (ll. 2000–2151) in substantial passages of first-person narration recounted by the poet in the third. Another contrast can be illustrated by the Arab hero Antara ibn Shaddad, who, unlike *Beowulf*, is a lover as well as a fighter, one prone to "drunkenness, rape, and even gratuitous killing," rather than

the restraint for which the Anglo-Saxon poet praises his hero (6). Finally, the authors propose “an alternative way of thinking of Grendel and his mother” to Arab students, “as representing those underprivileged who live within earshot of the wealthy....If we think of *Beowulf* in terms of social psychology, we can read it as a nightmare in which the ugly forms of the have-nots surface from the stinking swamps to which they have been relegated, to haunt those who would love to have their enjoyment untainted by such unsightly spectacles” (12). Malzahn and al-Fadl Badran contend that through such readings of *Beowulf* and other Old English poems, Arab Muslim students will come to a greater understanding of their own and of Western culture, and learn to engage more thoughtfully universal questions of morality and social justice.

In “Philosophical Adventures: Thinking Along with *Beowulf*” *Gifted Education International* 22: 192–206, Wendy Turgeon explores how teachers can use the poem as a primary text “to explore transcendent human questions” (194), like those of individual autonomy and freedom of the will, the nature of justice and morality, the role of perception and memory in the construction of knowledge, and the purpose or meaning of life. Turgeon supplies contextual notes, plot summaries, thematic overviews, and “thinking questions” on the different episodes of the poem for teachers to use in class, moving from the specifics of interpreting the text to more general problems of philosophical inquiry.

(The introduction to this section was adapted from the author’s essay, “Translating *Beowulf* [1999–2008],” which appeared online in *The Medieval Review*, 6 May 2009. Many thanks to Jun Terasawa for his coverage of works written in Japanese.)

CRD

Works Not Seen

Ajiro, Atsushi. “Textual Criticism of Old English and *Beowulf*(3),” *Daito Bunka Review* (Tokyo) 38 (March): 33–57 (in Japanese).

Karasawa, Kazutomo. “An Aspect of *Beowulf* Scholarship in Japan.” *The Development of the Anglo-Saxon Language and Linguistic Universals. Series 2: Universals and Variation in Language, Vol. 2*. Ed. Development and Research Center of Socio-Intelligence. Senshu Univ., Graduate School. 75–97 (in Japanese).

4d. Prose

Luisa Bezzo investigates “Parallel Remedies: Old English ‘Paralisin þæt is lyftadl’” in *Form and Content of*

Instruction in Anglo-Saxon England in the Light of Contemporary Manuscript Evidence: Papers Presented at the International Conference, Udine, 6–8 April 2006, ed. Patrizia Lendinara et al., Fédération Internationale des Instituts d’Études Médiévales, Textes et Études du Moyen Âge 39 (Turnhout: Brepols), 435–45. All the texts in the OE medical corpus share recipes without being copies of each other, suggesting a coherent body of medical knowledge, not simply a textual tradition. Bezzo focuses here on palsy, a disease that appears in both medical and non-medical texts. Several medical texts distinguish different kinds of palsy and offer treatments. Only the loan word *paralisin* and its native equivalent *lyftadl* appear in both medical and non-medical texts. Otherwise, both “poetry and prose employ evocative terms which express the idea of a person afflicted by lameness” using “native terms typical of everyday language” (444). Medical works instead use specialized words that describe symptoms and the affected portion of the body, often translating or calquing particular Latin terms. Bezzo concludes that the existence of shared terminology restricted to medical texts suggests a distinct body of professional doctors who taught apprentices using these texts.

Thomas N. Hall explores “Christ’s Birth through Mary’s Right Breast: An Echo of Carolingian Heresy in the Old English *Adrian and Ritheus*,” in *Source of Wisdom: Old English and Early Medieval Latin Studies in Honour of Thomas D. Hill*, ed. Charles D. Wright et al., Toronto Old English Series 16 (Toronto: U of Toronto P), 266–89. *Adrian and Ritheus* claims that Christ was born through Mary’s right breast; in their edition, James Cross and Tom Hill suggest a source in either folklore or heresy. Hall notes numerous Caesarian births in folktales and particularly early Irish literature, but none involve the breast. Carolingian scholars debated the manner of Christ’s birth, partly in response to docteric beliefs that he was not born but an immaterial being, and partly in response to concerns that Mary’s virginity had been compromised by the birth. The breast nourishes, and the right side is usually presented as the more positive; a theory of delivery via the breast allowed a physical birth but kept Mary’s virginity intact. Hall closes with an illustration from a fifteenth-century Ethiopic Life of St. Anne that shows Mary being born from Anne’s right side, evidence of widespread associations of birth from the right side with purity.

Legal Texts

In “Of Kings and Cattle Thieves: The Rhetorical Work of the Fonthill Letter” (*JEGP* 106: 447–467), Scott

Thompson Smith illuminates the “considerable narrative craft” of the Fonthill Letter (448). The Letter appeals to Edward the Elder to uphold a land donation to Winchester and gives the history of the land’s ownership. In recounting the previous lawsuit, the Letter omits the plaintiff’s reasons for his claim and subtly tarnishes his character. The Letter details King Alfred’s involvement, then appeals to Edward to uphold his father’s decision. In its perplexing conclusion, the Letter says that after being outlawed for cattle theft, Helmstan visited Alfred’s grave and returned to Edward with a seal. The Letter successfully narrates a “moral trajectory” (458), for Edward pardoned Helmstan and upheld the land transfer. This rather informal, vernacular document draws upon an image of Alfred as just judge established in Alfredian texts, then appeals to Edward to establish himself as a worthy successor. At Alfred’s death there were four possible claimants to the throne, and Edward’s cousin Æthelwold rebelled and remained a threat until his death in 902. Alfred had had Edward witness some of his charters and named him prominently in his will, apparently to secure Edward’s succession; an unusual number of Edward’s own charters then invoke Alfred and the West Saxon royal line, drawing authority from paternity. The Fonthill Letter, Smith concludes, skillfully matched its rhetoric to Edward’s own appeals to his father’s authority.

NGD

The usefulness of the Old English legislative corpus to the study of historical syntax is the subject of J.R. Schwyter’s “Slipping’ in Old English Narrative and Legislative Prose,” *Studia Neophilologica* 79: 133–47. Scholarship has never been able to agree on whether the phenomenon in which Schwyter’s essay is chiefly interested—unsigned changes in dependent speech of element order, person, and tense—is to be understood as a stylistic feature of some Old English prose indicative of its oral origins, or an element of Old English written grammar. Schwyter notices that studies so far published on this subject have ignored the evidence of royal legislation, and in these texts the author finds the phenomenon occurring with greater frequency during the tenth and eleventh centuries; so much so that Schwyter characterizes it as “an idiom of later Anglo-Saxon legislation that became predominant with king Æthelstan’s edicts” (144). As dependence on oral modes of composition is not to be suspected in this corpus, Schwyter concludes persuasively that “slipping” cannot be attributed to the usual culprits: the aim cannot have been to supply these texts with a lively, speech-like style, and so “slipping” must here be “a reflection of the

extralinguistic circumstances in which...Anglo-Saxon law was conceived, codified and disseminated” (144).

SAJ

Alfredian Literature

Jayne Carroll’s essay “Viking Wars and The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle,” in *‘Beowulf’ and Other Stories* ed. North and Allard (see sec. 4c under *Beowulf*), 301–50, outlines Scandinavian activities in England—“some murderous...some friendly and fruitful” (301)—emphasizing the contribution of Scandinavian people to English language, culture and history. Proceeding chronologically from the first coming of Vikings to the beginning of Cnut’s reign, the author takes her lead from *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* but situates its evidence within a wider context by considering dealings and attitudes reflected in other sources—from Alcuin’s letters and two versions of Life of St. Edmund to skaldic poetry and sagas. By including Richard North’s “Notes to the Old Norse Language” midway through the narrative, the author offers readers an opportunity to examine for themselves similarities and differences of two languages and reveal one more aspect of this “many-sided story” (302).

ZM

Yann Coz writes about “L’Antiquité romaine dans l’Angleterre des années 890: la traduction-adaptation des *Histoires contre les païens* d’Orose en vieil-anglais,” *Bien Dire et Bien Aprandre: Revue de médiévistique* 24: 271–285. The translator often writes, “cwæð Orosius,” to emphasize Orosius’s subjective judgments, but he makes many changes. Coz argues, *pace* Malcolm Godden, that the use of present tense for the Roman Empire indicates a sense that that empire has not fallen; the translator may consider Constantinople or the Carolingian empire a replacement. Orosius refused to discuss the Trojan War, but the translator summarizes the war for his audience before quoting Orosius’s refusal. Partly through confusion and partly through deliberate changes and omissions, the translator presents Caesar and Octavian as unappreciated heroes betrayed by those near them. Caesar’s connections to Britain are emphasized, while Claudius’s expedition is omitted. The translator deemphasizes Christ’s birth and Constantine’s conversion and highlights the Goths; he resents Emperor Theodosius, who sent Goths to their deaths. Coz concludes that the translator has little interest in Orosius’s apologetic themes or most of the great men in the narrative, but that he creates a self-consistent text from a new perspective.

Ohthere's Voyages: A Late 9th-Century Account of Voyages along the Coasts of Norway and Denmark and Its Cultural Context, ed. Janet Bately and Anton Englert, Maritime Culture of the North 1 (Roskilde: Viking Ship Museum), begins with Janet Bately's "Ohthere and Wulfstan in the Old English *Orosius*" (18–39), which orients readers by giving brief overviews of Orosius's *Historiarum adversum paganos*; the OE *Orosius*, its editing history, authorship, sources, and issues of its geographical chapter; and the accounts of Ohthere and Wulfstan. Bately then argues that the shifting points of view and abrupt or missing transitions signal that these accounts are partial transcripts of question-and-answer sessions. An interpolator probably introduced the reports into the *Orosius* after its translator had completed it, with less care than that translator used in updating the geographical chapter. The content of both accounts would surely have interested the king and court, but so would other matters not recorded here. The reference to Alfred as Ohthere's *hlaforð* could well have come from a foreigner's polite salutation "my lord," rather than a formal relationship. Cultural and linguistic differences between Ohthere (and perhaps a translator) and his audience complicated matters: Bately notes disjunctions between the senses of certain Old Norse words and the Old English terms found in the account. She finishes by noting that questions of Ohthere's own status remain open: no precise terms such as *jarl* (OE *eorl*), *þegn*, or any other words for noble, farmer, or merchant, allow us to know Ohthere's status.

Bately's piece provides an excellent introduction to her edition, which follows: "Text and Translation: The Three Parts of the Known World and the Geography of Europe North of the Danube According to Orosius' *Historiae* and Its Old English Version" (40–58, with two endnotes by E. G. Stanley). The section begins with excerpts from the Latin text (Zangemeister's edition). Then the OE appears, with excerpts from the geographical portion of the *Orosius* followed by the full accounts of Ohthere and Wulfstan, all based on Bately's own 1980 edition. She offers close Modern English translation in parallel columns next to both Latin and OE, with light footnotes. Longer endnotes, in alphabetical order, follow the texts and treat names, unusual terms, and related topics such as ale, freezing technology, and mare's milk. The notes should be useful both to complete novices (the name "Alfred" is glossed) and to advanced scholars, who will find linguistic details and numerous up-to-date references for further study.

Bately's essay contains the inset note "Troublesome Editing: Daines Barrington and J. R. Forster" by E. G. Stanley (*Ohthere's Voyages*, 20). Barrington, the

Orosius's first editor, is "held in contempt" for multiple transgressions. Most notably, though Barrington acknowledged in his edition that its notes were by J. R. Forster, an article he published drawing heavily on the edition and notes did *not* credit Forster. Forster later denounced Barrington so violently that a translator refused to render Forster's lengthy footnote into English.

Later in the same volume, Ian Wood surveys "Early Medieval Accounts of the North before the Old English *Orosius*" (60–65). Orosius's Latin geography provided key information to early medieval writers, but they used other sources too, some with greater interest in the North. Jordanes's *Getica* traces the Goths to Scandia and describes the region. Jordanes's Byzantine contemporary Procopius interspersed geographical details in his work, but Procopius had little influence in the West. The Ravenna Cosmographer drew on earlier texts, including three by Goths, but again this work circulated little. The roughly contemporary work ascribed to Aethicus Ister dwells at length on the North, though "the vast majority of the material is clearly fanciful" (63). Paul the Deacon's *Historia Langobardum* traces the Lombards to Scandinavia with many details about the region. Finally, Rimbert, made bishop of Hamburg-Bremen after doing missionary work in Scandinavia, recounts many episodes with significant religious and cultural details in his *vita* of his predecessor Anskar. Wood notes throughout where writers demonstrate particular interest in the Sami, though other Scandinavian peoples had more contact with the rest of Europe. He concludes that early medieval treatments of the geography of the North unite interests in "classical ethnography" (65) and contemporary developments, but none compare to Ohthere's account.

Susan Irvine offers a strong introduction to "Old English Prose: King Alfred and His Books" in *'Beowulf' and Other Stories*, ed. North and Allard, 246–71. Irvine briefly sketches out Alfred's myth and some key facts about his life and political, military, and cultural context. She notes both the paucity of English prose before Alfred and the radical nature of his translation program in using the vernacular, adapting texts, and choosing the particular texts that it did. The chapter briefly describes each of the texts associated with Alfred personally and with his patronage, and it mentions some works whose connections with the program are uncertain. Irvine then treats the program's emphasis on wisdom and wisdom's association with wealth. She closes by briefly illustrating the rhetorical skill of these works, including alliteration, recurring motifs, and vivid stories and images.

Citing George Lakoff and Mark Johnson's work on metaphor as a mode of thought, Antonina Harbus examines how "Metaphors of Authority in Alfred's Prefaces," *Neophilologus* 91: 717–727, construct authority for Alfred as both king and translator. Translations' authority derives partly from that of the original author and work, but Alfred's prefaces make new claims for the power of the vernacular. Across prefaces, Alfred presents himself as a skilled, powerful interpreter of texts, using metaphors of hunting and building to convey a physical sense of strength. His metaphors create little narratives wherein Alfred mediates between difficult text and readers. Alfred also draws upon Gregory's water imagery to depict himself as channeling living water from God, which passed through Gregory and now passes through Alfred. Alfred is called a *wealhstod* in the Preface to the *Boethius*, as Christ is in the OE *Pastoral Care*. Alfred even occupies the positions both of lord and his man: he compares his work in the *Soliloquies* to a man building a cottage with land and help from his lord, though elsewhere he speaks as king. Harbus concludes, "Alfred explicitly constructs a role for himself combining royal, divine, and authorial power" (725), showing his strength and skill through masterful use of language and rhetoric and thus presenting his works "as securely authorised transmissions rather than as the textual adaptations they seem to us to be" (726).

Dolores Fernández Martínez takes "A Functional Approach to Register in the Preface to the *Pastoral Care*," *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses* 55: 69–83. First, she uses M. A. K. Halliday's notion of field: the Preface introduces a new educational program against a setting of intellectual decline. James R. Martin's institutional approach to field helps reveal the relations between church, state, and education, all connected to wealth, as "not only an essential ingredient within the whole institutional purpose of the text, but the goal itself" and a "mark of social distinction" (73) that Alfred's program reinforces. References to Alfred's helpers name them, classify them, and emphasize their relation to power and to God. She moves next to Halliday's tenor: Alfred names and classifies both sender and receiver of his translation, specifying multiple roles for some participants in the discourse. References to *menn* universalize the letter even as the Preface reinforces existing social distinctions. Alfred's first person plural pronoun constructs "a collective participant" (76) and marks closeness between the king and his audience while keeping Alfred's own subjectivity central. The adverbs *luflice* 7 *freondlice* ("lovingly and in a friendly way") also indicate closeness, while his description of his *wiotena* ("council") as *godena* ("good") flatters readers. In

terms of mode, Alfred's epistolary appeal presents current danger, past decline, and the possibility of future success. The Preface constructs a program that will reconstruct society. Fernández Martínez concludes that discourse analysis supports traditional readings of the Preface while exposing the linguistic means Alfred uses to persuade readers to embrace his program.

David F. Johnson asks, "Why Ditch the *Dialogues*? Reclaiming an Invisible Text," *Source of Wisdom*, ed. Wright et al., 201–16. Johnson shows how little attention the *Dialogues* have received in editions and studies of the texts, anthologies, and even bibliographies. He identifies three reasons for this neglect. First, this early translation seems remote from Alfred the Great, and his motives in commissioning it unclear. Second, the work has been judged "naïve" and a poor translation. Third, lack of "an accessible, reliable, full-service edition" (206) discourages study. Johnson concludes by examining two anecdotes from the text to establish that the *Dialogues* should be studied with hagiography, and that their intended audience includes secular clergy. The welcome news that Johnson himself is working with Rolf H. Bremmer on a new edition, oddly, lies buried in the final footnote.

¶¶Kevin Kiernan's "Remodeling Alfred's *Boethius* with the *tol ond andweorc* of Edition Production Technology (EPT)," in *Making Sense: Constructing Meaning in Early English*, ed. Antonette diPaolo Healey and Kevin Kiernan, Publ. of the Dictionary of Old English 7 (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies), 72–115, simultaneously elucidates many of the problems of reading and editing the OE *Boethius* and the possibilities offered by the EPT. Kiernan surveys the history of both manuscripts and editions of the *Boethius*, which until Godden and Irvine's 2009 edition conflated the prose of the two major manuscripts, separated prose and verse, or both. Kiernan illustrates in words and images how EPT can be used to study the *Boethius* or be generalized for other manuscripts, saying, "the following screenshots from the *Electronic Boethius* will no doubt leave most readers yearning for a print equivalent of the browsers' Text Zoom feature" (84), which was at least true for *this* reader. He demonstrates how various tools can be used to study different features and do not require scholars themselves to write code in order to create very flexible or specialized searches.

Paul E. Szarmach uses "Alfred's Nero," *Source of Wisdom*, 147–67, as a lens to view Alfred's methods in the Old English *Boethius*. The *De consolatione philosophiae*'s part two, meter six and part three, meter four treat Nero in seventeen and eight Latin verses respectively. Alfred elaborates the first Latin poem, a list of

Nero's crimes, into a prose meditation on the nature of power and its force for evil. The metrical version amplifies Nero's particular crimes and queries why a good and omnipotent God permits evil. Szarmach finds no positive evidence for the use of commentaries in either adaptation. The second Latin meter asks whether those favored by Nero were *beatos* ('blessed,' 157–8); the OE prose asks instead whether they were *gesceadwis* ('wise,' 157). The poetic version downplays Nero's sin of luxury to emphasize a more general evil. Finally, Szarmach turns to part three, prose five and its examples of royal favor. In the prose passage, Alfred may have drawn on glosses for details of Seneca's death. Szarmach concludes that "'Word for word' and 'sense for sense' are insufficient mantras for Alfredian composition" (161), which reflects both a freer and a more complex process of translation drawing very selectively upon commentary traditions to reshape anecdotes and themes to Alfred's own times and purposes.

In "Rewriting Women in the Old English *Boethius*" (*New Windows on a Woman's World*, ed. Colin Gibson and Lisa Marr, 2 vols., Otago Studies in English 9 [Dunedin, New Zealand: Dept. of English, U of Otago, 2005], 488–501), Susan Irvine explores how changes to the Latin source text give greater attention to women in the *Boethius*. As Irvine notes, scholars usually consider the grammatically masculine *Wisdom* male. Yet Alfred presents Wisdom as a mother figure, replacing Boethius's Philosophy as nurse with Wisdom as foster mother and even mother. The OE text stresses Wisdom's role in the narrator's upbringing where the Latin describes men raising him. The OE also highlights individual women. Alfred not only describes the virtues of Boethius's wife but also emphasizes *her* sorrow at Boethius's imprisonment where the Latin tells of Boethius's sadness. Where Boethius recounts Nero's murders of mother and brother, Alfred adds the killing of Nero's wife to put "in the most brutal terms the dire effects of perverted power" (493). The OE emphasizes Eurydice's virtue where Boethius's account of Orpheus scarcely even mentions her. The OE version ends with the possibility of atonement, adding hope where the Latin lacks it. The Ulysses and Circe episode diverges further from the Latin. The *Boethius* presents Circe more as woman than goddess and emphasizes the love affair, which she apparently initiates. In more general passages, the OE text discusses marriage more than the Latin, adds the idea of suffering in childbirth as penalty for enjoying intercourse, and even raises the specter of death in childbirth, foregrounding women's perspectives.

An elaborate metaphor of cutting wood and building a pleasant home dominates the Preface to the OE

Soliloquies; Valerie Heuchan seeks the imagery's foundations in "God's Co-Workers and Powerful Tools: A Study of the Sources of Alfred's Building Metaphor in his Old English Translation of Augustine's *Soliloquies*," *N&Q* 54: 1–11. As king, Alfred had thirty fortifications built or renovated, and two literary sources complement his possible personal interest. 1 Corinthians 3:9–14 imagines Christians as God's helpers and building, then describes Paul as a "wise architect" (5), and urges others to build upon their own foundations as Alfred advises readers to cut and build with their wood. Both Paul and Alfred exhort careful selection of materials suitable for eternity. Heuchan argues that Alfred must have known 1 Cor. 3 well: she sees Paul's contrasts between flesh and spirit echoed in the opposition between *lichamlic* ("bodily") and *gastlic* ("spiritual") in *Soliloquies*, Paul's invocation as God as the giver of growth in Alfred's description of the cycle of life, and "the folly of worldly wisdom" (7) in each text. Aldhelm's prose *De virginitate* also envisions writing as building and invokes Christ's help. Asser uses Aldhelm's bee metaphor and tells of "building" Alfred's *enchorion* (Asser, Chap. 88), so he knew Aldhelm's work and the specific image. Alfred's Preface demonstrates "literary skill and imagination" (9) deployed so that Alfred might be "a useful and powerful *tol* for God and his subjects" (10).

‡‡Minwoo Yoon's "Origin and Supplement: Marvels and Miracles in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicles* and Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*," in *Global Perspectives on Medieval English Literature, Language, and Culture*, ed. Kaylor and Nokes (see sec. 2), 195–228, argues that the *Chronicle* depicts primarily marvels (evidence of an incomprehensible Other), while Bede presents miracles (works of God). Unusual weather or heavenly phenomena rarely have clear causes in the *Chronicle*. More strikingly, unnatural incidents may be signs (*tacen*) or even illusion (*dwild*); "a marvel is of 'mistlice'—dark and manifold—origin because of the polytheistic nature of pagan belief" (199). Miracles appear only late and rarely in the *Chronicle*. Yoon reads the *Chronicle* as "inorganic" "conglomeration" (203) with "nostalgia for the pagan ancestral origin" (204) where other recent work emphasizes more its art and rhetoric. Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* replaces marvels with miracles but reveals continuities between pagan magic and marvel and Christian prayer and miracle. Bede's accounts often follow a pattern: a holy person lives a Christ-like life, the corpse is miraculously preserved after death, and then translated relics produce further miracles. Fetishized relics replace pagan fetishes, and "dis-membering" (216) a body creates memory of a saint.

Where the *Chronicle* traces a pagan Germanic ancestry for Alfred, Bede's relics look not back to origins but ahead, as in a Foucauldian genealogy. Bede's miracles represent both Jakobson's modes of writing: metaphorical because they change "the interpretation of prodigies" (218), metonymic in their patterned repetitions. Christianity simultaneously assimilated its pagan Other and differentiated itself. Bede's miracles "are in a constant flux between origin and supplement, territorialization and deterritorialization, a new paradigm and its horizontal expansion, a universal religion and the 'micro-Christendoms'" (quoting Brown 2003: 222).

Tristan Major argues for "1 Corinthians 15:52 as a Source for the Old English Version of Bede's Simile of the Sparrow," *N&Q* 54: 11–16. He contends that previous scholars who located Biblical sources for Bede's own Latin simile were misled by coincidence; the allusions they identify do not enhance the text, but an allusion introduced in translation enriches it. The translator generally stays close to Bede's Latin in this passage, but he adds *eagan bryhtm* and *gerisenlicre*. While the otherwise untranslated *tuis oculis elabitur* in the Latin might have suggested the OE *eagan bryhtm*, the change makes significant reference to 1 Cor. 15. Indeed, Major asserts that most uses of this OE phrase are associated with Corinthians (although the typo *beahmtme* for *breahmtme*, 15, clouds the issue). Major then suggests that the doublet *cuðlicre 7 gerisenlicre* for the Latin *certius* puns on *gerisen*, 'resurrected'. He concludes that the translator, troubled by the hopelessness of the Latin image, crafts subtle allusions to Corinthians to offer "hope of an afterlife" (16).

NGD

The Benedictine Reform

Stewart Brookes offers an engaging, humorous, and accessible introduction to Old English prose in "Prose Writers of the English Benedictine Reform" (*Beowulf and Other Stories*, ed. North and Allard, 417–53). Starting with the Reform itself, he discusses the initiatives of Æthelwold, Dunstan, Oswald, and Edgar, before turning to Ælfric—his works, his rhythmic style, and his educational concerns, particularly as seen in his *Colloquy*. Next, Brookes sketches various responses to the new millennium, including the passionate exhortations of Wulfstan, the apocalyptic imagery of the Blickling sermons, or the censure of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* regarding fearful leadership amidst Viking raids. Turning to math and science, he discusses Byrhtferth's *Enchiridion* and the study of *computus*. Considering "fantasy literature," he speaks of Ælfric's enthusiasm for elephants and of the depiction of wondrous beasts

in *The Marvels of the East*. Concluding with an "early romance," he tells of the giddy adventures of *Apollo-nius of Tyre*. The result is a survey that may tempt the unwary reader to view Old English prose as having glimmers of potential interest.

AK

In "Reading Byrhtferth's Muses: Emending Section Breaks in Byrhtferth's 'Hermeneutic English,'" *N&Q* 54: 19–22, Rebecca Stephenson analyzes the passage wherein Byrhtferth dispatches the Muses but asks for a hot coal to purify his mouth. In Baker and Lapidge's edition of the *Enchiridion*, this appeal ends section 3.1, though Byrhtferth's source is the opening of Aldhelm's *Carmen de virginitate*. Stephenson argues that in the "monumental task" of editing the poorly copied *Enchiridion*, Baker and Lapidge's decision to place the start of section 3.2 before a rubric and Latin couplet was understandable but mistaken. The editors's section break should appear before the passage on the Muses. Here, Byrhtferth uses "hermeneutic English" to begin a section translating and explicating a poem on the Paschal cycle, establishing himself as a teacher in the mold of Isaiah, evoked in Aldhelm's longer passage.

NGD

Homilies

The study of Old English homilies received a boost this year with the publication of a landmark collection of essays edited by Aaron J. Kleist: *The Old English Homily: Precedent, Practice, and Appropriation* (Turnhout: Brepols). This large, well-planned volume consists of sixteen essays organized under three rubrics: "Precedent" (dealing generally with sources and contexts), "Practice" (dealing with issues such as style, codicology, audience), and "Appropriation" (dealing with the afterlife of Anglo-Saxon homiletic materials).

The section "Precedent" leads off with Charles D. Wright's "Old English Homilies and Latin Sources" (15–66), which is a learned introduction to the subject of source study with a wealth of bibliography. Focusing on the corpus of anonymous Old English homilies, Wright discusses the methods of source study, including key definitions and assumptions in the field. He stresses the significance of verbal parallels, chronology, intermediate sources, manuscripts, "oral transmission and memorial quotation" (24). He then illustrates the importance of source study in four areas: textual criticism, literary history, intellectual history, and stylistic analysis. Wright shows the importance of Latin sources for the editing of texts: knowledge of Latin sources may provide an additional bit of evidence in deciding an

Old English textual reading. In terms of literary history, source study can be valuable evidence for determining common authorship among texts; sources can also “sometimes fix the terminus post quem of a homily, or establish the relative chronology of two or more homilies” (34). Sources are important evidence for Anglo-Saxon literacy and questions of audience as well: “Close attention to omissions, additions, and alterations may thus yield insight into a homilist’s assumptions about his audience—what he thought needed to be simplified, elaborated, or qualified in order to accommodate the source to their needs and conditions” (41–42). Source study of homilies also can give us information about intellectual history—the intellectual lives, aspirations, and ideologies of homiletic authors. He treats this issue by discussing the Anglo-Saxon apprehension of the Bible, the apocrypha, and several patristic authorities and pseudo-patristic authorities. Wright’s final area is stylistic analysis, including authors’ perception of the rhetoric of the Latin sources they are reading and their subsequent transformation of that rhetoric into Old English prose. This essay is an excellent introduction to the field of Old English homilies and source study in general.

In the same volume Nancy Thompson searches for a context for the Blickling manuscript in “The Carolingian *De Festiuitatibus* and the Blickling Book” (97–119). She looks to Carolingian precedents and inspiration for the Old English collection, and she settles on the Carolingian capitula *De festiuitatibus*, a legislative text that sets out the important feasts of the liturgical year. These texts were “[i]ssued by both royal and episcopal authorities [and] circulated with legislation governing priestly duties or lay religious obligations, providing a convenient list of the most solemn occasions for the Church year” (101). The Carolingian legislation “suggest[s] an inspiration for the manuscript’s compilation and an explanation for its somewhat limited scope” (119); accordingly, Thompson argues that the Blickling collection may have been assembled by the inspiration of such a text. She surveys a variety of these capitula, showing that they were addressed to the laity and were also connected with the preaching of homilies. She notes, however, that when these texts made their way to Anglo-Saxon England, their extant manuscript contexts suggest they circulated with monastic materials in tenth-century England.

AS

Thomas J. Heffernan considers the impact of humanity’s Fall on the heavenly bodies in “‘The Sun Shall be Turned to Darkness and the Moon to Blood’: How

Sin and Redemption Affect Heavenly Space in an Old English Transfiguration Homily,” in *Place, Space, and Landscape in Medieval Narrative*, ed. Laura L. Howes (Knoxville: U of Tennessee P), 63–78. Having traced connections between sin and creation from God’s curse on the earth in Genesis to the apocalyptic devastation of Revelation, he turns to homily VI/11 in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 343 for a specific example of this theme. Heffernan briefly introduces the manuscript and suggests that the vernacular items therein were used principally for private reading and/or as a resource for new homiletic compositions rather than direct preaching: even if audiences in conservative areas could have understood the two-hundred-year-old vocabulary, he muses, “it is unclear how an evangelical ministry would have been strengthened while preaching linguistically anachronistic homilies” (67). He notes that homily VI/11 itself, while it derives primarily from a Lenten homily by Bede, adds a passage which teaches that the sun, moon, and stars were dimmed as a result of humanity’s sin and that their appearance will be transformed along with the saints’ at the Judgment even as Christ’s was at the Transfiguration. One key root of the homily’s suggestion that these bodies *þare menniscen cunde onfon sceoldon* (“were obliged to take on the condition of men”) may well have been Paul’s description of creation as subjected to corruption, from which it will be delivered into the glory of the children of God (Romans 8:20–21). Heffernan also surveys the relationship of human sin and creation in Greek, Semitic, and early Christian thought. Looking especially at the text’s assertion that the saints’ glory at Judgment will vary in accordance with their merits, finally, Heffernan proposes that the passage may derive not from Pseudo-Isidore’s *De ordine creaturarum*, as had previously been suggested, but Ambrose’s commentary on 2 Esdras in his *De bono mortis*.

In “Constructing Preacher and Audience in Old English Homilies” (*Constructing the Medieval Sermon*, ed. Roger Andersson [Turnhout: Brepols], 177–188), Mary Swan considers ways in which vernacular preaching texts defined Christian identity, and in particular the respective roles of preacher and audience within it. Examining three vernacular homilies for a single liturgical occasion which independently translate closely related source material, she shows that while all reinforce the idea that believers are a community participating corporately in ritual and holding doctrine in common, the homilies use different strategies alternately to merge and differentiate the speaker and those receiving his words. In Blickling III (s. x^{ex}) and Bodley 343 Homily V (s. xii²), Swan asserts, the traditional

address to *Men þa leofestan* ("most beloved men") both positions the preacher as one authorized to define the audience and constructs the latter as a uniform group with gendered overtones. Its use of the plural *we*, by contrast, subsumes the preacher within the body of believers even as it underscores his authority over it—as in *Us is þonne to geþencenne* ("We must therefore remember"), for example (183). Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies* I.11 (s. x^{ex}), on the other hand, opens with a first-person address (*ic ondræde þ[æt] ge ne magon...understandan* ["I fear that you might not understand"]) that distances the concerned pastor from his unlearned parishioners. Such an approach, Swan suggests, is unusual for Ælfric, who often avoids "I" or "you" when expounding the Gospel reading so that his explanations "sound absolutely unquestionable, rather than the interpretation of one particular person" (184). Halfway through the homily, however, he returns consistently to using *we*—as in *we scolun us bebiddan* ("we should pray")—in a way that unites preacher and audience as subjects of Christ even as it positions the audience as subject to the preacher's direction. Such nuanced forms of address thus contain "performative" power: the ability to craft the identity of performers and their receivers, molding preacher and audience into distinctive moral agents.

In *Gluttons for Punishment: The Drunk and Disorderly in Early English Homilies* (24th Brixworth Lecture, 2006; The Brixworth Lectures, Second series, no. 6, Leicester [The Friends of All Saints Church, Brixworth]), Elaine Treharne traces the evolving significance of drunkenness to the medieval Church, demonstrates the connection for homiletic writers between drunkenness and lust, and determines that stereotypical depictions of the English as drunkards have an unfortunately long history. In terms of Church views on drunkenness, first of all, Treharne distinguishes the Seven Deadly Sins enumerated by Gregory the Great from the Eight Capital Sins that appear as well in medieval English writings: in both lists, she notes, it is gluttony rather than drunkenness that is in view, though the latter becomes increasingly prominent in descriptions of gluttonous intemperance. Where John Cassian, who in the fifth century first places gluttony at the beginning of the Eight Sins (perhaps as the most common and least dangerous) and focuses on overeating rather than overdrinking (6 and 8), the tenth-century Vercelli homilist emphasizes them both, while in Ælfric drunkenness appears independently as a sin perhaps equal to gluttony (15). Vercelli and Ælfric in particular also draw a direct connection between drunkenness and lust. The Blickling homilist, too, notes the connection, though he recognizes the importance of sustenance

and reproduction: taking perhaps a more lenient view, he concedes that venial sins are an inevitable part of the human experience but warns believers against taking pleasure in eating, drinking, or sexual activity, since immoderate pleasure leads to mortal sin. These pervasive admonitions against drunkenness and its concomitant vices in Anglo-Saxon homiletic texts, combined with repeated depictions of Anglo-Saxon drunkenness by post-Conquest historians, lead Treharne to consider how reports of Anglo-Saxon behavior may have led to the creation of a national stereotype in this regard. By contrast, she portrays homiletic exhortations against drunkenness as calls to reject behavioral patterns that permit such stereotyping—calls for reform that serve as "literary resistance to Conquest and subordination" (23).

AK

Samantha Zacher offers a convincing re-appraisal of the literary artistry of the Vercelli homilies in "Rereading the Style and Rhetoric of the Vercelli Homilies" (*The Old English Homily*, 173–207). Her aim is to revitalize the study of Old English prose style in general but the anonymous homilies (including the Vercelli book texts) in particular. She notes that the artistic and aesthetic qualities of the anonymous homilies have been generally dismissed; most recent work has been directed at source study. Zacher helpfully shows that the artistry, rhetoric, and style of the homilies can be studied not only through comparison with Latin sources but also independently, taking the Old English works on their own terms. First, she introduces the Vercelli manuscript, its texts, and the scholarship on the homilies, noting in particular anything that has been written on the homilies' literary aspects (175–183); she also surveys various theories about the compilation of the Vercelli manuscript and its audience. Second, she surveys the devices and methods that have been used to analyze Old English poetic style and discusses how such criteria can be applied to prose (183–186). Third, she engages in a close rhetorical and stylistic analysis of one homily, *Vercelli XVII*, a text for the Feast of the Purification of the Virgin Mary (187–207). She shows that while the author follows his Vulgate source, there is also "considerable extemporization upon the biblical material" (189). The nature of the original flourishes include verbal repetitions such as echo-words and phrases, related clusters of similar words or word roots, repetition of thematically significant phrases, intricate use of typology, and symmetrical verbal structures of various sorts. She productively takes source study into the realm of stylistic analysis by measuring the homilist's careful

use of sources: “These influences can be measured not only by the negative evidence of the absence of a source text, but also through the use of such intricate rhetorical devices as verbal repetition, echo words, wordplay, and doublets, all of which go beyond those sources we have on record for the homily, and which showcase the potential of vernacular prose as a medium of effective, flexible, and artistic expression” (206). She concludes by calling for renewed study of the style of Old English prose homilies and “closer attention in general to the parallels between vernacular texts both within single manuscript compilation and, indeed, across those more densely perceived barriers with respect to authorship and chronology” (206–207).

Christopher Abram provides an excellent introduction to “Anglo-Saxon Homilies in Their Scandinavian Context” (*The Old English Homily*, 425–444). Abram explains that “specialists in Old Norse-Icelandic... have tended to marginalize utilitarian Christian texts” (426). About one-hundred and fifty Old Norse homiletic texts survive in about thirty-three manuscripts dating from the twelfth to the sixteenth centuries (425–426), and thus “a good deal of potentially useful work remains to be done on Old Norse-Icelandic homilies: a number of texts remain unedited; the influence of homiletic writings on other genres has yet to be traced; and, while the sources of many Old Norse-Icelandic homilies have already been identified, the circumstances by which these sources came to be disseminated in Scandinavia often remain obscure” (426). The Old Norse homiletic corpus provides new research opportunities and a window into intellectual transactions between the religious cultures of England and Scandinavia. Abram discusses the influence of Anglo-Saxon homilies in Scandinavia under three rubrics: “the physical transit of homiletic manuscripts from England to Scandinavia,” “the use of sources of English provenance, either in Latin or the vernacular, in translated Old Norse-Icelandic homilies” and “the adoption of motifs, rhetorical techniques, and prose stylistics drawn directly from the Old English tradition in original Old Norse compositions” (425). His essay proceeds through these three categories, examining the manuscript evidence for Anglo-Saxon texts in Scandinavia, sources for Old Norse texts that can be traced to Latin and vernacular sources of Anglo-Saxon provenance, including Ælfric’s works in Old Norse translation and composite Old Norse homilies based on Old English texts, using a variety of evidence such as style, verbal correspondences, and thematic similarities. He also explores the more general influence of Anglo-Saxon homilies on Old Norse compositions in terms of shared motifs and other stylistic

and rhetorical affinities. He ends by suggesting that the evidence points to Bury St. Edmunds and Worcester as possible conduits for the transmission of Anglo-Saxon homiletic materials to the Scandinavian world.

AS

Roland Perron’s 2006 M.A. thesis from McGill University examines “*In laudem sancti Michaelis: The Irish and Coptic Analogues and the Anglo-Saxon Context*” (*MAI* 45: 4). The text in question is an apocryphal vernacular sermon on the archangel Michael written in an eleventh-century hand in the margins of Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 41 alongside a copy of the Old English *Bede*. Having surveyed research to date on the text, Perron conducts a detailed examination of “idiosyncratic” or “heretical” elements therein (9), such as the etymological explication of Michael’s name; traces Irish and Coptic analogues to the sermon; links it thematically to other marginalia “archived” in CCCC 41 (60); and situates it in its Anglo-Saxon context, including Ælfric’s condemnation of unorthodox material. He concludes with an edition and translation of the sermon and its Irish analogue, the *Liber Flavus Fergusiorum*, and reproduces another scholar’s translation of a Coptic analogue attributed to Theodosius I of Alexandria.

Loredana Teresi’s study of “Ælfric’s or Not? The Making of a *Temporale* Collection in Late Anglo-Saxon England” (*The Old English Homily*, 285–310) calls scholars to reconsider Ælfric’s responsibility for three manuscripts hitherto closely associated with him: Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 302; London, British Library, Cotton Faustina A. xi; and Cambridge, University Library, Ii. 4. 6. Ranging from the middle of the eleventh to the first half of the twelfth century, these manuscripts represented for Peter Clemoes both the fourth phase (δ) of Ælfric’s development of the First Series of *Catholic Homilies* and a major reorganization of *temporale* homilies around 1002 to 1005 that he called TH I. Ælfric’s responsibility for the ancestor(s) of these manuscripts was challenged by John Pope, who argued that errors in the collections pointed to a faulty ancestor at some remove from Ælfric. Teresi, however, suggests a third possibility: noting that the Ælfrician material in the collections, while similar, corresponds directly to the *temporale* items for the period in question from Ælfric’s *Catholic Homilies* and *Lives of Saints*, she argues that the *temporale* series in CUL Ii. 4. 6 and in the ancestor of CCCC 302 and Cotton Faustina A. ix may have been compiled independently by others, perhaps at Canterbury, with access to the *Catholic Homilies* and *Lives of Saints*. Her argument challenges a major aspect

of Clemeos's larger theories regarding the development, chronology, and dissemination of Ælfric's works, and so implicitly calls for a wider re-examination of these foundational tenets of Ælfrician scholarship.

In discussing "A New Latin Source for Two Old English Homilies (Fadda I and Blickling I): Pseudo-Augustine, *Sermo* App. 125, and the Ideology of Chastity in the Anglo-Saxon Benedictine Reform" (*Source of Wisdom*, 239–65), Charles D. Wright gives a fascinating glimpse into a debate during the Benedictine Reform over the word *clænness* (moral cleanness) and its implications for lay and clerical sexual purity. The sixth- or seventh-century Pseudo-Augustinian sermon formed the basis for an extended passage in two vernacular sermons, Fadda I and Blickling I, and may have influenced Ælfric's composition of certain works as well. The author of Fadda I, first of all, quotes part of the Latin source to authorize his own discourse, attributes certain quotations from this source to Christ himself (perhaps indicating a broad view of what he considered divinely-inspired "scripture"), and yet occasionally revises his source's theology, minimizing woman's role as a source of grace (Mary) rather than sin (Eve), and "nudging passages that smack of semi-Pelagianism in the direction of an Augustinian theology of sin and grace" (250). In the process, he translates much of the sermon straightforwardly; where he does depart from it, he sometimes still preserves much of his source's language. As Wright observes, "it is as if the homilist felt bound to match the majority of the Latin words with some lexical equivalent, but equally free to say something different with them" (250). As what remains appears to reflect the homilist's own theological views, however, the sermon may provide another contemporary perspective on the question of clerical celibacy. While Fadda I does admonish married couples to live *on clænnessa*—that is, temporary abstinence—during Lent, in drawing on Pseudo-Augustine, it "accepts without qualification its equation of *castitas* with the virginity exemplified and founded by Christ, the *castitatis auctor* and *magister castitatis*" (253). That the author should give primacy to virginity and clerical chastity while providing room for lay virtue echoes Ælfric's views on the subject, and indeed, Wright suggests that Ælfric may have derived his description of Christ as the "origin and beginning of chastity" in certain works (*Catholic Homilies* I.21 and his first Latin and Old English letters for Wulfstan) from the Pseudo-Augustinian sermon. Blickling I, by contrast, uses the ambiguity of the word *clænness* to make Christ's pure example applicable to a wider audience. While the virginity of Christ and Mary constitute the highest form

of *clænness*, he suggests that "the virtue can also be fulfilled by Christians who have mercy, faith, love, and obedience" (255). As with *timor Domini* ("fear of the Lord"), Wright maintains, which the Reformers associated with obedience to a rule and the renunciation of property, the definition of the term *clænness* was far from an idle debate: rather, it was a battleground for those who supported and opposed the Reform's insistence that certain traits—in this case, celibacy—be the defining marks of monks and regular clergy.

Insight into the lasting nature of the post-Conquest homiletic tradition is offered by Aidan Conti in "The Circulation of the Old English Homily in the Twelfth Century: New Evidence from Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 343" (*Old English Homily*, 365–402). He argues that the importance of the vernacular in twelfth-century literature is better assessed not by the (highly limited) production of new works in English, but by the "sustained and profound interest" in English works evidenced by the ongoing reuse of Old English works (367). His case in point is the complex collection of material in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 343. The manuscript is valuable on a number of counts, particularly for preserving unique copies, major reworkings, or the sole twelfth-century witnesses to various Anglo-Saxon texts. In addition, however, in a series of little-studied Latin homilies, it reproduces a version of the Carolingian Homiliary of Angers, a work copied and translated into Old English in the eleventh-century Taunton fragments. While little analysis has been done of the homiliary's style, sources, and audience, Conti notes that the material is frequently catechetical rather than exegetical, suggests that the existing exegesis is original (if commonplace) rather than patristically derived, and argues that it was compiled as a series of notes or outlines to aid preachers delivering vernacular sermons to laity. Pointing to yet another witness to the Homiliary of Angers, the thirteenth-century Cambridge, St John's College C. 12, Conti concludes that the Bodley 343 collection reflects not antiquarian interests as much as contemporary need—a live, ongoing tradition of English preaching. Bodley 343 thus attests to the lasting importance of traditional homiletic works in the centuries following the Conquest.

E. G. Stanley offers a respectful but detailed analysis of "Lambeth Homilies: Richard Morris's Emendations," *N&Q* 54: 224–31. Noting that Morris was a very accurate transcriber working with limited assistance from contemporary dictionaries, grammars, and editions, Stanley nonetheless gives careful consideration to emendations proposed or made by Morris and by Sarah O'Brien in her 1985 Oxford dissertation

on the homilies of Lambeth Palace Library 487. Stanley depicts Morris as “very conservative” and O’Brien as “more adventurous”—with the latter earning some approbation in his view (224). At times, Stanley suggests, O’Brien’s emendations are to be welcomed (226); at others, it is Morris who “rightly corrects” when the manuscript makes poor sense (228). On occasion, however, Morris alters certain forms “unnecessarily” (224), particularly when swayed by the readings of a source text (e.g. by Ælfric); O’Brien too makes changes that deprive the reader of good (if rare) early Middle English words. In general, Stanley is concerned to allow the Lambeth text “to speak in its own right” when it makes good if idiosyncratic or “independent” sense (227). He also affirms the legitimacy of early Middle English spellings, even as he acknowledges that the *MED* (or portions thereof) would not have been available to Morris and O’Brien at the time of their writing. In all, he affirms the achievement of these scholars and the minor nature of most of the emendations under consideration, even as he brings his own formidable editorial eye to bear on these homiletic texts.

As against earlier scholarship that viewed these late collections as “stylistically backward-looking” or as “the ‘last flicker’ of an earlier tradition” (43–44), Bella Millett’s “The Pastoral Context of the Trinity and Lambeth Homilies” (in *Essays in Manuscript Geography*, ed. Wendy Scase [Turnhout: Brepols], 43–64) argues that they emerged “from a less marginal, more dynamic pastoral context, and that their incorporation of older material should be seen (as Elaine Treharne has suggested) as part of an active response to contemporary developments in preaching and pastoral care” (64). Treharne’s argument, which Millett echoes, posits that the inclusion of Old English elements in post-Conquest sermon collections reveals not antiquarianism or nostalgia, but rather a belief in the lasting applicability of these sermons in the face of new pastoral challenges (44). Dating the Trinity Homilies to the late twelfth century and the Lambeth Homilies to the first quarter of the thirteenth century, Millett situates them in the context of two major ecclesiastical movements on the Continent: the development of new methods of preaching to the laity (reflecting, for example, the “scholastic” style in Paris) and attempts to reform and better educate the secular clergy. The Third and Fourth Lateran Councils of 1179 and 1215 encouraged these reforms, and the English Church seems to have implemented them early on. Millett identifies five sermons shared by the Trinity and Lambeth collections that bear internal hallmarks of scholastic methodology from near the end of the twelfth century—making them not antiquarian

but modern in their preaching style. In addition, she argues, they reflect contemporary developments in pastoral care. Internal evidence in both collections indicates public preaching not necessarily by priests in their local parish (as has been suggested) but by bishops at the cathedral or other stations in their diocese. While some sermons give no indication of audience, moreover, others are directed at laity, clergy, or a combination thereof. “A diocesan pastoral context,” she concludes, “might account for the diversity of the sermons...and its more cosmopolitan cultural *milieu* would help to explain their incorporation of both recent developments in continental preaching and (in the case of [the Lambeth Homilies]) preaching material inherited from an older native tradition” (60). The traditional view of these collections as backwards-looking, in short, “may say less about the sermons themselves than about their readers” (64).

Wulfstan

Melanie Heyworth considers the degree to which a penitential text was associated with Wulfstan the Homilist in “The ‘Late Old English Handbook for the Use of a Confessor’: Authorship and Connections,” *N&Q* 54: 218–22. While previous scholars posited a tenuous connection between the archbishop and the Handbook, Heyworth sets forth several reasons for associating the two more closely. First, copies of the Handbook and Wulfstan’s so-called “Commonplace Book” appear jointly in three manuscripts. Second, it seems probable that the exemplar for CCCC 265, a manuscript used by Wulfstan, included another copy of the Handbook. Third, two other Handbook manuscripts either are arguably related to the “Commonplace Book” tradition or have their provenance in Wulfstan’s bishopric of Worcester. Fourth, a fragment of the Handbook appears in a manuscript with notes in Wulfstan’s hand. Fifth, one of the Handbook’s sources was the *Penitential of Pseudo-Egbert*, copies of which appear almost exclusively in manuscripts associated with Wulfstan (221). Sixth, where previous scholars suggested that penance may not have been a major topic of interest for Wulfstan, the reverse has in recent years been shown to be the case: he required his priests to administer confession, for example, and the Handbook “represents the practical instrument for the performance of that duty” (221). Finally, while the formulaic nature of penitentials made it difficult for earlier scholarship to confirm the Handbook’s authorship through stylistic analysis, recent studies have found “more numerous and more extensive indications of Wulfstan’s style and

vocabulary” than previously suspected (222). While we may not be able to conclude his authorship categorically, Heyworth makes a strong case that Wulfstan read the Handbook, likely annotated or edited it, and may well have been its author.

AK

Sara M. Pons-Sanz cautions against the hasty attribution of works to the Wulfstanian corpus in “A Paw in Every Pie: Wulfstan and the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle Again,” *Leeds Studies in English* 38: 31–52. The “poems” in question are the annals for 959 in the D and E texts of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* and the 975 annal in the D text. She admits the attractive plausibility of non-linguistic arguments for attribution of these poems to Wulfstan but then expresses more doubts when examining the linguistic evidence; she acknowledges that even her own lexical analysis has limits given the uncertain boundaries of the Wulfstanian corpus (32). Her aim is to “reassess whether the poems should be assigned to Wulfstan himself or should rather be attributed to someone else who was familiar with his extremely catchy style” (32). She methodically excludes certain non-Wulfstanian phrases and clauses and then divides the lexicon of the poems into three categories of evidence: “(1) expressions which are not exclusively Wulfstanian but are also somewhat common outside Wulfstan’s compositions; (2) expressions which could be perceived to be Wulfstanianisms (she defines “Wulfstanianisms” as “terms and collocations which are repeated time and again in the archbishop’s compositions and which make his style so idiosyncratic” [36]); (3) expressions which are not otherwise common in the archbishop’s works” (34). She carefully applies these categories to the 959 poem in the D and E texts, then to the 975 poem in the D text. Her careful sifting of evidence leaves her with three possible conclusions: one: that both poems are by Wulfstan; two: that the 975 Chronicle D poem is by Wulfstan and the 959 Chronicle D/E poem is by someone familiar with his work; three: neither poem was by Wulfstan, but rather “by someone who was able to reproduce most of the archbishop’s lexical traits” (46). In the end she does not decide among these three options but argues that “it is precisely this difficulty that should prevent us from attributing these poems to Wulfstan without any further caveats” (46).

Andy Orchard provides a thorough analysis of Wulfstan’s style in “Wulfstan as Reader, Writer, and Rewriter” (*Old English Homily*, 311–341). Orchard begins with an overview of Wulfstan’s career and the corpus and chronology of his writings, including a very clear discussion of the problems in defining that corpus as well

as extensive discussion of the shortcoming of various editions. Orchard illustrates the distinctive qualities of Wulfstan’s prose style, with copious examples of word/phrase repetition and other related rhetorical features: “The essence of [Wulfstan’s] style seems to lie in its heavy reliance on emphasis through repetition at every level of discourse. At the sub-verbal level, sounds are matched in purple passages of alliteration and assonance, while words, formulas, themes, and entire compositions are repeated, notably in the various versions of the celebrated *Sermo Lupi*” (320). He shows that studies of Wulfstan’s style have generally labored under the shadow of Ælfric’s abilities and asserts that “We need to understand Wulfstan on his own terms, and not simply as a less learned, less polished, less measured author than Ælfric” (341). He then moves to Wulfstan’s subtle and complicated use and transformation of sources and concludes that that he often replicates rhetorical features (such as repetition) found in his Latin sources; Wulfstan is not a clumsy craftsman, but rather a good reader and imitative stylist. He examines possible stylistic connections between Wulfstan’s works and the previous generation of homiletic activity, exemplified by texts such as the Vercelli homilies. Wulfstan “happily recasts, embellishes, and generally appropriates the material he uses, so that it smacks of his own too imitable style” (335). Orchard’s essay looks at not only Wulfstan’s use of source texts in his own writings, but also the reworking of his own texts at a later date and subsequent authors’ use and imitation of Wulfstanian texts: “Such dramatic recasting of biblical prose, let alone that of other authors (including himself), can be said to be the hallmark of Wulfstan’s distinctive prose style, one that caused Wulfstan’s works to be both widely heard and broadly read not only in his own time but also into the twelfth century” (316). Orchard notes that “as a powerful and evidently widely respected figure, Wulfstan’s works were often imitated by contemporary and later writers, in ways often difficult to distinguish from his own revisions” (316). This essay would serve as an excellent general introduction to *Wulfstanstudien* for advanced students.

Aidan Conti examines the re-use of Wulfstan’s writings in the twelfth century in “Revising Wulfstan’s Antichrist in the Twelfth Century: A Study in Medieval Textual Re-appropriation,” *Literature Compass* 4: 638–663. Building on the productive insight that has driven so much recent scholarship on Anglo-Saxon homilies—namely, that homiletic materials were constantly adapted, mixed together, and transformed to fit new contexts and new audiences—he focuses on the Wulfstanian texts found in the twelfth-century

manuscript Oxford Bodley 343. Conti concludes that “a clear description and appreciation of texts as they stand in their manuscript context allows us to understand the processes that are at work in the re-use and re-composition of medieval material” (647). He examines “three Wulfstan homilies written under a single rubric, namely *Secundum Marcum* (SM), *De Antichristo* (DA), and *De Temporibus Antichristi* (DTA)” (640). His intent is to show that the twelfth-century compiler/adaptor had aesthetic aims and ambitions and adapted these works in such a way to fit a twelfth-century cultural context: “The following study of this piece (or perhaps pieces) in its (or their) reconstituted twelfth-century form...examines the way in which Wulfstan’s work was adapted and rewritten while preserving characteristic themes and rhetorical devices of the archbishop. In the process, the examination considers the extent to which these three previously separate works have been integrated into a cogent whole” (640). In the *De Temporibus Antichristi*, for example, the story of Simon Magus is abridged, and he is more clearly equated with the Antichrist, giving the piece a new theological directness. The other two Wulfstan texts are also carefully synthesized with a purpose and aesthetic ambition, particularly in the presentation of Gog and Magog, imitating the typical Wulfstanian rhetorical flourishes of rhyme, alliteration, and other stylistic repetitions. The intellectual content is also clearly adapted to a twelfth-century milieu: “The recreation of both these homilies demonstrates not only significant revision within the individual works, but also remarkable stylistic and formal methods that integrate the material of two once separate homilies into a single composite work. The alterations and additions appear to have been construed in a studied imitation of Wulfstan’s style” (642). Conti concludes that “By re-using homiletic material that had accrued authority through its use over the passage of time, the homilist is able to integrate contemporary themes and tropes within the framework of the perceived universality of earlier-voiced concerns. The work presents new material within the comfort of a recognizable and well-known construct” (647). The essay ends with a useful appendix (“Appendix 1: A Twelfth-Century Composite Based on Wulfstan’s Eschatological Homilies”) in which he edits these pieces together with color graphics to distinguish various changes and rewritings of the texts.

AS

Ælfric

Frederick M. Biggs’ discussion of “Ælfric’s Mark, Other Things, and Apostolic Authority,” *Studies in*

Philology 104: 227–49, explores how Ælfric adapts his main source for the second part of his sermon on Mark (*Lives of Saints* I.15, *Item alia*) in order to underscore Mark’s authority, even though the evangelist was not one of the twelve apostles chosen by Christ. Biggs sets forth details from the four manuscripts that preserve the sermon, as well as internal evidence from the sermon itself, to show that both Ælfric and later scribes viewed the sermon parts as “distinct yet related” (228). Ælfric’s source for the second section was Jerome’s preface to his commentary on Matthew, which was often included among the prefatory matter to early gospel manuscripts and which Ælfric took as instructive for the gospels as a whole. This source Ælfric not only simplifies and condenses, but also alters in significant ways. He stresses that Matthew was chosen not only by Christ in person but by God from the beginning of time (234). He emphasizes that Mark, who according to Jerome did not see Christ, was instructed by Peter, who examined and approved Mark’s work. He omits Jerome’s comment that Luke recounted what he had heard rather than what he had seen (*cf.* Luke 1.3), highlighting instead that Luke lived among the apostles and was known for his pure life. While echoing Jerome’s statement that John drank his deep learning while leaning on Jesus’ breast, moreover, Ælfric states further that John declared truths which even the angels dared not do (242). Turning with Jerome to the Old Testament, Ælfric then points not only to the four creatures in Ezekiel which were associated with the gospel writers (Ezekiel 1:4–12), but to the four rivers in Paradise (Genesis 2:10–14) and the four creatures of the Apocalypse (Revelation 4:6–8). Even if Mark was not one of the chosen twelve, therefore, Ælfric firmly presents him along with the other evangelists as divinely foreshadowed and foreordained to be authoritative transmitters of the teachings of Christ.

Mary Clayton explicates an apparent Ælfrician inconsistency in “Blood and the Soul in Ælfric,” *N&Q* 54: 365–67. Discussing the biblical prohibition against eating blood, Fred Robinson had pointed to a passage in Ælfric’s *Letter to Wulfgeat* to suggest that Ælfric equated blood with the soul (*ic wylle ofgan æt ðe his bloddes gyte, þæt is sawul* [“I will require from you the shedding of his blood, that is the soul”]). Clayton points out, however, that blood does not feature in Ælfric’s extensive discussions of the soul elsewhere. In distinguishing human beings from animals, for example, Ælfric says that it is the soul that causes humans to live, even after the death of their bodies; the life of animals, by contrast, is in their blood, so that their existence ceases once that blood is shed. Clayton thus examines

the biblical context from which the *Letter to Wulfgeat* passage derives: Ezekiel 3:18, which Ælfric references or quotes in full on at least two other occasions. In Ezekiel, God is warning the prophet (or, for Ælfric, the teacher) that if the latter does not warn sinners of the consequences of their ways, God will hold him accountable—*ic wylle ofgan æt ðe his blod, þ[æt] is his lyre* (“I will require from you his blood, that is, his loss”), as Ælfric puts it elsewhere. Clayton rightly concludes, therefore, that in both passages it is not the nature of the soul but the importance of forthright preaching that Ælfric has in view: in the *Letter to Wulfgeat*, he is not equating blood with the soul, but interpreting the shedding of the one as the loss of the other.

Kari Ellen Gade's study of “Ælfric in Iceland” (*Learning and Understanding in the Old Norse World: Essays in Honour of Margaret Clunies Ross*, ed. Judy Quinn, Kate Heslop, and Tarrin Wills; Medieval Texts and Cultures of Northern Europe 18 [Turnhout: Brepols], 321–39) discusses the influence that Ælfric's *Excerptiones de arte metrica* or *Grammar* had on Old Icelandic vernacular grammars. Of the five such texts written before the early fourteenth century (four complete and one fragmentary), Gade focuses on Óláfr Þórðarson's *Third Grammatical Treatise* (ca. 1250), whose resemblance at points to Ælfric's work have long been noted. Gade writes, on the one hand, that the aims of the two authors are contradictory: Ælfric is trying to teach students the structure of Latin, where Óláfr is constructing a handbook on Old Norse using the principles of Latin grammar and rhetoric (325). Nonetheless, Gade argues that Óláfr knew and employed Ælfric's *Grammar* in some form. First, while both the *Grammar* and the *Third Grammatical Treatise* draw on Priscian's *Institutiones grammaticae*, both share material not found in this text. Second, while this shared material might be said to derive from a common source such as the *Excerptiones de Prisciano*, an abridged version that served as Ælfric's immediate conduit for Priscian's grammar, “When Óláfr departs from the *Institutiones* and appears to follow Ælfric, much of the added material is not in Priscian's *Excerptiones*” (329). Third, the technical grammatical vocabulary used by Óláfr is strikingly similar to that developed by Ælfric. As Gade notes: “It is difficult to see how two grammarians independently could come up with such tortured expressions” (334). Finally, Gade identifies a late-fourteenth century Icelandic fragment—itsself a copy of an earlier manuscript—as a direct translation of part of Ælfric's *Grammar*, placing Ælfric's work in Iceland “in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, or even earlier” (338). In short, not only was Óláfr familiar with at least

some of the *Grammar*—perhaps through lecture notes, glosses, or classroom material, rather than an entire copy, Gade suggests—but it continued to circulate in Iceland long after it ceased to be used in England (338).

Following up on her “Edition of Ælfric's *Letter to Brother Edward*” (in *Early Medieval English Texts and Interpretations: Studies Presented to Donald G. Scragg*, ed. Elaine Treharne and Susan Rosser [Tempe: ACMRS, 2002], 263–83), Mary Clayton offers a new version of her work in “Letter to Brother Edward: A Student Edition,” *Old English Newsletter* 40: 31–46. She explains the three sections of the letter; swiftly introduces the life and major work of Ælfric, its putative author; and quickly describes the manuscript evidence for the work before considering its contents in more detail: Is it one work or two? Why should it prohibit eating blood? What was the threat of Danish fashion? What may have prompted Ælfric to address the issue of eating on the toilet? When was this written? Who was Brother Edward?—and so forth. Clayton concludes with her edition of the text proper, here presented not with a translation, as in her 2002 study, but with textual notes and a full glossary.

Hugh Magennis provides a new translation of “Ælfric of Eynsham's Letter to Sigeward (Treatise on the Old and New Testament)” (in *Metaphrastes, or, Gained in Translation: Essays and Translations in Honour of Robert H. Jordan*, ed. Margaret Mullett, [Belfast: Belfast Byzantine Enterprises, Institute of Byzantine Studies, Queen's University Belfast, 2004], 210–35). Ælfric's text constitutes “the earliest extended discussion of the Bible, considered as a whole, in a western vernacular language” (210), one that “encapsulates the essentials of early medieval spiritual interpretation of the Bible as taught to congregations by the best-informed church leaders of the time” (213). Magennis's work provides a helpful complement to Richard Marsden's welcome 2008 edition for the Early English Text Society, and this may be the first published translation of the Letter since S. J. Crawford's EETS edition in 1922, which reproduced William L'Isle's translation of 1623. As Magennis notes, the Letter has a dual audience, as Ælfric consciously writes both to the layman Sigeward and to the wider audience of intelligent but unlearned individuals who will read or listen to copies of the treatise. Moreover, the Letter does more than list the books of the Bible and provide an overview of key events and figures therein: it comments on those details, explaining their spiritual significance and underscoring the unity of the two Testaments; it offers a useful summary of the monk's own biblical writings; and it augments the whole with extra-biblical additions such as an account of the angels' fall and the destruction of the Jews in the

aftermath of Christ's crucifixion. The result, Magennis suggests, is essentially a sermon with a moral message that helps explain the various components of Ælfric's narrative: throughout, Ælfric is emphasizing the need to live out one's faith in works as well as words, not just in speech but in righteous deeds.

Robert K. Upchurch provides a welcome edition of *Ælfric's Lives of the Virgin Spouses with Modern English Parallel-Text Translations: 'Julian and Basilissa,' 'Cecilia and Valerian,' and 'Chrysanthus and Daria'* (Exeter: U of Exeter P). Having sketched an introduction to Ælfric and his *Lives of Saints*, Upchurch discusses the hybrid nature of the three stories, which graft elements from the *vita* genre (chronicling the saints' righteous lives) onto that of the *passio* (their martyrdom) in order to affirm the value of unconsummated wedlock or spiritual marriage. The result, Upchurch suggests, offers a model of sanctity to laity that accords with the value placed on virginity by the early medieval Church. Where they seem in danger of running counter to biblical and patristic views on the procreative aim of marriage, moreover, the texts redefine procreation as spiritual childbearing, converting unbelievers to faith by their virtuous example. Upchurch surveys other treatments of the Lives by such Anglo-Saxons as Aldhelm, Bede, and the Old English Martyrologist; outlines evidence for the saints' cults in Anglo-Saxon calendars, litanies, and prayers; and then discusses Ælfric's treatment of the legends in the *Lives of Saints*. He analyzes Ælfric's language in the Lives, provides details about Ælfric's Latin sources, and then sets forth editions and translations of the Old English texts (two had not been edited since W. W. Skeat's Early English Text Society volumes of 1881 to 1900) and their Latin counterparts. Having provided line-by-line commentary on all six works, he rounds off the whole with a detailed bibliography for further study. In all, the volume constitutes a valuable point of access to texts that "captivated Ælfric's imagination because they provide him with models who embody the ascetic behaviour and orthodox belief central to his ideas of what it means for a layman to be a Christian" and help him in the process "gain a competitive advantage [over married secular clergy] for his brand of pastoral care" (2 and 24).

AK

Robert K. Upchurch examines "Homiletic Contexts for Ælfric's Hagiography: The Legend of Saints Cecilia and Valerian" (*Old English Homily*, 265-284). He reads the Legend of Cecilia (one of the tales of virgin spouses) in the *Lives of Saints* within the broader context of Ælfric's

sermons and their theological and pastoral contexts. Upchurch assembles a variety of evidence for Ælfric's views on chaste marriage in his sermons; once the context for this very particular type of chastity has been established, he looks at the legend of Cecilia and Valerian to see how Ælfric's version of their *vitae* promotes the vision of married chastity expounded in his homilies. In general, Upchurch finds that the married saints speak to the ideals of lay chastity and the role of the laity in the structure of the Church: Ælfric saw the saints as "symbols of the ever-virginal but ever-bearing Church" (266). Upchurch finds that in the depiction of spiritual marriage in Ælfric's homilies, "he emphasizes that married folk too are brides of Christ and thus should exhibit virginity by means of their steadfast belief and fecundity by giving birth to spiritual children" (271). The laity have an important role to play: they teach the faithful by "positively impacting others with their upright lives and even sharing spiritual truths and doctrines they have learned" (272). Thus "Ælfric rewrites the Legend of Cecilia to model for laymen their role in the procreative activity of the Church" (282); he suggests that this emphasis on lay spirituality reinforced the importance of reform monastic practices by calling attention to their shared values. There is then also a political subtext to these lives of chaste spouses: Ælfric "includes Cecilia and Valerian in the Lives to garner support of reformed monastic priests at the expense of unreformed, married ones" (266).

Rachel Anderson turns her eye to rather understudied works of Ælfric in "The Old Testament Homily: Ælfric as Biblical Translator" (*Old English Homily*, 121-142). Her main concern here is Ælfric's non-liturgical narrative pieces such as his translations of the books of Maccabees and Judges; she finds that in these texts Ælfric "comment[s] on such topics as kingly responsibility and the role of women in government" (122). These translations also had aesthetic ambitions: Ælfric "places a strong emphasis on coherent storytelling and the balance of a narrative, even to the point of eliding characters and elements of his biblical text in order to make his larger points unambiguous to his readers" (122). Anderson surveys the scholarship on Ælfric's contributions to the *Old English Hextateuch*, the *Letter to Sigeward*, his translations of the books of Judith, Esther, and Maccabees, before moving to a more detailed consideration of his translation of Kings (in the *Lives of Saints*) and of Judges (in the *Old English Hextateuch*). She finds that in *Kings* Ælfric carefully selects, omits, and adapts material to fit his main point: the contrast of wicked and laudable rulers and "what constitutes a good king" (132). Ælfric emphasizes,

for example, that Saul was chosen by the people rather than through divine election. Saul is described in very negative terms while any ambiguities about David in the biblical source are elided to emphasize the contrast between the noble, God-chosen king David and the faulty, people's choice, Saul. Thus the text is not a simple word-for-word translation, but rather an original interpretation of the story: "it is a discourse on what constitutes a good or bad king, and how important it was for a king to be counseled wisely" (135). His translation method in *Judges* operates in a similar fashion; Ælfric simplifies his sources for didactic reasons. For example, Anderson examines Ælfric's omission of Deborah from the narrative, arguing that this change produces a certain cyclicity and symmetry in his narrative; in contrast, Ælfric emphasizes the wicked nature of Delilah while softening any critique of Samson. These changes point to Ælfric's "anxiety about the power women have when they get men with ruling power into their private chambers" (142).

Stephen J. Harris provides some interesting insights on "The Liturgical Context of Ælfric's Homilies for Rogation" (*Old English Homily*, 143-169). Looking beyond the well-identified sources of Ælfric's homilies for Rogationtide, Harris proceeds to the themes of Rogation as they can be reconstructed from the liturgy. Drawing upon the observation that "[i]n an annual cycle of liturgy, homilies will often reflect on readings and themes proper (that is, specific) to a day or season" (144-145), Harris then measures these themes against Ælfric's homilies for this season and finds that "the liturgy of Rogationtide provides some of the themes that guided Ælfric as he composed" (144). He argues that these nine homilies by Ælfric are part of a thematic consistency in the liturgy for that season. The feast is essentially penitential in nature: "Rogationtide liturgy is celebrated in anticipation that it will act as a supplication to God, that it will appease him, and that so appeased, he will lessen the burdens of the prayerful community" (151). Harris reconstructs the prayers that would be used at Rogationtide; he then argues that these prayers influenced Ælfric as he worked with his sources to compose his homilies. Themes and emphases in both the liturgical season and in Ælfric's homilies include prayer, God's mercy, and release from suffering in return for penance and fasting, and the unity of the Christian community (i.e., "defining who is and is not a Christian" [155]). Additional related themes of the homilies include poverty, good works, the Apostles' Creed, prayer and grace, and visions of heaven. Harris finds a satisfying thematic coherence to Ælfric's homilies for this season: "the themes of Rogationtide are

manifested in the liturgy, specifically in those elements proper to the feast. Ælfric's sermons, *qua* sermons, contribute generally to the efficacy of the Rogationtide Mass, and therefore find their principle of coherence within a liturgical ordo" (169).

AS

E. Gordon Whatley scrutinizes the relationship between "Hagiography and Violence: Military Men in Ælfric's *Lives of Saints*" (*Source of Wisdom*, 217-38). Two lay military leaders commissioned Ælfric's *Lives* during a time of war in England. Some recent scholars have focused on martyrs such as King Edmund (who laid down his weapons to the Danes) and presented them as passive or pacifists. Yet Ælfric also writes at length about the Maccabees, using poetic vocabulary and phrases to depict war heroes. Whatley argues that Ælfric follows Augustine's teachings on war: the clergy should not fight, nor should individuals kill merely to protect their own lives or belongings, or for vengeance. However, laity acting for the state, not personal passions, may fight with God's backing. Edmund gave himself up to the Danes when his army had already been destroyed and only his own life was at stake, making his martyrdom an act of resistance against pagan attackers. Ælfric balances such saints as Edmund and Martin of Tours with military role models who fight well for their people but not for their own lives; Whatley concludes that the shift from "a fabled group of passive, weaponless victims" to "the violent patron saints" (230-1) of later medieval military men has already begun.

Late Old English

For the reception and transmission of homilies in the twelfth century, see the sections on Homilies, Wulfstan, and Ælfric, above.

Andrew Galloway's "Peterborough Chronicle and the Invention of 'Holding Court' in Twelfth-Century England" (*Source of Wisdom*, 293-310) highlights late Old English and its interactions with Anglo-Norman culture and language. The First Continuator of the Peterborough Chronicle introduced notions of holding court with the phrase *hired healdan*: *hired* ('followers' or *familia*), provided a working equivalent of "court." This Continuator shows great interest in happenings at court, which convened three times a year beginning in 1085. Most of his entries refer to the court (or its absence), and some provide great detail about political maneuverings at these occasions. The term *healdan curt*, however, with its Anglo-Norman word for 'court,' only appears in 1154. French and Latin equivalents

such as *tenir curt* and *curiam tenere* both date *after* this time, and Galloway argues that both English terminology and the Chronicle's close interest in court life influenced other, later sources. Ironically, however, the Second Continuator, who coined the term, displayed less interest in the court than the First; he observed from outside, not from inside, and gave the court less attention.

NGD

John Frankis contributes to the burgeoning field of Old English literary culture in the twelfth century in "Languages and Cultures in Contact: Vernacular Lives of St Giles and Anglo-Norman Annotations in an Anglo-Saxon Manuscript," *Leeds Studies in English* 38: 101–33. In this absorbing and lucidly written study, Frankis focuses on two related twelfth-century works, the Old English *Life of St. Giles* and the Anglo-Norman *Vie de Saint Gilles*. The former exemplifies the continuity of "the Anglo-Saxon tradition of prose narrative and vernacular religious instruction," and the latter "represents the newer world of French verse narrative, drawing on the conventions of secular verse" (102). Although both lives share a common Latin source, they would seem to represent two very different worlds of twelfth-century English literary culture. However, a copy of the Old English text found in Cambridge, University Library, li.1.33 contains quotations from the Anglo-Norman poem as annotations: "The initial interest of these insertions is that they are apparently the work of a reader of the late twelfth century who chose to note his thoughts about two Anglo-Saxon prose texts in Anglo-Norman verse, an unusual example of interlinguistic and intercultural reaction" (103). These annotations help to date the composition of the Anglo-Norman poem; further, while the connection between the quotation and the text it annotates is somewhat unclear, the main importance of the quotation is that it might provide evidence for the writer of the annotation and his base of operations. Frankis uses a variety of evidence to argue that the annotations point to the possibility that they were "written by someone closely connected with the Priory of St Andrew and St Giles at Barnwell" (112). Augustinian houses apparently had an interest in the preservation and generation of vernacular texts. Although the Anglo-Norman *Vie de Saint Gilles* is a sophisticated work with intertextual connections to twelfth-century

romance, and the English *Life of Saint Giles* was from a "very different literary world, unashamedly insular and retrospective," they were part of the same local context, and therefore the annotations "show how at least one reader appeared to have the ability to move in both worlds, though the depth of his understanding of the culture of either world must remain in some doubt" (124).

AS

Works Not Seen:

- Fujii, Takako. "Wulfstan and Ælfric: The Two *De falsis dies* [sic]." *Text, Language and Interpretation: Essays in Honour of Keiko Ikegami*, ed. Yoshiyuki Nakao, Shoko Ono, Naoko Shirai, Kaoru Noji, and Masahiko Kanno. Tokyo: Eichosha, 121–30. [in Japanese]
- Roberts, Jane. "The Fates of *and* in Vercelli Homily XVI: Some Thoughts." *Text, Language and Interpretation*, 5–18.
- Yamanouchi, Kazuyoshi. "King Alfred's Translation of Psalm 3: From Decoding to Creation." *Text, Language and Interpretation*, 110–20. [in Japanese]

Items Deferred until Next Year:

- Green, C. "King, Mother, Soldier, Whore: Multiple Performances of Virginity in Anglo-Saxon Prose Saints' Lives: The Heterogeneity of an Ideal." Ph.D. Diss., U of Manchester, 2007. Index to Theses 58 (2007), 4043.
- Heyworth, Melanie. "Apollonius of Tyre in Its Manuscript Context: An Issue of Marriage." *PQ* 86 (2007), 1–26.
- Home, Malasree. "'These Things We Have Written about Him': The Portrait of King William in 'The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle' 1086E." *Anglo-Saxon* (Aberdeen) 1 (2007), 239–68.
- Sauer, Hans. "A Didactic Dialogue in Old and Middle English Versions: The *Prose Solomon and Saturn* and the *Master of Oxford's Catechism*." *Form and Content of Instruction*, 363–98.
- Trilling, Renée R. "Sovereignty and Social Order: Archbishop Wulfstan and the *Institutes of Polity*." *The Bishop Reformed: Studies of Episcopal Power and Culture in the Central Middle Ages*. Ed. John S. Ott and Anna Trumbore Jones. Church, Faith and Culture in the Medieval West. Aldershot and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2007, 58–85.

5. Anglo-Latin and Ecclesiastical Works

Form and Content of Instruction in Anglo-Saxon England in Light of Contemporary Manuscript Evidence, edited by Patrizia Lendinara, Loredana Lazzari, and Maria Amalia D'Aronco [see sec. 6], is a collection of papers based on a conference at Udine in April 2006. The volume contains several items of interest. Filippa Alcamesi, in "Remigius's Commentary to the *Disticha Catonis* in Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts," 143–85, examines the complex glossarial activity surrounding the *Disticha Catonis*. Though Remigius of Auxerre's "commentary" is relatively well-known, there are in fact other substantial glosses in Anglo-Saxon manuscripts. As Remigius's commentary has not yet been fully published, and the Anglo-Saxon manuscripts remain unstudied, we in fact have quite an unclear picture of this corpus of glosses. Alcamesi discusses the background to the *Disticha* and Remigius's commentary, but focuses on the Anglo-Saxon evidence, which comes from four main manuscripts which are investigated in detail: Cambridge, Trinity College, O.2.31, Cambridge, UL, Gg.5.35, Oxford, Bodleian Library, Rawlinson G.57 (14788) and G.111 (14836) and Cambridge, Gonville and Caius, 144. In concluding appendices, Alcamesi provides an edition of the Remigian glosses in Anglo-Saxon manuscripts and a catalogue of continental manuscripts containing glossed copies of the *Disticha*.

Next, Concetta Giliberto, "An Unpublished *De Lapidibus* in Its Manuscript Tradition, with Particular Regard to the Anglo-Saxon Area," 251–83, investigates the anonymous *De lapidibus* that circulated in late Anglo-Saxon England. Giliberto distinguishes three different traditions concerning stones and precious gems, "the scientific and medical tradition, the magical-astrological lore and the Christian current," and traces the development of each from their earliest appearance in Theophrastus through the late eleventh-century *Liber lapidum* of Marbod. Giliberto provides an edition and translation of *De lapidibus* based on the eight manuscripts discovered to date, discusses the sources and traditions of the descriptions in the text, and assesses the manuscript contexts in which the treatise appears.

A third little-known text, the *Practica Petrocelli Salernitani*, is studied by Danielle Maion in "The Fortune of the So-Called *Practica Petrocelli Salernitani* in England: New Evidence and Some Considerations," 495–512. Maion signals the importance of the *Practica* for our understanding of Bald's *Leechbook*, noting that the *Practica* was translated not long after the Conquest as the *Peri Didaxeon*. Though the only edition of the

Practica was based upon a single manuscript witness, nine other manuscripts are now known, the earliest of which dates from the middle of the ninth century. Maion notes how wildly the contents of the *Practica* differ in each manuscript and examines what this tells us about the textual tradition of the work. A close look at the manuscripts is also useful in determining what form of the *Practica* the translator might have used. Maion concludes that the work was known in England before the Conquest, but that there is no clear evidence of its dissemination before the middle of the eleventh century. In the appendices, Maion provides some comparative passages from London, BL, Sloane 475 and Sloane 2839 (appendix I) and from Cambridge, UL, Gg.5.35 and Sloane 2839 (appendix II).

Also in *Form and Content*, Ignazio Mauro Mirto looks at a "parsing grammar" known as the *Beatus quid est* (*BQE*) in "The Choice and Use of the Word *beatus* in the *Beatus quid est*: Notes by a Non-Philologist," 349–61. Mirto argues that the choice of the word *beatus* as the example for *nomen* marks an important difference from the word *magister* which was the head-word of the main source for the *BQE*, Donatus's *Ars minor*. *Beatus*, because it is an adjective (*nomen* in the grammars refers to both nouns and adjectives), is much more flexible than *magister*, as it can be used to show positive, comparative and superlative forms, as well as grammatical gender and adverbial uses. In Mirto's words, "the compiler of the *BQE* made regular use of morpho-syntactic/distributional properties that set words like *beatus* and *magister* apart." Mirto examines the evidence of the glosses, and examines the head-words of other similar texts, concluding that this shift from noun to adjective as head-word may mark a "subgroup of medieval parsing grammars" and may thus be significant in tracing the relationships between, and chronology of, parsing grammars generally.

In an article that is more like a short book, "The Career of Aldhelm," *ASE* 36: 15–69, Michael Lapidge reconsiders what we know and can learn of the life and career of Aldhelm from the scant evidence that survives. Lapidge points out that only two dates have been established with any certainty, and that these are both late in Aldhelm's life: Aldhelm's ascent to bishop and his death (in 705/6 and 709/10, respectively). The lives of Aldhelm which do exist are from the twelfth century: one is fraught with error (Faricius's *Vita S. Aldhelmi*), and the other is by an author "prone to unsubstantiated conjecture" (William of Malmesbury's *Gesta pontificum*

Anglorum). Lapidge's first and main assertion is that we can trust William of Malmesbury's passing comment—taken, William says, from Alfred's lost *Handboc*—that Aldhelm was the son of Centwine, king of Wessex from 676 to 685. If we keep this fact in view, then many features of Aldhelm's life become explicable, and the genealogical history of the West Saxon kings can be drawn in better detail (as Lapidge does in fig. 1). For example, Aldhelm's "Bugga" of his third *carmen ecclesiasticum* was likely Osburg of the prose *De uirginitate*, and thus none other than his sister. Lapidge also demonstrates Aldhelm's close ties with Iona, Adomnán and Aldfrith (the latter of whom may have been Aldhelm's cousin): "Aldhelm may have got to know Aldfrith on Iona, and ... it may also have been at Iona where Aldhelm acquired his first knowledge of Vergil, through the tutelage of Adomnán." The evidence that Aldhelm studied under Adomnán is presented in detail but is interwoven with other evidence of Aldhelm's period of study at Canterbury and the production of the "Leiden Glossary" and the "Epinal-Erfurt Glossary." Aldhelm may well have contributed to and known both glossaries; in the latter instance, Lapidge concludes that "if some portion of Aldhelm's eccentric vocabulary was derived from 'Epinal-Erfurt,' it is equally clear that the compiler of 'Epinal-Erfurt' occasionally drew rare lexical items from the Latin writings of Aldhelm." The circle leads back to Adomnán and the study of Vergil at Iona, for all evidence of the commentaries of Junius Philargyrius in the study of Vergil is at Adomnán's Iona, and entries closely parallel to Philargyrius find their way into the "Epinal-Erfurt Glossary" (in addition to other evidence from, for example, the *Altus prosator*). In sum, the evidence allows us to affirm that Aldhelm was fostered at Iona, where he and Aldfrith (future king of Northumbria) studied under Adomnán. Aldhelm gained a thorough knowledge of Vergil at Iona and also "learned to write rhythmical Latin verse in the style practised in Irish schools." Hearing of the two new scholars at Canterbury, Aldhelm went off to study with Theodore and Hadrian. It was at Canterbury that Aldhelm worked through the texts represented in the "Leiden Glossary," and it was there that he was involved in compiling the a-order entries of the "Epinal-Erfurt Glossary," entries which show the influence of the "Leiden Glossary" and of Aldhelm's period of study at Iona (Vergil, "stray glosses to lemmata in Old Irish," the *Altus prosator*, and Adomnán's Latin prose). A separate argument suggests that Aldhelm's election as abbot at Malmesbury may have been Ceadwalla's way of smoothing his own path to the throne after the death of Centwine, for Aldhelm would have been first in line to be king; Malmesbury

may thus have been founded later than has previously been supposed (perhaps 682 to 685). Further, Aldhelm may have accompanied Ceadwalla on his trip to Rome in 688, and it would have been on that trip that he gathered the texts of *tituli* from Roman churches, though this evidence and date is difficult to reconcile with all of Aldhelm's works. Lapidge provides an appendix which offers a chronology of Aldhelm's writings, and leaves us with this comment: "[W]e will better understand Aldhelm's extraordinary achievement if we think of him as a well-connected prince-bishop rather than as a retiring monk whose only link to reality was expressed through deliciously difficult Latin prose and verse."

While very little is known for certain about the goddess Eostre, Carole Cusack, "The Goddess Eostre: Bede's Text and Contemporary Pagan Tradition(s)," *The Pomegranate* 9: 22–40, rehearses what information is available concerning pagan traditions in Bede's *De temporum ratione* and *Historia ecclesiastica*, all within the context of the conversion of the English in the seventh century. Cusack notes that scholarly opinion about the existence of pagan deities such as Eostre is divided between those who accept Bede's account as factual and those who believe that the goddess is an invention of Bede's. The majority of Cusack's investigation, however, is reserved for the presence of Eostre/Ostara in modern paganism, both what is "known" about her, and what rituals exist for her worship.

In "A Possible Arthurian Epitome in a Tenth-Century Manuscript from Cornwall," *Arthuriana* 17: 3–9, Scott Gwara suggests that a brief colloquy (concerning conflict between Britons and proud Saxons, then between Romans, to whom God granted victory, and Greeks) from *De raris fabulis* in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 572 (SC 2026) may "impart an Arthurian epitome" and "constitute the earliest link to the 'Roman' focus of Arthur's continental exploits, highlighted in the *Historia regum* [of Geoffrey of Monmouth] and hinted at in extracts from the 'Legend of Saint Goeznovius' (?ca. 1019)."

Thomas N. Hall, "Latin Sermons for Saints in Early English Homiliaries and Legendaries," in *The Old English Homily*, 227–63, explains that the origins of surviving Latin sermons in English manuscripts are to be found in "communal reading in the monastic Night Office." On the feast days of saints, the Office lections, as Ælfric points out in his *Letter to the Monks of Eynsham*, could be modified to include readings from *uitae* or from sermons about that saint. While evidence of saints' *uitae* has been studied in some detail, we know very little about the sermons that might have been available for this purpose. Hall thus investigates "what

manuscript evidence there is for the circulation of hagiographic sermon literature in England through the first quarter of the twelfth century." The investigation is divided into two parts: sermons for saints in homiliaries and in legendaries and other hagiographic manuscripts. In the first, Hall traces the development of the homiliary, especially with respect to which sermons for saints tended to be included. Paul the Deacon's homiliary began to exclude locally unknown martyrs and popes and to include local saints, a move that continued in the earliest English versions of his homiliary. The bulk of Hall's investigation, however, assesses in detail the specific contents of the most important manuscript witnesses to Latin sermons for saints. While the manuscripts are too numerous to list here, it is worth mentioning that Hall's study can lead to discoveries such as the following: Alcuin's sermon for St. Vedast [BHL 8509] is "one of the best represented Latin sermons for a saint in English manuscripts through the early twelfth century." Why? "In both English and continental hagiographic traditions ... Alcuin's sermon for St Vedast functioned as what is sometimes referred to as a model sermon, a generic template that can be used as the basis for a variety of novel compositions honouring any number of saints." Hall concludes by returning to Ælfric and the question of observations at Eynsham. The main sources of sermons for saints would have been versions of the homiliary of Paul the Deacon, a legendary like the "Cotton-Corpus Legendary," and, because many of them postdate Ælfric, individual *libelli* for certain saints. Further, the presence of *lectio* numbers in the margins of many of the manuscripts shows that the instructions of Ælfric's *Letter* were, in fact, being followed.

While scholars have generally agreed that the purpose of Adomnán's *Vita Columbae* was primarily political, Sara E. Ellis Nilsson, "Miracle Stories and the Primary Purpose of Adomnán's *Vita Columbae*," *Heroic Age* 10 [online], argues that the evidence of the miracles in the *Vita* suggests otherwise: the work is didactic, "that is, morally instructive or educative." Nilsson discusses what is known of the life and career of Adomnán and examines the structure of the *Vita Columbae* and its relationship in that regard to its sources (mainly Sulpicius Severus's *Vita Martini* and Evagrius's *Vita Antonii*) before examining the miracles in the work in light of the three main suggestions about its purpose: political, didactic, or illustration of the knowledge base of Iona. Nilsson assigns to each chapter a classification on that basis (political, didactic, or promotion of learning) and finds that 111 of the 119 chapters in the *Vita* can be described as having a didactic purpose, versus

twenty-seven having a political purpose and thirty-eight working to promote learning (some chapters have multiple functions). On that basis, Nilsson concludes that "[A]lthough a political intention can be shown to exist for the VC, it is apparent from this analysis that a didactic purpose and demonstration of learning are much more important to the writing of Adomnán's work."

Assuming that Jane Stevenson's attribution of the *Laterculus Malalianus* to Theodore of Tarsus is correct, James R. Siemens, "A Survey of the Christology of Theodore of Tarsus in the *Laterculus Malalianus*," *Scottish Jnl of Theology* 60: 213–25, reads the work for what it can tell us about how Theodore approaches the person and work of Christ. Siemens suggests that the work is overwhelmingly orthodox, and that there "is little evidence of any purely original, speculative thought." However, the metaphors used for Christ repay investigation. Siemens finds a connection in the image of Christ as physician between the *Laterculus* and Ephrem the Syrian, partly because Ephrem is mentioned elsewhere in the work. From *Christus medicus*, Siemens looks at Christ as *reparator*, an image which appears seven times in the work, and which leads him to consider Irenaeus of Lyons as a possible influence. Finally, Siemens concludes that the work, while not particularly innovative on the surface, synthesizes common images "in such a way as to give the impression of thoughtfulness and true originality."

A collection published in honour of Thomas D. Hill, *Source of Wisdom*, ed. Wright et al. [see sec. 2], contains two essays of note for this section of the YWOES. To answer the question posed in her title, "Bede's Style: A Neglected Historiographical Model for the Style of the *Historia Ecclesiastica*?" (329–52), Danuta Shanzer argues that the prose of Bede's *HE* is modelled after Rufinus's Latin translation of Eusebius's *Historia ecclesiastica*. Building on Richard Sharpe's recent exploration of Bede's style in his exegetical works ("The Varieties of Bede's Prose," *Aspects of the Language of Latin Prose*, ed. Reinhardt et al., 339–55; reviewed in YWOES 2005), Shanzer surveys scholarly opinion on Bede's prose style, noting that it is most often described as "clear," "biblical," and "void of all pompousness and bombast." But what were Bede's possible contemporary models? Gildas is clearly less likely (Bede avoids the "intrusive biblical language that is *not* flagged as deliberate allusion or quotation ... alliteration [and] deliberately recondite, even Hisperic, vocabulary") than Aldhelm or Stephen of Ripon. Shanzer examines several of Bede's (very) long sentences, shows why Gildas does not work, and demonstrates how the sparrow simile's structure (*HE*

2.13) betrays its “literary source” in Matthew 10:26–31. The key to understanding Bede’s prose is to isolate “Bede’s attempts at elegant, controlled, comprehensible full or close-to-full periodicity.” Shanzer looks at the two likely suspects, Orosius and Rufinus of Aquileia, and shows via several examples that it must be the latter. Ultimately, Shanzer concludes: “Bede’s style is unusual in its own temporal and historical context.... It evolved ... from reading Orosius, but above all from a deep and careful immersion in the style of Rufinus.”

Next, Joseph Wittig, “The ‘Remigian’ Glosses on Boethius’s *Consolatio Philosophiae* in Context” (168–200), gives a detailed overview of the highly complex history of “Remigian” commentary on Boethius. Wittig begins with an overview of the surviving manuscripts of the *Consolatio*, and notes that thirty-seven of forty-one complete manuscripts that have been identified from before the early eleventh century “contain interlinear and at least some marginal glosses.” There are three main “classes” of glosses: the “St Gall type,” the “Remigian” and those which are not clearly either of the first two types. The “Remigian” glosses do not tend to circulate until the tenth century, and thus, if Alfred’s manuscript had glosses, they would have been of the “other” type. Wittig takes issue with previous opinion on classification of the gloss types, suggesting that the picture is extremely complicated: “These [St. Gall] manuscripts seem inevitably to raise the question of whether one is dealing with ‘creation’ or ‘branching evolution.’” The situation with the Remigian glosses is most complex, and one must begin with the attribution to Remigius itself, which is seriously in doubt. Wittig goes into some detail about the manuscripts and the glosses they contain, adding an appendix of manuscripts with a general characterization of their contents, noting which manuscripts have been added since Courcelle’s edition of the *Consolatio* (both by Diane Bolton and by Wittig himself) and a second appendix with a list of sigla and brief descriptions of manuscripts he has collated. Overall, the evidence suggests not that there was a “master commentary,” but rather “a kind of branching evolution in which ideas were accumulated and were variously recast and combined.”

Taking Aldhelm as a starting point, Emily V. Thornbury’s “Aldhelm’s Rejection of the Muses and the Mechanics of Poetic Inspiration in Early Anglo-Saxon England,” *ASE* 36: 71–92, works forwards and backwards in time to assess the changing traditions surrounding attitudes toward the “Muses” and poetic inspiration. Aldhelm recognizes that he is the first “of the Germanic people” to write quantitative verse in Latin, and he is also the first, in the verse preface to his

Enigmata, to introduce the Muses, only to reject their influence in that same passage (Aldhelm suggests that Moses and David are his models). Thornbury observes: “This rejection of the Muses is an ancient topos of Christian-Latin poetry, but one with an ambiguous and complicated lineage, rooted deeply in ancient literary culture.” That lineage is then surveyed in detail, with special attention first to Vergil. Thornbury points out that Vergil’s request to the Muses is for knowledge; the call in *Georgics* II is for the hidden secrets of the workings of the world, thus suggesting that aesthetic judgements upon poetry have to do more with content than skill in versification. Clearly, such a belief would allow Christian-Latin poets to reject the Muses more easily, as we see, for example, in Paulinus of Nola and Proba. Aldhelm would also have been familiar with Persius’s *Satires* and the rejection there of the pretense of inspiration. Aldhelm’s stance, however, is idiosyncratic: “The peculiarities in Aldhelm’s use of themes connected to the ‘rejection of the Muses’ topos can thus be explained as the result of juxtaposing conflicting ideas about the principal requirements for good verse: even while using material from a tradition that privileges elevated subject-matter, Aldhelm himself assumes that polished technical ability is the most important quality a poet could desire.” Thornbury then demonstrates, via Old English and Old Norse examples, that this focus on poetic skill is most likely a Germanic inheritance which goes hand in hand with the notion that the subject-matter of poetry is fixed (“poets could only adorn already received truths”). The *locus classicus* for knowledge of the Muses in Anglo-Saxon England comes in Aldhelm’s verse *De uirginitate*: Thornbury demonstrates via glosses and finally Byrhtferth how the Muses came to be (mis)understood, powerless: “The Muses no longer needed to be rejected, because they had no power to threaten Christians.” She concludes that “Aldhelm’s preface to his *Enigmata* and its afterlife is emblematic of the complicated means by which Anglo-Saxon poets in Latin and Old English assimilated concepts, themes, and even words from both languages, juxtaposing or fusing them in unprecedented ways which, once established, often persisted for generations.”

In “Vergilian Quotations in Bede’s *De arte metrica*,” Seppo Heikkinen (*Jnl of Medieval Latin* 17: 101–09) explores the difficult relationship between Christian and pre-Christian models in Bede’s *De arte metrica*. Heikkinen observes that Bede’s work “could be described as the first major Christian treatise on metrics that genuinely reflects medieval culture.” As such, readers may perceive in it a “conscious and persistent attempt to drive the pre-Christian curriculum authors

Vergil and Lucan into the margin and to substitute them with quotations from such Christian poets as Sedulius and Prudentius." However, *De arte metrica* still contains thirty-four quotations from the works of Vergil (counting phrases of two words on up). Heikkinen explores many of them, noting that the Vergil appears most often in passages to do with prosody and prosodic irregularity (and sometimes Bede is mistaken or has his Vergil wrong), and least often in the context of stylistic issues. As Heikkinen concludes, because Vergil's verse was still likely the most influential model, "Bede parades Vergilian oddities before his reader to warn him against relapses to verse techniques no longer considered appropriate."

One of the editors of Byrhtferth's *Enchiridion*, Michael Lapidge, proves definitively that glosses to Bede's *De natura rerum* and *De temporibus ratione* which were published as the *Glossae Bridfertii* in 1563 are the work of Byrhtferth, in "Byrhtferth of Ramsey and the *Glossae Bridfertii* in Bedam," *Jnl of Medieval Latin* 17: 384–400. The main difficulty in working with the *Glossae Bridfertii* is the absence of a manuscript: one assumes, as in the case of the *Collectanea Pseudo-Beda*, that the manuscript came into Johann Herwagen's hands, was published, and then discarded. Lapidge rehearses arguments for and against Byrhtferth's authorship, noting that knowledge of his other works has advanced considerably since scholars first considered the question. The recent attack by Michael Gorman on Charles W. Jones seriously damaged the case of the opponents of the attribution to Byrhtferth, and Lapidge shows why Jones and his later supporter John J. Contreni must be wrong. What evidence which can be uncovered of the lost manuscript points not to Auxerre (as Jones presumed), but rather to Ramsey: "[P]ending the complete collation of all surviving manuscripts of Bede's three surviving scientific treatises, such evidence as we now have indicates fairly clearly that Herwagen took his text of Bede's three scientific works (*DNR*, *DT* and *DTR*) [which were published with the *Glossae*] from an English manuscript which had links both with Abbo of Fleury and with the *Computus* of Byrhtferth of Ramsey." Further, against Contreni, who had argued that there were no connections between the genuine works of Byrhtferth and the *Glossae*, Lapidge demonstrates a considerable and convincing overlap of source texts: many "common" texts appear in both the *Glossae* and the works of Byrhtferth, and, most compellingly, at least two rare pre-Conquest texts are cited uniquely in the *Glossae* and Byrhtferth: the *Historia Langobardum* of Paul the Deacon and Macrobius's *Comm. in somnium Scipionis*. Further, "there are a number of unambiguous

structural links": for example, "[t]he structure of the numerological mini-dictionary in the *Glossae Bridfertii* could economically be explained as a preliminary draft of the more substantial work on numerology which later formed Part IV of Byrhtferth's *Enchiridion*." Lapidge's concluding hypothesis is a masterpiece and must be quoted in full: "When he came to Ramsey in 985, Abbo of Fleury brought with him a number of manuscripts. These included the copy of Macrobius *Comm. in somnium Scipionis* which survives as BNF, lat. 7299, but also a copy of Bede's scientific treatises (*DNR*, *DT*, *DTR*) which carried Carolingian glosses related to, and in some respects identical with, those of Martin of Laon (as preserved in Berlin, Phillipps 1830 + 1832) and Heiric of Auxerre (as preserved in Melk, SB, 412). These Carolingian glosses served as the nucleus of a personal *collectaneum* compiled by Byrhtferth to aid his study of Bede's scientific writings, especially the *DNR* and *DTR*... While Abbo remained at Ramsey during the years 985–987, Byrhtferth had copied out long extracts of Macrobius ... and these, too, were incorporated in his *collectaneum* as he continued working on it in the 990s. When he came to compose his *Enchiridion* in the year 1011, Byrhtferth supplied as Part IV of that work an expanded version of the brief treatise on numerology which he had compiled while working on his *collectaneum* in the 990s. The result of his labours on Bede's scientific treatises was that a manuscript was assembled containing his own *Computus*, accompanied by Bede *DNR*, *DT*, and *DTR* (in that order), and augmented by Byrhtferth's own *collectaneum* of sources—the *Glossae Bridfertii*—to the *DNR* and *DTR*. This manuscript, or a copy of it, remained at Ramsey until the Dissolution, when it was discovered there by John Bale and subsequently taken by him to Basel, made available there to [Johannes Basilius] Herold and Herwagen, and subsequently destroyed."

Under the general editorship of David R. Howlett (with the assistance of T. Christchev, T.V. Evans, P.O. Piper and C. White), the next fascicle of the *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources* (*Fasc. X: Pel-Phi*) appeared from Oxford UP.

Rob Meens explores the well-known case of the sinful cleric who sought sanctuary at St. Martin's at Tours during Alcuin's abbacy, in "Sanctuary, Penance, and Dispute Settlement under Charlemagne: The Conflict between Alcuin and Theodulf of Orléans over a Sinful Cleric," *Speculum* 82: 277–300. One of the aspects of this situation that differs from other early medieval conflicts is that the evidence is epistolary: most other examinations have been made on the basis of charters or narrative sources. Five letters from 801 and 802

concerning the event survive; a further seven have perhaps been lost. Meens sums up the significance of the case: “The affair ... not only informs us about the way in which the right of sanctuary could be used in a local conflict but also illustrates the involvement of the Carolingian court in a local conflict.... [I]t also hints at the existence of conflicting views on sin and crime, penance and punishment at the Carolingian court.” Meens discusses the background to the right of sanctuary (there is only one other case documented in detail before this one, the case of Eberulf, which is preserved in the works of Gregory of Tours) and gives a meticulous reconstruction of the events of the case, both known, probable, and hypothesized. In short, a cleric who had been found guilty of certain unknown crimes escaped his chains and sought sanctuary in the basilica at St. Martin’s. Theodulf twice sent men to bring him back: the first time, they returned for fear of a rumored ambush; the second, he sent armed men into the basilica and the monks of St. Martin’s drove the men from the altar. Theodulf’s band seized a retainer of the cleric and took him outside the church, only to have a general riot break out as the poor of Tours got wind of the situation. We have Alcuin’s version of events, an idea of what must have angered Theodulf, and a strongly worded letter of Charlemagne which, as Meens puts it, must have been a “bitter disappointment” to Alcuin. To put it very briefly, Alcuin felt that too much force was used, urged mercy over justice, and felt that there were issues with sanctuary and appeal. Theodulf complained about the treatment of his men, and disrespect for Charlemagne’s command to hand over the fugitive. Charlemagne suggested Alcuin’s words were “much cruder and a lot angrier in tone” than Theodulf’s, reprimanded him for accusing a bishop (the bishop of Tours, who cooperated with Theodulf’s men) and defending a criminal who “had already been tried and convicted,” and closed by suggesting that St. Martin’s was clearly not functioning as it should. Alcuin was forced to hand over the fugitive to Theodulf to be brought before the royal court for judgement. The fourth letter concerns the royal *missus* who was sent to investigate what had happened, though it comes again from the perspective of Alcuin, who is defending the monks of St. Martin’s. The final piece of evidence is a letter from Alcuin to Archbishop Arn of Salzburg, asking him to take care of a “little calf” who was in trouble: the most likely explanation is that the “little calf” was a young monk who had interfered with Theodulf’s men. Though there is no way to know exactly how everything ended, Meens notes that Charlemagne in 803 issued a capitulary *legibus addendum* which dealt exactly with the sort of

scenario which had occurred in Tours: “In sum, Charlemagne’s capitulary makes in perfectly clear that royal justice was in no way to be hampered by the right of sanctuary.” In addition, Theodulf’s “first episcopal capitulary” demands no strife or tumult in the church, using language strongly reminiscent of Alcuin’s letters. Meens observes that the opposite views in the case—public conviction and punishment on the one hand (Theodulf and Charlemagne), and confession and penance on the other (Alcuin)—may have had an influence on changes in the practice of penance in the early ninth century (i.e., ought it to be public, or private?).

Francesco Roberg points out that Charlemagne’s program of reform included the goal of bringing the reckoning of time, or *computus*, into a standard form, “Der sogenannte Lorscher Prototyp und der Kalendar Manchester, John Rylands Library lat. 116,” *Archiv für Diplomatik* n.s. 53: 27–58. Just as sacramentaries and lectionaries, for example, were to depend on approved exemplars, so too were calendars to emulate specific models. Building on Arno Borst’s work in establishing the exemplars of Carolingian calendars, Roberg looks specifically at the late eighth-century “Lorsch Prototype” and the calendar in Manchester, Rylands Library, lat. 116. Via this mid-ninth-century calendar from Tours (or perhaps Trier), Roberg analyzes the development of the calendar. Bede’s contribution is significant throughout, particularly his *De temporum ratione*, but also *De temporibus*. Roberg includes an edition of the Manchester calendar in an appendix.

In the volume honoring Éamonn Ó Carragáin (*Text, Image, Interpretation*, ed. Minnis and Roberts [see sec. 2]), there are two contributions to be mentioned. First, Jennifer O’Reilly, “Bede on Seeing the God of Gods in Zion,” 3–29, considers Bede’s attitudes toward holy places, pilgrimage, and the journey to God. O’Reilly discusses Bede’s exposition of Numbers 33:1–49 on the forty-two resting places (*mansiones*) on the journey to the Promised Land and shows that Bede had his own take on this difficult passage, relating it to the irregular progress of the soul to God. Psalm 83:8 was commonly used to explicate Numbers 33, and Bede also uses the notion of progress from virtue to virtue (*de uirtute in uirtutem*) to see the God of gods in Zion. O’Reilly further points out that the verse was one of the antiphons chanted as Ceolfrith left for Rome, and this leads into a discussion of the “stational liturgy of Rome,” and a tangle of associations: Rome, Jerusalem, the living church, and metaphors of pilgrimage and building. The example of Cuthbert’s “retirement” also fits: “Psalm 83:8 is associated in the *Vita Cuthberti* with the anchoritic life of spiritual warfare in desolate places.” Cuthbert builds

a *mansio*, where he becomes almost a “citizen of the heavenly Jerusalem.” O’Reilly continues to point out other passages in which Bede thinks about “seeing God” and notes that the final *uirtus* is contemplating God (as Matt. 5:8), a notion Bede likely derived from Augustine and Cassian. Overall, “[t]here is an extraordinary spiritual and theological coherence in the multiplicity of contexts and ways in which Bede uses the psalm text to describe the heavenward journey, both in the life of the individual and of the Church through the ages.”

The second also concerns Bede. George Brown, like Danuta Shanzer for Bede’s *HE*, discusses the question of style, “Bede’s Style in His Commentary *On I Samuel*,” 233–51. Brown notes that Bede’s Latin is different in each phase of his work: historical, didactic, and exegetical. Within his exegetical prose, there is a further difference between his early works and his late works. In the commentary on I Samuel, “he changes the stylistic presentation according to the different structural registers of the commentary, so that within the commentary itself there exist very different styles.” Brown notes that there are not only stylistic divisions between the prologues and the main text, but the prologues themselves are also quite different. Brown analyzes the “syntax and ornament” of the first prologue in detail, noting, for example, Bede’s consistent use of the *cursus* (“the formal cadenced ending of clauses”). Prologues 2 to 4 are briefly described. To conclude, Brown compares and contrasts two lengthy passages from the commentary proper, noting the prevalence of allegory, and its effect: “With this emphasis on personal morality, the commentaries take on a homiletic tone, a strongly suasive modality.” As a work of Bede’s late career, the commentary on I Samuel is an excellent example of the “complexity and sophistication” of Bede’s exegetical style.

David N. Dumville, noting the extraordinary richness of the work of Gildas, explores the concept of “post-Roman” in Gildas’s day in “Post-colonial Gildas: A First Essay,” *Quaestio Insularis* 7 (2006): 1–21. Dumville reminds us how little we in fact know of Gildas (an anagram for “Sildag”?) and *De excidio Britanniae* (which did not circulate under the name of Gildas, nor with such a title): “the intellectual and cultural biography of Gildas remains unwritten.” Gildas, however, clearly identified his *patria* as Britain: to write a history of a Roman province would have been “treasonable” (Dumville here quotes E.A. Thompson). But when did the “provinces” of Britain cease to be Roman? Was the “post-Roman” distinction a matter of chronology, government, or culture? The questions are difficult. Dumville suggests that the issues are mainly cultural, and sketches some of the avenues of investigation, pointing

out modern parallels along the way. Gildas portrays Britain as a “modern Israel,” and locates the cause of the people’s distress in sinfulness, not in any effect of the Roman withdrawal. Gildas thought of the Romans as “external conquerors,” but it is not clear how he perceived of “the governance of the Roman empire.” Dumville asserts that “Gildas is on the face of it a perfect example of post-colonial cultural hybridity. The Britons had their own (non-Roman) identity, but the removal of the Roman politico-military embrace had exposed them to another cruel world in which their identity, their very survival, was at stake.” To survive, they had to emulate the Romans: “a wholly independent identity, whether of pre- or post-colonial character, was an insufficient option.” Though these tensions in Gildas’s senses of identity are clear, “it is very difficult to know whether he could recognize or deliberately articulate them.”

MF

Rolf H. Bremmer’s “The *Gesta Herewardi*: Transforming an Anglo-Saxon into an Englishman,” *People and Texts: Relationships in Medieval Literature: Studies Presented to Erik Kooper*, ed. Thea Summerfield and Keith Busby (Amsterdam: Rodopi), 29–42, offers a much-needed reassessment of the career and biography of the famous outlaw. Asking “what national or ethnic sentiments did the author [of the *Gesta*] entertain in his description of Hereward?” Bremmer concludes that he “consciously attempted to depict [Hereward] as a latter-day Anglo-Saxon but also that he eventually realized that in view of the new disposition such a characterization could not be maintained until the end of his narrative” (31). Bremmer situates the *Gesta* in relation to other later Anglo-Saxon texts concerned with cultural identity, including Ælfric’s Letter to Brother Edward and Wulfstan’s *Sermo lupi*, yet he notes that that the author also engages in rhetorical flourishes more typical of Classical epic than early English historiography. Ultimately, Bremmer argues, the political realities of post-Conquest England overtake any nostalgia for the Anglo-Saxon past, so that the narrative’s somewhat deflating conclusion—Hereward’s reconciliation with William—serves as a way of inviting the reader to accept the new, Anglo-Norman order: “Anglo-Saxon England is dead! Long live the new England!” (42).

AR

Shannon O. Ambrose, “The Continental Sources of Anglo-Saxon Literature: A Case Study of the *Collectio canonum Hibernensis*,” Ph.D. Diss., Univ. of Illinois at

Chicago, 2006, *DAI* 67A, 9, offers a study of the influence of the Hiberno-Latin compilation *Collectio canonum Hibernensis* on tenth-century Anglo-Saxon royal codes and ecclesiastical writings. Ambrose argues that the innovations and sophistications in English law were partly a result of continental documents such as the *Hibernensis* being adapted and studied in English centers. She places it within the context of the Benedictine Reform by studying references to the *Hibernensis* in the writings of Ælfric, Wulfstan, and Oda of Canterbury, and argues that this is evidence of a legal attitude that perceived Church and State as increasingly intertwined.

George Hardin Brown, in “Bede and the Cross,” *Cross and Culture in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Jolly et al. (see sec. 2), 19–35, reminds us that Bede’s allegorical and metaphorical treatments of the Cross were part of a tradition that extended from the Church Fathers to seventeenth-century “metaphysical” poets, and that while he remained traditional in many respects, he also offered some innovations. After surveying some of Bede’s treatments of the Cross, Brown offers a close reading of Bede’s unusual image of the pomegranate found in his commentary on 1 Samuel, demonstrating the skillful way Bede wove descriptions and allegorical interpretations from his written sources with his own emphases.

AA

Allen J. Frantzen’s essay, “All Created Things: Material Contexts for Bede’s story of Cædmon” (111–49), argues that Bede’s account of miracles, including the story of Cædmon, “inadvertently call[s] our attention to the everyday world and the ordinary objects in it” (113). Rather than focusing on high-status objects, which have been widely studied by scholars, Frantzen chooses to examine common objects and their functions, things so ordinary as to be unremarkable and perhaps therefore unconsciously infused with meaning. “Once the unity of ‘man and nature’ had been broken by sin, human relations with objects had to be reconceived. Miracles were instrumental to this process, which relied on the saints and God’s intervention through them to wrench ordinary things out of their functional or organic relation to humanity and to emphasize their place in God’s plan” (118). In a society wherein pagan superstition could lend meaning to objects, the Church had to counter such beliefs with miracles that demonstrated the superiority of Christian belief; it also “had to struggle to reorient pagans toward the material on a second level, that of ordinary things and their participation in a social world in which the human and the material were closely connected” (121). Christianity is

portrayed as making it possible to master the material world and thereby succeed where paganism was frustrated. Frantzen notes that in Book IV especially, many miracles are concerned with “the transformation of social rather than symbolic systems” (122); he analyzes in detail Wilfrid’s work among the South Saxons (4.13), Cuthbert’s retirement in the Farne islands (4.28), Adamnan’s vision at Coldingham (4.25), the wood-working monk Owine (4.3), and the story of Cædmon (4.24) (122–138). However, “[e]ven as Bede draws attention to God’s miraculous power over ordinary things, his narrative is forced to allude to the everyday practices and social relations that wonders do not transform”; further, the material things that appear in the miracle stories remain material objects and fulfill mundane purposes even after the miraculous has “flowed around and through them” (139). He concludes that for this reason, “scholars should understand of such objects in the context of what they were made to do, not in the context of what they could be made to mean.... Surely it is time for Anglo-Saxonists reading texts to look for these things and then to look at, rather than through, them to see what they can tell us about the matter of Bede’s world” (149).

MKR

Claudia Heimann (“Das Schreiben Cathwulfs an Karl den Grossen,” *Studentische Festschrift zur Verabschiedung von Professor Dr. phil. Habil. Peter Segl*, ed. Kristian Jebramcik and Florian Goßler [Fürth: Flacius, 2005], 58–76) presents an examination of the letter of Cathwulf to Charlemagne, concluding that the many gaps in our knowledge of the author and of Charlemagne’s reaction to the letter will render all theories tentative. It clearly belongs to the “mirror for princes” tradition, and Heimann argues that any attempt to stress the centrality of the concept of *Europa* over that of the concept of *rex* seriously distorts the letter’s meaning. Heimann also suggests that the letter would optimally be compared with other, contemporaneous documents in order to achieve an accurate picture of how *Europa* was conceived in the eighth century.

In “Using Philosophers to Think with: The Venerable Bede on Christian Life and Practice,” in *The Subjective Eye: Essays in Culture, Religion, and Gender in Honor of Margaret R. Miles*, ed. Richard Valantasis; Princeton Theological Monograph Series (Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2006), 48–58, Arthur G. Holder suggests that Bede demonstrated a wariness toward philosophy that was consistent with his interest in the devotional life of the early medieval Christian. He examines Bede’s citation of ancient philosophers and concludes that Bede’s use

of the term *philosophia* indicated he was comfortable with the term if used in a specifically Christian context, one that illuminated humility, devotion, and orthodoxy. On the other hand, secular philosophy could also represent heresy and pride, and it was not sufficient food for the Christian to think with, nor a solid-enough foundation on which to build a proper Christian life.

In "Moucan's Prayers Again," *Bulletin Du Cange* 65: 247–56, David Howlett returns to examine the sequence of prayers contained in British Library MS Royal A.2.xx. Howlett has previously argued that these prayers were the work of a Welshman named Moucan, who was writing a structured cento in rhyming rhythmical prose. He offers further emendations and observations about the text's structure and rhythm according to his theory of composition via geomatria.

In the same issue of *Bulletin Du Cange*, 235–46, Howlett's "Two Cambro-Latin Sequences from the Welsh Church" offers a reading of "Arbor eterna" and "Cum uenerunt angeli," two Latin sequences from Welsh manuscripts. "Arbor eterna" is contained in C.U.L. MS Ff.4.42, also known as the Cambridge Juvenius. Howlett gives a transcription of this poem and praise to the edition of Peter Dronke, who suggested that the poem might have been composed for the dedication of a particular church. Howlett suggests some textual emendations according to his method of reading numerological fingerprints in Latin texts and offers a translation. "Cum uenerunt angeli" is contained in Aberystwyth, National Library of Wales, MS Peniarth 2. Howlett reprints a previous edition and a transcription of the poem, and offers his own edition in isosyllabic rhyming lines, followed by a translation, and discussion of some of the text's formal properties.

Joanna Huntingdon, "Saintly Power as a Model of Royal Authority," *Aspects of Power and Authority in the Middle Ages*, ed. Bolton and Meek (see sec. 1), 327–43, argues that successive early rewritings of the legend of Saint Edward show an adaptation of the hagiographic miracle for the purpose of politics. Specifically, she analyzes how the importance of the "Royal Touch" becomes altered successively in the anonymous *Vita Ædwardi Regis qui apud Westmonasterium requiescit*, Osbert of Clare's *Vita beati Edwardi*, and Aelred of Rievaulx's *Vita S. Edwardi*.

Anne Lawrence-Mathers, "The Problem of Magic in Early Anglo-Saxon England," *Reading Medieval Studies* 33: 87–104, approaches the continuing debate over how to define magic in medieval studies through a consideration of the *Penitential of Theodore*, through which she hopes to read early Anglo-Saxon belief generally. This work survives in two ninth-century manuscripts,

and is the editorial product of one *discipulus Umbrensius* who claims the penitential originates from a dialogue between Theodore of Tarsus and a priest named Eoda. Lawrence-Mathers argues that this text presents "magical practices" as something more likely to be practiced by women, yet also as something rather minor, to judge by the penances prescribed. On the other hand, a distinction seems to be drawn between magical potions and charms and more serious crimes that were considered pagan and idolatrous but not magical. More serious magical acts were attributed to male *malefici*, but the *Penitential of Theodore* does not mention some of the more lurid magical practices, such as cannibalism, that are mentioned in Continental texts.

In "Goscelin of St. Bertin and the Life of St. Eadwold of Cerne," *Jnl of Medieval Latin* 16 (2006): 182–207, Tom Licence gives us an edition, translation, and introduction to the text *In natale sancti Eadwoldi*, the primary witness to the life of the ninth-century St. Eadwold. This text was excerpted from a Life (now lost) that Licence attributes to Goscelin of St. Bertin, and he suggests a date of composition of between 1060 and 1075. Licence makes the attribution to Goscelin on the basis of Latin stylistic features shared by *In natale* and Goscelin's other works, including favored rhetorical devices, stock metaphors, the presence of rhyming prose, and a lexicon flavored with Grecisms.

In "Bede and John Chrysostom," *Jnl of Medieval Latin* 17: 72–86, Rosalind Love argues that Bede had access to a copy of the collection of thirty-eight homilies that was attributed to John Chrysostom in the early Middle Ages, and offers a preliminary examination of parallels between this collection and Bede's references to John in his various Biblical exegeses. This collection, which circulated in twenty-five complete copies, has yet to be edited as a whole, although early modern printed editions of John contain its homilies. Love notes that some instances where Bede believed erroneously that he was citing John can be explained by references to this collection of homilies, which contains writings attributed to him. A good number of such attributions, which have puzzled editors of Bede, can be explained by a careful examination of this homily collection. Love does not find any indication that Bede was familiar with the writings of John Chrysostom outside of this collection.

John Moorhead, "Some Borrowings in Bede," *Latomus* 66: 710–17, suggests that Bede's debt to Gregory the Great in his *Ecclesiastical History* includes narrative as well as verbal borrowings; this can be seen in Bede's treatment of four miracles in *HE* 2.1. The first three miracles Moorhead discusses involve Mellitus, Aidan,

and Cuthbert. The fourth miracle, the tale of the captured soldier Imma, is given extended treatment, for Moorhead believes that the details that seem to give the tale such verisimilitude were literary flourishes added by Bede. After noting that Bede and Gregory show similarity in other ways concerning their handling of the miraculous, Moorhead suggests that the phrase *simplicitate rustica*, placed by Bede in the mouth of Wilfrid, is a borrowing from Jerome.

William Schipper, "Reading the Cross in Anglo-Saxon England," *Cross and Culture in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Jolly et al. (see sec. 2), 321–42, offers a reading of Cambridge MS Trinity College, B.16.3, the tenth-century copy of Rabanus Maurus's *In honorem sanctae crucis*. Schipper discusses the interpretation of the embedded figures and crosses, as well as the other symbols that comprise the texts. Imagining the course a tenth-century reader might have taken through the book, Schipper suggests some of the textual and visual challenges facing a reader of Maurus's complex and enigmatic art, and his reading benefits greatly from his willingness to imagine the work being read in both a public and private context. The text is fittingly accompanied by five beautiful plates.

James R. Siemens, "Christ's Restoration of Humankind in the *Laterculus Malalianus*, 14," *Scottish Jnl of Theology* 60: 213–25, offers some insight into the language and intent of the *Laterculus Malalianus*, the theological work of Theodore of Tarsus. Specifically, Siemens offers a close reading of chapter fourteen, which he believes reveals special Theodore's concern with and understanding the meaning of Christ's incarnation. Siemens notes the influence of Irenaeus of Smyrna and his doctrine of the recapitulation (*ανακεφαλαίωσις*) of humanity. He also points out that Theodore borrows the image of *Christus medicus* from Ephrem the Syrian, and detects similar influence in Theodore's handling of the symbolism of a measure of wheat (*tritici mensuram*).

[Editor's note: the following four articles on Anselm were not included in the *OEN Bibliography* for 2007.]

Toivo J. Holopainen, "Anselm's *Argumentum* and the Early Medieval Theory of Argument," *Vivarium: An International Journal for the Philosophy and Intellectual Life of the Middle Ages and Renaissance* 45: 1–29, offers a subtle reading of Anselm's form of argument in his *Proslogion*, specifically at his claim to have found the *unum argumentum*. He begins by analyzing the background to the "single argument" question by describing the *reductio ad absurdum* technique of Anselm's *quo aliquid maius excogitari non potest*. He relates this form of reasoning to that outlined by Boethius in Book

One of the *In Ciceronis Topica*, and traces the transmission of these Boethian ideas through Abelard, Lanfranc, and Anselm. Holopainen concludes that Anselm saw his own argument in this Boethian framework, and that *quo aliquid maius excogitari non potest* should be considered as Anselm's *unum argumentum*.

R. Dewitt and R. J. Long, in "Richard Rufus's Reformulations of Anselm's *Proslogion* Argument," *International Philosophical Quarterly* 47: 329–347, examine the critical response made to Anselm's argument of the existence of God in his *Proslogion* made by the Franciscan Richard Rufus around the year 1250, and found in Rufus's commentary on Peter Lombard's *Sententiae*. Rufus accuses Anselm of sophistry in the formation of his *quo aliquid maius excogitari non potest*, and he claims that in his attempt to explain the Fool, has diminished his own argument. Rufus offers five refutations to Anselm, who he believes has failed to distinguish between signification and supposition. The authors reproduce these refutations in modern formal logic, and conclude that four are valid, and the fifth might feature scribal error. Rufus concludes that while Anselm's second chapter is unconvincing, his third chapter does convince.

Gareth B. Matthews, "Inner Dialogue in Augustine and Anselm," *Poetics Today* 28: 283–302, notes that St. Augustine was the first writer to take up Plato's suggestion in the *Theaetetus* that thinking is a conversation the soul has with itself. Augustine did this in his *Soliloquies*, in which he presents himself having a dialogue with "Reason," for which he coined the term *soliloquia*. Matthews argues that Augustine uses the fiction of inner dialogue to consider the Paradox of Inquiry (from the *Meno*), with knowledge of God, rather than virtue, as his goal. This Paradox has two component parts, the Targeting Requirement and the Recognition Requirement: how can Augustine look for God, and how will he know God if he should find Him? Anselm of Canterbury takes up this same problem in his *Proslogion*, a far more sophisticated piece of philosophy. Anselm replaces Augustine's figure of Reason with that of the Fool, who helps him to see that God cannot be conceived as nonexistent without falling into absurdity.

H. M. Canatella, "Friendship in Anselm of Canterbury's Correspondence: Ideals and Experience," *Viator: Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 38: 351–67, reads the correspondence of Anselm with Gundulf of Bec and Ida of Boulogne, and argues that the letters reveal an interest in friendship that surpasses rhetorical display and achieves a genuine blending of Christian model and real experience. Canatella suggests that Anselm remains one of the foremost practitioners of the

Ancient and Medieval notion that friendship with both men and women was deeply connected to love and virtue, and was a key element in a good life, not a side affair.

AA

Reviews held over from OEN Bibliography for 2006

Manuela Bergamin offers a new edition and translation (into Italian) of *Aenigmata Symposii: La fondazione dell'enigmistica come genere poetico*, Per Verba: testi mediolatini con traduzione 22 (Florence: Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2005). Bergamin offers a full introduction, sketching out all that we can deduce about Symphosius and his cultural milieu, giving an overview of the "riddle" genre, discussing the language and style of the work, sources and parallels, and including a description of the manuscripts. The text is presented with a facing-page translation in Italian. However, the most impressive feature of the edition must be the extensive commentary offered on individual riddles and phrases—almost 150 pages! Bergamin also adds two indices: an *Index locorum* and an *Index uerborum*.

David Howlett, continuing in the tradition of earlier work such as *British Books in Biblical Style*, turns his attention to insular inscriptions from earliest times to Anglo-Norman French and Middle English with his book *Insular Inscriptions* (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2005). Howlett notes that the particular advantage of working with inscriptions (which for him includes autograph inscriptions of colophons in manuscripts) is the lack of intermediate "editions": the "patterns of thought" which he attempts to illuminate cannot be corrupted. A brief introduction lays out the principles of his investigation, working from a common belief in the world as "a created artefact sung by God." The number seven is important, as are numerical values for letters, music and especially "intervals between sounds and the ratios that produced harmonies," and the elements, to name a few. The book contains chapters on Latin (including Romano-British, Cambro-Latin, Hiberno-Latin and Anglo-Latin), Greek, Aramaic, Hebrew and Arabic, Welsh, Irish, Old and Middle English, Old Norse, and Anglo-Norman French inscriptions. Howlett treats numerous short "texts" in varying degrees of detail. For example, he demonstrates the sophistication of the chastic and parallel patterning in Aldhelm's double acrostic preface to the *Enigmata*, and is able to tease out other, more complicated, structural principles: "Aldhelm alludes to six Biblical texts in two parallel sets of three each: first in line 4 to Job XL 10, second in line 17 to the Song of Moses in Exodus XV 1 ff., third in line

21 to David's Psalm CIX 3, then again in line 30 to Job, in lines 32–34 to Exodus XIV 22–29, and in line 34 to David's Psalm LXXVII 13–15. The six sources of inspiration multiplied by the six Biblical texts yield the number of lines in the poem proper, $6 \times 6 = 36$. One line of the title and thirty-six lines of the poem proper equal thirty-seven, which, multiplied by six, equals the three words of the title and 219 words of the poem proper, $37 \times 6 = 222$." In fact, there is still more, and more sophisticated, patterning which Howlett explains. The chapter on Old and Middle English inscriptions considers runic inscriptions, including The Franks Casket and the Ruthwell Cross, as well as Aldred's colophons to the Durham Collectar and the Lindisfarne Gospels. Overall, Howlett suggests that "exposure to a mode of thought and composition" taught the writers of these inscriptions how "to make texts mean more than they appear at first to say. Many have more than one semantic meaning. Nearly all have a computus of numbers of lines and words and syllables and letters that represent both the numbers and the ratios by which God sang the universe into existence. Many exhibit a computus that represents the alphanumeric values of proper names. Many exhibit a computus that represents the numbers of time, days, weeks, months and years. Some may exhibit a computus that represents the numbers of harmonic structure."

In the same year, Helen and James McKee subjected Howlett's *Insular Inscriptions* to a painstaking review in "Chance or Design? David Howlett's *Insular Inscriptions* and the Problem of Coincidence," *Cambrian Medieval Celtic Studies* 51: 83–101. The title announces the direction of the review, but in fact this lengthy and carefully considered article takes on the whole of Howlett's oeuvre on patterning. The authors point out that while not everything in the book is new (there is repeated material from early works), the book also assumes a knowledge of Howlett's arithmetical theories. Mainly, however, the review assesses the likelihood that Howlett is correct. The potential problems are many: how to count words, word divisions, punctuation, word-spacing, abbreviations, what alphabet to use (i.e., how many letters?), the large number of ratios possible ($1/9$ or $8/9$, etc.), the lack of a defined data set (how many inscriptions did he look at, and what percentage yielded significant results?), etc. In a moment of levity, the reviewers discover hidden messages in a sticker from the side of their refrigerator. However, their main point is that there is absolutely no reference to the kind of "numerical infixing" that Howlett discovers anywhere before he "discovers" it in the twentieth century. Even Byrhtferth's *Enchiridion*, a likely place if there ever were one,

never mentions arithmetical composition. The features Howlett isolates may well appear as the result of chance. The reviewers conclude: "Having looked long and hard at Howlett's alleged evidence, we find nothing that supports his thesis, and many things that do not."

Andrew J. Turner and Bernard J. Muir provide an edition with facing-page translation of Eadmer of Canterbury's *Vita s. Odonis*, *Vita* and *Miracula s. Dunstani* and *Vita* and *Miracula s. Oswaldi* (*Eadmer of Canterbury: Lives and Miracles of Saints Oda, Dunstan, and Oswald*, Oxford Medieval Texts (Oxford: Clarendon). They introduce Eadmer's life and writings before devoting full and separate introductions to each of the works, including date, sources, manuscripts, evidence for later use and knowledge of the work. Though perhaps not all that well known (as a post-Conquest Anglo-Latin author), Eadmer's works survived the medieval period in a fair number of manuscripts, and his influence is seen in, for example, the works of William of Malmesbury, Gervase of Canterbury, and John of Tynemouth, and even, perhaps, in the Icelandic Life of Dunstan by Arne Laurentiusson.

Michael Gorman begins his study of "Adomnán's *De locis sanctis*: The Diagrams and the Sources," *RB* 116: 5–41, by noting that his is one of a very few works "known with certainty to have been composed in Latin in Ireland during the seventh and eighth centuries," and that Adomnán himself "is practically the only Irish author of this period ... who is more than a name." For these reasons, as well as the lack of extant manuscripts or booklists which might provide supplementary evidence, the range of Adomnán's sources is extremely important for our knowledge of what works might have been available in a seventh- or eighth-century library in Ireland. Gorman rehearses some familiar arguments for the lack of evidence of early Hiberno-Latin traditions before starting into the question of the diagrams which accompany the text, and which have been "obscured in recent editions." Adomnán relates that a certain Arculfus drew diagrams of buildings and sites in the Holy Land on wax tablets; Adomnán preserved four such sketches in his work: the Church of the Holy Sepulchre; the Basilica on Mt. Sion; the Church of the Ascension; and the Church at Sichem above Jacob's Well. Gorman indicates where the diagrams ought to be placed in modern editions and provides plates from different manuscripts and from the first (1672) edition of the text which did include the diagrams. Adomnán's sources include several works of Jerome (most importantly, Jerome's *De situ et nominibus locorum Hebraicorum*, but also the commentary on Ezechiel [one passage], the *Hebraicae quaestiones in Genesim*

and perhaps the commentary on Matthew), Hegesippus, the author of the Latin version of Josephus's *De bello iudaico* (the most important source), Sulpicius Severus's *Chronicon*, and a few other minor sources. To conclude, Gorman looks briefly at Bede's *De locis sanctis* and its relationship to Adomnán's work, noting that Bede himself also consulted Jerome and Hegesippus, but added a work attributed to Eucherius (*De situ Hierosolimae*) to his sources.

In "Strategies of Emplacement and Displacement: St. Edith and the Wilton Community in Goscelin's Legend of Edith and *Liber confortatorius*," Stephanie Hollis considers how Goscelin portrays St. Edith and her "presence" in the Wilton community (in *A Place to Believe In*, ed. Lees and Overing [see sec. 1], 150–69). Hollis points out that the sense of "place" Goscelin invokes is based more upon "an accumulation of textual meanings generated by absence and loss" than it is upon any "literal edifice." To explore further requires a sense of how she was "deployed" by the community at Wilton, and by Goscelin, but also a sense of Goscelin's biography, for his "displacement" colors his representations. Hollis reminds us of how Goscelin's Edith is intimately tied into his recollections of, and relationship with, Eve. The cult of Edith was not a local creation, and faced numerous difficulties, declining significantly after the conquest. Goscelin (writing around 1080) insisted "on Edith's particular and continuing presence at Wilton" partly in "an attempt to restore the community's flagging faith." Goscelin's "apocalyptic conclusion" to the *Liber confortatorius* reunites Edith and Wilton in the new Jerusalem as Edith is (a) bride of Christ, but also includes Eve, even though this "reincorporation" with Wilton may not have been Eve's desire. For himself, Goscelin imagines no place, "unsure what degree of union [Eve] might wish to share with him in the new Jerusalem."

Katherine O'Brien O'Keeffe also considers Goscelin's relationship with Eve, this time to suggest that opinion about the difference in their ages put forward by André Wilmart may not be correct ("Goscelin and the Consecration of Eve," *ASE* 35: 251–70). O'Brien O'Keeffe argues that they were closer in age than Wilmart assumed, and bases her argument primarily upon Goscelin's description of Eve's consecration in the *Liber confortatorius*. Wilmart and others had assumed that Goscelin was recounting Eve's oblation, but the evidence of other descriptions of consecration demonstrates that this was not the case. In fact, the general sketch of Eve's life derived by Wilmart is not nearly as clear as it has seemed. O'Brien O'Keeffe looks at the language Goscelin uses to describe Eve, examines in close

detail what the evidence of the *Liber confortatorius* has to say about the chronology of events, then moves on to the description of her consecration and why it must indeed be a consecration. The evidence suggests that “[i]t is likely that Eve was older than seven when Goscelin met her.” Thus, “[t]he consecration had to have taken place before 20 February 1078.... Given Eve’s age, it is likely that it took place closer to 1077 than earlier.” O’Brien O’Keeffe concludes with a detailed appendix of “Anglo-Saxon liturgical manuscripts with rituals of consecration.”

In “Hymns to the Cross: Contexts for the Reception of *Vexilla regis prodeunt*,” Inge B. Milfull investigates the hymn *Vexilla regis prodeunt* by Venantius Fortunatus, a hymn to the Cross nearly as famous as the *Pange lingua* (in *The Place of the Cross*, ed. Karkov et al. [see sec. 1], 43–57). Milfull sketches the general background to hymns to the cross, noting that it really begins with Venantius Fortunatus and the six poems he composed in 569 to celebrate the gift of relics of the Cross at the convent of the Holy Cross in Poitiers in Gaul. Milfull describes each of these poems, noting that two were *carmina figurata*, and two were in elegiac metre, meaning only *Pange lingua* and *Vexilla regis* were originally meant to be sung. However, “only hymns in the Ambrosian metre were acceptable as Office hymns,” ruling out *Pange lingua*. Though the *Vexilla regis* was probably modelled after the hymns of Ambrose in meter and structure, it, too, “was not regularly included in the Old Hymnal.” There is no evidence for the *Vexilla regis* in the Office of early Anglo-Saxon England, but things changed in the ninth-century New Hymnal, when a section of *Pange lingua* appears in Corbie and the *Vexilla regis* appears in a late ninth-century hymnal from Monza. In fact, “all witnesses for the New Hymnal in England include *Vexilla regis*,” which is assigned to the Passion. Milfull discusses the three types of usage in late Anglo-Saxon New Hymnals, and some other contexts for reception of the hymn, before concluding with editions of two versions of the hymn in an appendix.

Marie Ericka Swensson investigates “Gender, Transformation and the Body in Aldhelm’s *De uirginitate* and the Anglo-Saxon Double Monastery” (M.A. Thesis, California State Univ., Long Beach, 2006, MAI 44: 6). Swensson’s thesis examines the body and gender in the context of monasticism, suggesting that the double monastery was “instrumental in creating a distinctive gender ideology.” Further, works such as Aldhelm’s *De uirginitate* explore the “transcendent body,” or “third gender,” “the chaste or virginal monastic body ... stripped of ‘feminine’ sexuality and dedicated to the ‘masculine’ pursuit of spiritual purification.”

Nevertheless, Swensson suggests, the “third gender” fails as a category due to “reliance on classical and contemporary ideas regarding gender and the nature of sexuality itself.” Even in *De uirginitate*, the “masculinization” of the female body sometimes takes precedence over the “third gender,” perhaps suggesting a tension in Aldhelm’s text which is reflective of wider views. The thesis has chapters on “Gender and the Body in Anglo-Saxon Law,” “The Double Monastery in Aldhelm’s Age,” “The Body in *De uirginitate*,” and “The Function of Violence in the Anglo-Saxon *Vitae*,” the last of which Swensson flags as most difficult in her analysis, and most deserving of further study.

Michael Lapidge contributes a general overview of the eighth century, “Il secolo VIII,” to a guide for Latin literature from the sixth to the fifteenth century, in *Letteratura latina medievale (secoli VI-XV): un manuale*, ed. Claudio Leonardi, Millennio Medievale 31, Strumenti 2 (Florence: SISMEL Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2002), 41–73). Lapidge notes the importance and influence of Aldhelm before considering the major English Latin authors of the eighth century, Wynfrith/Boniface and Bede. Lapidge then shifts his focus to the continent and covers the major developments in Latin literature there, concluding with a discussion of the transplanted Englishman, Alcuin.

MF

In “Æthelthryth of Ely in a Lost Calendar from Munich,” ASE 35 (2006): 159–77, Mechthild Gretsch finds evidence in a fragment of a Munich calendar that the Anglo-Saxon missionaries working on the Continent were keen to preserve memory of the saints of their homeland, and even saw this memorializing as an essential feature to pass on to their brethren. The fragment, Munich, Hauptstadtsarchiv, Raritäten-Selekt 108, dated saec. viii^{2/4}, now lost, was printed in the *Codices Latini Antiquiores*, and can be seen to include the obits of five Anglo-Saxon saints, including Æthelthryth. Gretsch offers a careful comparison of the fragment with other known calendars, and while its loss and its fragmentary condition make final conclusions difficult, she believes it offers a useful indication of Anglo-Saxon monastic memorialization on the Continent.

David Howlett, in “Collectanea Pseudo-Bedae,” *Peritia* 19 (2005): 30–43, offers a now-familiar analysis along literary and computistical paths of the *Collectanea Pseudo-Bedae*, a compilation of Hiberno-Latin and Anglo-Latin lore. Howlett concludes as a result of his study the computistical devices he finds at work throughout the work were indeed part of its original design and not later additions to the text. Especially

relevant for him are the alphanumeric values of the names of the Magi and their Gifts, the name Adam, the name Galgala, and many numbers.

In “The Irregular Life in Ælfric Bata’s *Colloquies*,” (in *Essays for Joyce Hill on Her Sixtieth Birthday*, ed. Mary Swan, Leeds Studies in English n.s. 37 [Leeds: Univ. of Leeds, School of English, 2006], 241–60) Christopher Jones attempts to surmise how much of the *Colloquies* of Ælfric Bata can be taken as a joke, and how much could represent reality in Anglo-Saxon monastic life. The extreme liberties seen in the monastic practice of the *Colloquies* concerning *cura corporis* and corporal punishment, for example, have been seen as indicative that Ælfric Bata was a “rogue” monk, or that reform in England saw many lapses of discipline. Jones reads the *Colloquies* against similar texts and offers some qualifiers to the standard views, suggesting that we should read the text as both humorous yet also as revealing perhaps a period of unwilling transition from the earlier stage of monastic practice to a stricter and reformed way of life.

In the same volume of *Essays for Joyce Hill*, Patrizia Lendinara, arguably the world expert on the third book of the *Bella Parisiaca urbis* by Abbo of St-Germain-des-Près, offers the results of her continuing investigations in “A Difficult School Text in Anglo-Saxon England: The Third Book of Abbo’s *Bella Parisiaca Urbis*,” 321–42. After offering a summary of previous scholarship on the poet, she proceeds to unpack some new interpretations and origins of the many hard words used in the Third Book, keeping an eye on both the Latin and Old English traditions. She demonstrates that Abbo made frequent use of a variety of glossaries, and that he used them actively and creatively, finding opportunities for wordplay and wit in the creation of his enigmatic maxims. Lendinara also demonstrates that, despite the difficulties forced by Abbo’s Latin, the Old English glossator proved an able translator.

In “Leaving Wilton: Gunhild and the Phantoms of Agency,” *JEGP* 106: 203–23, Katherine O’Brien O’Keeffe offers a fascinating re-reading of the status and agency of Gunhild of Wilton, whose life has been thoroughly shaped by the narrative offered us by Anselm of Canterbury. She suggests that the “phantom agency” that Anselm ascribes to her needs to be reconsidered as evidence for the “cultural logic” that underlines Anselm’s own ideological interests. She notes how Anselm interprets two instances of passivity on Gunhild’s part instead as acts of volition, including her visible wearing of the nun’s habit, which she reads against the background of canon law and the ceremony of consecration. She also examines Gunhild’s later abduction from the

monastery by Count Alan Rufus, an act that Anselm again reads as indicating her own desire. O’Brien O’Keeffe also highlights how Anselm inserts himself and his own experience of seeing her as a nun into his account.

In “The Perception of Difficulty in Aldhelm’s Prose,” Carin Ruff examines the sentence structure of Aldhelm’s letters, and finds that while his prose is indeed difficult, there are also syntactical, rhetorical, and lexical aids to assist the careful reader (in *Insignis Sophiae Arcator: Essays in Honour of Michael W. Herren on His 65th Birthday*, ed. Carin Ruff and Ross G. Arthur, Publ. of the Jnl of Medieval Latin 6 [Turnhout: Brepols, 2006], 165–77). She analyzes the structure of several of Aldhelm’s longer sentences and finds that Aldhelm’s use of parallel structure can be both helpful and misleading. Ruff concludes that Aldhelm’s use of alliteration is actually a distraction from, not an aid to, the reading process, and that rhythm is the more important means by which to comprehend his writing. She concludes that the “tension and interplay” between rhetoric and syntax, and between alliteration and rhythm, create the most notable feature of Aldhelm’s art.

In the same festschrift honoring Michael W. Herren, Gernot Wieland offers “A New Look at the Poem ‘Archalis clamare triumuir’” (178–92), an Anglo-Latin acrostic, which Michael Lapidge has suggested shows John the Old Saxon offering a prophecy concerning the future of King Æthelstan at a ceremony in his honor when he was a child. Wieland examines the problems inherent in the story found in William of Malmesbury that Alfred was present at the ceremony for his grandson. He suggests that the story is suspect, and offers a counter-proposal that the *Iohannes* of the poem’s right side was a second name taken by Æthelstan, received at baptism, and whose symbolism was strengthened when he ascended to the throne in 924, at which time John X was pope. Wieland concludes that the poem should be dated to his ascension and eliminates John the Old Saxon from its composition.

Joyce Hill’s “Making Women Visible: An Adaptation of the *Regularis Concordia* in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS. 201” (in *Conversion and Colonization in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Catherine Karkov and Nicholas Howe, MRTS 318, Essays in Anglo-Saxon Studies 2 [Tempe: ACMRS, 2006], 153–67) examines a fragmentary yet invaluable attempt to incorporate the specific needs of a female monastic community into one version of the *Regularis Concordia*, a partial Old English translation of the Latin original written in an eleventh-century hand and contained in CCCC 201. Hill suggests that the various adaptations of the *RC*

were not integral to the original but might have been marginalia incorporated by the scribe. These changes were an acknowledgement that a community of women would be able to carry out many aspects of daily devotion without a male presence. She pays special attention to the adapted form of the *Collatio*, and sees the text as an effort to “convert and colonize” the RC for female monastics.

Sally Crumplin’s “Modernizing St Cuthbert: Reginald of Durham’s Miracle Collection” (in *Signs, Wonders, Miracles: Representations of Divine Power in the Life of the Church*, ed. Kate Cooper and Jeremy Gregory, *Studies in Church History* 41 [Woodbridge: Boydell, 2005], 179–91) offers a reading of Reginald of Durham’s *Libellus de Admirandis beati Cuthberti virtutibus*, a large miracle collection whose first section was written between the years 1160 and 1167. Crumplin argues that, contrary to earlier readings of the *Libellus* which believe that the text indicates a decline in the cult of Cuthbert, Reginald’s text was instead an effort to modernize the cult by bringing it into line with the more stable political reality of the mid-twelfth century. Reginald made the saint more pacific than the earlier rendition, and also devoted new space to additional miracles. Crumplin thus reads the *Libellus* as indicative of a healthy and secure cult of St. Cuthbert, one confident of its position in a stable world.

In “Latin Prayers Added into the Margins of the Prayerbook British Library, Royal 2. A.XX at the Beginnings of the Monastic Reform in Worcester,” *Sacris Erudiri* 45 (2006): 223–303, Joseph P. Crowley offers a valuable edition and discussion of the marginalia found in Royal MS 2.A.xx, a Latin prayerbook written in (probably) the first quarter of the ninth century, probably at Worcester. The majority of the marginal additions to the manuscript were done in one hand, although two additional hands can be seen as well, one of which provided a number of Greek interlinear glosses (in Roman script). Crowley offers palaeographic analysis of all three hands and also describes the non-textual marginalia, which include a number of whimsical animal drawings and assorted marks of punctuation and notation. Crowley notes the existence of these Latin prayers in other manuscript contexts, and suggests that the copyist of the marginalia in Royal

2.A.xx was copying out texts found in the process of his reading into a book which he himself owned and carried, with the intention of copying them out properly at another time.

Thomas N. Hall’s “Latin Sermons and Lay Preaching: Four Latin Sermons from Post-Reform Canterbury” (in *The Power of Words: Anglo-Saxon Studies Presented to Donald Scragg on His Seventieth Birthday*, ed. Hugh Magennis and Jonathan Wilcox, *Medieval European Studies* 8 [Morgantown, WV: West Virginia UP, 2006], 132–70) offers an edition and translation of four sermons contained in Trinity MS O.230, a late tenth- or early eleventh-century grouping. In the spirit of the similar examination made by Don Scragg of four homilies for the Rogation days and Ascension Day, Hall examines the language of the homilies and concludes that they are similar in using the language of Christian brotherhood to apply not to a monastic audience specifically, but rather to Christians generally. This could indicate a lay audience, and these sermons might provide tantalizing evidence for lay preaching in Latin during the Anglo-Saxon period. Hall notes that the fourth sermon is a freely-adapted version of one by Caesarius of Arles for the Sunday preceding Lent, and he details the borrowings made by the Anglo-Saxon homilist.

AA

Works Not Seen:

Gneuss, Helmut. “Zur Geschichte des Hymnars.” *Der lateinische Hymnus im Mittelalter*. Ed. Andreas Haug et al., 63–86.

Haug, Andreas; Christoph März, and Lorenz Welker, eds. *Der lateinische Hymnus im Mittelalter: Überlieferung-Ästhetik-Ausstrahlung*. Monumenta Monodica Medii Aevi, Subsidia 4. Kassel: Bärenreiter, 2004. x, 422 pp.

Howlett, David. “Fredegisus *De substantia nihili et tenebrarum*.” *Bulletin du Cange* 64: 123–43.

Milfull, Inge B. “Spuren kontinentaler Einflüsse in spätangelsächsischen Hymnaren.” *Der lateinische Hymnus im Mittelalter*. Ed. Haug et al., 173–98.

Pettit, Emma Joanne. “Aldhelm’s *Opus Geminatum De uirginitate* in Its Early Anglo-Saxon Context.” Ph.D. Diss., Univ. of York (England), 2005. DAI 67C: 855.

6. Manuscripts, Illumination, Charters

Manuscript Studies

For manuscript studies, this was a year dominated by edited collections. One of the more intriguing volumes was edited by Wendy Scase, *Essays in Manuscript Geography: Vernacular Manuscripts of the English West Midlands from the Conquest to the Sixteenth Century*, Medieval Texts and Cultures of Northern Europe 10 (Turnhout: Brepols), which collects a number of essays first presented as papers in 2003 at the University of Birmingham. These contributions cover material from the eleventh century through the sixteenth; what joins them together is a concentration on “geographical parameters” (1) of manuscripts, in this case the regional network of manuscript production and influence in the West Midlands. Two contributions by Elaine Treharne and Mary Swan feature work of interest to Anglo-Saxonists.

In her study of “Bishops and Their Texts in the Later Eleventh Century: Worcester and Exeter” (*Essays in Manuscript Geography*, 13–28), Elaine Treharne shows how manuscript production under Wulfstan II and Leofric may provide insight not simply into the transmission of earlier works (e.g. by Ælfric), but into the living concerns of two key communities and their leaders in the years surrounding the Conquest. Worcester and Exeter are of particular importance, Treharne notes, in that the majority of surviving codices and fragments from ca. 1060 to 1080 originate in these two centers—making them “clearly, in terms of today’s surviving books, the leading vernacular manuscript producers of their day” (19). The former was a monastic cathedral with a well-established library which may have focused more on regular than on lay concerns; the latter was a recently refounded secular cathedral with no library at first to speak of, which may have actively ministered to a lay congregation. Nonetheless, in both cases, similar bodies of materials were produced to support the work of their bishops. The penitential and homiletic collections, for example—Hatton 113 and 114 and Junius 121 in Wulfstan’s case; Cotton Cleopatra B. xiii, Lambeth 489, and CCC 419 and 421 in Leofric’s case—depart from Ælfric’s vision of homogeneous sets of texts arranged methodically according to the liturgical year, offering rather “a pool of readily-adaptable material” for *quando uolueris* occasions such as the dedication of a church (25). Where Ælfric offered a new vision (at least in his first set of homilies) of regular preaching by parish priests, moreover, the vernacular works copied at Worcester and Exeter appear to

have been largely for the use of Wulfstan and Leofric themselves, a trend in keeping with the longstanding Western tradition of viewing preaching as an episcopal practice. Indeed, Traherne points out, not just in Worcester and Exeter, but across England as a whole, late tenth- and eleventh-century English manuscripts “do not—at any time or in any discernible way—indicate ownership or use by parish priests, or, in fact, by anyone other than those at the upper echelons of the Church hierarchy” (26). While manuscripts produced under Wulfstan and Leofric provide important witnesses to the textual development of earlier Old English works, they also reveal much about the needs and concerns of these bishops and about preaching practice in late Anglo-Saxon England.

AK

In another article in *Essays in Manuscript Geography* concerning religious prose, Mary Swan examines “Mobile Libraries: Old English Manuscript Production in Worcester and the West Midlands, 1090–1215,” 2–42. Swan presents a detailed overview of the vernacular manuscripts written in the post-Conquest period, focusing particularly on Worcester and its intellectual pursuits, before providing a consideration of Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 115; Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 367; and London, British Library, Faustina A. x; and a handful of Latin manuscripts. Swan proposes that her final case study, London, Lambeth Palace, Lambeth 487, a manuscript that Swan has written on extensively, was not manufactured for a non-Benedictine audience—a religious audience that is, in other words, different from those that produced and used vernacular manuscripts in centuries prior to the early thirteenth. Such a suggestion necessarily means that scholars might usefully remember to look outside Worcester when assigning manuscripts to the West Midlands.

Another of the more significant collections of essays to be published this year is *Form and Content of Instruction in Anglo-Saxon England in the Light of Contemporary Manuscript Evidence: Papers Presented at the International Conference, Udine, 6–8 April 2006*, ed. Patrizia Lendinara, Loredana Lazzari, and Maria Amalia D’Aronco; Fédération Internationale des Instituts d’Études Médiévales, Textes et Études du Moyen Âge 39 (Turnhout: Brepols). One of the editors, Patrizia Lendinara, offers a particularly useful study in “Instructional Manuscripts in England: The

Tenth- and Eleventh-Century Codices and the Early Norman Ones,” 59–113). Taking up more material than even the expansive title suggests, it is an excellent resource for courses on palaeography and the history of the book. It sets out to describe and evaluate manuscripts containing education material from later Anglo-Saxon England, but along the way, Lendinara outlines the development of instructional miscellanies from the Carolingian period onward, and provides a synopsis of manuscript production in Anglo-Saxon England itself. Cognizant of the difficulty in defining what constitutes a specifically educational manuscript, and of the problems of determining modes and venues of reception, Lendinara takes a nuanced stance that could helpfully be emulated by other manuscript scholars keen to categorize and ascertain definitive form and function. This essay is so dense and rich that it is difficult to summarize, but among the major reminders to us are the careful distinctions that can be made between educational books and reference books.

In the same volume, László Sándor Chardonnens claims that he rescues his manuscript from the scholarly footnote when he examines “London, British Library, Harley 3271: The Composition and Structure of an Eleventh-Century Anglo-Saxon Miscellany,” 1–34. This composite manuscript, datable to ca. 1032, contains Ælfric’s *Grammar*, the *Beatus quid est* tract, part of the *Bella Parisiaca urbis*, and a number of other, shorter materials added around these three grammatical treatises. Previously unlocalized, Chardonnens proposed a New Minster, Winchester origin for the manuscript, based on the three grammatical texts and their various links to the Winchester school. Additional correlative material includes the prognostics in Harley 3271, and the case for the textual links with manuscripts of known Winchester provenance is well made. Moreover, Chardonnens posits this codex as containing the greatest number of contemporary pedagogic texts available in its day.

Alexander R. Rumble provides a characteristically important and erudite reading in his “Cues and Clues: Palaeographical Aspects of Anglo-Saxon Scholarship” (*Form and Content of Instruction*, 115–30). In this richly illustrated, detailed essay, Rumble moves through significant characteristics of insular manuscript production, reminding readers how few autograph manuscripts survive in English, and analyzing the overarching features of preparing membrane for text. In the latter case, the discussion focuses on the differences between main text copying and subsidiary text, including the way glosses are entered onto the page, and the *signes de renvoi* employed by scribes in

annotating. Rumble investigates layout and the use of suprascript letters for determining the potential function of manuscripts containing glosses.

Moving from the center to the margin, Loredana Teresi’s essay, “The Drawing in the Margin of Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 206, f. 38r: An Intertextual Exemplification to Clarify the Text?” (*Form and Content of Instruction*, 131–40), discusses the map in the lower right corner of a page, which contains a paraphrase of the section concerning “quantity” from the *Categoriae decem*. Although the map looks like one of the rainfall maps traditionally associated with Macrobius’s *Commentarium*, Teresi suggests this specific manifestation is a visual continuation of the text itself, here used to illustrate the concepts of “above” and “below” in relation to heaven and the earth.

Also in *Form and Content of Instruction* is Claudia Di Sciacca’s “An Unpublished *Ubi Sunt* Piece in Wulfstan’s ‘Commonplace Book’: Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 19, pp. 94–96” (217–50), which edits the Latin text, analyzes its sources, and pays particular attention to the “smoke” simile within it. Finally, the collection includes Florence Eliza Glaze’s “Master-Student Medical Dialogues: The Evidence of London, British Library, Sloane 2839” (467–94), which provides a useful reassessment of the “medical catechism” in an English manuscript from the late eleventh or early twelfth century, BL Sloane 2839.

In *The Illustrated Old English Hexateuch, Cotton Claudius B. iv: The Frontier of Seeing and Reading in Anglo-Saxon England* (Toronto: British Library and U of Toronto P), Benjamin Withers offers the first major sustained study of the eleventh-century parts of the manuscript—the original codex, if you like—and it will immediately be essential reading for anyone working with this book, or those working in late Anglo-Saxon art history generally. It offers a thorough and innovative examination of the complex and multi-layered material in that extraordinary manuscript, though I would have wanted much more on the exceptionally important English and Latin twelfth-century interventions. Withers takes a material perspective, developing the work of Chartier to progress through the manuscript from the external to the internal, always with an immensely erudite and sensitive eye to the historical moment of its production. His lucid and thoughtful analyses of the book’s producers and users set new standards for manuscript studies, and at a time when the materiality of text is emerging as a significant area of Anglo-Saxon studies.

In “Defining Doctrine in the Carolingian Period: The Contents and Context of Cambridge, Pembroke

College, MS 108,” *Trans. of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 13.2 (2005): 133–51, Sven Meeder advocates a manuscript-by-manuscript appraisal of the ninth-century Carolingian Renaissance. His small codex, Pembroke 108, is a “utilitarian” volume, produced, according to Bischoff, in eastern France but here relocalized to northeastern France, though its later provenance is Bury St. Edmunds. The manuscript contains six doctrinal works by authors considered among the greatest in the ninth century, and each is analyzed in turn to assist in gathering information about the manuscript’s origin, form, and function, as a book intended as an instructional tool, “with special attention [paid] to the doctrine of the Holy Trinity” (150).

Also continental in content is “Boniface’s Booklife: How the Ragyndrudis Codex Came to Be a *Vita Bonifatii*,” *Heroic Age* 10: [n.p.], Michael Aaij tackles the mythical association of the Ragyndrudis Codex with Boniface, as the “tortured bok,” with which Boniface attempted in vain to protect himself from the plunging sword. Seeing the codex as a metonymic container of and for the life of Boniface, Aaij claims that the manuscript “provides a narrative of violent conversion and violent retaliation,” and traces the history of the manuscript and its links to Boniface through the early centuries of the story and in its subsequent critical reception. By analyzing the manuscript’s form and content, Aaij concludes that it bears false witness to Boniface’s life, and yet has its own function “as a relic in the imagination of the believer,” and as an active participant in the still dynamic Bonifatian cult.

Francisco Álvarez López has published two articles this year, the first of which (“Changing Scripts: A Case Study of the Use of Different Scripts in the Bilingual Text of Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 178, Part B,” *Quaestio Insularis* 8: 19–35, ill.) required more careful proof-reading than it received. In this discussion of Corpus 178, Part B, containing a text of the bilingual *Regula Sancti Benedicti*, Álvarez López provides a detailed palaeographical discussion of the distinctions between the Latin and Old English scripts. Finding that the single scribe of these folios seemed to find it difficult to maintain the graphical distinctions between the model scripts, López calls for a more thorough investigation of the issue of “scribe-response” in bilingual texts.

In a collection edited by I. Moskowich-Spiegel et al., *Bells Chiming from the Past* (see sec. 3b), Álvarez López turns his attention to another text of the *Regula Sancti Benedicti*, focusing this time on the Old English in the manuscript. In “DCL, B IV, 24: A Palaeographical and Codicological Study of Durham’s Cantor’s

Book,” 220–26, Álvarez López enumerates the thirty-two items contained in the “record-book,” drawing attention to the diversity of material, before focusing on the *Regula* and its palaeographical features. Since the manuscript—a product of Anglo-Norman Durham—contains only one Old English text, Álvarez López concludes that this shows how difficult it was for the Anglo-Saxon tradition to survive in the post-Conquest period, and that, presumably, the vernacular was required for those whose Latinity was deficient. Given the physical context, however, it seems to me that the manuscript evidence does not support this view.

The first volume of David Dumville’s new journal, *Anglo-Saxon*, appeared this year. Among its many strong offerings are two articles by Dumville himself. In “A Twelfth-Century Translation of a Tenth-Century English Royal Diploma?” *Anglo-Saxon* 1: 339–60, David Dumville concerns himself with a phrase-by-phrase analysis of the “alliterative diploma” datable to between 940 and 956, and traditionally associated with Cenwald, bishop of Worcester. Twenty extant witnesses are listed in the appendix to the article, though all are later copies. Dumville deduces that a key diploma in this group, issued by King Eadred in 955 and granting land in Alwalton, Cambridgeshire to Ælfsige Hunlafing, was originally composed in much the same primarily vernacular form as it now exists in Society of Antiquaries 60, a twelfth-century cartulary from Peterborough.

In “The Two Earliest Manuscripts of Bede’s *Ecclesiastical History*?” *Anglo-Saxon* 1: 55–108, Dumville considers Cambridge University Library, Kk. v. 16 (the Moore Bede, usually dated to c. 737) and St. Petersburg, National Library of Russia, Lat. Q. v. I. 18 (the Leningrad or St. Petersburg Bede, dated to ca. 746) with a view to reassessing their relationship and date. Discussing the early manuscript history of Bede’s *Ecclesiastical History*, Dumville publishes the texts of two eighth-century manuscripts—Münster i. W., Universitätsbibliothek, Fragmente-Sammlung Kps. I, Nr and New York, Morgan Library, M. 826. Dumville tackles the issue of the dates of the Moore and St. Peterburg manuscripts, raised most recently by Kevin Kiernan. Of particular note are the “Moore Memoranda” in CUL Kk. v. 16, and the marginal material in the St. Petersburg Bede. As Dumville points out, there are important implications in revisiting the dates of these manuscripts, particularly for the evolution of insular minuscule in the eighth century and subsequently. A detailed philological survey of the four scribes in the St. Petersburg Bede, together with an analysis of the text’s transmission and the scriptorium at Monkwearmouth-Jarrow supports the view that both manuscripts can be dated

somewhat later than usually thought. The scriptorium, indeed, seems to have been a victim of its own success, incapable of producing the number of Bede manuscripts requested—a brilliant argument postulated by Malcolm Parkes, and followed here by Dumville, who adjusts the date of that crisis to around 746 (92). Thus, the St. Petersburg manuscript can be re-dated to the last third of the eighth century, perhaps, while the Moore Bede is slightly later still. Dumville finishes by calling for much more detailed work on the early texts of the *Ecclesiastical History* to address the very significant aspects of eighth-century manuscript and textual production in the northeast.

Also on Bede, Lorraine Taylor focuses on the dissemination of the vernacular *Ecclesiastical History* in “Towards a Reception History of the Surviving Old English Bede Manuscripts: A Diachronic Study Extending from the Date of Their Production in Anglo-Saxon England to Their First Appearance in Print in 1643,” (Ph.D. Diss., Queen’s Univ. Belfast, 2006, *DAI* 68.03C: 649). This doctoral dissertation aims to provide a diachronic investigation of the translation techniques, transmission and reception of the Old English *Ecclesiastical History*, by analyzing the five surviving manuscript witnesses and many subsequent readers’ marks and interventions. This is attempted in a four-chapter evaluation that ranges from the survey of the literary tradition of the work from genesis to vernacular adaptation; to a detailed examination of the alterations occasioned by the act of translation; a comparative account of the redactions; a very detailed description of many of the footprints of use; and a survey of those who appear to have come into contact with the manuscripts in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. A bibliography and a number of appendices complete the dissertation. There is a reasonable amount of original research in this thesis, most of which consists of first-hand work with the edited texts and the manuscripts themselves. Chapter four identifies users of the Bede manuscripts, ranging from Nowell to Parker to Wheloc, and builds on the lengthy lists of marks of readership or ownership in the manuscripts catalogued in chapter three.

An exciting discovery is also revealed by Andrew Turner in “A Missing Manuscript of Eadmer’s *Vita S. Wilfridi*,” *Trans. of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 13.1 (2004): 105–10. Cambridge University Library, Additional 3096, discovered by the author in 2004, contains nine items, seven of which are hagiographies, including a version of Eadmer’s *Life of St. Wilfrid* (as well as a *Life of St. Herluin*, *Life of Oswald*, *Passions of St. Margaret* and *Catherine*) and the *Life of St. Gudwal*. Turner provides a brief overview of the possible

localization of the manuscript (from a scriptorium connected to Christ Church or Worcester), its date (second-half of the twelfth century), and its general textual affiliations. The manuscript might also ultimately provide additional clues to the ownership of the relics of Wilfrid in the twelfth century.

A very useful and well-illustrated small book is that edited by David Ganz, Jane Roberts, and Richard Palmer to accompany the superb exhibition put on for ISAS at Lambeth Palace, London, in 2007. In *Lambeth Palace Library and Its Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: Exhibition Mounted for the Biennial Conference of the International Society of Anglo-Saxonists, 3rd August 2007* (London: Taderon Press), the editors highlight the collections’ major codices up to and beyond the Anglo-Saxon period. Each manuscript has a new description accompanying at least one plate and summarizing the current state of scholarship in relation to script, localization, and contents.

M. J. Toswell interrogates “The Codicology of Anglo-Saxon Homiletic Manuscripts, Especially the Blickling Homilies” (in *Old English Homily*, ed. Kleist. [see sec. 4c], 209–22). Toswell’s analysis looks at multiple physical elements of Princeton, Scheide Library, 71, including the make-up of the quires, the evenness of wear on the membrane, patterns of copying and the punctuation marks used throughout the homilies. She agrees with Scragg’s conclusion that the manuscript was compiled from varied exemplars over a period of time, suggesting that the place of origin did not have easy access to ample exemplars. Further, she proposed that it was not considered a unified whole by its scribe in its specific historical moment of production, and that scholars might themselves re-consider the manuscript as a series of individual texts, each in itself being composite.

In “The Regius Psalter, Folio 198V: A Reexamination,” *N&Q* 54: 208–211, P. A. Stokes suggests that the additions to the Regius Psalter, previously considered significant evidence for a Christ Church Canterbury origin, do indeed point to Christ Church, particularly because new research shows direct links between the second addition and Sawyer 1471, an important ninth-century land grant, associated unequivocally with Christ Church.

ET

2007 witnessed the publication of the twelfth and thirteenth volumes in the *Anglo-Saxon Charters* series: *The Charters of St Albans*, ed. Julia Crick, and *The Charters of Bath and Wells*, ed. Susan Kelly. Both volumes, from Oxford UP, continue the series’s practice of providing a detailed history of the archive, carefully edited

texts, extensive notes, and a comprehensive bibliography. The *St Albans* volume is particularly notable for its new edition of the will of Æthelgifu, among the most frequently edited and discussed Anglo-Saxon legal documents. As Crick notes, the will “captures with unaccustomed clarity aspects of the wealth and resources of an otherwise unknown provincial family, suggesting something of the material culture of a noble household in the late tenth century and the exploitation of agricultural resources” (92). Despite its prominence, though, the will of Æthelgifu is not the only document of value in this volume. The relative unfamiliarity of the St. Albans archive—many of the seventeen charters it contains were known only in later Latin translations until the discovery of a seventeenth-century transcription of the Old English in the late 1980s—means that many of the texts edited here have yet to receive full academic scrutiny. Crick’s introduction and notes provide a useful background on the history of St. Albans, a discussion of its connections to Westminster and other centers of charter production, as well as a number of provocative suggestions for future paths of inquiry. In *Charters of Bath and Wells*, Susan Kelly edits the twenty-six surviving charters from Bath Cathedral along with the sixteen extant legal documents from Wells. The relatively high proportion of authentic charters in these archives—especially Bath’s—makes this volume particularly useful for students of pre-Conquest diplomatic practice. Although Bath declined in prominence after the reign of King Edgar, never equalling such foundations as Abingdon or Canterbury as a center of charter-production, the collection nevertheless contains several documents of considerable interest. Especially worthy of note are the four authentic seventh- and eighth-century charters as well as the series of tenth-century royal diplomas. The Wells collection, although smaller than that from Bath, also contains a number of highly important documents, most notably an original royal diploma of 958 and a charter of King Edward’s from 975. Kelly’s introduction provides detailed histories of both foundations as well as extensive discussions of the contexts in which these documents were produced and their usefulness for the study of Anglo-Saxon diplomatics.

AR

Maria Catarina De Bonis examines contrasting practices in making a doctrinal text available to Anglo-Saxon audiences. Her analysis informs “Learning Latin Through The *Regula Sancti Benedicti*: The Interlinear Glosses in London British Library, Cotton Tiberius A.iii” in *Form and Content*, 187–216. One practice is outright

translation, attributed to Æthelwold, containing comments, shortenings, and expansions, together with the Latin exemplar in six of eight manuscripts. The translation’s readership had the opportunity to approach the translation in several ways to satisfy somewhat different purposes, educational and otherwise. De Bonis’s primary end, however, is to analyze the extant, quite independent alternative to translation, an interlinear gloss, attributable to several hands. Readers dependent on the interlinear gloss, in her view, nevertheless had to have some acquaintance with Latin and probably sought to advance their language learning. Glossators exhibit inconsistency, by their irregularly pairing of OE and Latin lexemes or intermittently indication of grammatical and syntactic comparisons through words, parts of words, or letters of the alphabet. The gloss supplied, again unpredictably, occurs with stops, commas, and strokes as well as with variants in Latin found in manuscripts other than Cotton Tiberius. Despite this inconsistency, some passages of the interlinear gloss are comprehensible, at times closely rendering the exemplar. Much of De Bonis’s essay offers examples and analyses of the glossators’ practices. Under the heading “lexical glosses” appear examples of vernacular interpretations of Latin lemmas. Noting that some glosses are very likely *hapax legomena*, she instances *gegearcon*, used as a participle with *bið*. Most lexical glosses aim to match the Latin lexeme semantically: the genitive *humilitatis*, for example, rendered as *eadmodnesse*, their cases the same. This rendering of forms, however, does not always result in grammatical matches: for example, the superlative *nequissimos* appears as the positive *wyr*. Some vernacular forms appear shortened, say *wilce* for *swilce*; others replace, unpredictably, a neuter form in Latin with an OE masculine counterpart. A further practice includes doubling OE forms for a word in Latin: *lysta* and *gehyra* for *audire*, a doubling that supposedly abets comprehension. Yet this doubling of forms in the vernacular is due perhaps to linking interlinear and marginal glosses or to annotating the Latin exemplar with glosses from different manuscripts. Sometimes this doubling results in ambiguity: so both *sæigð* and *sæde* appears with *ait*. Grammatical glosses reveal some awareness of possible confusion: thus the sequence *debemus ofslean* sits atop *occidere* to indicate that the Latin infinitive form may work as an imperative. Syntactical glosses form a third category, directed typically at structural segments in clauses. These glosses occur as words or letters of the alphabet. To identify a clausal subject a glossator may, for *sub qua militare vis*, insert a pronoun in the vernacular: *under þære þeowian þu wilt*. Letters and strokes

highlight differences in syntax: for *Que / humiliare corde a domino; erigitur ad celum*, the glossator writes [f.] *seo bið / geeadmedre heortan* [k.] [g.] *uparærede to heofonum*. The letters apparently draw attention to added words ([f.] before *bið*), to deletions ([k.] for the absent *a domino*), and to syntactic structure ([g.] to link the auxiliary and the past participle). A final form of annotation—suppletive glosses—finds Latin words, sometimes, in the vernacular, as in *on æcere oððe swa hwar swa he bið fuerit / sittende [...] he syg* for *in agro vel ubique / sedens [...] sit*. These patterns of annotation are hardly systematic: some passages of the text have but lexical glosses, others but syntactic glosses, still others skipped over. Glossing of Latin lexemes, grammatical forms, syntactic units occur irregularly. Letters mostly attend psalms and prayers—sections of the *Regula Benedicti* closely related to music. The project of glossing aids the study of Latin haphazardly: the better prepared one is, the clearer the annotations. The text opens itself most to a dedicated and skillful reader, aided at times with a boost from glosses.

Evelyn S. Firchow's collection *Wege und Irrwege der mittelalterlichen Textausgaben*, edited in collaboration with Richard L. Hotchkiss (Stuttgart: Hirtzel), contains among the collected articles an examination of a leaf from an Anglo-Saxon glossary. "Harley 3376 und das Glossarfragment Pryce Ms. P2 A:1 in der Spencer Bibliothek der Kansas Universität in Lawrence, Kansas: Das Beispiel eines lateinischen Glossars mit nennenswerten altenglischen Elementen" is as thorough as its title suggests. First published in 2001, her textual analysis is likely to remain an incontrovertible model. It proposes that the fragment housed at the University of Kansas was the work of an Anglo-Saxon compiler who also wrote the far better preserved manuscript Harley 3376. In addition, Firchow presents her views on a third fragment, identified as the Oxford-leaf, now at the Bodleian. The argument of the thesis excludes, however, the possibility that the Kansas and Oxford fragments stem from the Harley 3376 manuscript, itself incompletely extending from the letters A–F. To demonstrate the high unlikelyhood of one textual provenance for Harley 3376 and the two fragments, Firchow summarizes the principal features of the three manuscripts. The lemmas have in the three manuscripts a similar arrangement by capital, yet Harley 3376 alone also has a system of paragraphing. Since for the Kansas and Oxford fragments the Latin words alphabetized all begin with *I* and since their excision seems contemporaneous, they very likely stem from the same manuscript. Of Harley's Latin vocabulary, glossed mostly in Latin, a fourth has OE accompaniments, mainly interlinear, some marginal;

the manuscript also contains a few Greek and Hebraic entries. The low frequency Latin words and phrases in the Kansas fragment have interlinear glosses in Latin and OE, together with some explanatory, marginal annotations. Details of page design also argue a provenance for the fragments different from the Harley manuscript. The fragments have double, vertical boundary lines partly separating marginal glosses from text; Harley 3376 has single bounding lines. Both fragments, too, unlike Harley, contain reference markings to help connect marginal annotations appropriately to entries. As for physical dimensions, the texts in the fragments fill nearly the same amount of space; the text in pages of Harley 3376 is appreciably tighter. Yet the handwriting for all three manuscripts suggests that a single glossator worked on the fragments and on Harley 3376. The conclusion points, then, to a single provenance for the fragments different from Harley 3376, and to one person, however, as glossator. Throughout Firchow supplies valuable notes on the history of the fragments, reviews and identifies the failures in earlier editions, while alluding to modern, illuminating techniques. An appendix contains a facsimile of Pryce Ms. P2 A:1, a computer-generated copy of its recto and verso sides, and a modern transcription.

EG

Teresa Webber's wide-ranging "L'écriture des documents en Angleterre au XII^e siècle," *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes* 165: 139–65 (translated by Marc Smith) surveys the evolution of twelfth-century scribal practice in England. She describes the variety in writing styles that developed as the result of pressures to write more documents more rapidly and the desire to maintain appropriately legible records of official acts. Anglo-Saxonists will be interested in her discussion of the survival of traits developed earlier by eleventh-century scribes.

In a similar fashion Michèle Bussièrès shows what a concentrated study of a single folio can reveal in her "The Controversy about Scribe C in British Library, Cotton MSS, Julius E. VII," *Leeds Studies in English* 38: 53–72. Analyzing and graphing letter frequency, orthography, and spelling, she determines that the hands responsible for the text on folio 117, traditionally identified as "Scribe A" and "Scribe C," are actually the same individual.

BW

Illumination

Form and Content of Instruction, ed. Patrizia Lendinara et al. [see sec. 6], contains Maria Amalia D'Aronco's

“The Transmission of Medical Knowledge in Anglo-Saxon England: The Voices of Manuscripts” (35–58). In this continuation and extension of her earlier studies of the *Old English Herbarium*, D’Aronco attends to the relationship among the four surviving copies of the text, arguing that they all can be traced back to one late tenth-century exemplar. Created by a highly trained practitioner, this exemplar most likely originated in Winchester. In explaining the decision to use the vernacular in these manuscripts, D’Aronco suggests that Old English allowed medical knowledge to be dispersed widely and more quickly. The success of the project, she notes, can be seen in the intense handling of the manuscripts and the many changes to the text introduced in response to practical needs.

ET

Manuscript “geography” provides the organizing principle of another essay collection, *Signs on the Edge: Space, Text and Margin in Medieval Manuscripts*, *Medievalia Groningana* n.s. 10 (Paris: Peeters), edited by Sarah Larratt Keefer and Rolf H. Bremmer, Jr. Building on the interest in the physical layout and spatial organization of the manuscript page, particularly the relationship of “margin” to “main” text, the editors gather several papers first presented in the mid-1990s at Kalamazoo. The contributions are organized into five parts, the first three of which pertain to the study of Anglo-Saxon material. Part I, “Early Margins in the North,” contains two papers. In “Re-drawing the Bounds: Marginal Illustrations and Interpretative Strategies in the Book of Kells” (9–24), Ann Dooley focuses on the “small decorative motifs that act as continuous extra-textual visual markers surrounding and interfacing with the scriptural text” in the Kells manuscript (Dublin, Trinity College Ms. 58). “The relationship of text to margin in Kells should have internal consistency and should begin from the reading act itself,” she argues (16). Her method links the specific location of images in the manuscript to the “mental habits” of the scribes who wrote and illustrated the text, particularly in the emphasis on the literal meanings of a text and the “etymological word-analysis” that she argues characterizes the exegetical practices of Irish scholars. Her article addresses specific examples, divided into two categories. The first, “Reading Words,” re-examines the marginal illustrations found in the Lucan genealogy of Christ. She suggests that word resemblance of the Hebrew name Maath and the Irish *moth* (MnE ‘penis’) explains the presence of a naked figure on folio 200r. In the second category, “Reading Passages,” Dooley calls attention to images, such as in the Beatitudes (Mt 5, fol.

40v, or Mt 22:23–4, fol. 97v) that pay “special graphical attention...to aspects of the Gospel text that pertain particularly to the monastic experience” (21). As a result of her analysis, Dooley offers here a “third conceptualization of the book,” one that perhaps complements the emphasis on liturgical use (best exemplified by the work of Carol Farr) or as a contemplative medium (Jennifer O’Reilly). A second contribution to the same section, William Schipper’s “Textual Varieties in Manuscript Margins” (25–54) takes a broader approach and “examines how some of the variety of textual materials in the margins of manuscripts interact with ‘primary’ texts” (26). Schipper discusses the various uses of margins: as places to indicate sources (a practice pioneered by Bede and quickly adapted by other authors, including Hrabanus Maurus). Schipper discusses the use of interlinear spaces for one reader to communicate with another. This practice can provide clues regarding provenance and reception, an observation that he uses to great advantage in a discussion of St. Augustine’s Gospels (CCCC 286) and a late fourth-century fragment of a collection of letters by St. Cyprian of Carthage (BL MS Add. 40165) which was corrected by an eighth-century English hand. Schipper also outlines the use of the margin for annotations and commentary, using a twelfth-century commentary of the works of Horace as his example (Cambridge, Trinity College O.3.57). His final section focuses on “the margins as centre of attention,” that is, instances (such as CCCC 41 and the Peterborough Chronicle). Schipper concludes with a comparison of modern and medieval attitudes: “the variety of texts and commentary in the margins of surviving manuscripts suggests that they were seen as part of the manuscript page as a whole, not as something ‘merely marginal’ or secondary” (43). Part II, entitled “Anglo-Saxon England: Layout” consists of two essays. Catherine E. Karkov’s “Margins and Marginalization: Representations of Eve in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Junius 11” (*Signs on the Edge*, 57–84) addresses the poses, positioning, and meaning of depictions of Eve in the illustrations to the Genesis poems in Junius 11. Karkov argues that the artist signals meaning through changes in compositions and poses at key narrative moments. For example, Karkov writes, “It is only after eating the apple that Eve becomes and active rather than just a visually striking figure in the pictorial narrative. From the moment of creation, Eve’s body has tended to either repeat or mirror (directly reverse) the pose of Adam’s body, even though the spaces their bodies have inhabited are different. That changes in her temptation of Adam.... Eve takes a central and powerful position” (65). This centrality of Eve continues after

the fall, through the artist's use of Marian iconography in the extensive genealogical images that depict Eve "as the mother of a dynasty of Old Testament leaders" (71). In the same section, Sarah Larratt Keefer turns attention to a different class of books, those used in liturgical services, in her "Use of Manuscript Space for Design, Text and Image in Liturgical Books Owned by the Community of St Cuthbert," 85–115. Keefer addresses two broad aspects of manuscripts at Durham. First, she discusses "design" or "overall layout of the pages of a text, showing its students some ideas of the book's intended appearance as it was conceived by the scriptorium that produced it" (86–7), for example, the arrangement of text *per cola et commata* and in long-line or columns. Her second section is devoted to "intra-spatial text" or interlinear glosses, with particular attention to the "Durham Gospels" (Cathed. Lib. A.II.17), the "Durham Ritual" (Cathed. Lib. A.IV.19), as well as discussion of Aldred's role as glossator of the Lindisfarne Gospels. The final sections of the essay focus on graphic images, such as the historiated initial "O" in the "Durham Hymnal" (Cathed. Lib. B.III.32, fol. 2r) and the marginal drawings found in the Durham Ritual.

Part III of the collection is entitled "Anglo-Saxon England: Secondary Material." It contains a reprint of a posthumous article by Phillip Pulsiano, "Jaunts, Jottings and Jetsam in Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts" (119–33), which first appeared in the journal *Florilegium* in 2002 (reviewed in *YWOES* 37.2, p. 147). Karen Louise Jolly examines "a curious manuscript" in her "On the Margins of Orthodoxy: Devotional Formulas and Protective Prayers in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College MS 41" (135–83). This manuscript, she writes, "is unusual in the amount of material stored in the margins that is completely unrelated to the main text" (135). She observes that modern scholars tend to fragment these texts, studying them individually and in part according to language and genre. She suggests a more holistic reading, as a "medieval hypertext...the Anglo-Saxon producing and using such a manuscript did not read it, much less write it, in the linear way moderns tend to approach a book, but saw the page as a differently-ordered space with multiple possibilities" (136). The first section of her essay, she traces the mechanics and motivations of the scribe as he worked to integrate texts within the manuscript. The second section of the essay looks more specifically at the pattern of placement of the "charm" texts. She concludes, "the texts are at least one step away from performance, archived here for later transmission into another format. As a consequence, CCC 41 allows us to see how texts came to be associated with one another in the mind of an ordinary

Anglo-Saxon believer who should not be identified as an unorthodox practitioner of Christian magic, but instead as a devotional user of Christian ritual as applied to daily living" (174).

Under the Influence: The Concept of Influence and the Study of Illuminated Manuscripts, edited by John Lowden and Alixe Bovey (Turnhout: Brepols), publishes fifteen papers that were first presented at the Courtauld's Research Centre for Illuminated Manuscripts in 2003. Two of these essays examine manuscripts made in Anglo-Saxon England. Michelle P. Brown's "An Early Outbreak of 'Influenza'? Aspects of Influence, Medieval and Modern" (1–10) contemplates the meaning and implications of the term "influence." Using the Lindisfarne Gospels and Vespasian Psalter as well as the Harley, Ramsay, and Utrecht Psalters as examples, she traces the modern connotations to the astronomical and astrological theories of the Middle Ages. George Henderson's "Insular Art: Influence and Inference" (11–20) focuses on the influence of the classical past, particularly tituli from Roman sources, on Anglo-Saxon inscriptions.

In *Text, Image, and Interpretation: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Literature and its Insular Context in Honour of Éamonn Ó Carragáin* (see sec. 2), Alastair Minnis and Jane Roberts edit a monumental collection of essays with an all-star cast of contributors. Several of the papers focus on Anglo-Saxon manuscripts. Considering documentary and paleographical evidence, M.B. Parkes, "History in Books' Clothing: Books as Evidence for Cultural Relations between England and the Continent in the Seventh and Eighth Centuries" (71–88), provides a comprehensive survey of manuscripts and texts that witness cultural interchanges between England and the continent. As a complement to the broad focus of Parkes's contribution, Elaine Treharne offers a detailed study of "The Form and Function of the Vercelli Book" (253–66). Following Ker, she dates its production to the second half of the tenth century, likely before 975 and, following Scragg, accepts a provenance of St. Augustine, Canterbury. Reviewing the evidence of its content, organization, and physical appearance, Treharne compares the Vercelli manuscript to later, eleventh-century compilations (BL Cotton MS Cleopatra B.XIII and Lambeth MS. 489 and CCCC 201 Part I), which have been described as designed for the personal and private use of one person (Leofric of Exeter and Wulfstan of York). She concludes that the manuscript "can be seen as representing a spiritual and pastoral impulse emerging from a major monastery in the early years of the Reform movement, possibly under the influence of

a leading figure of that movement, such as Dunstan himself, provocative as that might seem” (265).

Other essays in the same collection attend to the role of images in manuscripts. Michelle P. Brown discusses a well-known but understudied series of illustrations in “The Barberini Gospels: Context and Intertextual Relationships” (89–116). Brown compares this manuscript, now housed in the Vatican (Biblio. Apost. Vaticana, Ms. Barb.lat.570) to the Lindisfarne Gospels in the way it presents “a heady mix of cultural and stylistic references...designed to express a depth and breadth of international contacts ...” (89). Brown outlines the role of the four scribes (including, possibly, a “Wigbald” who is mentioned in a colophon) and the single artist who worked on the manuscript, suggesting a connection with Peterborough (countering Larry Nees, who has recently suggested a continental origin for the manuscripts). The second half of her article discusses symbolic meaning and exegetical references of the illustration, from its quotation of Byzantine, Celtic, and Germanic styles, the famous priapic figure contained in the Canon Table (fol. 1), to the potential meaning of the representations of human heads and beasts intermingling with the initials and decorated letters on the page. Carol A. Farr, inspired by Ó Carragáin’s work, considers the interaction of “manuscript images in the world of words and ritual actions” (118) in “*Bis per chorum hinc et inde*: The ‘Virgin and Child with Angels’ in the Book of Kells,” (117–34). Farr links the illustration of the Virgin as a devotional icon to a hymn written by Cú Chuimne, a monk of Iona, which describes the back-and-forth singing of community in their Marian devotions. Farr closely examines the illustration, describing the artist’s attention to chiasmic composition and the visual and thematic links among the figures. She then in turn links these forms to the liturgical practices, exegetical meanings, and the structure of Cú Chuimne’s hymn. Catherine E. Karkov, “Text and Image in the Red Book of Darley” (135–48), examines “complex interactions of visual and verbal elements...and the conscious effort to unite the reader or viewer with the object” (135) in the Red Book of Darley (CCCC Ms 422). As currently constituted, the manuscript consists of two parts. Part I contains a tenth-century copy of *The Dialogues of Solomon and Saturn* while Part II contains “a manual that combines elements of a sacramentary, missal, and breviary” that can be localized to either Sherborne or New Minster, ca. 1061 (136). Karkov’s attention is directed toward two illustrations, Christ in Majesty and a Crucifixion found in Part II. In particular, she demonstrates that in each case the opening lines of the texts function

as part of the images both compositionally and figuratively. She argues that the effect of this integration is to encourage the sense of active participation and witness by the reader/viewer. Though included in this section, Anna Maria Luiselli Fadda’s contribution only tangentially concerns manuscripts; “The Mysterious Moment of Resurrection in Early Anglo-Saxon and Irish Iconography” (149–67) focuses primarily on the Cross of Scriptures at Clonmacnois. She explains that this Cross, along with an ivory panel now in the Victoria and Albert Museum, contains two of the earliest representations of Christ’s resurrection. Fadda places these images within pastoral and catechetical uses of stone crosses; in this context, the representation of the moment of resurrection make visible theological concerns of the unity of soul and body and early medieval interest in questions of individual identity after death.

Outside of these collections, several studies concentrate on the visual and artistic aspects of manuscripts. Michelle P. Brown’s beautifully illustrated survey *Manuscripts from the Anglo-Saxon Age* (Toronto: U of Toronto P) adopts a view that is broad both chronologically, in its inclusion of material from the mid-sixth century through the Conquest, and culturally, in its examples from and discussion of Celtic as well as Germanic traditions. Brown divides her book into five parts. Her introduction provides historical background as well as discussion of the basics of codicology and paleography. The four main chapters proceed chronologically, beginning with “The Insular World: Celts, Britons and Anglo-Saxon,” before moving to “Southumbria: The Rise of Mercia and Wessex,” “Shaping England: From Alfred to Ælfric,” and “The Second Viking Age: Cnut to the Conquest.” Brown discusses and illustrates folios from over 100 different manuscripts. By including examples of important documentary, literary, and artistic sources, Brown provides a valuable resource that introduces the quality and breadth of the Anglo-Saxon culture.

A well-preserved stone sculpture of an angel, discovered recently by Warwick Rodwell in his excavations of what is thought to be the shrine of St. Chad at Lichfield, prompts yet another contribution from Michelle Brown, “The Lichfield Angel and the Manuscript Context: Lichfield as a Centre of Insular Art,” *Jnl of the British Archaeological Assoc.*, 160: 8–19. The angel, likely one half of an Annunciation panel, retains much of its original color, which consists of shades of purple, white, and black. Brown links this unusual palette with two manuscripts that have been associated with early Lichfield: the Lichfield Gospels (Lichfield Cathedral Library) and the Book of Cerne (Cambridge University

Library, MS Ll. 1. 10). Based primarily on the similarities in color and decoration, Brown argues that the Lichfield Gospels was made during the mid-eighth century, probably at Lindisfarne, for the shrine at St. Chad's foundation of Lichfield. The distinct preference for the colors purple and white in the Gospels were perhaps influenced by the writing of Bede, Brown suggests, and may in turn have encouraged the coloration of the stone sculptures added to Chad's shrine around 800. The Book of Cerne (likely made for Bishop Æthelwald of Lichfield in the early ninth century) displays a similar color scheme. In Brown's view, the symbol of St. John the Evangelist from the Book of Cerne provides a close analogy for the sculptural treatment of the angel's wings, reinforcing the possibility that the prayerbook's origins are at Lichfield.

Laura E. Cochrane reevaluates the presence of early Psalter illustration as she explores the meaning of the two surviving illustrations to Durham, Cathedral Library, B. II. 30 in "'The Wine in the Vines and the Foliage in the Roots': Representations of David in the Durham Cassiodorus," *Studies in Iconography* 28: 23–50. An eighth-century copy of an abbreviated version of Cassiodorus's Commentary on the Psalms, the manuscript preserves two illustrations, placed before the commentary to Psalms 51 and 101. She notes that while it is common later in the Middle Ages to find a tripartite division of the Psalms using illustrations, surviving examples of this type are some 150 to 250 years younger than the Durham manuscript. Examining the content of Cassiodorus's text and the details of the illustrations, she argues the two images represent "David and Christ as one ..." (32) presenting David "as the seed that held the potential harvest and the branch that contained the promise of the fruit" (37). Thus, she argues that the Durham Cassiodorus should not be seen as witness to an early lost Psalter but "in both their format and their iconography comprise a thoughtful visualization of Cassiodorus's ideas" (23–4).

Rebecca Rushforth's *St Margaret's Gospel-Book: The Favourite Book of an Eleventh-Century Queen of Scots* (Oxford: Bodleian Library) reproduces some fine color plates of this well known, eleventh-century manuscript, containing excerpts from the Gospels. The niece of Edward the Confessor, daughter of Edward the Exile, and wife of Malcolm of Scotland, Margaret's piety and sanctity were described by her biographer Turgot, prior of Durham. This manuscript is associated with

Margaret on the basis of a text describing its miraculous immersion in water, and incident described by Turgot. Rushforth's account, aimed at a general audience, describes how the procedures for the manufacture of medieval manuscripts and outlines its specific content and illustrations. The bulk of Rushforth's study is devoted to the manuscript's historical context, i.e., Margaret's life and times and descendents.

BW

Works Not Seen:

- Biddle, Martin. "Edgar's Lost Grant of Exton, Hampshire." *Collectanea Antiqua*. Ed. Henig and Smith. [see sec. 2]. pp. 75–79.
- Fujii, Takako. "The Handwriting and Punctuation of Archbishop Wulfstan." *Osaka Gakuin Univ. Foreign Linguistic and Literary Studies* 54–55 (March 2007): 195–205.
- Hill, Joyce. "Ælfric's Manuscript of Paul the Deacon's Homiliary: A Provisional Analysis." *The Old English Homily*. Ed. Kleist. [see sec. 4]. pp. 67–96.
- Kleist, Aaron J. "Anglo-Saxon Homiliaries in Tudor and Stuart England." *The Old English Homily*. Ed. Kleist. [see sec. 4]. pp. 445–506.
- Rollason, David and Lynda, eds. *The Durham "Liber Vitae": London, British Library, MS Cotton Domitian A. VII. Edition and Digital Facsimile, with Introduction, Codicological, Prosopographical and Linguistic Commentary and Indexes, Including the Biographical Register of Durham Cathedral Priory (1083–1539) by A. J. Piper*. Contributions from †Elizabeth Briggs et al. 3 vols. London: British Library, 2007. xvi, 517 pp.; vi, 362 pp.; vi, 638 pp. + CD-ROM.
- Rosenthal, Jane E. "An Unprecedented Image of Love and Devotion: The Crucifixion in Judith of Flanders's Gospel Book." *Tributes to Lucy Freeman Sandler: Studies in Illuminated Manuscripts*. Ed. Kathryn A. Smith and Carol H. Krinsky. London and Turnhout: Harvey Miller, 2007. pp. 21–32 + plates.
- Tamoto, Kenichi. "MS Junius 76 (S.C. 5187)." *Bungaku Ronso (Literary Symposium)* 137 (July 2007): 218–198.
- Thomson, R. M. "The Use of the Vernacular in Manuscripts from Worcester Cathedral Priory." *Trans. of the Worcestershire Archaeological Society* 3rd ser. 20 (2006): 113–19.
- Tiefenbach, Heinrich. "Rückgewinnung eines zerstörten Codex: Die Handschrift der Glossaria Werthinensia." *Language and Text*. Ed. Johnston et al. [see sec. 2]. pp. 307–15.

7. History and Culture

a. General Sources and Reference Works

Three papers concerned with Anglo-Saxon history and culture appear in *Quaestio Insularis* 8, which contains selected proceedings of the 2007 Cambridge Colloquium in Anglo-Saxon, Norse, and Celtic, one of the most popular graduate conferences in the field. Two are reviewed here; the third is reviewed below in Subsection C. Janet Nelson's "Knowledge and Power in Earlier Medieval Europe" (1–18) addresses the theme of the Colloquium from a general perspective, outlining manifold possible interactions between these two concepts. Recalling some examples illustrating that knowledge-power relations may be either that of contradiction or that of apposition, Nelson dwells upon what she calls "on/off relationships" (8) and in particular associates this type of relationship with *scientia*, that is, practical, utilitarian, and useful knowledge, ranging from bell-founding to vernacular poetry. She also examines more closely from this point of view the cases of Gottschalk, an involuntary oblate who escaped from Fulda; Ohthere, the Norwegian merchant and sea captain whose memory is preserved in the Old English *Orosius*; Irish scholars on pilgrimage; and Dhuoda, the high-born author of a moral guidebook for her son. Nelson concludes with the rather optimistic thesis that knowledge and power are bound together in any case, and—in the words of the old song—"you can't have one without the other" (18). Sally Lamb's "Knowledge about the Scandinavian North in Ninth-Century England and Francia" (82–93) sets the well-known geographical preface of the Old English *Orosius* in the wider context of contemporary geographical writing and argues that it is not as unique as it may initially appear. Lamb begins by examining two geographical treatises, the *Liber de mensura orbis terrae* by Dicuil (ca. 825) and the *De situ orbis libri duo* (ca. 875) of the so-called *Anonymus Leidensis*, who was probably working at Auxerre or Rheims. Rejecting the usual view of medieval geography as based exclusively on authoritative texts rather than on contemporary empirical knowledge, she demonstrates that new knowledge, such as that produced by European-Scandinavian contacts, although not much affecting the content of the works, does reveal itself in some shifts in perspective and in the ways of selection and rearrangement of earlier source material. One putative example of this change is the tendency of both authors to link exotic, peripheral areas to the Ocean, whereas classical authors concentrate more on the Steppe world to the north of the Black Sea. To trace

the influence of contemporary circumstances, Lamb also examines the difference between two texts' attitudes to Northern areas. In the fifty years separating the two treatises, Europeans' knowledge of the North increased dramatically and in some ways tragically: if for Dicuil the North was in the first place a mysterious and unknown land, for *Anonymus Leidensis* it is the homeland of Vikings. Lamb notices that in order to describe the inhabitants of the North, the author of the *De situ orbis libri duo* quotes an unusual source, the *Cosmographia* attributed to Aethicus Ister. This choice was obviously determined by the fact that the *Cosmographia* depicts a northern world inhabited by barbaric peoples, some of whom are noted for their brutality, as well as for their skill in attacking fortified settlements and in shipbuilding. Lamb concludes that the absence of explicit descriptions of Viking Age Scandinavia apart from the Old English *Orosius* is due to literary convention rather than to the lack of interest or knowledge.

There is even more on *Orosius* to interest Anglo-Saxonists in *Ohthere's Voyages: A Late 9th-century Account of Voyages along the Coasts of Norway and Denmark and its Cultural Context*, Maritime Culture of the North 1 (Roskilde: Viking Ship Museum), which is edited by Janet Bately and Anton Englert. This useful volume supersedes Niels Lund's *Two Voyagers at the Court of King Alfred: The Ventures of Ohthere and Wulfstan, Together with the Description of Northern Europe from the Old English Orosius* (York: Sessions, 1984) and results from an interdisciplinary seminar on Ohthere's voyages that was held at the Viking Ship Museum in 2003. The essays published here present the participants' diverse opinions through a combination of full essays and short sidebars. Anglo-Saxonists will turn to the facsimiles of the texts in the Lauderdale and Cotton manuscripts, the explanation of how the accounts of Ohthere and Wulfstan came to be included in the Old English *Orosius*, and the text and annotated English translation of the relevant parts of *Orosius's* Latin *Historiae* and its Old English version. Many other essays will be of interest as well. In "Geography, Toponymy and Political Organisation in Early Scandinavia" (66–73), Stefan Brink provides philological and political analyses of the place names *Norway*, *Sciringes healh*, *Tjölling*, *Kaupang*, *Blekinge*, *Sweoland*, and *æt Hæðum*. In "Ohthere and His World—A Contemporary Perspective" (76–99), Inger Storli suggests that the Þórólf Kveldúlfsson described in *Egils saga* may have been a contemporary of Ohthere, a suggestion that leads first to a discussion of the political setting

and then to discussions of farming, fishing, whaling, and reindeer breeding in Viking Age Hålogaland. His consideration of the Norse relationship with the Sami is continued by Irmeli Valtonen with "Who Were the *Finnas*?" (106–7), who reminds us of the related facts that the Sami habitats extended at least as far south as Trøndelag in Norway and that Sami ethnicity underwent significant changes during the Viking Age. Valtonen also asks "Who Were the *Cwenas*?" (108–09), but no conclusive answers are possible: if the *Cwenas* are the people known in Old Norse as the *Kvenir*, they are archeologically elusive. Ohthere's account presents them as non-Sami, non-Norwegian, and non-Swedish, which leaves the possibility of a mixed or Finnic group. Anton Englert looks at "Ohthere's Voyages Seen from a Nautical Angle" (117–29). Results of experimental archeology indicate that the voyage of five days from Kaupang to Hedeby must have taken place under favorable conditions of wind and visibility, without camping every night. Less certain is the terminus of the fifteen-day voyage of discovery to the north, but it is likely that Ohthere reached the Varzuga river. In "The Fifth Day: Ohthere's Route through the Schei Fjord" (130–34), Andres Siegfried Dobat describes the places that Ohthere would have passed on the last leg of his voyage to Hedeby: Warhuje, Rinkenise, Sieseby, Ulsberg, Lindauer Noor, Missunde, Kosel-Weseby, and Reesholm/Palörde. Peter Sawyer provides a brief survey of the rulers of "Ohthere's Destinations: Norway, Denmark and England" (136–139), with some attention to related issues of nomenclature. After arguing that the reign of Harald Fairhair of Norway began around 900 rather than in 871, as Ari Thorgilsson relates, Sawyer discusses the status of local rulers in Denmark and Sweden and the question of the extent of the power of the kings of the *Svear* and the kings of the Danes. He closes with some thoughts regarding Ohthere's visit to England and future English influence on Norway. Nikolaj A. Makarov reviews what is known of "The land of the *Beormas*" (140–149), a vague area called *Biarm(a)land* in Old Norse. One of the difficulties in locating it is that estimates of the distance Ohthere was able to travel put the final point of his voyage on the north shore of the Kola Peninsula or the easternmost tip of the Varanger Peninsula, where there is no big river of the sort that Ohthere mentions as being there, nor a shore along which he could have sailed for five days, nor archeological evidence of a well-settled land inhabited by a people who were not the Sami. Moreover, so-called "eastern" objects found in northern Norway are from well after Ohthere's time. Makarov concludes that we still do not know where Ohthere turned around

nor whom he saw there. Dagfinn Skre, the director of the current excavations at Kaupang, offers an overview of "The *Sciringes healh* of Ohthere's Time" (150–156). Thanks to the efforts of Charlotte Blindheim, *Sciringes healh* (ON Skíringssalr) has definitively been located at the Kaupang farm in Tjølling, Vestfold. Skre's own subsequent work has shown that although trade continued at *Sciringes healh* until the mid-tenth century, the number of artifacts drops dramatically by the end of the ninth century. At the time of Ohthere's visit, then, the permanent settlement there was turning into a seasonal market place. In "Hedeby in Ohthere's Time" (157–167), Michael Müller-Wille gives an archeological overview of Hedeby and south Jutland from the eighth to the eleventh centuries. We learn that whetstones from southern and western Norway were imported, as were items of soapstone from western Sweden and southeastern Norway, but the archeological finds do not yet reflect the real settlement patterns as they are suggested by onomastic and architectural evidence. Despite more than a hundred years of investigation into the houses, cemeteries, jetties, and ramparts of Hedeby the ongoing and unpublished dendrochronological, geophysical, geomagnetic, and artifact studies mean that we will have to wait a little longer for a clearer picture of the general development of Hedeby during the ninth and tenth centuries. Stéphane Lebecq provides a broad discussion of "Communication and Exchange in Northwest Europe" (170–179), particularly along the "Northern Arc" (170) that stretched from the British Isles to Russia. The history of this route from the seventh century to the year 1000 prompts consideration of the nature of the exchanges that took place along it, and Lebecq argues that in the eighth and ninth centuries, the economy was a commercial one, practiced by free merchants who sold, carried, and resold merchandise in free markets. Once the Vikings installed themselves in their new territories, they too became economic agents who created or developed port settlements and towns, minted coins, engaged in commerce, and created mercantile contacts. At the end of the Viking Age, western Europeans wished to profit from the northern and eastern markets, and the ultimate success of the Hanseatic League, Lebecq proposes, was due to the sophisticated model of market activities that came to them from Byzantium via Scandinavia. Carsten Müller-Boysen also considers "Economic Policy, Prosperity and Professional Traders" (180–183) and also concludes that the time of Ohthere and Wulfstan saw the existence of free and independent traders who travelled with their goods from emporium to emporium, engaged in both buying and selling. He argues that the Scandinavians

independently developed the separation between capital and labor when they invested in trading enterprises or in shares of ships.

Stephen Matthews assembles and analyzes a fascinating body of evidence regarding *The Road to Rome: Travel and Travelers between England and Italy in the Anglo-Saxon Centuries* (Oxford: Archaeopress). The volume falls into two parts: a substantial set of appendices and eight short chapters that discuss their contents. The appendices list specific travelers and their routes, specific travelers and their reasons for travel, the timing of these journeys, the status of the travelers, miscellaneous references, and an extremely useful group of excerpts from eighty-four primary sources in English translation. After brief introductions to the subject and the sources, Matthews turns to the timing, planning, and duration of the journeys between England and Italy. The chapter on “Who Went and Why” consists of short sections giving examples of journeys undertaken for pilgrimage, Church business, state business, political sanctuary, political summitry, legal reasons, medical needs, trade, and the conveying of messages. The chapter on “The Mechanics of Travel” covers at greater length the evidence regarding transport, roads and rivers, accommodation and the size of parties, maps, passports and letters of introduction and safe conduct, money and finance, ships and the sea, and language and communication. The chapter on “The Routes to Italy” identifies the principal routes and how their usage changed over the course of the seventh through eleventh centuries, and the analysis ends with a review of the evidence about the routes and forty-eight known individual travelers. A number of surprisingly positive conclusions emerge from this material, such as the relative safety of these routes and the ability of people to travel in winter as easily as in summer, but these conditions are balanced by the scarcity of welcoming hospices, the impossibility of estimating how much the journey would cost, and the challenge of passing the security checks at every frontier—a challenge that is only a little less daunting a thousand years later.

b. Religion and the Church

Scholarship on the medieval clergy as a social unit and the clerical vocation as a career has in the past focused primarily on the education received by those in training to become priests or monks. In “Grades of Ordination and Clerical Careers, c. 900–c. 1200” (*Anglo-Norman Studies* 30: 41–61), Julia Barrow seeks to balance this approach, grounded in theology and intellectual history, with one drawing on social history and prosopography.

In doing so, she shifts her emphasis from education to the grades of ordination that marked the stages in a cleric’s career. The article grounds its argument in an in-depth consideration of the lives of prominent clerics from both England and the continent, including Abbot Odo of Cluny, Bishop Æthelwold of Winchester, Archbishop Dunstan of Canterbury, Archbishop Hugh of Rheims, Bishop (and Saint) Wulfstan of Worcester, and several others. Barrow provides a valuable discussion of both the various grades of ordination and the age at which promotion to each grade was considered appropriate. Tracking the developing understanding of the grades of ordination allows Barrow to adduce evidence concerning not only the evolution of the understanding of religious vocation in the later Anglo-Saxon period but also the evolution of church bureaucracy generally.

“The late ninth and early tenth centuries are not fruitful periods for the student of English church councils,” writes Catherine Cubitt in “Bishops and Councils in Late Saxon England: the Intersection of Secular and Ecclesiastical Law,” *Recht und Gericht in Kirche und Welt um 900*, ed. Wilfrid Hartmann and Annette Grabowsky (Munich: R. Oldenbourg), 151–67. Cubitt sets out to shed some light on this difficult period and, in doing so, to open up some avenues for future research. She suggests that “one way of approaching the changes in the convocation of synods in the ninth and tenth centuries is to focus on the question of the interaction between secular and ecclesiastical law, and particularly the use of a religious penalty, excommunication, in secular law and in charters” (153). Pointing out that excommunication appears as a penalty in only three codes before the reign of Æthelred (*Wihfred, Alfred-Ine, and I Edmund*), Cubitt tracks the dramatic increase in the number of crimes for which excommunication is prescribed in the laws composed by Archbishop Wulfstan. After comparing these laws to diplomatic and narrative sources that mention excommunication, she concludes that “the evidence marshalled here points to the continuing significance of councils and bishops from the seventh to the tenth century and to their vigour in promoting the church’s place in royal rule and behaviour” (167).

Much of what we know about the Anglo-Saxon Church comes from the writings of Anglo-Normans who sought its reorganization. Mary Frances Giandrea’s *Episcopal Culture in Late Anglo-Saxon England* (Rochester: Boydell) is one of several recent studies to emphasize the problems stemming from historians’ dependence upon William of Malmesbury, Orderic Vitalis and others for knowledge of ecclesiastical life before the Conquest. As Giandrea notes, the latter

dwell on the corruption, isolation, and degraded learning of the Anglo-Saxon clergy, adhering both to standard typological tropes and the private self-interest of a newly installed class that sought to legitimize its overthrow of old institutions. Yet their appraisals in many instances have become the conventional wisdom guiding contemporary research on pre-Conquest ecclesiastical history. As a corrective to this tendency, Giandrea urges a reexamination of pre-Conquest sources such as laws, penitentials, and vernacular homilies, as well as a range of other evidence that might potentially reveal something of the activities of bishops. Her conclusions are enumerated in chapters devoted to the relations between kings and bishops, the activities of cathedral schools, and the role of the episcopacy in pastoral care; these do much to recuperate the image of Anglo-Saxon bishops by arguing for their close connections to developments on the Continent, their well-developed role in the governance of England and their preservation of Latin learning and learning itself. As Giandrea astutely points out, the extraordinary vernacular literatures produced by the Anglo-Saxon church are not merely evidence of poor Latinity. Final chapters turn to the more traditional evidence of historians to answer nuts-and-bolts questions about the material and landed wealth enjoyed by late Anglo-Saxon bishops. Giandrea's study plants its feet both in material of interest to wider audiences of Anglo-Saxonists and in what is traditionally the province of historians. It does much to illuminate the activities of an ecclesiastical estate whose importance is not reflected in the relative paucity of studies devoted to it.

c. Ecclesiastical Culture

Christopher Loveluck's "Caedmon's World: Secular and Monastic Lifestyles and Estate Organization in Northern England, AD 650–900" (in *Caedmon's Hymn and Material Culture in the World of Bede*, ed. Frantzen and Hines [see sec. 4], 150–190) considers the ways in which contemporary archeological knowledge sheds light on the monastery at Whitby where, according to Bede, Caedmon was installed as a monk after having miraculously received the gift of song. The problem to be considered is a relatively simple one: What kind of monastery was Whitby? Loveluck begins by chastising earlier archeologists and historians for an excessive reliance upon texts to determine the nature of early settlements—specifically, too-passive acceptance of the categories that these texts posit, such as an opposition between "secular estate centers" and monasteries which in his view undermines archeological as well as

historical scholarship (156). Loveluck also sees a lack of interest in comparative evidence in the relevant studies, and so his focus is the archeology of Flixborough, a contemporaneous but less celebrated locale to the south whose examination Loveluck has recently overseen. In the author's view, the material evidence available at this site in particular offers much to complicate standard views about the distinction between monastic and secular life. Yet Loveluck's narrative arguably seems to show the utility of the categories to which he objects: by the author's own admission, Flixborough shows evidence of radically different forms of habitation that seem to accord with its passage from a secular to primarily monastic estate (189). Still, this essay does much to suggest the status of Whitby as a site of continuous change, of which Caedmon's career is a convenient example.

Anchoritic spirituality has attracted a great deal of attention as a late-medieval phenomenon, but as Tom Licence notes in "Evidence of Recluses in Eleventh-Century England," *ASE* 36: 221–234, the Anglo-Saxon side of this institution is somewhat less known. Licence focuses in particular on how much Anglo-Saxon recluses adhered to what appears to have been the standard on the Continent, most amply documented in Grimlaïc's rule, which required that a "postulant recluse... should spend at least a year in a monastery before being sealed in his cell" (224). After briefly reviewing eight cases of English recluses, Licence concludes that "though some subsequently enjoyed monastic sponsorship not one of them, as far as can be seen, undertook a coenobitic probation" as had been urged on the Continent (233). Licence suggests finally that although evidence for recluses surfaces somewhat late in the development of the Anglo-Saxon church, the institution already had a long history ("not one of these cases...conveys any impression that recluses were a novelty"), and these recluses probably were "prototypes for the ubiquitous parochial recluses of twelfth- and thirteenth-century England" (233).

Benjamin Snook's "Bishops and Pawns: Parallels between 'Caesaropapism' and Crusade Ideology in Tenth-Century England and Thirteenth-Century Denmark," *Quaestio Insularis* 8: 151–178, revisits the much-discussed question of Caesaropapism in order to apply this concept to the careers of St. Dunstan of Canterbury (959–988), St. Aethelwold of Winchester (963–984) and Anders Sunesen of Lund (1201–1228). The author's purpose has been "to take a theory of religious involvement in secular affairs which has been largely constructed by modern scholarship and to apply it to certain aspects of the careers of these three men" (177); thus he wants "to

highlight parallels between these men as they blurred the boundaries between their supposed religious function and the practice of secular government" (154). Snook's treatment of well-known events of English history between the 950s and the 970s is comprehensive, although his usage of the term "infamous bishops" (154) for Dunstan and Aethelwold, as well as his efforts to present all the Benedictine reform as an enterprise of a "cabal of ecclesiastics" (166), rings a bit old-fashioned, reminiscent of many famous nineteenth-century authors from Charles Dickens to Edward Freeman. Proceeding to the activity of Anders Sunesen, archbishop of Lund and brother of Valdemar II's chancellor, the author emphasizes the similarities between him and aforesaid English bishops "in terms of his involvement in the affairs of the Danish court and the extent to which he used his influence in order to achieve his own ends" (170). Such behavior is exemplified, to Snook's mind, by the expedition of the Danish fleet to the Estonian island of Ösel, which he treats as "a Church-sponsored effort to expand the influence and mandate of Lund, in which the state played second fiddle" (172). Snook also notices that Sunesen present this expedition as a local crusade; this is another link between Sunesen and tenth-century English bishops, because Dunstan and Aethelwold may "very well approve" "an aggressive philosophy of the crusade" (168). The conclusion is that although "Caesaropapism" is a tricky term to define, it may be fairly applied to all three aforesaid ecclesiastics.

Flora Spiegel, "The *Tabernacula* of Gregory the Great and the Conversion of Anglo-Saxon England" *ASE* 36: 1–13, considers Pope Gregory's curious recommendation in his letter to Abbot Mellitus (preserved in Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica* 1.30) that the recently converted English "build small huts, or 'tabernacula,' in conjunction with Christian festivals" (1). Spiegel first reviews the context of Gregory's letter, noting that his aim was to adapt "the English practice of sacrificing cattle to pagan gods" to Christian norms by introducing the English first to an Old Testament ritual intended for the Jewish festival of Sukkot, "the week-long autumn harvest feast held five days after Yom Kippur in commemoration of the end of the Israelites' forty years in the wilderness" (2–4). Gregory is likely to have been acquainted with the practice of building simple huts from tree branches for the festival both from his biblical reading (cf. Deut. 16.13–16) and from his fairly extensive dealings with sixth-century Jewish communities. From the latter, Spiegel argues, he would have learned the details of how these structures were built (4). His aim in urging this practice on the English, Spiegel suggests, was to "first bring the English up to the intellectual level

of the Jews, with knowledge of the Law, the Old Testament, and the concept of a single deity and Creator" before subsequently introducing them to the subtleties of Christian theology (5). Material evidence that these structures were actually constructed shows, according to Spiegel, that the much-discussed "typological correspondence between the Anglo-Saxons and the Jews was not simply an exegetical conceit constructed from patristic sources" (1); rather, it was an idea that governed the earliest efforts to convert the English.

d. Gender and Identity

¶¶Robin Fleming opens "Acquiring, Flaunting and Destroying Silk in Late Anglo-Saxon England," *Early Medieval Europe* 15: 127–58, with a claim sure to shock those still clinging to the image of the fur-clad, pelt-wearing Anglo-Saxon: "Before I began this research...I imagined [the people we study] dressed in the earth-toned woollens of the Bayeaux Tapestry. Now, however, I know better. Men like these...hard, tough, serious individuals dressed like peacocks" (127). Fleming's essay argues, first, that silk was ubiquitous during the later Anglo-Saxon period; and second, that wearing, displaying, and even destroying silk carried a host of ideological implications with which the Anglo-Saxon aristocracy would have been intimately familiar. Fleming begins with a detailed discussion of the economics of silk which draws on both documentary and archaeological evidence. She then turns to an analysis of the way silk was used, both in a practical sense and as a means of expressing ideology, status, or political affiliation. On one level, she points out, silk marked social status, yet the use of silk in church garb and rituals meant that it could also be used by royalty attempting to proclaim the sacrality of their office. Finally, silk also bore a close association with the cult of the saints, an association which influenced its visual display as well as its use in more prosaic practices, such as burial ceremonies. Fleming's essay is a brilliant contribution to the study of Anglo-Saxon material culture, and it should attract the attention of anyone interested in the ways in which power and social relations were communicated through physical objects during the early Middle Ages.

In "Women and the Law in Seventh-Century England," *Nottingham Medieval Studies* 51: 207–30, Carole A. Hough surveys the legislation of Æthelberht, Hlothhere and Eadric, Wihtred, and Ine in order to adduce evidence for the status of women in early Anglo-Saxon society. Providing what she calls "a semi-diplomatic edition" (209), Hough gathers together all the clauses in the seventh-century codes that regulate women's lives

and affairs. Her discussion covers not only the content of these clauses but the semantic field of legal vocabulary relating to women as well. She concludes that “overall, the extant legislation from early Anglo-Saxon England shows a concern with the rights and duties of women which suggests that they played a role within the legal system comparable with, though not always identical to, the role of men” (230). Hough’s essay is a magisterial contribution to the study of both Anglo-Saxon legal history and women’s roles in early English society. It will doubtless become a necessary source for the students of both of those subjects.

In “‘To Have and to Hold’: The Bridewealth of Wives and the *Mund* of Widows in Anglo-Saxon England,” *Nottingham Medieval Studies* 51: 231–245, Anne Klinck offers a sequel to her seminal 1982 essay, “Anglo-Saxon Women and the Law,” *Journal of Medieval History* 8 (1982): 107–21. Her focus here is on the Old English vocabulary concerning the brideprice (what will later come to be called the dowry) of unmarried women and the *mund* (“protection”) of widows. As she did in the earlier essay, Klinck continues to resist the tendency to reduce the Anglo-Saxon period to an uncomplicated “Golden Age” of gender relations (231). Instead, she examines how perceptions of women’s roles change over the course of the period and how these changes are expressed both legally and linguistically. About the brideprice she argues that “in early Anglo-Saxon England brideprice was not degrading to women, but came to be regarded as problematic later, and needed to be transformed into something more acceptable” (239). In her study of *mund*, she finds that later Anglo-Saxon England exhibited “a weakening of kinship ties, and this both benefitted widows and made them more vulnerable” (245). Together, she suggests, the development of these two concepts indicates “a growing sense that women are entitled to a certain degree of autonomy” (245).

Pauline Stafford considers the role of gender in “Reading Women in Annals: Eadburg, Cuthburg, Cwenburg, and the Anglo-Saxon Chronicles,” in *Agire da Donna: Modelli e pratiche di rappresentazione (secoli VI–X)*, ed. Cristina La Rocca (Turnhout: Brepols), 269–290. Noting the scarcity of women in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicles, she “attempts to turn that scarcity to productive use, by asking what brings women into the story of the past, or recent present, these chroniclers told” (269). To answer this question, Stafford reads the entries related to the three women named in her title, considering along the way which details are included and which left out. Ultimately, she concludes, although the Chronicles are “highly edited, overwhelmingly pictures of a patrilineal and male past” (288), they provide

evidence for the way in which the act of remembering was not gender-neutral and how the writing of history can be shaped to serve masculinist dynastic claims.

e. The Economy, Settlement, and Landscape

In “Two Landscapes, Two Stories: Anglo-Saxon England and the United States” (*Nature’s Past: The Environment and Human History*, ed. Paolo Squatriti [Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P], 214–239), the late Nicholas Howe engages with the burgeoning field of eco-history (although he does not use the term himself) in order to develop a new way of thinking about the relationship between geography and cultural identity. He writes, “[P]ut baldly, my subject is less the landscape itself than it is ways of talking about landscape. To inhabit a landscape is not simply to live in a topography; it is also to find a source of self identification. In that sense the topic of this study might be described as the ways in which landscape becomes imbricated within the culture of a people” (218–219). Howe points out that the myths shaping our perceptions of landscape in the United States bear a number of striking similarities—particularly a shared basis in a Biblical rhetoric of Eden and Paradise—with those defining the Anglo-Saxon relationship to the English forest and countryside. Drawing on sources as diverse as Bede, the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, charters of Athelstan, Thoreau, *Moby Dick*, and Ansel Adams, Howe masterfully surveys the stories told about landscapes in Anglo-American culture without ever succumbing to the temptations of reductive or formulaic analysis. Without question, this essay will become an essential starting point for anyone wishing to engage in further study of this fertile topic.

f. Magic, Medicine, and Science

Anne Van Arsdall’s “Medical Training in Anglo-Saxon England: an Evaluation of the Evidence,” in *Form and Content of Instruction in Anglo-Saxon England in the Light of Contemporary Manuscript Evidence*, ed. Lendinara et al. (see sec. 6), 415–434, points out that Anglo-Saxon Latin and Old English medical texts should be seen not as the full collections of all medical knowledge of the epoch nor as textbooks for self-education but as manuals and reference books for persons already possessing the necessary practical skills. Van Arsdall argues that medical knowledge in Anglo-Saxon England as well as in early medieval Europe was transmitted directly from skilled persons to apprentices, so that books were of less importance in medical training than this apprenticeship. To give more weight to

her arguments she addresses recent theories about how empirical scientific knowledge is transmitted today and also her own observation on medical training practiced among traditional healers in New Mexico. With references to these two pieces of contemporary experience, Van Arsdall formulates the thesis that medieval medical texts as well as recent descriptions of laboratory experiments imply more than they actually say, so that only those who have learned the requisite empirical skills can follow them. She then demonstrates how the evidence for existence and to some extent for the content of medical training can be obtained from two Old English medical treatises: *Hebrarium* and Bald's *Leechbook*. Examining these texts, Van Arsdall concludes that practical medical knowledge transmitted from master to apprentice included the skill of finding, identifying, and preserving medical plants; familiarity with how and when to let blood; familiarity with the internal organs of human body; and the skill of recognizing symptoms. She thus concludes that the corpus of Anglo-Saxon medical texts in Latin and the vernacular may provide evidences not only of medical knowledge but also of the medical training available in Anglo-Saxon England.

Alaric Hall's *Elves in Anglo-Saxon England* (Rochester: Boydell) is a remarkable and much-needed study. Although these ambiguous beings figure prominently in everything from medical recipes to personal names, attempts to clarify their nature as understood by the early English have been scarce, and the sources themselves give only the most frustrating of clues. Hall's study is set apart from much recent work in Old English by its unabashedly philological approach to its subject. Essentially, *Elves* is a study in lexicography and etymology that makes some brilliant forays into literary exegesis, and the reconstructed nomenclature of supernatural beings is just as important to Hall's arguments as what is attested in the written record. He concedes in his introduction that this approach is made necessary by the relative paucity of materials with which to explore things elvish; accordingly, his will inevitably be "a study of elite beliefs" as they were colored by ecclesiastical ideologies (20). Given that evidence of beliefs concerning elves is more amply attested in Scandinavian literatures than anywhere else, Hall's study begins with these materials, proceeding case by case through the several texts in which elves are a significant element. Some readers may quail at his suggestion that these (very late) sources enable the reconstruction of the "earliest meanings" of *álfr* and its cognates (54): should we assume in the manner of early philologists that these are anterior to those attested in Anglo-Saxon

evidence? Perhaps so, but doubts routinely expressed about this approach demand more caution than seems to be manifest in this portion of the study. More persuasively made is Hall's conclusion that elves among the medieval Scandinavians were "otherworldly beings," a more contentious claim that it might seem, given that it runs counter to "German historiographical tradition" as well as more recent arguments (32). This exhaustive discussion of Norse materials precedes the chapter on Anglo-Saxon evidence and colors much of what follows. His discussion of elves in all of their manifestations is, in the opinion of this reviewer, as exhaustive as could be hoped for, and his conclusions about the "male gender and effeminate nature" of Anglo-Saxon elves, if they at times seem to reach the limits of what our scanty evidence will allow, are persuasively made (4): certainly no one has squeezed more out of this turnip or is likely to ever again. Particularly admirable is the discussion of onomastic evidence. Hall's study strikes one as the sort of book that might have been written a century ago, which in the opinion of this reviewer is not a bad thing at all.

g. Law, Politics, and Warfare

In "Demonstrative Behaviour and Political Communication in Later Anglo-Saxon England," *ASE* 36: 127–150, Julia Barrow notes that while the early medieval language of gestures has attracted considerable interest among historians focusing on Frankish and Ottonian materials, there has been no comparable interest in what light early English sources might shed on its development. As the author notes, Timothy Reuter has even suggested that such an inquiry would be impossible for Anglo-Saxon England given the relative paucity of sources (129). Barrow acknowledges these limitations where the standard narrative sources are concerned (the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, for example, can offer little), and so Barrow focuses primarily on the lives of Anglo-Saxon saints and bishops. Even in these sources, Barrow finds "only very limited signs of demonstrative behaviour" but enough to allow for intriguing speculations on whether the theft of a belt, for example, might have been seen as "the opening gambit in a feud rather than simply as kleptomania" (139). Barrow goes on to consider a range of behaviors similar to those attested in Ottonian sources, ultimately questioning the legitimacy of arguments that reliance on these indicates a "lack of functional literacy in Ottonian government" (145). Like any other mode of communication, Barrow suggests, the language of gestures had its own "dialect," and the author finds in Anglo-Saxon sources both a set

of signs distinct from that of the Continent and a willingness "to add new ideas from external sources" (150).

In "Divide and Rule? The Military Infrastructure of Eighth- and Ninth-century Mercia," *EME* 15: 53–85, Steven Bassett examines the basis of the military might that enabled Mercian kings to forge and maintain a large kingdom in midland England in and after the seventh century. He argues for the existence of a network of fortified places in the form of major royal settlements that were given substantial defenses in the eighth and early ninth centuries. Bassett reviews in detail the archeological evidence of the defenses at Hereford, Tamworth, and Winchcombe and suggests that Nottingham, Derby, Lincoln, Leicester, Stamford, Northampton, Bedford, Cambridge, Huntingdon, and perhaps Buckingham were probably other places fortified by the Mercians. Not only would this have been a major step forward in early medieval military organization, it would also have created the physical infrastructure for a new, hierarchically arranged administration that formed a significant advance in the nature of Anglo-Saxon royal power. It is very likely that each fortified settlement had a clearly defined rural territory assigned to it, which it was responsible for protecting and from which it drew the men who were required to build, man, and maintain it. The Mercian kings thus instituted a burghal system more than a hundred years before the kings of Wessex did, and this use of public power rather than a network of local aristocrats turned out to be a very effective mechanism for uniting the territories over which the Mercians had gained control.

In his "MS C of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and the Politics of Mid-Eleventh-Century England," *English Historical Review* 122: 1189–1227, Steven Baxter contends that the varying accounts of the years 1035 to 1066 in versions C, D, and E of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle may be attributed to their places of composition: each version's "political sympathies...were conditioned by the rivalry between the families of Leofric, earl of Mercia, and Godwine, earl of Wessex" (1189). That the C version shows "a sustained interest in Midland affairs, sympathy for the earls of Mercia and antipathy towards the house of Godwine" is best explained, Baxter argues, by assuming Mercian origins, whereas E was composed in Canterbury by "writers who were partisan in favour of the house of Godwine" (1190). This thesis is contrary to prior assumptions about the provenances of these texts, and much of Baxter's study is devoted to a detailed overview of earlier studies of the Chronicle. What follows is an exhaustive demonstration of how each version's account of major political crises is colored by the partisan politics of the time. The texts

sometimes call for qualifications, most dramatically in what Baxter admits is the C version's "sudden and rather uncharacteristic burst of enthusiasm for Harold" in the entry for 1065 (1213). But the sporadic failure of these texts to conform precisely to Baxter's assumptions does little to vitiate their explanatory power, and Baxter succeeds in demonstrating that these versions of the Chronicle are deeply enmeshed—perhaps more than some have acknowledged—in local rivalries.

Susan E. Kelly's "King Æthelwulf's Decimations," *Anglo-Saxon* 1: 285–317, is a revised version of an essay included in the introduction to her *Charters of Malmesbury Abbey* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2005, 65–91). In it, she assesses the diplomatic evidence for King Æthelwulf's ninth-century gift of one-tenth of all the land in his kingdom to the Church. Fourteen of the so-called "decimation charters" survive, although nearly all are plagued by questions regarding their accuracy and authenticity. Kelly's essay surveys these charters, revisiting along the way the questions surrounding their authenticity, in order to determine the political circumstances and consequences of Æthelwulf's gift. She concludes that there is evidence to support a decimation gift by Æthelwulf in both 844 and 854. She further notes that, although the gifts may have stemmed from Æthelwulf's extraordinary personal piety, they also almost certainly contributed to the revolt of his son, Æthelbald, upon the king's return from pilgrimage to Rome in 856.

In "King Edgar, Wales and Chester: The Welsh Dimension in the Ceremony of 973," *Northern History* 44: 9–26, Stephen Matthews argues that the Norse possession of Anglesea in 972 was part of the reason Edgar paid Chester a visit the following year. According to Matthews, the coronation at Bath and the visit to Chester brought together two strands of policy: the pronouncement of imperial grandeur and the formation of a defensive strategy. As regards the former, Matthews finds himself disagreeing with Julia Barrow ("Chester's Earliest Regatta? Edgar's Dee-Rowing Revisited," *EME* 10 [2000]: 81–93), who had interpreted the ceremony on the Dee as one between equals. Instead, on the basis of a report in the *Chronica Walliae* that says that in 973 Edgar's army despoiled North Wales, Matthews holds that Edgar plainly regarded himself as the supreme figure and that the Welsh princes at Chester would have been ones he had defeated. Matthews also disagrees with the accepted interpretation that Edgar sailed round the west coast of Wales and arrived at Chester by sea. Matthews suggests that the king took the shortest, safest and most obvious route, which was to sail from Bath or from any suitable point near the mouth of the

Avon, up the Severn and then march overland. Edgar might also have trans-shipped to the upper Dee. As regards the formation of a defensive strategy, Matthews argues that the unity of Edgar's new expanded kingdom was threatened, and it would have been politic for Edgar to proclaim a new regime, bring all his subordinates together, and remind the princes of South Wales of his strength. These factors would account for the decision to hold a coronation at Bath, and the need to stabilize relations with the kingdoms of Scotland would account for the presence of the Scots at Chester. The campaign in North Wales might have been conducted to complete an alliance whose purpose was to defend English against the depredations of the Irish Sea Norse.

In *The Political Thought of King Alfred the Great* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP), David Pratt uses new tools to navigate the ever-expanding sea of scholarship that has come to surround the king and his achievements. Among other things, Pratt's study attempts to bring to Alfredian scholarship a Foucauldian emphasis on "the social basis of intellectual interaction" as well as "the political uses of knowledge, its relationship to wider social organization and collective psychology" (9). A series of chapters on "The West Saxon Political Order," covering matters traditionally of interest such as military service, lordship, the nature of office-holding, and the effects of viking assaults on the institutions established by Alfred's predecessors, thus serve as a springboard for the main focus of Pratt's study: the nature of what he calls "Alfredian discourse" as attested in the translations whose attribution to the king has become increasingly difficult. The chief advantage a Foucauldian framework affords Pratt's study is the ability to discuss these texts in corporate rather than individual terms and thus sidestep the question of authorship, which seems at times to be his aim (e.g., "What distinguished Alfredian discourse was the extreme exclusivity of its 'royal' delivery, and its commitment to universalizing, and in this sense 'philosophical' explanation, frequently generated independently within the ambiguous constraints of translation" [133]). Thus it is surprising to see Pratt occasionally unable to resist identification of these texts with Alfred himself (as on pages 116 to 117), and the book as a whole tends to waver between a consideration of "Alfredian discourses" that minimizes the agency of the king himself and the sort of biographical scholarship that has long been standard fare in this field. The considerable importance of this study resides perhaps more in its command of the scholarship and of the intricacies of ninth-century political and social history than in its theoretical commitments, which at times make *The Political Thought*

of King Alfred the Great read more like literary criticism than its title would have us expect. In spite of the challenges it may pose to some readers, the Foucauldian frame does allow Pratt to characterize the rhetoric of the Alfredian canon in new and striking ways, and the study as a whole will no doubt be of major value to studies of early Anglo-Saxon England.

Andrew Rabin's "Old English *forespeca* and the Role of Advocate in Anglo-Saxon Law," *Medieval Studies* 69: 223–254, explores different uses of the term *forespeca* in Anglo-Saxon law codes and extant case records, revealing the ways in which depictions of the *forespeca* reflect the interests and agendas that influenced each type of document. The author begins with the analyses of law codes and argues that rare references to the *forespeca* in the laws highlight his role as a means of normalization of judicial procedure, thereby expanding the king's control over the legal lives of their subjects. At the core of his consideration of depictions of *forespeca* in lawsuits records is a thorough discussion of the "Fonthill Letter" (ca. 900–920), which addresses various disputes that surrounded the ownership of a collection of estates at Fonthill. This document as well as many other extant records portrays the *forespeca* as an influential person of high social status who acts as a patron of an individual represented but who does so in view of his political interests. Rabin underscores that such *forespecan* not only participated in in-court arguments, pleadings, and negotiations between litigants but also took responsibility for case records and used them to advance their own political interests and limit the centralization of legal authority.

I.P. Stephenson offers a popular yet informed account of *The Late Anglo-Saxon Army* (Stroud: Tempus), that is, from the accession of Æthelred the Unready to the death of Harold Godwinson. After a survey of the surprisingly little previous scholarship on the subject and a brief military history of the Anglo-Saxons, four substantial chapters cover "Rituals, Units, and Tactics," "Military Equipment, *Heriots*, and the Complete Warrior," the Battle of Maldon, and the battles of 1066—what Stephenson terms the War of the English Succession. One might expect the usual survey of artifacts supplemented with references to the Bayeux Tapestry, but although archeology and tapestry are by no means neglected, Stephenson repeatedly turns to Greek and Roman histories to support his argument that the late Anglo-Saxon military was a direct descendant of the Greek phalanx, via the Roman legions and their Germanic mercenaries. In addition to rejecting the notion that the Anglo-Saxons practiced "tribal" warfare, Stephenson also refutes the idea that a shield wall

consisted of overlapping or interlocking shields. The term is not literal but poetic, denoting a wall-like line of shielded men (cf. Vegetius's description of heavy infantry standing like a wall of iron). Another common interpretation to be revisited is that of the Germanic "swine array" (ON *svinfylking*), which is often understood to have been a pointed wedge formation. With a close-up photograph of a wild boar to remind us that a pig's snout is quite flat, Stephenson argues that the military formation in question was most likely two columns of attack that converged at the front, resulting in a hollow trapezoid. The question of Anglo-Saxon cavalry also comes in for examination, and in his usual practical way, Stephenson resolves it by declaring that if the definition of "cavalry" is "tactical bodies composed of horsemen," then the lack of evidence that Anglo-Saxon warriors drilled on horseback means that they cannot be said to have possessed cavalry (41). The analyses of the battles are equally interesting and include persuasive explanations why Byrhtnoth had to allow the vikings to cross the causeway at Maldon and why William of Normandy had so many more archers than Harold Godwinson.

Damian Tyler's "Reluctant Kings and Christian Conversion in Seventh-Century England," *History* 92: 144–161, addresses the issue of conversion in terms of relationships between kings and politically powerful groups and individuals within their kingdoms. He maintains that the reluctance of many seventh-century Anglo-Saxon kings to accept Christianity may be due to their unwillingness to alienate their supporters, whose power they relied on. He then weighs the possible benefits and disadvantages of accepting Christianity for non-royal noblemen, kings' wives, and kings' sons. Tyler points out that if kings, as a rule, profit ideologically and practically from accepting the new religion, for local noblemen such factors as alienation of lands granted to churchmen, prohibition of endogamous marriages practiced broadly to prevent the detachment of family property, and loss of control on religious rituals may outweigh the possible advantages. As for kings' wives, their views on Christianity were influenced by the views of their birth kin and so may have differed from the views of their husbands. Kings' sons used their attitudes to Christianity as an effective instrument in intra-dynastic competition.

Among Patrick Wormald's final projects was editing a collection of essays on Anglo-Saxon and Carolingian intellectual life based on a series of sessions he had organized at the International Congress on Medieval Studies in 1999 and 2000. Upon his death in 2004, Janet Nelson assumed editorial duties, and the volume finally

appeared this year under the title *Lay Intellectuals in the Carolingian World* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP), with Wormald and Nelson listed as co-editors. Both the range of material covered and the uniformly high quality of the essays mean that there is much here to delight and instruct the Anglo-Saxonist reader. Although several of the essays touch on pre-Conquest English history, only three deal directly with Anglo-Saxon England itself. In "Problems of Authorship and Audience in the Writings of King Alfred the Great" (162–191), David Pratt returns to the much-debated question of which so-called "Alfredian" texts may be attributed to the pen of the king himself. Pratt surveys the many scholarly responses to this problem, noting as he does so that the contours of the historical debate coincide in many particulars with questions in contemporary literary study concerning the nature of authorship itself. He particularly addresses Malcolm Godden's attempts to minimize Alfred's contributions to the texts originating at his court. Pratt, in contrast, argues for a much greater royal investment than is typically accepted. Turning to the texts themselves, Pratt claims that "the impression is of conscious self-projection, heavily dependent on authorial recognition. The overall effect is to restore confidence in the king's distinctive contribution, very far from ecclesiastical 'ghost-writing'" (190–191). Taking up the claim by William of Malmesbury that no king ruled England "more lawfully or learnedly" (*legalius vel litteratius*) than Æthelstan, Michael Wood examines the evidence for that king's "learned" governance in "Stand Strong Against the Monsters: Kingship and Learning in the Empire of King Æthelstan" (192–217). He argues that "Æthelstan saw himself as an intellectual and patron of scholars in the Carolingian style, and that he gathered around himself a court school in the manner of his grandfather and the ninth-century Frankish kings" (193). He further claims that "the king's role was more than simply that of a donor of manuscripts, that his intellectual and spiritual interests may be the key to the political and intellectual revival of the second quarter of the tenth century, and that he was also the sponsor of one of the most important vernacular translations of the Anglo-Saxon period," the Old English version of the Gospels (193). Although Wood's argument is admittedly speculative, he makes a strong (although not entirely convincing) case and draws a number of provocative connections between the flowering of literary culture at Æthelstan's court and the Reformist movement at Edgar's court some twenty years later. In "The Lay Intellectual in Anglo-Saxon England: Ealdorman Æthelweard and the Politics of History" (218–245), Scott Ashley examines Æthelweard's much-maligned

Chronicon, a text about which little has been written other than to criticize the author's shortcomings as a Latin stylist. Ashley attempts to pair the revisions Æthelweard introduces into his source, the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, with what little is known of his political life in order to resituate the *Chronicon* in tenth- and eleventh-century intellectual history. Ultimately he argues for a more cosmopolitan understanding of the text, one that recognizes its place in a larger European intellectual movement. He writes, "Æthelweard and his *Chronicon* were formed by and in a European context as well as a local one, just like his greater forbears, Bede and Alfred. Together their work makes up the central triptych in the early history of 'Englishness,' defining its nature while reminding us of the truth of the dictum passed down by that *mythomoteur* of an imperial nation, Rudyard Kipling: 'And what should they know of England who only England know?'" (245).

h. Vikings

Martin Arnold's *The Vikings: Wolves of War* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield) seems to be a condensed version of his 2006 *The Vikings: Culture and Conquest* (London: Hambledon Continuum), tailored for the "Critical Issues in History" series. With its raging berserks (40), rampaging Vikings (58), and "the homicidal Thangbrand, whose mission included beating people to death with his giant crucifix" (27), the 2007 redaction is crafted to draw in the lay reader. There is even the suggestion that pagan Scandinavians were cannibals (24). Part one deals with Viking culture, and part two treats "The Viking Age" in six concise chapters that cover the conquest of England, the ravaging of Western Europe, the founding of Russia, and the Atlantic settlements. The first of these gives a clear account of England's first and second Viking Ages. The characterizations are also clear: Alfred is the heroic unifier of the generally determined, plucky English, and the Vikings are by turns opportunistic and disorganized.

Simon Keynes's fascinating and nearly monograph-length article, "An Abbot, an Archbishop, and the Viking Raids of 1006–7 and 1009–12," *ASE* 36: 151–220, considers how the writings of Ælfric of Eynsham and Archbishop Wulfstan of York might reflect the turbulent politics and massive social disturbances of the times; it also contains a new argument concerning the date of Wulfstan's *Sermo ad Anglos* and a substantial commentary on the *Agnus Dei* coins issued by King Æthelred. Scholars are not in the habit of seeing Ælfric as a commenter on the events of his day, but Keynes points out a number of instances in which it is hard to

see Ælfric doing otherwise (169–170). For Wulfstan, of course, this is a familiar role, and Keynes offers a comprehensive survey of his relevant works while emphasizing the basis of Wulfstan's legislative responses to the viking raids in "Carolingian antecedent and analogy" (184). This is an important essay that is one of the best introductions yet to the turbulent reign of Æthelred.

In the conclusion to *Viking Kings of Britain and Ireland: The Dynasty of Ívarr to AD 1014* (Edinburgh: Dunedin Academic Press), Clare Downham notes that "historical research tends to proceed within the confines of national boundaries" (234). All too often, Anglo-Saxon narratives characterize the Viking raids from a localized point of view: the Norse are outsiders who force their way onto English shores and into local power. Downham's book is a refreshing change from this perspective. By focusing on one family's dynasty she enables a reader to understand the political forces of the northern maritime region that includes Ireland, Wales, Scotland, and the Isle of Man. The book is a meticulously researched account of Ívarr and his descendants, who, from an original power base in Viking-controlled Dublin extended their sway into Northumbria, Wales, Strathclyde, and the Isle of Man at various points from the mid ninth century until her *terminus ad quem* in 1014. The book's structure is both chronologically and geographically arranged; the opening chapters relate Ívarr's own activities and rise to power in and around Dublin and how he and his descendants are described in the multiple Irish chronicle sources available to scholars. Later chapters each focus on a specific region of the dynasty's expanding power; England's situation is dealt with in two chapters, one focusing on events from the conquest of York (866) to the Battle of Brunanburh (937) and the other on events from that battle until the Danish Conquest (1013). Further chapters examine Ívarr's descendants' power in north Britain, "The Kingdom of the Isles" centered on the Isle of Man, and also in Wales. Downham ends her examination of this dynasty in 1014, at the Battle of Clontarf, citing the dynasty's lack of influence outside of Ireland afterwards, even though Ívarr's line did remain as a locus of power within the area of Dublin and the western isles, but it came more and more under the sway of other kingdoms. Downham's greatest achievement in this book is her ability to expand her readers' focus from the usual national bias present in most political surveys of the ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries to one that allows us to see the larger, interactive forces at work. As Downham concludes, "The descendants of Ívarr were therefore involved in formative processes of political development in Britain

and Ireland" (234) and thus are major, though often ignored, figures in the national identity formation of these peoples. Downham's meticulous work of identifying the role of Ívarr and his dynasty will serve scholars for years to come.

i. The Norman Conquest and Settlement

George Garnett's *Conquered England: Kingship, Succession and Tenure, 1066–1166* (Oxford: Oxford UP) offers a striking insight into the origin and nature of Anglo-Norman tenure system and succession practices, as rooted in William the Conqueror's efforts to justify the Conquest. Garnett argues that the necessity to confirm William's rights in England resulted in the idea that the whole kingdom was Edward the Confessor's bequest to William, as if it were a piece of land, so that William was its only rightful owner, and any other landholder, Norman or Englishman, had to acknowledge that he held his land by William's favor. The author also maintains that the chaotic successions of early twelfth-century England originated from "the inability of William and his successors to treat the kingdom as conceptually different from any other landed estate" and from "the system of precarious dependent tenure, which [William's] claim had engendered" (i). Anglo-Saxonists may be particularly interested in the first chapter of the book, "The Justification of the Conquest" (1–44), which addresses the issue of appropriation of the Old English past by William and his councilors. They also may be pleased with Garnett's unambiguous intention to advocate the case of the Anglo-Saxons and to see the Conquest as a brutal and unjust deed that had very grave consequences. The author demonstrates that the logic of Norman claims to the English throne inevitably led to the assertion that William became the king of England at the very moment of King Edward's death, and that assertion, in its turn, was the reason for treating Harold and all Englishmen as traitors and rebels. It was eventually expressed in the framework of assumptions underlying the Domesday Inquest, so that the Domesday Book gives an impressive example of legal *damnatio memoriae*: Harold had never been a king, England had not been conquered at all, and there were immediate links between antecessors of Edward's reign and new Norman tenants. Thus, apart from being "an index of continuity over the conquest", the Domesday Book is, in Garnett's view, "a legal fiction" (27). Another point commanding particular attention is the parallel between the treatment of Harold in royal documents and the treatment of Archbishop Stigand in ecclesiastical documents of Lanfranc's pontificate. The role of

Lanfranc, in particular his well-known *Collectio Lanfranci*, in the justification of the Conquest becomes a subject of the more insightful, to my mind, discussion contained in the chapter.

Anglo-Saxonists have long recognized that the 1066 conquest of England by William of Normandy will receive more scholarly attention than the Danish conquest by Swein Forkbeard and his son (and eventual English ruler) Cnut in 1013. Chris Dennis's "Image-Making for the Conquerors of England: Cnut and William I" (*Aspects of Power and Authority in the Middle Ages*, ed. Bolton and Meek [see sec. 1], 33–52) challenges this inequity by putting the two eleventh-century conquests into direct conversation with one another. By manipulating his public image, Cnut managed to win the praise and loyalty of contemporary historians, while William's image as ruler differed sharply between the local writers of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* and the contemporary Norman chroniclers of the Conquest, William of Jumièges and William of Poitiers. Dennis's analysis of the divergence of images between the Anglo-Saxon and Norman views of William points to outside evidence that *Chronicle's* more negative portrayal might have been "more realistic" (45), but also "informed by the reputation of his predecessor" (46). One of the major differences, Dennis asserts, between William and Cnut is how their immediate predecessor was viewed by the populace. Cnut followed the rather disastrous and unpopular king Æthelræd II; William succeeded the popular and well-liked Edward the Confessor. Each successive king's image was related to the image of his predecessor; by this measure, Cnut came off as much more likable to contemporary chroniclers. While this is an intriguing thesis, and while Dennis also makes a passing reference to Cnut's willingness to learn Old English and to support it as a written vernacular, his argument ultimately elides some other major issues and differences between the two conquests. For example, Dennis makes little to no mention of Emma of Normandy and her role in the continuity of rule between her first husband Æthelræd and her second husband, Cnut. Both Cnut and William were complex historical figures; Dennis's article focuses needed attention on the question of the role of conquest and image-making in eleventh-century English politics and social life.

Some less-studied events leading up to the Domesday inquest are considered in J.R. Madicott's "Responses to the Threat of Invasion, 1085" *English Historical Review* 122: 986–997; in particular, a council mentioned in William of Malmesbury's *Vita Wulfstani* that "must have preceded the better known meeting at Gloucester and which evidently formed an essential element in the

King's riposte to the Danish threat" but has been "overlooked by almost all those who have written about the events leading up to the 'Domesday' council..." (986–87). Madicott finds that the council, in spite of the casual way in which events surrounding it are narrated in the *Vita*, offers "additions to our knowledge of William's methods of government and of the Anglo-Norman constitution" (990). Amid these arguments are miniature biographies of the abbots ousted by Lanfranc from the Fenland and East Anglian monasteries that were seen as particularly vulnerable to viking assaults.

David Roffe's *Decoding Domesday* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press) does not tackle the Anglo-Saxon period directly but may be of interest to Anglo-Saxonists as an innovative investigation of a historical source on which so many conclusions (among others, concerning late Anglo-Saxon society) are based. In accordance with his earlier *Domesday: the Inquest and the Book* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000) Roffe supposes that the inquest and the production of the Domesday Book were two entirely different enterprises. The *inquest* was a survey of the royal demesne and a geld audit in order to maximize royal income and to reassess the military service owed by the tenants-in-chief. The main reason for such enterprise was the Danish invasion of 1085, when the king was faced with great financial and military problems. The *compilation* of Domesday Book was an administrative initiative that used the records of the inquest, probably to effect a settlement sometime after the revolt against William Rufus in 1088. Roffe proposes a radical reappraisal of Domesday data, examining all the texts as equal in their own right and exploring their sources and concerns. This approach allows him to reveal some new facts: for example, a hitherto unsuspected survey of royal churches is identified, and the missing account of Winchester is uncovered. It also provides new insights into controversies about the nature of ploughlands and the meaning of waste, and it leads to a reassessment of the limits of Domesday data. Of particular interest for Anglo-Saxonists is Roffe's conclusion that contrary to popular belief, the inquest records focused not on lordship and land but on service and soke, so that the Domesday Book cannot be perceived as an exhaustive survey of land. Even more interesting is his thesis that "Domesday England was still an essentially tributary society (albeit one which Domesday Book was soon to change forever)" (xiv), which may be a not unimportant contribution to the discussion on the continuity between Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman society.

[RSA reviewed Dennis; Downham. SA] reviewed Barrow "Demonstrative"; Baxter; Giandrea; Hall; Keynes;

Licence; Loveluck; Madicott; Pratt, *Political Thought*; Spiegel. AR reviewed Ashley; Barrow "Grades"; Cubitt; Fleming; Hough; Howe; Kelly; Klinck; Pratt "Problems of Authorship"; Stafford; Wood; Wormald and Nelson. EAR reviewed Arnold; Bassett; Bately and Englert; Brink; Dobat; Englert "Nautical"; Lebecq; Makarov; Matthews "King Edgar"; Matthews *Road to Rome*; Müller-Boysen; Müller-Wille; Sawyer; Skre; Stephenson; Storli; Valtonen "Cwenas?"; Valtonen "Finmas?" ZM reviewed Garnett; Lamb; Nelson "Knowledge and Power"; Rabin; Roffe; Snook; Tyler; Van Arsdall.]

Not Seen

- Bailey, Keith. "Slavery in the London Area in 1086" *Trans. of the London and Middlesex Archaeological Society* 57 (2006): 69–82, ill.
- Baxter, Stephen. *The Earls of Mercia: Lordship and Power in Late Anglo-Saxon England*. Oxford Historical Monographs. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2007. xviii, 360 pp. + plates.
- Blair, John. "What Millennium Are We Celebrating?" *Oxoniensia* 71 (2007 for 2006): 499.
- Bolton, Timothy. "Was the Family of Earl Siward and Earl Waltheof a Lost Line of the Ancestors of the Danish Royal Family?" *Nottingham Medieval Studies* 51 (2007): 41–71, ill.
- Breeze, Andrew. "Britons in West Derby Hundred, Lancashire." *Northern History* 44 (2007): 199–203.
- Breeze, Andrew. "Edgar at Chester in 973: A Breton Link?" *Northern History* 44 (2007): 153–57.
- Campbell, James. "Some Considerations on Religion in Early England." *Collectanea Antiqua*. Ed. Henig and Smith. [see sec. 2]. pp. 67–73, ill.
- Cooper, Alan. *Bridges, Law and Power in Medieval England, 700–1400*. Woodbridge: Boydell, 2006. xii, 185 pp. + maps.
- Crafton, John Michael. *The Political Artistry of the Bayeux Tapestry: A Visual Epic of Norman Imperial Ambitions*. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen, 2007. iii, 197 pp.
- Daniels, Robin, with contributions by Sue Anderson et al. *Anglo-Saxon Hartlepool and the Foundations of English Christianity: An Archaeology of the Anglo-Saxon Monastery*. Ed. Robin Daniels and Chris Loveluck. Tees Archaeology Monograph Series 3. Hartlepool: Tees Archaeology, 2007. xv, 239 pp. ill.
- Dumville, David N. "The Death of King Edward the Martyr—18 March, 979?" *Anglo-Saxon* (Aberdeen) 1 (2007): 269–84.
- Fordham, Michael. "Peacekeeping and Order on the Anglo-Welsh Frontier in the Early Tenth Century." *Midland History* 32 (2007): 1–18.

- Grimmer, Martin. "Britons in Early Wessex: The Evidence of the Law Code of Ine." *Britons in Anglo-Saxon England*. Ed. Higham. pp. 102-14.
- Hamilton, Sarah. "The Anglo-Saxon and Frankish Evidence for Rites for the Reconciliation of Excommunicants." *Recht und Gericht in Kirche und Welt um 900*. Ed. Hartmann. pp. 169-96.
- Hartmann, Wilfried, ed. with assistance from Annette Grabowsky. *Recht und Gericht in Kirche und Welt um 900*. Schriften des Historischen Kollegs, Kolloquien 69. Munich: R. Oldenbourg, 2007. ix, 249 pp. ill.
- Higham, Nick, ed. *Britons in Anglo-Saxon England*. Publ. of the Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies 7. Woodbridge: Boydell, 2007. [xii], 253 pp. ill.
- Higham, Nick. "Britons in Anglo-Saxon England: An Introduction." *Britons in Anglo-Saxon England*. Ed. Higham. pp. 1-15.
- Higham, Nick. "Historical Narrative as Cultural Politics: Rome, 'British-ness' and 'English-ness.'" *Britons in Anglo-Saxon England*. Ed. Higham. pp. 68-79.
- Hills, Catherine. "Anglo-Saxon Attitudes." *Britons in Anglo-Saxon England*. Ed. Higham. pp. 16-26.
- Holman, Katherine. *The Northern Conquest: Vikings in Britain and Ireland*. Oxford: Signal Books, 2007. vii, 272 pp. ill.
- Lavelle, Ryan. *Royal Estates in Anglo-Saxon Wessex: Land, Politics and Family Strategies*. BAR British Series 439. Oxford: Archseopress, 2007. ix, 153 pp. ill.
- Lewis, C.P. "Welsh Territories and Welsh Identities in Late Anglo-Saxon England." *Britons in Anglo-Saxon England*. Ed. Higham. pp. 130-43, ill.
- Marsden, John. *Harald Hardrada: The Warrior's Way*. Stroud: Sutton, 2007. xiii, 242 pp. ill. + maps, plates.
- Matthews, Stephen. "King Edgar, Wales and Chester: The Welsh Dimension in the Ceremony of 973." *Northern History* 44 (2007): 9-26.
- Mori, Takako. "Using Old English in Charters: The Estate Management of the Church of Worcester in the Later Anglo-Saxon Period." *The Dynamic Images of Medieval Europe: Dialogues between the Sources and the Theories. Studies Offered in Honour of Yoshiki Morimoto*. Ed. Y. Fujii and H. Takita. Fukoka: Kyushu Univ. Press, 2004. pp. 87-110.
- North, William L. "Truth, Tradition, and Authority in Bede's Interpretation of the Council of Whitby, 664." *Anglo-Saxon* 1 (2007): 1-54.
- Oosthuizen, Susan. "The Anglo-Saxon Kingdom of Mercia and the Origins and Distribution of Common Fields." *Agricultural History Rev.* 55 (2007): 153-80, ill.
- Rankin, Susan, ed. *The Winchester Troper: Facsimile Edition and Introduction*. Early English Church Music 50. London: Stainer and Bell, 2007. xii, 108 pp. + plates.
- Rex, Peter. *Edgar: King of the English 959-75*. Stroud: Tempus, 2007. 222 pp. ill. + maps.
- Richardson, H.G., and G. O. Sayles. "The Anglo-Saxon Knight and His Post-Conquest Successor." *Anglo-Saxon* 1 (2007): 361-84.
- Ryan, Martin. "Ad sedem episcopalem reddantur': Bishops, Monks, and Monasteries in the Diocese of Worcester in the Eighth Century." *Discipline and Diversity: Papers Read at the 2005 Summer Meeting and the 2006 Winter Meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society*. Studies in Church History 43. Woodbridge and Rochester, NY: Boydell, 2007. pp. 114-29.
- Schieffer, Rudolf. "Neues Bonifatius-Literatur." *DAEM* 63 (2007): 111-23.
- Secker, Daniel. "Four Saxo-Norman Churches near Wallingford." *Oxoniensia* 71 (2007 for 2006): 31-66, ill.
- Sharpe, Richard. "King Harold's Daughter." *Haskins Society Jnl* 19 (2007): 1-27. [Gunnhild]
- Shippey, T.A. "A Missing Army: Some Doubts about the Alfredian Chronicle." *Anglo-Saxon* 1 (2007): 319-38.
- Stafford, Pauline. "The Anglo-Saxon Chronicles, Identity and the Making of England." *Haskins Society Jnl* 19 (2007): 28-50.
- Symons, D.J. "The Family of Baldric: Worcester Monkeys and Goldsmiths of the Eleventh to Fourteenth Centuries?" *Trans. of the Worcestershire Archaeological Society* 3rd ser. 20 (2006): 103-12, ill.
- Thacker, Alan. "Martyr Cult within the Walls: Saints and Relics in the Roman *Tituli* of the Fourth to Seventh Centuries." *Text, Image, Interpretation*. Ed. Minnis and Roberts. [see sec. 2]. pp. 31-70 + map.
- Thornton, David E. "Some Welshmen in Domesday Book and Beyond: Aspects of Anglo-Welsh Relations in the Eleventh Century." *Britons in Anglo-Saxon England*. Ed. Higham. pp. 144-64, ill.
- Tyler, Damian J. "Early Mercia and the Britons." *Britons in Anglo-Saxon England*. Ed. Higham. pp. 91-101.
- Walsh, Christine. *The Cult of St Katherine of Alexandria in Early Medieval Europe*. Church, Faith and Culture in the Medieval West. Aldershot and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2007. xvi, 22 pp. + maps.
- Woolf, Alex. "Apartheid and Economics in Anglo-Saxon England." *Britons in Anglo-Saxon England*. Ed. Higham. pp. 115-29.
- Dissertations*
- Carlson, E. R. (2007). *The Crisis of Violence: Warfare, Genetics, and Culture in Old English and Old Norse Texts*. DAI 67A (2007): 3396-3396.

- Dailey, E. T. "Roman Influence in Early Anglo-Saxon Briton." M.A. Thesis, Univ. of Leeds, 2007. *Index to Theses* 57 (2007): 10250.
- Hawkes M.A. "Early Anglo-Saxon Settlement in the East Midlands AD 450–850." Ph.D. Diss., Univ. of Leicester, 2007. *Index to Theses* 57 (2007): 2712.
- Litte, G.R. "Dynastic Strategies and Regional Loyalties: Wessex, Mercia and Kent, c. 802–939." Ph.D. Diss., U of Sheffield, 2007. *Index to Theses* 58 (2007): 7715.
- Makuja, Darius Oliha. *Eschatology and Inculturation: The Missionary Strategy of Pope Gregory the Great*

- (590–604). Ph.D. Diss., Saint Louis U, 2006. DAI 67A (2007): 10.
- Riddiford, M. "Social Exclusion from Early Medieval Wessex." Ph.D. Diss., U of Sheffield, 2007. *Index to Theses* 58 (2007): 7716.
- Singer, Mark Alan. "Holding the Border: Power, Identity, and the Conversion of Mercia." M.A. Thesis, U of Missouri-Columbia, 2006. *MAI* 45 (2007): 2.
- Uvalle, Amanda D. "The Problems of Power: Constructions of Leadership from the Anglo-Saxons to Elizabeth I." Ph.D. Diss., U of California at Riverside, 2007. DAI 68A (2007): 2447.

8. Names

Victor Watts's *The Place-Names of County Durham, Part One: Stockton Ward* (Nottingham: EPNS) appeared in 2007 with Paul Cavill having edited the volume after Watts's death. It discusses the major names, the names of "ways, roads and buildings," as well as field names occurring in each township in the various parishes of Stockton Ward in County Durham and gives the earliest spellings and dates as well as etymologies. The book is thorough, of course, but it is also quite readable and useful, particularly the twenty-six-page section "The Elements, Other Than Personal Names in the Stockton Ward Place-Names and Field-Names" and the eight-page "Index of Personal Names" used as elements in the place names at the end of the volume. Another important volume in this year's bibliography is *Of Names and Places: Selected Writings of Mary Higham* (Bristol: EPNS and the Society for Name Studies in Britain and Ireland), ed. Alan Crosby. It collects twenty-two of Mary Higham's previously published essays as well as two previously unpublished papers: "Early church sites in North-West England: the place-name evidence and its implications" and "Upland settlement, with particular reference to Lancashire." In the first of these, Higham shows that the OE *hām* in the North-West had the specialized meaning of "sacred" or "monastic" enclosure; homestead, village, estate' and that place names in *hām* are on or near the earlier British ecclesiastical sites. The entire collection shows Higham's knowledge of the landscape, topography, and farming in Lancashire and the West Riding of Yorkshire as they are related to place-name studies.

Richard Coates has written a long essay "Azure Mouse, Bloater Hill, Goose Pudding, and One Land called the Cow: Continuity and Conundrums in Lincolnshire Minor Names (*JEPNS* 39: 72–143) commenting on Kenneth Cameron's earlier works on

Lincolnshire place names: the six-volume *The Place-Names of Lincolnshire, A Dictionary of Lincolnshire Place-Names*, and his 1996 *Nomina* essay. He discusses minor names in five sections called "Continuity: linking earlier and later records," "Antedatings," "New, confirmed, rejected and rediscovered place-name elements," "Conundrums: interpretation and reinterpretation," and "French traces in medieval Lincoln." Various observations that might be of particular interest to Old English scholars include deriving the first element of Wherleberghdale from OE *hwerfel* 'something round or rounded' or possibly Sc. **hwirvil-* 'hill-top'; deriving the second element of North Pontus and South Pontus from OE *pund* '(animal) pound'; deriving Thows from OE *pō(h)* 'clay'; deriving "The Urn" and "Urn Bottom" from OE *hyrne* 'corner, angle; bend'; rejecting OE *mæte* 'mean, poor, bad' as the middle element in Portermeteholm; and rejecting the derivation of "Ordepit(te)" and "Ordepit(te) Well" from OE *ord* 'point' and OE *pytt* 'pit', proposing instead a derivation from Anglo-Norman *ord puz* or *put* 'foul well' with the addition of ME *welle*. The article concludes with an index of elements introduced or discussed and an index of all the names discussed.

Several essays in this year's bibliography focus on individual place names. In "Tacitus, Ptolemy and the River Forth," *The Classical Quarterly* 57: 324–328, Andrew Breeze derives Tacitus's name for the River Forth, Bodatria, as well as related forms in the Ravenna Cosmography and Ptolemy from Common Celtic **boud-ro-* 'dirty (river)' from a root **geudh-* common to Celtic and Germanic. However, this etymology has nothing to do with the modern name "Forth" which is cognate with the Welsh name for the river, Gweryd, which means 'earth, soil, mould, humus, sward, land; clod, sod', which Breeze says makes sense as the original name

for Flanders Moss; if this is true, the regional names would have been transferred to the river. In "Carlton on Trent," *JEPNS* 39: 145–149, Jean Cameron (with Paul Cavill) suggests that the Domesday Book spellings like "Carlentun" appear to reflect the northern genitive plural form of OE *ceorl*, *ceorlena*. She also lists the major names and the field and minor names in and around this Nottinghamshire village. In "The Name *Bedwyn*," *Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine* 100: 198–99, Richard Coates proposes that "Bedwyn" in the villages of Great Bedwyn and Little Bedwyn derives from a British form **Betwondjon* or **-ja* meaning 'place, or stream, that is white with birches' and was first a stream name that may have been transferred to the hill-fort a half-mile away from the stream. In "Britons and Saxons at Chittoe and Minety," *Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine* 100: 199–202, Andrew Breeze supports Richard Coates's derivation of the village name Chittoe in Wiltshire as deriving from the Brittonic equivalent of Welsh *coed tew* 'thick wood, dense woodland', but he rejects Coates's derivation of "Minety" from primitive Welsh **men* 'my' and the equivalent of Middle Welsh *ty* 'house' in favor of the derivation from OE *minteg* 'mint island', citing the seventeenth-century botanist John Anbrey's statement that there was "an abundance of wild mint" there.

Three essays this year deal with place names in large geographic areas in England. In "The P-Celtic Place-Names of North East England and South-East Scotland," *The Heroic Age* 10, [online, n.p.], Bethany Fox focuses on the place names between the Firth of Forth and the River Tees which corresponded to the kingdom of Bernicia before it was joined with Deira to form Northumbria. Although the p-Celtic dialect spoken in this area would have been Cumbric, Fox represents the p-Celtic place-name elements in their corresponding Modern Welsh forms. She shows the largest group of p-Celtic names, often from Brittonic *caer* 'fort', *tref* 'farmstead', or *pen* 'summit, promontory', to the north of the Moorfoot and Lammermuir hill ranges, suggesting that p-Celtic survived longer there than in other parts of Bernicia. Fox also observes that the distribution of p-Celtic names is generally mutually exclusive with the distribution of Old English place names such as these ending in *-hām* or *-ingahām* in the area. In her appendix, she summarizes previous discussions of each name and indicates whether the name is of p-Celtic derivation by using the labels "unlikely," "possible," or "probable."

In "Place-Names and the Saxon Conquest of Devon and Cornwall," *Britons in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Nick Higham, Publ. of the Manchester Centre for Anglo-Saxon Studies 7 (Woodbridge: Boydell),

215–230, O. J. Padel concentrates on the fundamental east-west division between Brittonic and Saxon names in Devon and Cornwall as evidenced by distribution maps showing names with the Cornish place-name element *tre* 'farmstead, estate', the Cornish place-name element **bod* 'dwelling', the English place-name element *tūn* 'farmstead, estate', and the English place-name element *cot* 'cottage'. Padel interprets the survival of names with the Cornish place-name elements in Cornwall as proof of the survival of a substantial number of Cornish speakers after the Saxon conquest with a small number of Saxons demonstrating "elite dominance" over the Cornish speakers. In contrast, the relative absence of names with such elements in Devon reflects the low number of speakers of a Celtic language after the Saxon conquest, either because of a lower population density to begin with or, more likely, the result of "ethnic cleansing."

In "A Land Named From the Sea? Coastal Archaeology and Place-Names of Bigbury Bay, Devon," *Arch J* 163: 67–91, F. M. Griffith and E. W. Wilkes suggest that several of the coastal names in the Bigbury Bay area of Devon that relate to topographical features may have been named from a maritime view of the coast of Devon rather than from a land perspective. These include "Bigbury" itself, which they derive from OE *bīc* 'something pointed or beak-like' and OE *beorg*, so that "Bigbury" would mean 'beak-shaped hill' and probably refer initially to Borgh Island, which does look beak-like from the sea. Similarly, at Battsborough, the ridge is a significant landmark from the sea but not from the land. They also suggest that "Mothecombe" as a name makes more sense if understood as describing the view from the sea.

Two other articles deal with the broad topic of place-names studies itself. In "Commonplace Place-Names," *Nomina* 30: 101–120, Carole Hough calls into question that when first coined, place names indicated an aspect of settlement or topography that was unique and differentiated that place from others in the same area. She says, instead, that commonplace names like "Easton" and "Fishburn" may identify prototypical features rather than exceptional ones and that such names may indicate only that the location was prototypical or a best example of such a feature and likely to be the first so named. She also points out that commonplace place names may have been chosen for political and legal reasons, such as those names with Old Norse or Anglo-Saxon personal names in place names indicating ownership such as "Edulfstun." Even names based on minority group membership such as "Danby" may have been chosen to stake the group's claim to the

territory, particularly if the other elements in the place names are from the majority or more powerful language such as “Cumberhill” in Derbyshire or “Cumberwell” in Wiltshire.

In “Place-Names and the Scots Language: The Marches of Lexical and Onomastic Research,” *Scottish Language* 26: 1–15, Maggie Scott calls for the establishment of a Scottish equivalent of the Institute for Name Studies at the University of Nottingham and more studies being done as part of the Scottish Place-Names Survey following the methodology used by Simon Taylor and Gilbert Markus’s first volume of *The Place-Names of Fife*. She argues that onomastic evidence will be useful in providing insight into what she calls “pre-literary Scots,” which dates from 1100 to 1375. She also notes that she identified Germanic place-name elements that have no direct parallel in English place names in her 2003 dissertation, *The Germanic Toponymicon of Southern Scotland: Place-Name Elements and their Contribution to the Lexicon and Onomasticon*, such as OE *musel* ‘a mussel’ in the Midlothian name Musselburgh. Scott also suggests that earlier interpretations of Scottish place-name evidence need to be questioned in light of Old English place-name studies and suggests that May Gordon Williamson’s interpretation of *graden* in Milne Graden, Berwickshire as deriving from OE *græg* in the sense of ‘a gray animal’ and OE *denu* ‘valley’ and meaning ‘badger’s valley’ might better be interpreted as meaning ‘valley of wolves’ since **græg* in Old English names is felt to have connotations with wolves, which are also gray.

Several articles this year discuss specific place-name elements. In “The Wirral Carrs and Holms,” *JEPNS* 39: 45–57, Stephen Harding identifies and illustrates the fifty-one ON *kjarr* and twenty-four ON *holmr* minor and field names in north Wirral from ON *kjarr* ‘boggy land overgrown with bushwood’ borrowed into English as *ker* and ON *holmr* ‘dry ground in a marsh’ borrowed into English as *holm* in order to show the density of Old Norse settlement in the area and the absence of the normal Old English elements for these topographical features. Additionally, Harding ties the presence of *carrs* and *holms* to “The Battle of Brunanburh” where *Brunanburh* is identified as Bromborough on the Wirral and *Dingemere* in the poem is identified by Paul Cavill et al. as “the thing’s mere,” which might refer to a region of marshland around Heswall about four kilometers from Thingwall, the site of the Scandinavian Thing in Wirral. The element *-mere* itself could come from OE *mere* ‘wetland’ or ON *marr* ‘marsh’.

In “Seven Wells,” *JEPNS* 39: 7–44, Keith Briggs identifies sixty-six English place names referring to “seven

wells” as well as identifying four such names in Old English charters: *Seofenwyllas* in a charter of Æthelbald, (*on*) *syfan wyllan* in a charter of Æthelstan, *seuen willes pry* in a charter of Eadred, and *seofan wyllan broc* in a charter of Æthelred. Briggs shows that the “seven wells” names tend to be concentrated in the limestone country from Somerset to the midlands. He also notes that such names occur in French, German, and Italian and were connected to springs associated with pagan superstitions. While the Church tried initially to suppress the superstitions, it later adapted the names by using Christian interpretations, and several monastic orders including the Cistercians started using “seven wells” in the names of their monasteries.

Sarah Semple’s “Defining the OE *hearg*: A Preliminary Archaeological and Topographic Examination of *hearg* Place Names and their Hinterlands,” *Early Medieval Europe* 15: 364–385, is a hybrid of archaeology and place-name studies, which examines certain places with *hearg* in the name. The term has usually been understood as ‘pagan temple’ or ‘hilltop sanctuary’ when in reference to a place. Semple tackles the issue in three phases. First, she examines the primary and secondary literatures and current understanding of the archaeology. Next, she looks at the archaeology and topography of a few sites firmly identified as *hearg* sites. Finally, the archaeological themes that tie these sites together are detailed along with the conclusions. These conclusions, interestingly, are that *hearg* sites are not Anglo-Saxon centers, but rather denoted a cult site of some kind with a very long history predating the Anglo-Saxon arrival in the area. Further, the particular site had some kind of topographical distinction that made it stand out in the immediate area, and had been used and perhaps was still being used when the Anglo-Saxons settled the region. This makes it likely that even as late as the sixth and seventh centuries, some of these sites were still in use by the local population. It is probable that the Conversion period ended use of the sites, and at the same calcified the memory of that use in the term *hearg*.

In “Shoreditch and Car Dyke: Two Allusions to Roman-British Built Features in Later Names Containing OE *dic*, with Reflections on Variable Place-Name Structure,” *Nomina* 30: 23–33, Richard Coates derives the Middlesex place-name “Shoreditch” from the Brittonic **skor* (the ancestor of Old Welsh *ysgor* ‘fort or rampart’) in the Old English form **scor(-e(s))* and OE *dic* so that the name means ‘ditch or dyke related to the thing or place called [in Brittonic] the fort or rampart.’ He identifies Car Dyke, a Roman canal or major drainage ditch, which runs “from the river Witham about four miles east of Lincoln through Kesteven via the

Soke of Peterborough, probably to the Cam near Waterbeach in Cambridgeshire," as the Old English borrowing of a Primitive Welsh **kair* 'civitas, city' referring to "Lincoln Dyke."

In "The Scandinavian Element *Gata* Outside the Urbanised Settlements of the Danelaw" (*West Over Sea*, ed. Ballin Smith et al. [see sec. 2], 445–459), Gillian Fellows-Jensen points out that the Scandinavian place-name element *gata* generally means 'a street (in town)' in urbanized areas like York and the Five Boroughs, but it often refers to 'a right of way leading cattle to pasture,' 'right of pasture,' or even 'an allotment of pasture' and cites *Shepegates* 'sheep-gate' in *The Place-Names of Cheshire* as one such example and *Cowgate* in Aberdeen as another. Fellows-Jensen provides discussions of the use of the element *gata* in Lowland Scots, the Isle of Man, Lancashire and Cheshire, and Manchester and concludes with a discussion of other Scandinavian settlement names in and around Manchester such as the Hulme-names from an original Scandinavian *holmr* such as Hulme Hall in Reddish as indicating "a Danish contribution to the urbanisation of the area."

In "Die englischen Hundertschaftsnamen" (*Völker-namen-Ländernamen-Landschaftsnamen* [Leipzig: Universitätsverlag, 2004], 53–128), Klaus Dietz provides a thorough discussion of the names for the hundreds in Old English. The term "hundred" first appeared as a name for a territorial administrative unit around the middle of the tenth century but then spread to other counties. Dietz identifies and discusses the earliest recorded hundred-names by county, but the counties are organized into geographic groupings themselves.

In "Bede's *Hefenfeld* and the Campaign of 633," *North-ern History* 44:193–97, Andrew Breeze attacks what Catherine Clarke and others say about Bede's account of Oswald of Bernicia's defeat of and killing of Cadwallon of Gwynedd and sets the record straight: "First, the Old English form is *Hefenfeld*, not *Hefenfelth*; second, this place was the site of Oswald's camp, but not his defeat of Cadwallon; third, that the campaign was in November or December of 633, and not in 634 or 635; fourth, that Heavenfield lay just north of the Wall and east of the North Tyne, being some miles from modern Hallington ...; fifth, that the toponym existed before the campaign and was not the result of the victory; sixth, that the cross was raised before battle, and not afterwards." Breeze then proposes that *Hefenfeld* 'heaven plain' is a faulty translation of Bede's *Caelestis campus* which really means 'plain of Caelestis,' where *Caelestis* was the name of a local British leader sharing the name of the fifth-century Caelestis of North Wales.

In "The Feminine Name *Wealhtheow* and the Problem of *Beowulfian* Anthroponymy," *Neophilologus* 91: 701–715, Stefan Jurasinski argues against the standard translation of *Wealhtheow* as 'Welsh slave' which is generally viewed as inappropriate as a name for a queen by suggesting the possibility that the name doesn't mean anything at all. He cites Cecily Clark's argument that most names become "semantically emptied." The prototheme in dithematic names usually just indicates ancestry by alliterating with the prototheme of an ancestor's name, so the first element of *Wealhtheow* may indicate nothing more than the fact that one of her paternal or maternal ancestor's name began with the sound [w]. Similarly, the deutertheme *-þeow* may have only familial significance, particularly if *Wealhtheow* is, as has been suggested, a nickname-derived dithematic name. [Editor's note: this item was listed under this section and section 4b. *Beowulf* in the *OEN Bibliography*, and it is reviewed separately in each place.]

Stan Beckensall's *Place-Names and Field Names of Northumberland* (Stroud: Tempus, 2006) is aimed at the popular reader rather than the scholarly reader and summarizes current knowledge of place names and field names rather thoroughly, but it does not add any new knowledge. While Beckensall says all of the data are "gleaned" from place-name scholars like Allen Mawer, Eilert Ekwall, Margaret Gilling, and Victor Watts, he does not attribute the information with any specific citations. On the other hand, the book does have some beautiful landscape photographs and facsimiles of old maps.

In "South-West English *dumball*, *dumble*, *dunball* 'Pasture Subject to (Occasional) Tidal Flooding,'" *JEPNS* 39: 59–72, Richard Coates identifies six fields or lands primarily in Somerset or Gloucestershire which he says are likely to contain a lost lexical word as a place-name element **dumball* or **dunball* 'pasture subject to occasional saltwater flooding' as in "The Dumbles." Coates derives this place-name element from a local Scandinavian expression **dunnu-ból* 'mallard's, duck's lair or bed' and contrasts the *dumble*-names with the *warth*-names from OE *waroð* 'shore,' both of which refer to a meadow or marshland along a stream, by pointing out that the *dumble*-names are further out from dry land than the *warth*-names.

JDC

The essays listed in the *OEN Bibliography* for 2007 by Wolfgang Haubrichs, Jurgen Udolph, and Theo Vennemann were included in the bibliography for 2006 and reviewed in the "Names" section of *YWOES* 2006 in *OEN* 41.2 (Winter 2008).

Works Not Seen:

Kobayashi, Ayako. "Names of the Lords and Earls in *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*." *Studies in English Languages and Literature* (Tokyo) 13 (2007), 1–6.

Sandred, K.I. "Some Lost Dialect Features Found in Early East Anglian Field-Names." *Namn: yllingsskrift till Eva Brylla den 1 mars 2004*. Ed. Svante Strandberg. *Namn och samnälle* 15. Uppsala: Uppsala universitet, 2004, 115–17.

9. Archaeology, numismatics, sculpture

a. Excavations

Jennifer Alexander, in "The Introduction and Use of Masons' Marks in Romanesque Buildings in England," *Medieval Archaeology* 51: 63–81, looks at kinds of masons' marks, noting that they are not restricted to ashlar masonry exclusively, that they were of two kinds—assembly marks for construction purposes and banker marks for authorship and pay issues—and that the systems of employ do not seem to have been uniform. Architecture after 1090 provides an effective *terminus ante quem* as the Normans introduced significant advances in the cutting of ashlar and a more systematic banker mark system, which possibly reflects the economic realities for the expertise required for finished stone production. What interests Alexander is the question of whether the marks in English architecture are a Norman introduction or whether there is any sort of systematic use in the late Roman or Anglo-Saxon periods. Her examination works back from the first generation (1070–1090) Anglo-Norman sites (Battle Abbey ca. 1070, the early stonework at Lincoln on the west front after 1072, the Winchester crypt and transepts ca. 1079, the crypt at Lastingham, North Yorkshire which shows assembly marks but not banker marks, the mix of marks in Tewkesbury); the preliminary survey shows a use of some banker marks on both rougher stone cuts and ashlar masonry, but they are few in number and not consistent in all buildings. Particularly convincing in the article is the evidence from a number of different fields which Alexander brings to bear on earlier English construction. Alexander combines historical analysis, such as Richard Gem's discussion of the apparent recession of the early eleventh century, which created a paucity of new construction or renovation which may have been a further result of late tenth-century monastic reforms with economic attention to quarrying techniques, and visual analysis of building forms at Brixworth, Stow, Escomb, St. Lawrence's (Bradford on Avon), Jarrow, and Monkwearmouth, and finally Roman construction as on Hadrian's Wall. Emphasizing the difficulty of drawing conclusions based on the few site remains, she suggests that the Anglo-Saxon

practices of rubble construction and re-use of Roman stone tended not to show consistent or systematic use of masons' marks and that Roman systems tended to require a fairly high level of literacy not available in the Anglo-Saxon period, but that it is clear from the archaeological evidence that both assembly marks and banker marks were available knowledge to masons of the Anglo-Saxon period.

Rachel C. Barrowman, Colleen E. Batey, and Christopher D. Morris have compiled *Excavations at Tintagel Castle, Cornwall, 1990–1999* (London: Soc. of Antiquaries of London), which not only focuses on the recent archaeology at the site, but also provides a much needed summary of the work done from the 1930s to the 1950s by Dr. Raleigh Radford (which has never had a final report) and an updating of the work since Dr. Radford's excavations. The background of Radford's investigations of the site, along with details from his excavation methods through a thorough examination the archives of his draughtsman J.A. Wright, highlights both work done and raises new questions about the current state of the consolidated remains. The present excavation report centers on Site C; the second chapter addresses the lower terrace, and proposes three periods of activity. The first, 395 to 460, shows little evidence of the importation of pottery that marks first the scattered occurrences from 415 to 535 or the last structures of hearths and large amounts of foreign pottery from 560 to 670. The third chapter looks at the trial excavations of Radford's trenches on the upper terrace that occurred between 1990 and 1994 and the fourth chapter Radford's trenches in the middle terrace from the same period; the reexamination of these trenches was designed to follow up on Radford's claim of "no sign of buildings, but...evidence of intensive cultivation." Problematic in topographical arrangement, both excavation sites revealed shards of later medieval pottery (thirteenth to fourteenth centuries), shards of imported wares (Mediterranean B-ware), vessel lids and notched slates, all pointing to extensive occupation debris from the fifth to seventh centuries. Chapter five addresses a collapsed structure discovered in the middle terrace in 1999; the building is extremely important, however, as

it shows signs of only seasonal occupation, perhaps for trading in olive oil and wine, bolstered by more finds of post-Roman imported Mediterranean pottery, and there is some evidence of smelting or smithing, suggesting small industrial activity. Part three addresses site T, known as "The Great Ditch Area," largely excavated in 1999, highlighting some of the quarrying that was undertaken in the post-Roman era to strengthen the natural geological features of this heavily used site. Chapter nine highlights the area known as the Lower Ward, notable for its examples of imported fifth/sixth century glass and ceramics and the absence of any later material. Part four addresses first artifacts, such as the late Roman inscribed stone reused as a drain cover, but which can be read to connote an official administrative presence, gaming counters, and a vast number of notched slates of varied uses (amphora stoppers, fire sparkers, structural post supports); chapter ten also surveys mortar samples from the site C building. Perhaps the most interesting section of this chapter is the analysis of glass and ceramics, particularly as it places Tintagel in the context of what we already know of the trading networks along the Aegean via southern France or North Africa in the late fifth and sixth centuries and virtually stopping completely by the seventh century. Chapter eleven is of interest primarily to archaeobotanists, though the cereal remains here point largely to few cultivars (oats, hulled barley, free-threshing bread wheat) and the importation of partially processed crops; interestingly no non-native plant remains were found, despite the extensive trade economy. Throughout, there is, as one might expect, extensive discussion of excavation methods, cereal/plant remains (much of which adds significantly to our understanding of the environment and economy of the fifth to seventh centuries), radiocarbon results, beautiful topographic surveys, fracture analysis of items such as glassware, ceramics, and iron. The authors have done a stunning job of recognizing the valuable in Radford's work, particularly through their systematizing and summarizing of his material, while simultaneously moving us away from Radford's monastic model (itself a necessary scholarly correction of Arthurian romance) to a much more complicated site with seasonal buildings, adapting Roman material in the late Romano-British period but moving into an active, high status trading site in the fifth to seventh centuries and a substantial site shift in the later settlement.

FA

This year's *Archaeology Journal* 164 presents four studies of interest to Anglo-Saxonists. First, "Bronze Age

Burnt Mounds and Early Medieval Timber Structures at Town Farm Quarry, Burescombe Down, Devon" by Joanne Best and Timothy Gent (1–79) reports on the site in the title. Occupation and use of this site extends over several historical periods and was discovered during top soil stripping in 2005. There are two timber structures that are fairly well-preserved from the site and are thought to have been constructed and used in the seventh century. Also of interest was a complete shoe made of leather found in a hollowed tree trunk of the same period as the structures. It is thought that perhaps the trunk was used as a wellhead. The investigators engaged in a number of studies including dendrochronological and radiocarbon dating that assisted in a discussion about the environment and how it changed over the periods of the site's occupation and aided in dating the finds. Following that article in the same issue is Jonathan G. P. Erskine's "The West Wansdyke: An appraisal of the dating, dimensions and construction techniques in the light of excavated evidence" (80–108). The Wansdyke is thought to be a late Roman or early post-Roman earthwork in the region of Bath and northeast Somerset. This study discusses the results of excavations in several cross-sections of the dike. The results indicate that the dike existed in some areas of its length where we no longer have visible remains, but they also reveal that there are some inexplicable, at least on our current knowledge, gaps in the dike's construction. Notwithstanding those facts, overall Wansdyke is constructed in a consistent and uniform manner displaying the same dimensions throughout. This indicates that in spite of gaps, the builders had a plan and coordinated their work. Further, there is evidence at some places of various kinds of revetment: at places such as Binces Lane near Stantonbury the revetment was of local stone, at other places such as Compton Green readily available timber was used. Interestingly, the excavations yielded very little in artifactual remains, but what was discovered included Romano-British pottery. The authors conclude that the dike may be of Roman or more likely post-Roman date, based on methods from the Roman military tradition, and that the builders may have been reusing previous defenses along the line of the dike. Next comes "Anglo-Saxon and earlier settlement near Drayton Road, Sutton Courtenay, Berkshire" by Helena Hamerow, Chris Hayden, and Gill Hey on pages 109–196. This article reviews the evidence of excavations at Sutton Courtenay from its first excavation by E. T. Leeds in the decades after World War I. Subsequent artifacts recovered from the site indicate that it was larger and of a higher status than originally posited by Leeds. Among the subsequent finds is a timber

building of Anglo-Saxon date. It should be mentioned, too, that additional study since Leeds has revealed evidence of a Roman field system, Neolithic pits and a barrow, Late Bronze Age burial, and Early Iron Age settlement in addition to further evidence and artifacts relating to Anglo-Saxon occupation. Craig Cessford contributes to this volume as well with “Middle Anglo-Saxon Justice: the Chesterton Lane Corner execution cemetery and related sequence” (197–226). Cessford gives an overview of Middle-Saxon Cambridge and attempts to situate this execution cemetery within that historical period and place. The presence of a Late Roman decapitation on the site indicates that the Middle Saxon use may be influenced by the older Roman use. Cessford discusses the relationship between justice and places such as this cemetery and what execution and burial may mean in this context.

John Niles and Tom Christensen offer an examination of the hall at Lejre and explore its possible connections to *Beowulf*. The volume and most of its contents have been reviewed elsewhere in this year’s *Work*. It falls to this section to review two of the new contributions to the question of Lejre and *Beowulf*. First up is Tom Christensen’s “A New Round of Excavations at Lejre (to 2005),” 109–25. The piece was translated by Faith Ingwersen and fortunately includes plates and photographs and diagrams to help us along. Christensen brings the reader up to date on the excavations. In the 1990s, two hills on the south of the building discovered in 1986, one more northerly than the other, were examined. In the top center of the southeasterly hill, additional houses were discovered; the sites of the houses were reused multiple times, each successive building having the same dimensions as the previous building on the same location. Entrances, where it was possible to discover where the entrance was located, were at each end of the long building with perhaps one entrance in one of the long sides. So far, Christensen remarks, remains of more than twenty houses have been discovered, but no more than seven or eight were present at any given time. Further, the same pattern of construction was maintained over a very long period, extending from the eighth to the tenth centuries. This latter fact has led some to assume that the purpose of the buildings was as fixed as their construction. Among the objects that have been found were potsherds, some of which were imports, some of which were produced locally but in the English fashion demonstrating a technological import from England. The more northern hill of the two mentioned above has also been examined. Other than exploratory trenches, the results here were achieved through using magnetometer scans. Like the

southern hill, there appeared to have been buildings of some size centrally located and of the same approximate dimensions of the southern hill. Likewise, the scans indicate a series of rebuilding on the same spot. Results from the exploratory trenches showed that at least part of the occupation of this location was contemporaneous with occupation on the southern hill.

Christensen also reports on what was originally a find by an amateur archaeologist of the Lejre region who in 2000 discovered a handful of jewelry and mounts that were dated to the sixth or seventh century. After some unpromising exploratory trenches at the time, further investigation in 2002 led to some startling finds of a large post hole, originally mistaken for a trash pit. This find encouraged further investigation undertaken in earnest in 2005. Here there was a settlement complex with houses, a hall, and an intentional heaping of stones, surrounded by pits in which a large number of animal bones were found. What connection there is between the pits and the stone pile is unclear, but evidence suggests there is a connection. Textual evidence suggest that this mound and pit area may have been used for sacrifices. The discussion of this early hall, an earlier mound situated next to it, the stone heap, and other elements of the site are interesting in themselves. Interest is heightened, however, by a last-minute note added as the book was in press that dating of this part of the site by C14 accords with the archaeological evidence and places it firmly in the sixth century, contemporary at least with the events and people in *Beowulf*.

The article contributed by Nicolai Garhøj Larsen titled “Virtual Reconstruction of the Viking Hall at Lejre,” 159–66, deals with using computer virtuality to reconstruct the hall and accompanying buildings at Lejre. Larsen begins with an overview of the archaeology, particularly issues such as the size of the hall and other related matters. These measurements and concerns figure into building the virtual models. Over the next few pages Larsen walks the reader through the process of creating a virtual model of the site. Such a model would have multiple applications in and outside of the classroom. Sadly, there is but a single image included, in black and white, from a fascinating site. Larsen does report anecdotal evidence of the success of the model at the Lejre Museum: it has fooled a number of visitors who thought that the model was reality and inquired where they would find the hall. That speaks very highly of fascinating work; perhaps someday it may be available to a wider audience.

Back in 1989, the media was abuzz with a new find of the Anglo-Saxon era in the parish of Flixborough in Lincoln, near North Conesby. What was particularly

thrilling about this find was that it was the largest and perhaps most significant collection of artifacts and animal remains yet for an Anglo-Saxon site. Excitement subsided in public circles, with only occasional announcements and updates in the British press in the nineties. At long last, this year's bibliography for 2007 has the first, second, and fourth of the four volumes in the series *Excavations at Flixborough: The Early Medieval Settlement Remains from Flixborough, Lincolnshire: The Occupation Sequence, c. AD 600-1000*, ed. Christopher Loveluck and David Atkinson; *Farmers, Monks and Aristocrats: The Environmental Archaeology of Anglo-Saxon Flixborough* ed. Keith Dobney; and *Rural Settlement, Lifestyles and Social Change in the Later First Millennium AD: Anglo-Saxon Flixborough in Its Wider Context*, ed. Christopher Loveluck with contributions by James Barrett et al. (all three published in Oxford by Oxbow Books; the third volume is yet to be published). Excavations were carried out between 1989 and 1991 on a site next to the village that was known as North Conesby in the later medieval period. The village was located on a sandy bank overlooking the River Trent's floodplain just south of the Humber estuary. For the Anglo-Saxon period, the site was occupied from the seventh through the eleventh centuries and beyond and yields a significant amount of information on daily life. Some forty buildings and other structures were identified; but most interesting were the large refuse deposits that yielded a substantial number of artifacts and other kinds of remains, particularly animal bones. The large body of evidence on which to draw allowed the archaeological team to observe the changes in the nature of occupation over the Anglo-Saxon period. The site is not mentioned in any Anglo-Saxon period sources until the Norman Domesday Book entry, which makes the only information we have about the site archaeological.

Perhaps the best way to look at this material is to start with the discernible periods. The earliest for our purposes is the late seventh through early ninth centuries, when the use of the space in terms of building and building location, the location where trash was deposited, and other such considerations remained the same. Two activities seem to define this period: feasting and hunting. On the feasting end, multiple glass drinking vessels were recovered from within the buildings from the eighth century layer. Most of these seem to have been imports from Francia, the Rhineland, or Belgium and to be part of feasting kits. The fact that they were found inside suggests that they were not special use items, but used by the inhabitants and occupants of the buildings. Related to the issue of feasting, the use

of cattle for food was at its highest during this period, as evidenced by the number of bones and remains exhibiting evidence of butchering. Further, these cattle were the largest cattle for the entire occupational spectrum, and comparing them with other remains at other Anglo-Saxon sites for the same period shows that the cattle at Flixborough were larger than those elsewhere in England. This has suggested that they were perhaps breeding stock imported from the continent.

Related to these matters are the evidence of hunting and the consumption of game. There are multiple wild species represented here. Among the more interesting is the evidence of bottle-nosed dolphins being consumed; moreover, that the remains indicate that the dolphins were for the most part caught and butchered elsewhere and only the choicest parts shipped to Flixborough. In addition, mammal species represented include roe deer, pine marten, and hare. Wild fowl species include cranes, wild geese, ducks, and black grouse. Of these, cranes, dolphins, and deer were particularly favored in early medieval society as feast food. Taken together the evidence points to a high status presence at the site; the signs of imports, feasting equipment and feast foods, hunting of particular kinds all indicate that the site was home at least some of the time to some part of the Anglo-Saxon elite. Artisans were also at work in the settlement, though somewhat limited in comparison to later periods. Woodworking, blacksmithing, textiles, and non-ferrous smithing were all present, apparently supporting daily life as well as an elite lifestyle. A discussion in volume four suggests that the site may have been the home or sometime home of the royal family of Lindsey in the seventh and early eighth centuries, powerful enough that even when Lindsey ceased to be an independent entity the family would have continued to be of some importance in the region.

Moving into the ninth century, life in the village changed significantly. The buildings were changed, for one thing: the locations in the eighth century continued to be used, but the original buildings were replaced by smaller ones and additional small buildings were added. Artisan activity increased significantly as witnessed by the increase in tools and accoutrement of various crafts, especially spinning and weaving tools. Non-ferrous metalworking also increased in both quantity, range, and variety of product. While the eighth century showed evidence of contacts in trade on the continent, the ninth century displays few such contacts, but rather the site seems to have become significantly integrated into the local area networks of the Humber and Humber estuary, the east coastal villages, and East Midlands. Pottery was imported from English sources,

largely Ipswich. Sheep replaced cattle as the most commonly attested domesticated animal. In addition a literate element seems to have been introduced into the settlement: styli were found along with inscribed artifacts. This has suggested to some a monastic presence; perhaps even the whole site had become a monastery, suggesting a reason for the change in buildings mentioned previously. Others, including Loveluck, argue that the evidence for literacy is strong, but that evidence is not unambiguous in terms of indicating a monastic community rather than a secular one. Thus, from the eighth century's focus on an elite feasting community, the ninth century remains indicate a busy, artisanal community.

The late ninth-, early tenth-century period is the poorest in the site's history. As earlier in the ninth century, there is little evidence of the consumption that characterized the eighth century. Likewise, there is a significant decrease in the activity of the craftsman from earlier in the ninth century, as well. All such activity seems to have dropped to the level of supporting only the locals with nothing left over to sell further afield. After the 870s, no further coinage was found until later in the tenth century. No goods from the continent, and none that could be identified positively from other markets, were found in this period. This suggests a low-status, poor village during this period.

Finally, the tenth century saw the fortunes of the village change again. The small buildings of the ninth century were destroyed and the largest buildings of the occupation sequence built. There was conspicuous use of local resources: timber, domesticated animals, and wild animals. Evidence of craftsmen was a bit limited but iron smelting was done at this period in addition to the blacksmithing. It is difficult in this period to discern the village's place within the economic networks of England. Nonetheless, there is evidence of imported goods, however limited.

Volumes one and two, as their titles indicate, undertake detailed description of their topics. Thus, volume two, for example, discusses all matters dealing with the environment including topography, animal husbandry, grains grown, exploitation of resources, and so on. Because many of the same people are contributing to the three volumes, there tends at some points to be repetition of material. This is not a negative; since there is so much to absorb, this repetition is sometimes a most welcome feature. For the non-specialist, the fourth volume gives an overview of the work on the site, summarizing the material in volumes one and two and what will come in volume three, suggests a historical context in so far as that can be carried, and contains an entire

chapter of conclusions. But the volume does assume in some cases familiarity with the more detailed presentation in previous volumes. Accompanying the text are maps of various sizes, images of artifacts and environment, charts, graphs, and building plans. Each volume contains a bibliography, and while there is some overlap, each volume tailors the bibliography to the subjects covered in that volume. Also in each is a collection of color plates of artifacts and materials related to the text in question. It is good to have this series to disseminate the results of this find from two decades ago. It remains to be seen how this will aid in writing or rewriting Anglo-Saxon history.

LS

In "The Narragansett Runic Inscription, Rhode Island," *Beowulf and Beyond*, ed. Sauer and Bauer [see sec. 4b under *Beowulf*], 89–99), Ian Kirby tackles the myth that Norsemen never explored beyond Greenland, despite evidence to the contrary (brief eleventh-century settlement in L'Anse aux Meadows, Newfoundland; late eleventh-century penny found in Maine); the runic inscription which marks a stone at the tide mark in Narragansett Bay (near the mouth of the Potowomut River near North Kingstown, RI) exists against a substantial backdrop of North American forgeries. Written as a preliminary site report, Kirby first discusses the inscription, which is difficult to parse since the runes do not have any obvious meaning or match any known runic alphabet; although it does have correspondence with early Germanic and transitional Norse futhork of the seventh and eighth centuries, there are also parallels with the Kensington forgery and the possibility of re-reading the runes to form the initials of a local Swede who might have been the carver. Kirby then discusses his site visits and traces the regional history of the area and the marker, suggesting that the marker was unknown until recently; he produces few (but at least one) residents of the area who had the desire or knowledge to forge the runes. Examination of the material condition—smooth, with consistent fluorescence—also suggests that it is not a recent work. Kirby leaves the question open, pending further evidence either from the area or elsewhere, but leaves the impression of a modern work, though not for the same fame and fortune as other North American forgeries.

Kevin Leahy's book, *"Interrupting the pots": the excavation of Cleatham Anglo-Saxon cemetery*, North Lincolnshire, CBA research report 155 (York, England: Council for British Archaeology) summarizes the excavations undertaken between 1984 and 1989 at Cleatham, located between the well-settled parish boundaries of

Manton and Kirton in Lindsey, an area of importance as a possibly independent kingdom in the early Anglo-Saxon period, largely dominated by the Northumbrians after the mid-seventh century. The find includes 1204 urns and 62 inhumations with a few single burials under mounds, from an estimated total of 1528 burials. Excavation revealed that cremations and inhumations were generally intercut, resulting in urn fragments and suggesting some parallelism of the rites and a gradual movement away from cremations in the last quarter of the fifth century through the site's end in the later seventh century. The study carefully connects the urn findings with other vessels and objects, creating a careful stratigraphic analysis; Cleatham shows none of the phase spreading seen at Spong Hill (Norfolk), as urns from all phases are spread across the site with a small concentration of Phase 1 urns in the northern part of the cemetery. Inhumations are similarly found over the whole of the Cleatham cemetery and history. The excavations found a correlation between depth of finding and grave goods (all with a depth of more than 500mm contained some grave goods); no correlation was found in the use of either field or reused Roman stone fill. No orientation or consistent body alignment for age or sex could be determined. The study, with its copious study material and admirably neutral approach to issues of quality and artistic intention, codifies the stylistic trends for the decoration of the urns (with a large number of different characteristics from rims, stamped decorations from multiple dies, bases), which correspond with findings at other sites in East Anglia. There are also report chapters on associated findings (brooches, iron pins, beads, pendants, knives, and other tools). The excavation report highlights the wealth of burial information at Cleatham (and the color photographs that supplement the huge number of line drawings are lovely) despite the lack of funding in the study (only estimates are done on human bone remains, for example); one drawback is that Cleatham seems to reinforce what we know of burial practices for the period, rather than bringing to light startling new information which might entice funding sources. It should be noted for interested researchers that there is a wonderful companion site and computer database available at ads.ahds.ac.uk/catalogue/archive/cleatham_cba_2007.

FA

The Churchyard (York: York Univ. Department of Archaeology), by Simon Mays, C. Harding, C. Heighway et al., is the eleventh volume in the series concerning the archeological excavations at Wharram Percy (North Yorkshire). The structure of the earliest

church on the site dates to between 950 and 1050, and the evidence published in Wharram III (1987) suggested that the earliest burials were located around the church. However, the present volume features the definitive radiocarbon dating of the osteology, which conclusively and unexpectedly shows that in fact the burial ground was established soon after the middle of the tenth century, before the erection of the first stone church. The authors now argue that the cemetery was a planned burial provision not only for the inhabitants of Wharram Percy but also for surrounding communities. This provision could well have been part of the formation of Wharram Percy parish, and if so, this would move the date for the creation of the parish back more than a hundred years earlier than previously believed. Roman sarcophagi found reused in burials here may have been supplied by the archbishop of York to establish a physical link between the archiepiscopal center and the new parish church. The results published in Wharram XI cover finds dating from pre-Roman to medieval times and are organized by topic: churchyard and glebe land, excavations, human remains, burials, pottery, small finds, and environmental evidence. Nine appendices provide a catalog of the burials, various concordances, and additional detail regarding individual burials, the burnt clay, the coal, the charcoal, and the metalworking residues.

EAR

Another noteworthy essay focusing on archaeology in *Ohthere's Voyages*, ed. Batley and Englert [see sec. 7] is "Borg in Lofoten: A Chieftain's Farm in North Norway," 100–5, by Gerd Stamsø Munch. The essay discusses the excavation of the large housing settlement located on farmland on the Lofoten island, which contains overlapping buildings spanning a period from ca. 200 AD to the tenth century. Munch outlines the lengthy excavation project, which produced some surprising results when "remains not of one but of two buildings" (100–1) were discovered. Further excavation led to additional discoveries of a wealth of artifacts ranging from the usual Norwegian Iron-Age and Viking-Age settlement—items like spindle whorls, pottery, jugs, and pendants, to "the most spectacular and rare artifact" (103), a gilded bronze harness mount, possibly of southeastern Scandinavian origin. Munch quips that "perhaps a Borg chieftain in the second half of the sixth century received a saddled horse as a gift" (103); on a more serious note, however, Munch asserts that the finding of a gold sheet artifact that most likely belonged to a pointer for holy manuscripts "probably has an Anglo-Saxon origin" (103). Turning his attention to the structure of

the excavated buildings, Munch notes that “the later building was modeled on the earlier one, instead of following the fashion of southern Scandinavia” (105), thus indicating, perhaps, that the seventh- or eighth-century Borg chieftain was powerful and adequately independent enough to assert his own ideas for a “fashionable building” (105). After a full assessment of the entire building, Munch employs a seemingly optimistic view and questions whether Ohthere’s farm might one day be discovered, since other chieftain farms must have existed in northern Norway. Upon reading of such a gloriously unexpected find, it is no wonder why the tone of the essay is light-hearted at times and optimistic; at any rate, the paper sheds light on this fascinating excavation, and the impressive list of artifacts is supplemented by exceptionally clear color photos.

MR-O

b. The Anglo-Saxon Church

Brian Barber’s brief note “Doncaster and the Church of St George in the Eleventh Century,” *Yorkshire Archaeology Journal* 79: 326–28, considers evidence that Doncaster was a significant settlement at the time of the Domesday and concludes that the supposition that the church of St. George existed before the Conquest is erroneous. Barber argues that Joseph Hunter’s 1828 claim and P. J. P. Goldberg’s more recent assertion that Doncaster existed after the Conquest are correct; however, the brief note explains how the foundational date of 1061 for St. George’s church is referenced in two influential works of reference, *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church* (ODCC), and the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (ODNB), as well as being cited incorrectly in online sources. Essentially, Barber addresses the erroneous contention and points out that the dating error has been wrongly attributed to Reverend J. E. Jackson’s 1855 historical publication which became a generally accepted statement in “an edition of a work by a highly-respected antiquary” (328). However, the 1061 date is unfortunately “based on the uncritical acceptance of wholly unreliable evidence” (328), and Barber asserts that the most convincing evidence suggests that Doncaster emerged and the date of St. George church’s construction began in the post-Conquest period.

MR-O

The story of Caedmon’s miraculous transformation from reticent cowherd to England’s first Christian vernacular poet is so numbingly familiar to students of Old English that it is hard to see anything new, much less “transgressive” about it. Yet John Hines argues

in “Changes and Exchanges in Bede’s and Caedmon’s World” (*Caedmon’s Hymn and Material Culture*, ed. Frantzen and Hines [see sec. 4b], 191–220) that the poet’s brief biography is “considerably more than the showcase for another of the miracles of Book 4 of the *Ecclesiastical History*” (199). Hines’s carefully argued essay sees in the Caedmon story a narrative of transformations reflective of both religious and social instabilities inherent in Bede’s Northumbria. The author draws attention to Caedmon’s probable servile status in order to highlight what is likely to have been most striking about the narrative to the earliest audiences of the *Ecclesiastical History*: “Caedmon is not just an aged layman who unexpectedly becomes a monk; the idea of a cowherd fulfilling the functions of the *clericus*, attended to by his own teachers, is really quite shocking” (200). The construction of the monasteries of Wearmouth and Jarrow, whose architectural history was evidently of interest to Bede, was itself a remarkable departure from the past. By Bede’s time, monasteries were becoming “centers of production, distribution, exchange and trade” (214). Caedmon’s gift, Hines argues, was seen by Bede within such a context, affording Caedmon something “he could sell as his own special product and thus bargain his way into a new and more favorable social position” (215). Hines’s essay shows that much is to be gained from seeing Old English verse in light of a specific social environment.

SAJ

c. Funerary Archaeology and Practices

Kenneth Penn, Brite Brugmann, et al., in *Aspects of Anglo-Saxon Inhumation Burial: Morning Thorpe, Spong Hill, Bergh Apton and Westgarth Gardens*; East Anglian Archaeology 119 (Dereham: Norfolk Museums and Archaeology Service), have taken the excavation reports of these sites (largely done in the 1970s and available as catalogues) and synthesized the material into a very dense and rich analysis of Anglo-Saxon customs of material culture in inhumation burial, ca. 450 (earliest at Spong Hill) through the second half of the seventh century (latest at Morning Thorpe and Westgarth Gardens). These cemeteries all show elements of status and gendered burial practices and should be seen in the context of Anglian self-definition. Penn and Brugmann see changes in burial distribution with greater numbers of female jewelry and weapons (with summary of form types and profiles) in the fifth century; drops in the numbers of wrist clasps and girdle hangers indicate changes in fashion and burial custom of the mid-sixth century. Notable changes in the concentration and kinds of brooches (annular less common

than isolated square-headed) suggest elite female status of the seventh century. The material here (especially at Spong Hill) supports an idea that there are stronger status differences within a household than across social groups, and raises questions about whether these groups are representative of Anglo-Saxon culture as a whole or specific to a small number of elite households intent on social distinction.

Christina Lee's essay, "Pær Wæs Symbbla Cyst: Food in the Funerary Rites of the Early Anglo-Saxons" (in *At the Table: Metaphorical and Material Cultures of Food in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*, ed. Timothy J. Tomasik and Juliann M. Vitullo; Arizona Studies in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance 18 [Turnhout, Brepols], 125–144) previews her larger book study on the subject of the complicated role of food within the social context of Anglo-Saxon inhumation burials. The deliberate nature of burials should be critically analyzed for the food inclusion at deposition level, as some animal bones are clearly deposited after the grave's closure, the size and kind as a conveyor of meaning. Lee first considers literary and historic accounts in both pagan and Christian contexts for evidence of feasting commemoration as a part funerary or post-burial practice and an important indicator of social class interaction. Germanic inhumations seem to have frequently included animal remains; in Anglo-Saxon England, where inhumation burials consciously followed a conservative Germanic tradition, some food and cooking vessels were often included (as at Sutton Hoo). Less elaborate inclusion of animal remains with more emphasis on smaller animals seems common in inhumation burials at the cemeteries of Butler's Field (Gloucestershire) from the sixth century and Castledyke South (South Humber-side) from the seventh century. At Castledyke, there is a clear gendering—for instance, dogs are found only with men, pigs only with women—as well as consistencies of age distribution, such as no cattle in graves of females under twenty-five or over forty-five, no animals at all in sub-adult burials. High status kin-group burials may have shared animal burials. Charcoal pits at inhumation ceremonies, recently shown not to have been hot enough for the melting of artifacts, may support feasting, in keeping with possible appropriation of Roman practice. In contrast, animal deposits in cremation burials, ca. 400–500, appear to have been a part of the burning process in the social activity of the funeral; the animal bone then seems to have been specially selected as evidenced at Spong Hill (Norfolk). A greater number of animals occur in graves sexed male than female, in adult graves over juvenile, in decorated

urns over plain vessels, and one of the key elements is the social value placed on the animals. Lee's study is fascinating and makes a persuasive case for food (grain, animal bones) and associated vessels as important items of status and social interaction around the commemoration of the dead.

FA

Those interested in medieval funerary practices and cuisine will benefit greatly from Christina Lee's *Feasting the Dead: Food and Drink in Anglo-Saxon Burial Rituals*, Anglo-Saxon Studies 9 (Woodbridge: Boydell). Lee endeavors to demonstrate "that food offerings found in pre-Christian cemeteries were part of an elaborate system of signs that contain 'meaning'" (2). Since no written sources that deal with funeral rites from pre-Christian Anglo-Saxon England have survived, and not all Anglo-Saxons were buried with food or drink deposits, Lee utilizes an assortment of archaeological evidence from funerary rituals, and draws on art and indirect literary sources like Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica*, *The Battle of Maldon*, and the Exeter Book's *The Phoenix*, *Andreas* and *Guthlac B*. In effect, she aims to demonstrate how these early medieval communities used feasting the dead as a means of commemoration and to celebrate friendship. At the crux of the book is an osteological analysis of both animal and human skeletal remains, and an analysis of the different food and drink deposits buried with the dead. The recovery and analysis of animal bones found at Anglo-Saxon settlements sheds light on animal husbandry in early medieval England. Additionally, investigating animal remains provides further insight not only into the types of meats that were available, but analysis of animal skeletal remains can broaden our understanding of specific diets individuals possessed within pre-Christian Anglo-Saxon communities. Essentially, these findings make it possible to scrutinize the physiological features of skeletal remains and teeth from cemeteries. Although some investigative techniques make it easier to assess what dietary needs were lacking as opposed to what individuals might have possibly consumed, Lee's explores as many analytical avenues to determine what the dietary needs of the deceased were. Despite the absence of attention paid to discussing the exact food types consumed by early Anglo-Saxons, as neither an investigation on skeletal remains nor an analysis of textual and artistic sources was conducted in relation to specific foods, it is fair to say that Lee's aim is more focused on what the food offering during funerary rituals meant, as opposed to what exactly the offerings consisted of. Not only does Lee's examination

deal with human and animal vestiges, but an inventory and assessment of excavated food containers, like buckets, pots, glass vessels, and cauldrons is undertaken. Lee concludes that precious vessels indicated prestige of the deceased, while pottery vessels, which were traditionally thought to be exclusively in female graves, have also been discovered in male burials. Despite the lack of written documents directly relating to funerary rites in pre-Christian England, Lee provides an abundance of evidence for food deposits, cooking gear and hearths which have been found in early Anglo-Saxon cemeteries, thus she provides a compelling argument that such deposits were used as a means of commemorating the deceased. Although the book focuses on funeral rites within pre-Christian Anglo-Saxon England, Lee's awareness of analogous developments throughout other early medieval societies is apparent in her reference to evidence of food and drink present at Frankish, Roman, and other burial rituals. The brevity of discussion on analogous evidence throughout other medieval societies is not a criticism of the book in the least, since Lee remains focused and extremely thorough in her investigation of her subject. This anthropological and archaeological study will prove invaluable to those interested in social practices and customs in early Anglo-Saxon England, as well as providing an excellent resource for those considering the relevance of food and funeral rites in early medieval England.

In "Anglo-Saxon Execution Cemetery at Walkington Wold, Yorkshire," *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 26: 309–329, J. L. Buckberry and D. M. Hadley offer compelling evidence to suggest that the two barrows in east Yorkshire originally excavated by J. E. Bartlett and R. W. Mackey between 1967 and 1969 contain "the most northerly example yet found of an Anglo-Saxon execution cemetery of the type identified further south and is seemingly comparatively isolated" (327). The paper outlines the results of past excavations which led previous archaeologists to conclude that one of the barrows, containing partial human skeletal remains of what were believed to be twelve males and one female, were the result of an early post-Roman massacre dating from the fifth century. Previous dating was done by coinage and through analysis of bronze objects found in the cemetery, however due to their dating methods and notoriously acidic soils found in northern and northwestern England, Bartlett and Mackey's claims were admittedly speculative. The uncertain dating of the site and of the "cemetery [itself], characterized by careless burial on diverse alignments where most skeletons did not have associated crania" (309) has given rise to scholarly reassessments. The first of two

reinterpretations is G. B. Bailey's re-examination in 1985, in which he suggests that the site may have been a "small shrine associated with a Celtic head cult" (312), and secondly, Andrew Reynolds's 1997–98 study which proposes the site was a late Anglo-Saxon execution cemetery. Upon consideration of the competing interpretations and armed with radiocarbon dating, recent developments in osteological techniques and technological advancements not available during the original excavations, Buckberry and Hadley conducted a series of re-examinations of the bones within the cemetery to establish a more precise date for the cemetery and enable the team "to cast further light on its characteristics and context" (321). Ultimately, reanalysis suggests the site was most likely an execution cemetery which was in use for a long period of time. This is most evident concerning the triple grave at the site, which was initially thought to be used for a short period of time. By comparing Walkington Wold cemetery with the execution cemeteries at Stains, South Acre, and Old Dairy Cottage "radiocarbon dating of 2 of the 3 skeletal remains in the triple grave both yielded a confidence level of 95%, dating the remains from AD 775 to 965 and AD 890 to 1020 respectively" (323), as opposed to only being in use throughout the fifth century. Reanalysis also shed light on details concerning the skeletal remains such as the individuals's sex, age, and trauma endured. The test results are astonishingly different than previous skeletal analysis which was undertaken and reported by Jean Dawes in Bartlett and Mackey's paper. The main findings in Buckberry and Hadley's reanalysis reveal that all the individuals buried "were adult males aged between 18 and 45 years, with the majority of these falling at the younger end of this spectrum" (321). Two previous studies by Wymer 1996, and Hayman and Reynolds 2005, respectively, involving excavations similar to and including Walkington Wold have concluded that "the populations of execution cemeteries were overwhelmingly male" (323). Buckberry and Hadley's reanalysis reaffirms this, and although it is impossible to prove "whether or not men were more inclined to criminal activity than women, the evidence indicates that men were more likely to be executed for their criminal behaviour than women during the later Anglo-Saxon period" (323). Notwithstanding all these new insights, the team admits that the study is not without issues of accuracy and they approach both their study and analysis with great care and caution. Although they cannot confirm the exact number of individuals within the grave with complete certainty since isolated crania at the site may not be associated with the various headless bodies, the team,

nevertheless, provides a wide estimation between 30.8 and 84.6 per cent that the individuals buried at the site were decapitated. Buckberry and Hadley acknowledge that the estimation is quite wide, but even at its lowest percentage, they still have a higher level of accuracy than any other excavated execution cemetery site in England. Among other problematic issues, Buckberry and Hadley acknowledge taphonomic factors may mitigate against identifying other execution cemeteries in parts of northern England, as well as modern roadwork and land development in and around surrounding areas. However, the soil in Walkington Wold yielded positive results, thus providing new insight into the cemetery's characteristics and context, while also opening the door for further research into the legal system of Anglo-Saxon society's handling of criminals. Overall, Buckberry and Hadley provide stunning new insight regarding the site at Walkington Wold and their new interpretation is well supported by osteological evidence. The report clearly outlines their reanalysis with reference to earlier examinations of the site, and the paper is supplemented with several charts and images revealing trauma to skulls, vertebra, and mandibulae.

In *Remembering the Dead in Anglo-Saxon England: Memory Theory in Archaeology and History* (Ph.D. Diss., Univ. of York, 2006. DAI 68C: 655), Zoë L. Devlin examines the commemoration of the dead during the Anglo-Saxon period, basing her study on monuments and remains from four cemeteries in southeastern England. Devlin selects the cemeteries at Spong Hill, Norfolk, Edix Hill, Cambridgeshire, Apple Down, Sussex, and Rivenhall cemetery 1, Essex, ranging from the late fifth to early tenth centuries, because they have been extensively scrutinized in previous excavation reports. With adequate data in hand, Devlin embarks on an investigation to discover the role of memory in Anglo-Saxon England, since "memory has an important role to play in the formation of identity, both of the individual and the group" (8). Before discussing themes like the contents within graves, grave placement, rituals, landscape, and Anglo-Saxon funerary customs and social perceptions relative to memory and the deceased over a 500 year span, Devlin attempts to define memory and concludes that "if we characterize all forms of narrative deriving from a particular cultural context as 'social memory' we lose its impact as a tool for understanding perceptions of the past" (11). Thus, she considers the theory of memory in its various forms and constructs her analysis on a series of methodologies which explore literacy, gender, and medieval constructions of memory. Illustrated maps,

charts, tables, photographs and a series of statistical appendices supplement the text and provide readers with a visual awareness of the excavated artifacts, the layout of human remains and the overall presentation of the existing cemeteries.

In "Depicting the Dead: Commemoration through Cists, Cairns and Symbols in Early Medieval Britain," *Cambridge Archaeological Journal* 17: 145–64, Howard Williams builds on recent interpretations of mortuary practices in relation to social memory and identity. He suggests that current understanding of and use for funerary practices in early medieval Britain can be further developed through analysis of excavations of early medieval cists and cairns, such as those found at Lundin Links, Fife. In this thought-provoking article, Williams argues that early medieval cists and cairns were used to memorialize ideas of genealogy and gender, thus functioning as commemorative monuments and serving to symbolize social memory of an individual and to celebrate personhood. In assessing the complex nature, location and structure of mounds of stones and cists in relation to other commemorative monuments, such as Class 1 symbol stones, methods of commemoration can be identified.

A volume of *Anglo-Saxon Studies in Archaeology and History* dedicated to mortuary archaeology and its contexts takes up the remainder of this section with reviews of the individual contributions. Howard Williams's "Introduction: Themes in the Archaeology of Early Medieval Death and Burial," *ASSAH* 14: 1–11, outlines the roots of early medieval burial archaeology and assesses its progress over the course of the nineteenth, twentieth, and twenty-first centuries. It also highlights methods, techniques, interpretations, and debates surrounding investigations dealing with medieval burial rites and presents contextual, corporeal, and artifactual data. With the articles organized in subsections such as burial rites and artifacts, mortuary practices, excavation reports, directions in early medieval mortuary archaeology, and mortuary theory, Williams provides summaries of the papers included, and concludes by exploring a theoretical approach to how early medieval mortuary archaeology fits into the wider study of the early Middle Ages, while also analyzing associated ethical debates. The individual articles are reviewed here in order of their appearance.

Rik Hoggett presents three ways to use the Anglo-Saxon East Anglian burial record in order to follow the spread of Christianity throughout the region in "Chartering Conversion: Burial as a Barometer of Belief?" *ASSAH* 14: 28–37. Since surviving textual sources relating to the conversion of East Anglia are

sparse, Hoggett asserts that investigations relating to this subject should be archaeological in nature. Thus, he employs a sensible methodology and maximizes its use to discover patterns indicating changing beliefs. By analyzing grave-good assemblages, burial orientation involving west-east placement, which is primarily the norm in Christian burials, while also taking into account the presence or absence of cremation pots, Hoggett provides a strong report which traces the spread of Christianity throughout the region. Although somewhat short, this article is a segment of Hoggett's doctoral research, and the subject is treated with caution and with a modest disclaimer. Albeit, on its own, the paper provides the inkling of what should be a fruitful study and the evidence provided is solid with a good deal of archaeological data presented, including a graph illustrating the distribution of fifth- to seventh-century inhumations in East Anglia.

Memory theory and early medieval funerary rituals also feature centrally in Devlin's "Social Memory, Material Culture and Community Identity in Early Medieval Mortuary Practice," *ASSAH* 14: 38–46. Devlin summarizes preliminary debates from continuing investigations on the theoretical approaches to memory in early medieval burial practices, and then takes a practical approach to the theme by analyzing archaeological finds that might facilitate our understanding of social memory in mortuary contexts. Defining memory is critical to Devlin's argument, and she sets out to characterize the term clearly before further discussion of her analysis of excavated artifacts proceeds. Conscientiously attempting to avoid the problem that has plagued some previous analyses that permit the term "memory" to be too vaguely defined, Devlin asserts that the lack of a clear definition can cloud our understanding of early medieval perceptions of the past. As a result, she specifies her definition of social memory as context-driven, something remembered on certain occasions to satisfy specific necessities, and something that should also "be seen as being limited both temporally and spatially" (41). Following Devlin's discussion of memory theory, a concept fundamental to her own argument, she examines grave goods excavated from cemeteries and mortuary rituals as they relate to the deceased. She contends that the excavated items have biographies of their own, but also work together with rituals, language, and performance, as "their relationship to the deceased structured the community's memories of them, placing them firmly in the context of the community's past, present and future" (43). Devlin's examination reveals that "social memory is active, not passive, helping to create new ways of seeing" (43)

history and the future, thus providing new insights into life, death, and associated mortuary practices throughout Europe in the first millennium. The article advocates strongly for continued applications of theoretical mnemonic approaches in the early medieval period within disciplines other than archaeology.

Rebecca Gowland's "Beyond Ethnicity: Symbols of Social Identity from the Fourth to the Sixth Centuries in England," *ASSAH* 14: 56–65, explores ethnic variation in human skeletal remains and grave goods excavated from two clusters of sites of late Roman and early Saxon date, in an attempt to reconcile previous "archaeological interpretations [that have] become self-perpetuating and constrained by paradigms of their own creation" (56). Supported by one table outlining analysis conducted by Gowland of human remains, supplemented by two further tables, one summarizing ages of individuals based on dental development and wear, and the second cataloguing estimated ethnicity based on formulae of Trotter and Gleser, the report provides informative data in understanding changes in social organization over two centuries. Additional graphs outline the number of bracelets buried with each age group at Lankhills, the percentage of grave goods buried with females of differing age groups, proportions of personal items of adornment in each age group and the dental age for juvenile skeletons. In light of these records, Gowland is able to deduce that "both the late Roman and the early Anglo-Saxon cemeteries [containing] grave-goods fluctuate in both quantity and type throughout the life course of individuals and between the sexes" (59). She also demonstrates that since "dental development and eruption has a strong genetic component and is only minimally affected by environmental factors" (58), some of the findings are "consistent with what one would expect from a population with no significant 'intrusive' migrant elements" (58). Although grave-good evidence from the Romano-British period was limited, Gowland offers a fruitful discussion on ethnicity in early Anglo-Saxon England. Given that the article is densely packed with a solid list of osteological and artifactual evidence and data that solicits continued research in this area, her claim that further investigations on this topic "should aim to forge greater integration" (63) of the two types of archaeological finds seems to be a valid point.

In "Transforming Body and Soul: Toilet Implements in Early Anglo-Saxon Graves," *ASSAH* 14: 66–91, Howard Williams utilizes previous scholarly publications dealing with the function of particular artifacts during the cremation process, in order to suggest that toilet apparatuses such as combs, tweezers, ear-scoops,

shears, razors, and blades in early Anglo-Saxon crematory graves served more than a practical function. More precisely, simple toilet equipment functioned to mediate the cremation ritual, with mnemonic agency between the living and the dead. Williams first reviews toilet implements from various cemeteries throughout England and subsequently embarks on a comparative study of the differing toilet apparatuses preserved on burial sites containing cremation practices. A number of graphs, illustrations, and tables provide visual aids while clearly outlining statistical data relating to the grave-good discoveries and further detailing how they were distributed among different age groups and between the sexes. The data also sheds light on the practical function these objects had and gives an indication of how these objects held commemorative significance in death. One particularly noteworthy diagram is figure 19, which builds on Metcalf and Huntingdon's interpretation of Robert Hertz's formulation of death rituals in non-Western societies. In Williams's argument, he employs the diagram to "illustrate the centrality of 'technologies of remembrance' for transforming relations between the living, the body and the soul in early medieval funerals" (85). In addition, two impressive artistic renditions of an Anglo-Saxon cremation in progress, and the resulting post-cremation ceremony depicting toilet implements, respectively, by Aaron Watson, allow readers to visualize what the author conveys through archaeological evidence and data. Williams provides a thoughtful and stimulating article on the function of toiletries in Anglo-Saxon cremation ceremonies, and encourages further research in this area. Since the article does not enquire further into how "different communities developed variations upon this theme, and how the rite changed over time" (88), the door is open for further research. Considering the evidence presented by Williams and his conclusion that "toilet implements [were] more than prosaic and mundane objects in early mortuary practices" (88), to be seen as "mediating relations between the living and the dead and holding mnemonic agency" (88), he deals with the subject matter with care and attentiveness. Relying on descriptions found in previous excavation reports from Spong Hill cemetery does not weaken the value of this study in the slightest because Williams employs the evidence available to him in a sophisticated and thorough manner.

Chris Fern's article "Early Anglo-Saxon Horse Burial of the Fifth to Seventh Centuries AD," *ASSAH* 14: 92–109, provides a comparative study of the practice of horse cremation and inhumation in early

Anglo-Saxon England and examines the motives behind and implications of these practices. What Fern uncovers are differing attitudes in operation with regards to the treatment of horses in Anglo-Saxon funerary practices. These differences are further compared to Continental horse burials. Previous research suggested that among the sixteen identified cemeteries in Anglo-Saxon England which contain horse burials, five included horse cremations; however, this view has been significantly modified and a number of other sites with horse inhumations and cremations have been identified. Considering "the perception of the practice in England as a minority rite no longer appropriate" (92) by the seventh century, Fern reports that within the mid centuries of the first millennium, "some 227 examples have been identified from over 2000 cremations at the large cemetery of Spong Hill alone" (92), with sizeable finds elsewhere. This certainly calls to mind the importance of continued excavations. Turning attention to the distribution of horse inhumations and cremations from the fifth to seventh centuries across Anglo-Saxon England, the author provides a chart outlining such archaeological discoveries, and supplements the article with five further illustrations of horse inhumations, grave goods with inhumations, the distribution of horse cremations at Spong Hill compared with finds of fifth-century artifacts, representations of urned horse cremations with associated assemblages and gender/sex assignments, and pottery stamps, respectively. Not only does the article focus on horse burials among the Anglo-Saxons, detailing what evidence has survived, examining attitudes towards the species, and who had access to these animals, but in a larger context, European horse burial is discussed. Although Fern devotes particular attention to Anglo-Saxon England, the author allows for a more comprehensive assessment of the issue, giving readers a more thorough study of horses and funerary rites in the early medieval period. In comparing the horse burials, Fern concludes that "across Europe the horse inhumation rite, with its combination of martial, equestrian and wealth symbolism, was used as a statement of authority by a ruling minority" (102). Likewise, in Anglo-Saxon England, the "rite was employed as an aspect of social display" (102) and status. This thorough analysis of horse cremations and inhumations provides a wealth of evidence and will no doubt be of great interest to archaeologists, historians, and anthropologists alike.

Sue Harrington's "Soft Furnished Burial: an Assessment of the Role of Textiles in Early Anglo-Saxon Inhumations, with Particular Reference to East Kent,"

ASSAH 14: 110–16, explores a range of evidence to support the argument that soft furnishings including pillows, cloaks, bags, coverings, and rugs, were used more frequently in graves than previously suggested. Harrington explains the difficulty in finding soft furnishing data and expounds on the problems associated therein, since, most notably, textiles tend to survive when in contact with metalwork objects. However, a host of other hindrances make the exploration of soft furnishings difficult, so the author outlines the associated problems with textile data in detail. Problems aside, the paper describes in detail the findings from the east Kent textiles database, while supplementing the text with illustrations presenting the textile fragments on both faces of the scabbard and sword from Wickhambreaux, Kent. After analysis of the artifacts, Harrington suggests that “burial practices of people in the Saxon and Anglian regions may have been normative and consistently identifiable” (115). Her conclusion purports that it is plausible that burial rituals included wrapping and enveloping entire assemblages in early east Kent, thus making it conceivable that textiles were a “means through which the transition between life and death was enacted” (115).

In light of increasing amounts and condition of osteological evidence relating to the Anglo-Saxon period, Jo Buckberry’s “On Sacred Ground: Social Identity and Churchyard Burial in Lincolnshire and Yorkshire, c. 700–1100 AD,” ASSAH 14: 117–29, compares differing early medieval mortuary practices, following archaeological investigations at a sample of late Anglo-Saxon cemeteries in Lincolnshire and Yorkshire, and additionally explores the correlation between age and gender of the deceased as presented in six cemeteries. A useful table outlining the range of grave types and grave variations present in urban and rural cemeteries supplements the paper, and an invaluable table chronologically summarizes documentary evidence of burials at York. Buckberry provides additional tables that delineate grave types and grave variation at specific sites, while further records chart chi-squared tests and Kruskal-Wallis tests between sex and grave type at various cemetery sites. The article provides much insight into the distribution of graves between the sexes, shedding light on the fact that grave location was not governed by the sex of the deceased. Further analysis of the graves indicates that “adult males were more likely to be accorded elaborate burial in a prestigious location during the late Anglo-Saxon period, but this was a privilege from which adult females and children were not excluded” (125). Buckberry’s vigorous analysis of excavation work conducted at a series

of cemeteries from Anglo-Saxon England yields a significant amount of data and, through the series of practical osteological tests combined with meticulous scrutiny contextualizing the results in view of gender, age, and social status, will allow for further anthropological and historical assessments to foster our understanding of the social practices and those involved therein. Overall, the article provides a stimulating and worthwhile read.

Stuart Brookes’s article provides an analysis of the division of Early Anglo-Saxon graves in east Kent and discusses the relationship the burials share with land and naval routes in “Walking with Anglo-Saxons: Landscapes of the Dead in Early Anglo-Saxon Kent,” ASSAH 14: 143–53. Brookes discusses “evidence from the spatial distribution of cemeteries and Old English place names [which] suggest[s] that the geometric structure of Roman settlement heavily influenced the shape of the Anglo-Saxon social landscape” (144). While further analyzing movements and roads in Anglo-Saxon Kent, the pattern of funerary monuments emerges as a theme and features highly in Brooke’s article. An illustrative map indicates the location of early Anglo-Saxon funerary monuments in east Kent, and a reconstructed Wantsum and Romney coastline ca. AD 700 outlines major Roman and prehistoric route ways. Further supplementing the informative and thought-provoking article are maps charting the eastern extent of the least-cost path and an additional map showing the distribution of place names containing the Old English element *ora* in comparison to main least-cost paths. According to Brookes, least-resistant paths in Anglo-Saxon Kent bore close association with routes indicated by the place-name *ora*, which derives either from the Latin for ‘shore’ or ‘land ahoy’. Taking a more linguistic approach, Brookes ponders the correlation between the place names, settlements, and burial patterns. In light of evidence presented in the article, Brookes argues that “for lower echelons of [Anglo-Saxon] society, daily praxis and the social construction of the world was defined by the permitted routes of movement” (151) and governed by economic sanctions of land property preservation. Brookes provides additional insights into how specific route-ways in Anglo-Saxon Kent were utilized by exploring how “freemen and the elite...interacted more widely with the landscape, although [seemingly], still from the locus of the defined routes of communication” (151). This joint archaeological and linguistic study focusing on burial sites and place names is a superb example of how interdisciplinary research can produce fruitful and stimulating results relating

to Anglo-Saxon studies. It may additionally provide a systematic approach to the study of the English landscape that may prove successful if applied to other areas of the country and abroad.

Nick Stoodley offers "New Perspectives on Cemetery Relocation in the Seventh Century AD: the Example of Portway, Andover," *ASSAH* 14: 154–62. The primary areas of focus are a partially excavated seventh- to early eighth-century site at Portway West and a late fifth- and sixth-century cemetery at Portway East. Stoodley conducts a comparative study evaluating Anglo-Saxon evidence alongside data from Roman and Iron-Age sites, suggesting "a paradigm both for the evolution of Portway's land, and for the nature of regional organization during the early Anglo-Saxon period" (154). The study outlines how notions of land ownership and area organization may have been vital to rural settlement in the sixth century, and that by the seventh century, land and property boundaries carried a more central and diverse role in the post-Roman period in Britain. Investigations carried out in Portway prove to be fruitful as the land yields data reflecting how it was used in response to changing social and political climates, while offering much to the debate surrounding why cemetery relocation occurred. Stoodley asserts that some of the findings are varied and complicated, although generally speaking, results from "Portway broadly confirm [A.] Boddington's claim that the reason behind relocation has more to do with the evolution of the landscape than religious factors" (160).

In "Separated from the Foaming Maelstron: Landscapes of Insular 'Viking' Burial," *ASSAH* 14: 173–82, Stephen H. Harrison surveys previous studies dating back to J. J. A. Worsaae's nineteenth-century systematic evaluation of Scandinavian activity in Britain in light of Viking burials in order to determine what their locations, dates, and excavated grave goods suggest about their customs and social interactions. Pondering a wealth of data collected over years of archaeological, linguistic, anthropological and historical studies relating to Viking graves, Harrison suggests that after 150 years of varying investigations, research now indicates that "even coastal sites show far more concern for small inlets than any open 'foaming maelstrom,' with only a handful of furnished burial sites overlooking extensive sections of the coast" (179–80). Harrison's assessment of previous scholarship illuminates how far archaeological research has come in relation to views on Viking burials, most notably because of the amount of evidence available to today's investigators. As a result of continued research in this area,

Harrison notes that findings reveal "that over half of all [Viking] burial sites occur at either 'Christian' or 'prehistoric' monuments" (180). With this in mind, there seems to be a connection that the Scandinavian people in Britain established with the local landscape when creating burial sites; the results of this conclusion shed light on our understanding of the social and psychological aspects of their lives. Harrison reports that "far from being the last resting places of wandering Vikings, these sites represent specific individuals and communities who sought to make their presence felt at a local level...through the shared memory of what was a constantly modified and adapted funerary rite" (180). This article will prove useful for those considering what existing research into Viking funerary rites suggests about Scandinavian societal attitudes relating to death; and in broader terms, archaeologists, anthropologists and historians interested in early medieval burial rituals will benefit from this paper.

"The Garden Gives Up Its Secrets: The Developing Relationship Between Rural Settlements and Cemeteries, c. 750–1100," *ASSAH* 14: 194–203, by Dawn Hadley provides an assessment of the connection between rural cemeteries and the settlements in which they were situated. Results indicate "that later Anglo-Saxon cemeteries were often ephemeral features in the rural landscape, prone to abandonment and often given over to domestic occupation and agriculture" (194). Mulling over evidence collected from excavated sites containing Anglo-Saxon cemeteries across central and southeastern England, Hadley explores the intricate materialization of the medieval pattern of churchyard burials, the manner in which parish communities were united and the phases in which medieval villages came to be. Complemented by a photograph presenting an excavation of an eighth-century cemetery in Lincolnshire and accompanied by several graphs indicating the geographical location of excavated sites in Lincolnshire, Yorkshire, and Buckinghamshire, the paper mostly concentrates on the analysis of burial grounds and graves, as Hadley makes a concerted effort to provide a balanced assessment of the findings without overstating or devaluing the evidence. Through her investigation, she asserts that the notion of unaccompanied burials not possessing dates later than the seventh century can no longer be assumed; although archaeologists "have often lamented the lack of excavated evidence for later pre-Conquest settlements," Hadley contends that in fact, there is considerable evidence in the form of mortuary remains. The research provides an outlet in which "the social and psychological impact of transformations in land use"

(200) is assessed, but efforts to make accurate judgments in this area are difficult. Hadley acknowledges that “available evidence is rarely able to resolve these matters” (200). The paper provides a systematic review of a relatively large topic consisting of a series of scattered excavations, carried out as early as 1814 and as late as 1989, and it “throw[s] important light on both continuity and change in later Anglo-Saxon rural settlements and the landscapes in which they were situated” (200).

“Minerva: An Early Anglo-Saxon Mixed-Rite Cemetery at Alwalton, Cambridgeshire,” *ASSAH* 14: 238–350, by Catriona Gibson, with specialist contributions from Ian Baxter et al., illustrations by Donna Cameron et al., catalogs and assesses data collected after a 1999 archaeological excavation conducted on two separate areas in Cambridgeshire in advance of site development. Area A yielded artifacts primarily from the Iron Age, and Area B was mainly composed of an early Anglo-Saxon cemetery. The report further discusses the finds obtained at Area B, artifacts that included “twenty-eight urned and two un-urned cremation burials dating to between the fifth and sixth centuries AD and thirty-four inhumations, dating to between the late fifth and early seventh centuries AD” (238). In addition to these finds, further pyre and grave goods were discovered, and it is noted that some of the graves were richly adorned. The final fifty-five pages of the report provide supplementary tables, illustrations, charts and graphs outlining the exact methodology carried out, offering visual reference to the actual findings and further providing lists in detail of grave goods, while additional appendices catalog inhumations and associated grave goods.

In the report “Rescue Excavation of an Early Anglo-Saxon Cemetery at Gunthorpe, Peterborough,” *ASSAH* 14: 204–37, by Philippa Patrick, Charles French, and Christine Osborne with a contribution by Bob Middleton, and illustrations by C. French et al., the authors describe the results of a ten-day rescue excavation of an Anglo-Saxon cemetery in Peterborough. Additionally, they contextualize and further scrutinize the findings within a wider context of the site, since original attempts to do so were cut short due to severe time constraints and lack of funding. A detailed report of the findings is relayed and accompanied by a number of graphs, photos, and statistical data relating to both corporeal and artifactual remains. The sixth-century cemetery, however, proves to be a rare occurrence in the area. The excavation was highly productive, and a large quantity of grave goods and skeletal remains were analyzed. Ultimately, the unexpected discovery

was saved (if only temporarily) in what must have been nothing short of a time-restricted rescue mission, and the evidence retrieved “provided previous unattested evidence of a sixth-century population along the fen-edge” (235). In broader terms, the cemetery has provided opportunities for further discussion about its comparative relation to other settlements throughout the region.

MR-O

d. Regional Studies and Economic Studies

The Thames Valley has produced a great deal of evidence of human habitation on the island of Britain for all periods. *The Thames through Time: Archaeology of the Gravel Terraces of the Upper and Middle Thames: The Early Historical Period: AD 1–1000* (Oxford: Oxford University School of Archaeology) by Paul Booth, Anne Dodd, Mark Robinson, and Alex Smith gives an overview of data found chiefly through quarrying in gravel terraces covering the late Iron Age, Roman Period, and the Anglo-Saxon period in the upper and middle Thames Valley. The geographic coverage begins at the source in Gloucestershire and ends at Teddington Lock, the beginning of the tidal zone. The volume is not an archaeological report. Rather, the authors make use of multiple reports about finds and sites and synthesize them to provide a detailed overview of the geographical region during the first millennium CE. Each chapter takes up a different theme: after the introduction in chapter one, the second chapter examines changing environments, the third chapter settlement patterns, the fourth chapter the inhabitants, the fifth ritual and religion, the sixth economics, production, and communication, and the seventh power and politics. Chapters two through seven are subdivided by period: late Iron Age, Roman period, early Anglo-Saxon period, and middle or mid-to-late Anglo-Saxon period. The eighth chapter offers a summary of the authors’ conclusions.

The fifth century yields little evidence of low status buildings, a typical result overall for the period. There is evidence for high level contacts between the Thames Valley inhabitants and the western empire. Farming continued, though not at so intensive a level as previously, which may indicate some depopulation. What is most interesting is that over the course of this period there is a noticeable shift from spelt to bread-wheat grains as the chief grain grown, and later in the Anglo-Saxon period the increase in the production of rye seems to indicate a long-term pattern of change from the Roman period to the Anglo-Saxon. There are several ways to explain these changes, but the authors suggest that the cultural changes were less radical than

these shifts may indicate at face value. Widespread Anglo-Saxon settlement in the valley seems to be evident by the sixth century. Oddly, however, much less is known about the early to mid Anglo-Saxon period, since other than a few notable exceptions there is a paucity of settlement remains. Looking at the Domesday Book from the end of the Anglo-Saxon period indicates that overall the Thames Valley was likely not heavily populated throughout the period. What evidence does exist indicates settlement largely along the river's banks. No pagan Saxon worship sites are known within the area, though several early Saxon settlements later became somewhat important minsters, such as Eynsham and Abingdon. There is increasing evidence of the use of the Thames as a major transportation avenue, both for shipping of goods and food up and down the valley, as well as for human travel. For settlements in areas bordering Mercia or Wessex, for example, no artifacts explicitly indicate belonging to one or another kingdom.

There are several issues the authors see as needing further study, such as the diversity of settlement pattern, form, and chronology accompanied with the diversity in agricultural practices; another would be the use of the river for trade and transportation and its effect on settlement patterns. Correlation to historical issues such as land tenure, and markets and related factors are also fields for further investigation.

The volume is peppered with useful tidbits. Maps, images of artifacts and modern landscapes of the areas being discussed, village and building plans, renderings of artifacts all play their part and are quite welcome. Occasionally there are digressions that provide quick information on a particular site, for example, or a topic making use of images, such as a two-page summary on the execution cemetery at Staines, which also includes photos of some of the skeletal remains, a plan of the cemetery, and an image from a manuscript depicting an execution. An appendix with a map and list of Saxon era cemeteries closes the main text and is followed by a detailed bibliography. The only drawback is that on occasion one has an artist's rendering of a scene that seems to belong more to a young adult book or encyclopedia than such a detailed, scholarly overview. Even so, these few renderings do not distract from the overall usefulness and welter of data in the volume.

LS

Economics and Social Change in Anglo-Saxon Kent, AD 400-900: Landscapes, Communities and Exchange, BAR British series 431 (Oxford: Archaeopress) is based

largely on Stuart Brookes's 2003 dissertation (University College London). It explores five centuries of the Anglo-Saxon kingdom of East Kent to get at the root of why this area's medieval political and social institutions develop so quickly and strongly. Part of what Brookes wants to shape for the reader is the critical degree to which Kent must be seen as a focus of social/cultural/political transition in the period and the degree to which this is a process informed by very complicated systems of social identification and its friction with others (Roman vs. Frankish, cross-channel contacts, Scandinavian trade, North Anglian/Mercian/West Saxon neighbors), economic interaction (both in legitimate trade and piracy), and indeed, topographical realities. As one might expect with a dissertation publication, the literature survey is thorough in all areas, making clear where Brookes's work draws together the work of other scholars. Because the book makes extensive use of models of distribution and regression, rather than creating a more straightforward reading of the extant material, chapter two is important for understanding Brookes's theoretical grounding on modes of exchange, which he sees as configurational (modeling of trade transactions, craft working; relying heavily on archaeological evidence), contextual (asking social questions in the nature of identification both internally and to a wider outer audience), spatial (relying on topographical and spatial patterning of commodities and artifacts), and distributional (use of commodities/artifacts in the smaller social units of households and individuals); in the combination of these models, he is generally sensitive to nuances such as voluntary vs. coercive exchange, hierarchies of value (and the fluctuations of these depending on reading audience), and historical change that can disrupt the theoretical structure. Chapter three is a discussion of the physical landscape of Kent, with much material on the geomorphology of sites such as Romney Marsh and the Wantsum Channel as well as the coastline itself; Brookes uses this evidence to ground the strong link here in Kent between regional geographic organization and "kingdom" identification. The chapter is followed by a discussion of roads, coastal movement, cemetery location, and settlement names, in order to map communication along Roman legacy and Saxon developed routes, with attendant ideas of social value in these sites and their visibility. Chapter five narrows in the discussion of settlement, creating a model of parcelization which follows primary (Roman roads, river valleys) and secondary infilling broadly supporting Everitt's conclusions on movement out from the Original Lands (Foothill on the northern coast and the Holmesdale pays). Somewhat jarringly, Brookes has

split the analysis of grave artifacts into two chapters: chapter six swamps the reader with large-scale chemical analysis covering the whole of Kentish grave archaeology, and chapter seven follows the trends of current scholarship on burials as constructed displays of social identity with their varying hierarchies of value for the receiving audiences. Chapter seven applies interesting modeling arguments of scarcity of material, originality of object, quality of construction to the current ideas of funerary performance. Models of wealth distribution (chapter eight) are paired with a digest of coin archaeology and regression analysis, reminding the reader of the difficulties of interpreting a socially intertwined overlay of gift economy and developing monetary and transactional systems. This is a dense, highly complex, highly theorized approach to the culture of Anglo-Saxon Kent; it is not for the casual reader.

Ryan Lavelle looks at a very particular kind of land use in *Royal Estates in Anglo-Saxon Wessex: Land, Politics and Family Strategies*; BAR British series 439 (Oxford: Archaeopress). In this revision of his 2001 University of Southampton dissertation, which retains some of the dissertation sections such as literature studies, extensive bibliography, and useful appendices gathering site information, he concentrates on lands used to support the royal family and retinue and lands given by kings to members of the royal family, particularly in Hampshire and Dorset, generally from the mid-ninth to mid-eleventh centuries. There are three categories of land analyzed here. Lavelle looks first at the common farms of one night which seem to have been excluded from hide assessment in the Domesday Book and appear infrequently in royal charters, suggesting their use as in-kind provision for a traveling king and court; his analysis suggests the importance of these sites in the development of boroughs as a manifestation of royal public/private obligations in social culture, with significant differences in distribution in Dorset and Hampshire. Lavelle's night's farm land-use analysis is also elaborated in a chapter that looks at king's use for events at specific sites. The second category is land granted to queens and other family members, where the very loose patterns tentatively suggest an entailing of land so that it returns to royal control, especially given the social fluctuation of status (in terms of political standing of women as queens, consorts, or dowagers and men in terms of succession degree). Finally, Lavelle examines land held by royal agents (*taini regis* or *servienti regis*), looking at these men/families as dependents of the king and the lands' modest size and proximity to night's farms as part of a system of land management. Lavelle's book helps

us better understand the social implications of land use at the very height of social class during the pre-Conquest period.

FA

Keith Lilley's review essay "Agents and Agency in the English Medieval City," *Journal of Urban History* 33: 1048–1056, evaluates two recent volumes, *London in the Later Middle Ages: Government and People 1200–1500* by Caroline Barron and the comparative study of *Urban Growth and the Mediaeval Church: Gloucester and Worcester* by Nigel Baker and Richard Holt. Given that forty years have passed since the publication of the first systematic historical survey of medieval "town plantation" (1), Lilley explains how these two recent books offer a fresh evaluation of medieval town planning. The ideas proposed in both provide new scholarly insights into the area of medieval urban landscapes with added supporting evidence on matters in which previous support was scarce, lacking or altogether amiss. As Lilley states, these two new publications "help reveal what processes were at play in shaping the English medieval city...and that town planning in the Middle Ages gave rise to different urban forms, not just archetypal regular layouts" (1055).

MR-O

In *Viking Burial in the North of England: A Study of Contact, Interaction and Reaction between Scandinavian Migrants with Resident Groups, and the Effect of Immigration on Aspects of Cultural Continuity*, BAR British Series 429 (Oxford: John and Erica Hedges), Angela Z. Redmond looks at the apparent disparity between Viking contact and settlement in the north (Northumbria, Cumbria, Westmoreland, Lancashire, Yorkshire, and Derbyshire) and the funerary remains, focusing on the period between 789 and 1017 and suggesting that our interpretation of Viking burial remains should be read not for their purity of traditional forms but for the degree of cultural interaction and regional assimilation between the incoming Viking and the established local population. Consistent with its origin as a dissertation, it provides a large, useful literature review. Chapter three is a quite readable summary of Viking religious and social beliefs, the historical landscapes of Denmark, Norway, and Sweden, funerary practices on the whole and in particular for each country; it is followed by a thorough historical sketch of Viking interaction (in all of its social forms from piracy to winter settlements of armed forces to politics and law), all of which makes the relevant issues clear for the reader. Redmond's investigation into legal codes and treaties

particularly makes the case for a growing connection and accommodation between Anglo-Saxons and Vikings, which is reciprocal. In perhaps too condensed a discussion, chapter five synthesizes the very uneven available settlement evidence (archaeology, sculpture, place names, etc.) from site reports (Cottam, Bryant's Gill, York); while place names and sculpture show high levels of influence, the archaeological data is less clear and more inter-connected, trends which Redmond connects to incoming elite Viking patrons as a "catalyst" on local consumption. Chapters seven (Viking burials in Ireland, Scotland, and the Isle of Man) and eight (review of specific English burial sites), combined with the extensive chart presentations of kind of burial, gender of deceased, proximity of Scandinavian settlements, and identifying features found in the appendices, highlight problems of defining ethnicity from a scale of "Scandinavianess" in the artifacts without attention to differences in colony/ settlement/ transience and present a wealth of material yet to be fully plumbed. Redmond's analysis of traditional burials as seen at Crossmoor and Aspatria is interesting for its addition of geographic awareness, suggesting that these internments use earlier prehistoric barrows, association with transportation routes, and their relative isolation to reference a strong cultural identity. Type II burials—accompanied burials from Christian cemeteries—number at least twenty-two across eleven sites; they commonly held weapons but also might contain knives, whetstones, horse equipment in keeping with Scandinavian practices; other features, such as hogback tombstones, can be read as alien to both Anglo-Saxons and Scandinavians. Redmond suggests that these artifacts are evidence of non-Christian rites incorporated into Christian sites in order to specifically and cooperatively join these groups together but creating a set of funerary customs uncommon to both; it is a highly social reading of the interaction of patrons, religions, and influence in a complicated dance of absorption, assimilation, and resistance. These sites suggest that we are not dealing with culturally homogenous groups and that to address them all as Scandinavian is to miss the complexities of social interaction and the connotations of visual culture in the period.

John H. Williams has edited a beautiful book in *The Archaeology of Kent to AD 800*; Kent History Project (Woodbridge: Boydell) with key period contributions from Timothy Champion, "The Growth of Archaeology in Kent" (7–22) and Martin Welch, "Anglo-Saxon Kent to AD 800" (187–248). Part of a multi-volume publication series of the Kent History Project, it also fleshes out the picture of the county with a chapter

by Francis Wenban-Smith, "The Paleolithic Archaeology of Kent" (25–64), a chapter by Timothy Champion on "Prehistoric Kent" (67–132), and a chapter on "Roman Kent" by Martin Millett (135–184). There is no question that the book could be used in an upper college or graduate level class: a readable but still scholarly summary of massive quantities of research with citations for further reading, bolstered with two-page spreads on key sites, lovely clear maps, drawings, and color photographs. The photographs in the Anglo-Saxon section were useful for their presentation of less published material and for their captions with size comparisons; they were unfortunately blurry in many cases. One of the strengths of the arrangement is the way each author acknowledges that the periodization in the chapters is useful but not always as precisely delineated as convention would have it; particularly notable in the Roman and Anglo-Saxon chapters, the authors write sensitively about the cultural and material adoptions, alterations, and rejections as the social and political climate changes. Timothy Champion's historiographic essay on "The Growth of Archaeology in Kent" sets the context of county archaeology from the first recorded excavation of the Barham barrow around 1542 through the ardent but often unscientific excavations of the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, focusing on the more methodical studies of Faussett between 1759 and 1773 on the almost 800 graves at Gilton, Barfreston, and Kingston Down. What he sketches is the way nineteenth century archaeology in Kent really falls in with patterns of economic development and the roles of archaeologists such as George Payne, Charles Roach Smith, and Flaxman Spurrell, as well as the Kent Archaeological Society, in the development of maps of find spots, gazetteers, and bibliographies for the rich archaeological record of Kent. Of particular interest to readers here will be Martin Welch's chapter on Anglo-Saxon Kent, which sets the literary and historic record of settlement in the period against the archaeological record; the largest section is naturally on cemeteries and burials, with cogent discussion of the differences between western Kent (with Saxon characteristics seen in fifth-century Germany, its distinctive pairing of saucer and disc brooches in female graves, the common find of single spears in men's graves, and the greater distribution of cremations) and eastern Kent ("distinctively Kentish" and simultaneously cosmopolitan, gilt-silver castings, rarer cremations, greater Scandinavian brooch influence—with a lovely two-page overview of brooch types, Jute influenced pottery, Frankish weapons). There are also sections on early stone churches,

as at St. Mary Reculver, with discussion of the design, and Anglo-Saxon building types (sunken featured buildings at Monkton, Thanet, and Canterbury; post-built forms of the later seventh century, and highlighted accounts of Church Whitfield's settlement and Ebbsfleet water mill). The analysis of landscape, settlement distribution patterns, regions and lathes, and place names is somewhat scattered in both the beginning and the end of the chapter; while thorough, it would have been better as a coherent transition from Roman Britain. These are, however, minor complaints on a strong study that helps summarize the archaeological history of Kent up to 800 and our archaeological approach to the area both for itself and for its contextual connections to the rest of Britain.

FA

e. Artifacts and Iconography

The brief report by Barry Ager, Amy Cooper, and Gareth Williams, "The Harrogate Hoard: St Peter Islam & Thor in the Melting Pot," *British Archaeology* 97: 32–33, discusses the discovery of the Harrogate Hoard in North Yorkshire. David Whelan and his son Andrew made the discovery of the silver cup containing coins of many periods, including a coin of Edward the Elder of Wessex. The cup contained or was buried with sixty-seven pieces of silver, including four arm rings, broken-up brooches, ingots, rods, and 617 silver coins. Based on location, date, and content it is believed that this is a "Viking" hoard, meaning that it was probably left by Danes during their occupation of the Danelaw. It is considered the most important find of this type since the Cuerdale hoard was discovered in the early nineteenth century. The cup itself is the most important element of the find. It bears a great deal of similarity to another cup, this one discovered in 1815 at Halton Moor. Both cups are of Frankish origin, and both have vine scrolls with animals, and Christian symbols. Such cups have in the past been interpreted as church vessels, and so the authors posit that the Harrogate cup was looted from a Frankish monastery or church or was paid as tribute in Francia. Contents of the cup show a wide range of contacts, from Afghanistan to Ireland. Some coins are Islamic; some are from Viking York, one from Wessex. Of interest in the coins is one from Viking York issued in the name of Saint Peter. In the Latin version of the name, the "I" of Petri forms the stylized hammer of the Norse god Thor, suggesting that Thor was assimilated into Viking Christianity as Saint Peter during the early conversion stages. And while there are coins from Æthelstan's reign, there is also a Viking coin minted during that reign that has suggested to some that Æthelstan

did not have as complete a control of the North as has been often thought. As for the date, subsequent examinations of the site have not yielded further discoveries, and so it seems to be an isolated discovery.

LS

A. Blackwell's discussion of "An Anglo-Saxon Figure-Decorated Plaque from Ayton (Scottish border), Its Parallels and Implications," *Medieval Archaeology* 51: 165–172, details a 2003 find from the village Ayton, near the Scottish border of a 33.5 mm. copper-alloy plaque showing most of a frontal human figure (torso and head), holding a spear in each hand and wearing an elaborate helmet with inward curling horns. There are few parallels; the closest is the Finglesham buckle from a male grave site, but this is significantly different in that it shows traces of gilding where the Ayton plaque has none, and the position of the spears and arms of the figure is different; both plaques are placed around the first half of the seventh century. The Ayton plate also has a hole in the top, suggesting a possible secondary life for the buckle plate as jewelry. The iconography of the figure is still in scholarly dispute, possibly meant to be Odin or Woden, but Blackwell takes a cultural perspective on the figure's appearance to suggest that the plaque is part of a deliberate and consciously maintained connection between Scandinavian and Anglo-Saxon traditions. In keeping with recent interpretations of sites like Sutton Hoo and Scandinavian gold bracteates versus Anglo-Saxon silver versions, Blackwell reads the plaque as a possible visual part of a socially-constructed identity which linked militarily East Anglian and Northumbrian royalty in the first quarter of the seventh century.

FA

At first glance, it might appear that S. Brookes's "Boat-Rivets in Graves in Pre-Viking Kent: Reassessing Anglo-Saxon Boat-Burial Traditions," *Medieval Archaeology* 51: 1–18, about clench nails and the reuse of ship timbers in Anglo-Saxon burials would not appeal to any but archaeologists. This reexamination of ship burials in Anglo-Saxon England, however, appeals to a much wider audience. Brookes examines the survival of clench nails, so-called because they were shaped to literally clench the wood together, that indicate the reuse of ship timbers in some burials, especially in the sixth and seventh century in Kent. These burials show a deliberate reuse of these materials in a kind of "mock" or imitative boat burial rather than a burial on the scale of Sutton Hoo. This paper demonstrates further the wide-ranging economic and cultural contacts

of Kent in this period with Jutland and the Continent; these contacts were made by a thorough-going maritime community. What is surprising, however, is that Brookes shows that this sea-borne contact was carried out in ships made in Scandinavia. The author suggests that these "pseudo-boat burials" in Kent, since they are often placed in view of the sea-lanes, were statements of independence: that the inhabitants of Kent were resisting Frankish overlordship and Frankish Christian culture into the late seventh century. This symbolism seems also to be designed to call for unity between Kent and Jutland in the face of growing Frankish hegemony. As if this were not enough, Brookes also suggests that this symbolism of the ship and burial was taken up into Christian iconography and influenced such burial iconography in the eighth century at Christian centers such as Jarrow among others.

LS

In *Ohthere's Voyages*, ed. Bately and Englert [see sec. 7], Arne Emil Christensen studies "Ohthere's Vessel" (112–16) to discover what kind of ship Ohthere may have used on his voyage. Since only a handful of written Old Norse sources make mention of various ship types, such as *karve*, *karfi* and *sess*, and merely "a few fragmentary finds from western Norway are the only other archaeological parallels" (112) to give any indication of what specific ship Ohthere travelled in, Christensen entertains the possibility that the ship "could have been a purpose-built merchant vessel" (113) because Ohthere was on a trading journey. After investigating oak fragments and forests containing oak trees, Christensen proposes that "Ohthere had a vessel of roughly the same type as the Gokstad and Tune ships, but [it was] most likely built of pine" (114). An illustration of the sail plan of the Gokstad supplements the short essay and provides readers with a visual reference of the type of vessel that Ohthere may have sailed in. Because so little evidence exists relating to the type of ship and the material used, Christensen's essay is somewhat speculative; however, concerted effort is made to demonstrate what type of vessel Ohthere used by drawing on literary records, archaeological artifacts and the Norwegian landscape.

MR-O

The collection of essays in *Collectanea Antiqua: Essays in Memory of Sonia Chadwick Hawkes*, ed. by Henig and Smith [see sec. 2], reflect her key interests and some of her personal eclecticism, with papers on such diverse topics as Anglo-Saxon weaponry, Sir John Soane's Greek vase collections (Tyler Jo Smith), key

figures in British archaeological scholarship (Martin Henig, Arthur MacGregor), and personal reflections of her and the history of the Oxford Institute of Archaeology. This review looks at the archaeological essays particularly; essays on historiography and memorials of Chadwick Hawkes can be found elsewhere in this YWOES. As a whole, what the archaeology articles clearly affirm is Hawkes's commitment to the art and archaeology of Anglo-Saxon England for its rich cultural interaction at moments of political and social transition. Birte Brugmann, Helena Hamerow, and Deborah K. Harlan in "The *Novum Inventorium Sepulchrale*: Anglo-Saxon Graves and Grave Goods from Kent in the Sonia Hawkes Archive" (45–47) is a historiographic and public-relations look at the project that grew from Hawkes's hopes for a published research corpus of the rich finds in Kent of graves and grave goods which now exists online at <http://web.arch.ox.ac.uk/archives/inventorium/>. This is a critical updating of Faussett's original research as well as publication of new finds, many with digital pictures and bibliography. Lydia Carr, in "Sonia Chadwick Hawkes and the 'Three Ships'" (49–51), revisits the question of Saxon integration into British culture following the Saxon migrations to Britain. Sonia Chadwick Hawkes long argued for a small invasion force, suggesting that the anthropology seemed to argue for Saxon social settlement patterns of men being sent on ahead of women and children, supported by the literary evidence from sources such as the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and the archaeological cemetery evidence. Carr reviews Hawkes's position, drawing in recent approaches to late Roman Britain that suggested a loose Romanization at the farm level and a population familiar with and accepting of Saxon social customs. The crux of Carr's paper also argues for a cultural view of cemeteries that emphasized social status (elite vs. non-elite) over racial make-up (foreign vs. native) and that the presence of weapons when compared against genetic height variation and grouping suggests a small pool of homogeneous descent but with strong inclusive tendencies that supports Hawkes's approach to the period. Sally Crawford's essay, "*Gomol is Snoteros?*: Growing Old in Anglo-Saxon England" (53–60) is an interesting mix of linguistic, historic, and archaeological analysis around the social implications of old age in Anglo-Saxon England. Crawford begins with a literary analysis to remind us that old age is a cultural construct, balancing the oft-cited negative perceptions from literature with analysis of the terms *eald*, *frod*, *har*, and *gamol*, suggesting their positive weighting as an indication of value for leadership, authority, and wisdom. She follows this with analysis of

the historic sources, drawing attention to the age of ecclesiastics particularly and the valuation of their experience and wisdom; Crawford is sensitive to the social parameters that might manifest themselves in key differences between the ecclesiastic and secular populations, particularly in her analysis of the literary references for kings that point to political inheritance as a facet in the world of Charlemagne, Louis the Pious, and the literary figure Iliach's (in the Irish poem *Táin*). Finally, her analysis of the archaeological record is sensitive to problems of physically typing human remains for age and extrapolating to population distribution, but she suggests the social status indication of grave goods as a decline more in quality than in quantity of grave goods, which suggests a change in status from child-bearing to old women, from warriors to men who are too old to be warriors. William Filmer-Sankey's essay, "Was Redwald a European? Sutton Hoo as a Reflection of British Attitudes to Europe" (61–66), is a historiographic analysis of scholarship on the Mound 1 grave finds and national(ist) identification. What his research traces is an intricate (and clearly not always conscious) dance between Sutton Hoo scholarship and Britain's national identity, from identification of objects as Saxon and therefore "not English" in the eighteenth and early nineteenth century, to the assertion of insular traits in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, to the push away from Germany towards Sweden during the years of World War II, to the factional scholarship that asserted a special relationship between East Anglia and Sweden despite differences in facture in the weapons, size, goods distribution, and ceremonial make-up between Mound 1 and the Vendel and Valsgärde boat graves, to a modern (in his view, temporary) quiet around questions of national relationships. Christine Finn's essay, "What We Call Home: Reflections on Ancient and Modern Settlement in Deal, East Kent, UK" (145–149) is an entirely personal reflection on the ways in which a sense of modern identification with her family home and the place of Deal help bring alive for her the find spots that Sonia Chadwick Hawkes excavated just inland at Northbourne and Finglesham. Brian Gilmour's essay, "Swords, *Seaxes* and Saxons: Pattern-Welding and Edged Weapon Technology from Late Roman Britain to Anglo-Saxon England" (91–109) aims at summarizing very technical information on the facture and distribution of particular weaponry in this period; condensing a good deal of information, it is still somewhat of a specialist approach, particularly in vocabulary, despite being an analysis that clearly helps us understand socio-cultural resonances around these objects, since Gilmour suggests that the technique was

done not for strength but largely for display. Gilmour addresses the facture process first, explaining the specialized skills for pattern-welding of long swords (classified as 75–90 cm and the primary form for almost all swords of the Anglo-Saxon period) and the use of wax resists in the decoration of swords; he then discusses iconographic issues with Roman sword decoration with the figure of Mars and the eagle and standard. Noting period phases, he suggests that the strong connection formally with Merovingian works in the pattern-welded swords of the period between the end of the Roman era and the late sixth century can be further examined for their regional identity, not just through metallographic analysis but through types of pattern. Variations on the herringbone pattern, made by twisting up to six rods to make the central portion of the blade, are common in northwest Europe and Anglo-Saxon England; English swords have a notable lack of distortion in the pattern. Looped patterns (welding two or more composite rods side by side and then grinding away the surface to show the internal composition) can be seen in the Frankish blade from Saltwood, but not in Anglo-Saxon blades, which don't show this labor- and material-intensive technique. Phase 2 of weapon survival (mid-seventh to mid-ninth century) is difficult to analyze because of changes in inhumation customs, but a re-emergence of votive deposition customs yields a few weapons with pattern-welding practices changing in the ninth century; in the last phase (mid-ninth to mid-eleventh century), we see the technique used not only on swords but also seaxes and spearheads, with a corresponding reduction in the complexity of the design. Gilmour's iconographic analysis, connecting the appearance of the pattern both to snakes and water (in literary sources and where swords are described as watered), is not always as persuasive as his technical analysis; the argument that the patterns were a deliberate period cultural identification is, however, substantially convincing. Kevin Leahy, in "Soldiers and Settlers in Britain, Fourth to Fifth Century—Revisited" (133–143), looks at an area of Sonia Chadwick Hawkes's 1961 study in belt fittings, generally considered against Continental examples as belonging to German *foederati*, whose presence in Britain was a facet of Roman treaty practice to open land on frontiers in exchange for military service. Their distribution in frontier areas, association with Germanic, not Roman style burials, and formal connections to Roman *cingulum* military belts but with Celtic elements of head and bird designs has led to the *foederati* conclusion. Leahy's map of their distribution in the south and east of England, especially against Roman military geography, calls this into

question (though Leahy is also sensitive to possibilities of perception based on incomplete fieldwork); concentrating on Lincolnshire, Leahy looks at distribution of the main types of belt fittings, noting that they are more common here than to the north or west, with Type IIA imported buckles tending to be in the north of Lincolnshire along main roads and Type IIB tending to the south in more open areas like Kirmington and Dragonby. While the buckles are clearly related to Continental Germanic military dress, whether they were evidence in Lincolnshire of *foederati* is unclear: many seem to have been locally produced, with few found near forts, indicating they were not used by garrisoning troops; Leahy posits a different military situation in the region, perhaps a local militia force in a society with a particularly Anglo-Saxon acculturation in late Roman England. The essay also contains a formal analysis by Barry Ager which suggests that the basic Type IIA buckle may be an insular version of the northern Gaul-Danube form of ca. 350–380, produced independently with very Anglo-Saxon variations in animal decoration. In “The Anglo-Saxon Cemetery at Old Park, Near Dover, Revisited” (111–126), Keith Parfitt and Tania M. Dickinson situate the Old Park cemetery as part of Hawkes’s approach to cemeteries and settlement culture in the Dour Valley, setting it first in its find history and landscape context. Though the full extent of grave goods cannot be known given the roughshod excavation/findings, the authors focus on the silver rim fitting (likely 530–570) for a probably wooden cup, decorated with animal patterning and four anthropomorphic stylized heads. It shows clear use of Salin Style 1, mirror imaging stamping typical of later fifth- and sixth-century luxury *pressblech* fittings from Scandinavia, and unusual connections to Scandinavian C-bracteate dies. Parfitt and Dickinson also discuss the now-missing-but-once-well-documented assemblage of tinned copper-alloy fittings from hanging bowls; the many pieces in similar decoration and facture suggest an unparalleled luxury of a matched set. Other Oak Park grave goods (an ivory casket, a metal bound wooden bucket, several swords and spears, possibly a shield boss, inlaid belt fittings) and other nearby cemeteries on the hills of the Dour Valley all point to tight settlement control of the region, and bespeak the wealth and cultural connections to Scandinavia and Kent of the Buckland area. George Speake’s article, “Interlace—Thoughts and Observations” (127–131) discusses interlace in Anglo-Saxon art as having markedly different forms in the works of the seventh century; the article focuses largely on Style II interlace from its highly dynamic and zoomorphic use in Scandinavian art well before the fifth

century, highlighting its differences in the works at Sutton Hoo and the Book of Durrow. Suggesting that its coil and confusion of space are directly related to filigree and calligraphic facture, Speake is also interested in cross-media influences. While not introducing new material, Speake summarizes some of the key formal issues around interlace, which serves to further draw attention to the history of scholarship around the design.

This slim volume, *The Sutton Hoo Helmet*, by Sonja Marzinzik, is part of the series British Museum Objects in Focus (London: British Museum). Pitched for a general reader, it contains a first chapter summarizing the find at Sutton Hoo and a concluding chapter on the sensational mystery of the man buried in Mound 1; Sutton Hoo makes a fabulous story, that’s certain. Marzinzik’s book is most useful in the two chapters on the helmet itself. The first discusses the find of the helmet along with the historiography of the reconstruction and the museum’s replica. The helmet’s current form uses over 500 fragments, often arranged by curvature and thickness as determined by the crest; the construction of the *wala*, the wire-wrapped ridge band running over the helmet, has clear textual parallels with the references in *Beowulf*. She then focuses on the Swedish Vendel period equivalents, which reproduce other crested helmets (Valsgärde, Sweden; Deurne, Netherlands), die stamps from Torslunda in clear line drawings and beautiful color images, and hint at the connotations of Roman modifications and Germanic burial practice as related to helmets. Marzinzik’s inclusion of supplemental images, maps, glossary, and selected bibliography make this a useful introductory guide.

FA

In “Medieval Cross Slabs in the North Riding of Yorkshire: Chronology, Distribution and Social Implications,” *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal* 79: 155–93, Aleksandra McClain carries out a systematic archaeological investigation of the cross slabs of the North Riding of Yorkshire, providing a survey of their stylistic features as they developed throughout the Middle Ages, while also analyzing the monuments within their physical and social contexts. Using a methodology designed with the aim of providing a tightly defined and manageable sample set of monuments, yet equally large enough to gather significant data and record useful patterns, McClain analyzed all stone non-effigial monuments found in churches or chapels dating from the eleventh to the sixteenth centuries. Since “cross slabs were powerful social communicators because they

were connected to patrons who hailed primarily from the elite secular and spiritual classes” (186), McClain contends that study of these monuments in their social and conceptual contexts is long overdue. She provides a thorough investigation into their various functions within a wider context than just the North Riding, since the Riding itself “exhibits such sharp geographical and social differences to its surroundings, [providing] all the more reason for it to be studied and compared with the other Ridings and northern England” (158). Useful appendices cataloging data collected in North Riding Churches with cross slabs and graphs illustrating the number of monuments per site across the entire Riding provide readers with a clear perspective of the scale of McClain’s undertaking. The article outlines “how the study of monumental commemoration can move beyond the construction of typological and chronological trajectories of development” (186), as McClain thoroughly investigates the slabs in detail. Overall, McClain not only explores how, in some instances, medieval cross slabs had an unusually direct influence from tenth- and eleventh-century Anglo-Scandinavian monument styles, but she also conveys how the continuity between cross slabs can be illustrated conceptually by scrutinizing the modern burial practices that correspond with late medieval burial customs.

Given Éamonn Ó Carragáin’s immense scholarly contribution to numerous areas of medieval studies, it is both fitting and unsurprising that he was presented with a book in his honor. *Text, Image, Interpretation, Studies in Anglo-Saxon Literature and its Insular Context in Honour of Éamonn Ó Carragáin*, ed. Minnis and Roberts (see sec. 2), includes twenty-six essays covering a number of disciplines and themes to which Ó Carragáin has made invaluable contributions. Due in part to antiquarian interest in monuments like Anglo-Saxon stone crosses that first began to draw public interest in the mid-eighteenth century, England now has an impressive collection of pre-Scandinavian monuments, which has allowed for much scholarly discussion of this group of Anglo-Saxon sculptures. With much of the groundwork laid down concerning common features and differences between the various sculptures, more specific studies relating to individual motives behind those responsible for creating these monuments has flourished, thanks in part to Ó Carragáin’s outstanding facilitation and contribution to this area of study. He is recognized in relation to the study of Anglo-Saxon stone crosses in Jane Hawkes’s “Gregory the Great and Angelic Mediation: The Anglo-Saxon Crosses of the Derbyshire Peaks” (431–448). At the heart of the essay, Hawkes examines

the significance of the Peak District sculptures, focusing her attention on the angelic settings etched into the stone monuments. Between the seventh and ninth centuries in Anglo-Saxon England “angels functioned as figures of contemplation in fellowship with humanity” (439), and accordingly, angels were not only viewed as heavenly beings, but akin to men and “fellow-servants” of God. Hawkes notes the close link between the angelic and the human is reflected in liturgy which, in turn, is specifically highlighted in Gregory the Great’s works, such as his Homilies on Ezekiel and *Moralia*. With this in mind, attention turns to Gregory’s ideas that angels played important roles in the act of contemplation, and this is illustrated with an examination of an image of Gregory situated on a cross in Bradbourne. This visual commentary explicitly presents Gregory as Scribe paired with two clerical figures in the panel revealing the importance he placed on contemplation. Overall, Hawkes emphasizes the complex setting of the monuments’s production, and stresses how the “designers seem[ed] to have been concerned, on the one hand, to encourage the active participation of each viewer in the most central of processes (contemplation of the divine), while at the same time, to define their ecclesiastical role as one that integrated the contemplative with the active and the pastoral” (448). Along with several photos of the monuments that accompany the text offering complementary visual aids, Hawkes provides a thought-provoking reading of angels depicted on several Anglo-Saxon monuments alongside their relationship to Gregory the Great’s teachings.

In the same volume, Carol Neuman de Vegvar’s “Converting the Anglo-Saxon Landscape: Crosses and their Audiences,” *Text, Image, Interpretation*, 407–29, provides a panoramic view of the crosses that punctuated the Anglo-Saxon landscape and highlights the intended function and original location of extant crosses. Given that surviving Anglo-Saxon records provide various reasons for erecting crosses, Neuman de Vegvar asserts that “the need to observe and record these crosses at all suggests that their respective emplacements do not reflect predictable cultural norms” (409). Because many of the crosses are fragmentary and some cross-shafts do not have an original apex, it has been proposed that some of these forms may have served numerous functions apart from being crosses, such as standing as obelisks or being positioned as beacons demonstrating their association with Rome and imperium. Although the precise function of incomplete crosses is unclear, to make matters worse, as Neuman de Vegvar claims that the

exact location in which the crosses originally stood is equally uncertain. She claims that several English monuments have been relocated from where they were originally erected, sometimes more than once. Additionally, since “the pre-Conquest history of the sites of these crosses is often obscure, it is uncertain if they have been moved locally or a considerable distance” (410). Apart from outlining problems associated with the monuments, two possibilities concerning the crosses’ function are considered. Firstly, in the context where crosses were covered with vegetal motifs, they “may have been seen as weather crosses, deflecting harmful storms and providing spiritual insurance of a good harvest” (415), thus exemplifying an interrelation between pagan recidivism and Christianity. A possible alternative function for remotely situated crosses focuses on the protective correlation between ecclesiastical institutes and the countryside, where “these crosses may have served as stopping points and ritual stations for Rogationtide processions” (420). Within the lay population, such stone crosses could serve as markers indicating predetermined stopping areas for Rogationtide prayers while sacralizing the landscape and serving to remind Anglo-Saxons “given to more secular and unrestrained vernal celebrations, of the Christian and penitential nature of Rogations” (424). Both weather-magic crosses and Rogationtide processional markers may have existed alongside each other, and a more scripturally oriented reading arrangement subsequently reveals the measures taken by the Church to “save their crops along with their souls” (426). Neuman de Vegvar provides an insightful and thought-provoking analysis of the function of Anglo-Saxon vegetal crosses and accompanies her study with a useful table outlining a list of non-figural crosses/shafts decorated primarily with vegetal motifs between the eighth to tenth centuries.

An established tradition in Ireland with an unknown date of origin and associated with a votive or bile tree is the veneration of natural springs or holy wells. Niamh Whitfield queries whether a number of sacred wells that stand next to freestanding inscribed early medieval cross-slabs in Ireland and Scotland may not only have functioned as remedial sites, but also places where baptism occurred, as she ponders “A Suggested Function For the Holy Well?” *Text, Image, Interpretation*, 495–513. Since a Christianized “Ireland had no grand tradition of architecture comparable to that in the Romanized world” (497), Whitfield asserts that “the holy well [could] have been the Irish counterpart to the detached baptistries attached to large Continental churches” (497) within the early medieval

period. Drawing on evidence throughout Britain over more than a millennium, Whitfield engages readers by providing comparative literary and sculptural evidence to support her claim. She examines existing evidence from the Anglo-Saxon period acknowledging that English wells functioned as baptistries, and highlights more recent Irish accounts that demonstrate the use of wells as baptismal sites around 1800 AD. Effectively, the paper elucidates that “the use of water from holy wells for baptism probably goes back to the beginnings of Christianity itself in Ireland” (499). Utilizing a range of early medieval literary sources from Ireland, Anglo-Saxon England, and Wales supplemented with a number of liturgical and biblical references, supported by comparative monumental evidence from Anglo-Saxon England, and strengthened with further proof from traditional folklore, Whitfield provides a convincing argument that sacred wells functioned as baptismal vessels in the early centuries of Christianity in Ireland. If, at all, there are any alternative functions of holy wells in early medieval Ireland, they may very well still be open to interpretation, however this essay proposes a compelling case for at least one function and provides a considerable amount of supporting evidence to reinforce the claim that they were used as baptistries.

Also in *Text, Image, Interpretation*, Michael Ryan’s “Sacred Cities?,” 515–29, examines evidence of early medieval Irish ecclesiastical communities and investigates the number of priestly orders that may have been typical within such communities. Ryan suggests that one reason there is no way of telling just how many churches once existed on Irish sites such as Armagh, Clonmacnois, Kells, and Lismore is the non-survival of wooden churches, subsequently making for poor excavating prospects. Despite the lack of material evidence for wooden and earthen churches in Ireland, Ryan points out that excavation of surviving stone churches provide insight into various aspects of church life in early tenth-century Ireland. Supported by evidence from the stone churches, Ryan assesses pastoral care, processions, liturgy, and congregational size within the medieval Irish church. Further to this, the essay outlines the “altar-like features variously called *leachta*, *altóir*, and *ulaí*” (522), and analyzes examples in greater detail with accompanying illustrative plates. The foremost argument of the essay, which Ryan also discusses in a different publication, is “that the Irish church clusters represent, at least partly, a conscious attempt in many cases to produce a simulacrum of Rome itself” (527). Although Ryan points out that there is no method to prove conclusively that the

Irish church community aspired to replicate the Holy City, strong evidence within medieval Irish literature suggests that this is the case. This notion is reinforced by “writers of the period [who] often refer to church sites as ‘cities’, and the [eighth-century] term *ruam* is applied to a foundation within a cemetery because it resembled Rome” (527). For readers interested in the early Irish church, this essay succinctly hypothesizes what medieval Irish church life and structure may have included while providing insight into some of the actual ecclesiastical sites where evidence of religious and lay activities occurred.

While surviving medieval iconography of the Last Judgment is not scarce by any means, readings of the iconography on its own merits can provide further insight into early Medieval modes of thought. Anna Maria Luiselli Fadda’s essay “The Mysterious Moment of Resurrection in Early Anglo-Saxon and Irish Iconography,” *Text, Image, Interpretation*, 149–167, provides a thoughtful and thorough assessment of two surviving icons, an ivory panel, housed in the Victoria and Albert Museum, which represents the Last Judgment, and the Cross of the Scriptures monument or High Cross of Clonmacnois, Ireland. Luiselli Fadda evaluates “the ‘language’ which the two anonymous artists used to depict their understanding of the resurrection of the body after death” (152), and highlights how the two images belong to a complex series of religious art focusing on salvation. Particular emphasis is placed on consideration of the icons in relation to time and the resurrection, stressing how the depictions articulate time “not according to the human experience...but rather according to the sacral dimension of time” (152). Luiselli Fadda further discusses the iconography in relation to the written biblical sources that the two pieces draw upon, underlining their function as “sermons in stone” (155), which enabled Christians continuous opportunities for edification and reflection. In addition to the specific scriptural references and patristic commentary relating to the icons, an analysis of the soul in relation to bird imagery is featured. Luiselli Fadda contends that not only is bird imagery evident in patristic exegesis, but she delves further into ancient history, demonstrating that images of the soul in connection with bird imagery can be referenced back to the Eastern influences of Ancient Egypt. Though the iconography under scrutiny cannot be identified as being part of an Egyptian revival, “much evidence appears to confirm it” (16) as such. Overall, the essay attentively exemplifies how the two anonymous artists offer theological explanations of the resurrection “in line with Christian thought”

(165), and do so with great dramatic vigor, while also demonstrating their own fixation “on the mystery of life beyond death, on the body and on the soul” (167).

“Why Sight Holds Flowers: An Apocryphal Source for the Iconography of the Alfred Jewel and Fuller Brooch” by Charles D. Wright, *Text, Image, Interpretation*, 169–186, assesses the treatment of differing elements and similarities between the Alfred Jewel and the Fuller Brooch, illuminating the handling of the “Osiris pose” represented on both artifacts. Wright suggests that the “Osiris pose” model was used on both pieces “because the foliate or floriated objects such figures regularly hold [are] thought to have some literal or figural relevance to the faculty or organs of Sight” (174). Though the flowers depicted on both artifacts depict different varieties of flowers, Wright takes care not to categorize the florae because ornamental plants depicted in medieval art were sometimes taken from a pattern and not from nature. After evaluating other academic theories attempting to classify the plants, Wright cautiously endeavors to identify them by consulting plant physiologist, Professor Mosbah M. Kushad, who states with some certainty that the objects held by Sight in the Fuller Brooch are floral, although no particular variety can be identified. Upon verifying the plausibility that the artists of both the Alfred Jewel and Fuller Brooch “thought flowers (together with large, wide-open eyes) were the appropriate attribute for Sight” (177), Wright turns his attention to questioning why flowers were held by Sight. A version of the apocryphal Book of the Secrets of Enoch (II Enoch) is said to hold the key, since it describes Adam’s complete creation including the foundation of his eyes which are made from flowers. Wright asserts that the apocryphal text was known and quite popular in early medieval England, and similarly, the Adam Octipartite motif was evident in Old English texts. Wright further explores the Old English texts, claiming that “one group of Adam Octipartite texts, including two Old English versions, the eyes—specifically their ‘variety’ (i.e. of colouration)—are said to have been created not from the sun, as in II Enoch, but from a pound of flower(s)” (179). The essay draws to a close by turning attention back to the Alfred Jewel and Fuller Brooch, where Wright claims that both artifacts represent a “distinctively Anglo-Saxon iconography of Sight that adapted the ‘Osiris pose’ model to exploit the felicitous congruence of its characteristic floriated rods or plant-stems with the apocryphal tradition whereby God is said to have created the eyes from a pound of flower(s)” (183). An implicit interpretation of the Alfred Jewel involves the encouragement

and pursuit of wisdom and learning, as the Osiris pose suggests that with sight, humans can access and obtain wisdom through the act of reading. The Osiris motif on the Fuller Brooch, on the other hand, can be read in a more spiritual sense relating to the eternal soul or "mind's eyes" (183). Both artifacts point towards spiritual edification; thus, Wright concludes with an examination of *episcopus* meaning 'overseer', and proposes that the Fuller Brooch may have been made for Alfred's Archbishop of Canterbury, Plegmund. Wright gives readers an intriguing view of the Osiris motif in two Anglo-Saxon artifacts and offers several insights into the purpose for and use of both pieces.

In "The Representation of the Apostles in Insular Art, with Special Reference to the New Apostles Frieze at Tarbat, Ross-shire," *Text, Image, Interpretation*, 473–94, George Henderson considers the representation of the apostles in painted images, mosaics, and sculptural art in early medieval Europe, with special emphasis on Anglo-Saxon and Celtic examples. Henderson highlights the most common early medieval images of the apostles involving their commission to go and preach, in addition to the visualization of Matthew 19 involving the apostles and Christ at his Second Coming. He notes that traditional specifications in representations of the apostles became less popular as interest in different aspects of their lives became more widespread throughout western Europe. Henderson argues that among seventh- and eighth-century Irish scholars who imported their representation of the apostles from Rome, there was an enthusiastic concentration on both the apostles' physical appearance and heroic qualities. Further still, in instances such as on the North Cross at Castledermot, County Kildare, where depictions of biblical heroic and typological scenes are displayed, figures not customarily adding up to twelve "reasonably lay claim to being apostles on several Irish monuments" (477–80). Further examples of art and sculptures typifying the apostles are given in relation to both a scriptural and non-scriptural basis, with several sizeable photos supplementing the essay. At the heart of Henderson's paper is an examination of the Tarbat frieze in Easter Ross, which underwent reconstruction after the sculpture's initial discovery in 1995. He notes that "the Tarbat frieze of apostles is iconographically and stylistically informative, [and] indeed explicit" (493). Essentially, the representation of the apostles on the sculpture provides a practical demonstration of "the stage of absorption and adaptation of Continental models similar to that represented by the Hedda Shrine in the Anglo-Saxon midlands, while the clarity of its outlines and its scored and serrated

surface treatment argue its connection with panel and perhaps also manuscript painting" (493). Henderson's commentary on the Tarbat frieze and its relationship to artistic representations of the apostles broadens our understanding of the entire Insular Church's devotion to the apostles and will engage readers with special interest in medieval religious iconography, ecclesiastical history, and art history.

Another specific iconographical study can be found in "The Winwick Cross and a Suspended Sentence" by Richard N. Bailey, *Text, Image, Interpretation*, 449–472. This comprehensive essay reexamines the Winwick Cross, the largest cross to survive from Anglo-Saxon England, standing on St. Oswald's church at Winwick on the Lancashire/Cheshire border. With accompanying images and illustrative plates, Bailey assesses the panels depicted on each side of the cross and offers interpretations of each. While revisiting his previous 1980 interpretation of Face B, which portrays a figure suspended upside-down by two other figures, he withdraws his earlier suggestion that the scene is a representation of the death of Isaiah. Armed with stronger historical evidence and an actual rubbing of the panel, Bailey offers alternate readings of the scene, suggesting that the image might be Saint Oswald, while he rejects a number of other unlikely possibilities based on comparisons to analogous Celtic representations and analyses of patristic and apocryphal texts. The most prominent reading of Face B discussed in the essay concentrates on "sculptural analogies from the Celtic world" (469) where the "iconography draws upon a complex of interrelated 'attack and suffering' scenes which are exemplified on early medieval sculpture from Ireland and Scotland" (469), while furnishing the item with a new Christian meaning. This reassessment is noteworthy not only because it offers more plausible readings of the panel, but also because the most prominent reading involving the damned awaiting hell is the only surviving "depiction of suspended souls in Insular pre-Norman art" (471).

Since little consideration has been given to the subject of embroideries with inscriptions in recent years, Elizabeth Coatsworth's "Text and Textile," *Text, Image, Interpretation*, 187–207, explores surviving textiles with inscriptions from early medieval Western Europe. Embroidery with inscription can be arranged in four categories which include: "those commemorating donors, commissioners, makers or owners; those which identify something in or on the textile; those which tell a story; and those which make a statement" (188). Coatsworth assesses a number of surviving examples and concludes that embroidery

with inscription served communities in ways that tapestries in later centuries functioned. She asserts that “evidence suggests that embroidery [was used] as a medium for display, for decoration, for teaching, and indeed for propaganda” (207). Informative on the many uses of textiles with inscriptions, this essay also sheds light on those who both created and used these materials whether for secular or religious purposes.

Fragments of History: Rethinking the Ruthwell and Bewcastle Monuments by Fred Orton and Ian Wood, with a contribution from Clare Lees, is an ambitious, collaborative study offering alternative archaeological and art-historical interpretations of these two premier surviving stone sculptures. Assembling revised articles published over the last decade or so, focusing on the monuments’ origins, contexts, structure, functions and reception, the book offers a wide range of interdisciplinary interpretations of the Ruthwell and Bewcastle sculptures. Including research in history, art history, ecclesiastical history and antiquarianism, medieval literature, archaeology, philosophy, and gender studies, the book will appeal to researchers in a wide spectrum of academic disciplines. While there is the danger that a collaborative effort of this scale might be unsuccessful, the volume is well organized and presented coherently as a whole, with chapters ranging from “place,” “fragments,” “style,” “time,” “textuality,” “identity,” and the similarities and differences therein. Although the wide-ranging discussion is for the most part successful, some medievalists may balk at a few issues raised by Orton such as whether or not the original forms of the Ruthwell and Bewcastle monuments were actually crosses. However, challenges to empirical views demonstrate the importance of understanding why certain notions may be more acceptable than others, while acknowledging that reassessment of traditional views can further strengthen and confirm their suitability and relevance. Orton focuses attention on new interpretations of the monuments and offers some strikingly fresh approaches to looking at the sculptures. He suggests that elusiveness of carved details stirs an awareness of the sculptor’s actions. Orton claims that “lines, which here are formed by shadows at the edges where shallow planes meet...seem to cling to the body...we must look into shadow to perceive what [is] there; shadows slow the way we come to understanding of form” (86). As Orton concentrates on form, structure, and style, Wood contextualizes the monuments by concentrating on their functions, and reflects on varied forms of monastic communities in the regions while also considering the cult of the crosses in Northumbria. Lees

offers further discussion on the relationship between the *Dream of the Rood* and the Ruthwell Cross, and additionally reflects on using senses. Apart from oral and aural, she emphasizes a multi-sensory analysis of and experience with the monument by looking on “the very kinetic and kinaesthetic processes, the different levels of movement, interaction of body and mind, sense and cognition that it was almost certainly made to effect in the first place” (169). The work comes to a close with a brief segment on class and ideology, in which the creators and users of the Ruthwell and Bewcastle monuments are said to have been both religious and secular aristocrats. In reviewing the work discussed in the book, Wood, Orton and Lees conclude that “no refined and spiritual things, like the Bewcastle and Ruthwell monuments, could exist were it not for the struggle for the crude and material things” (203). Overall, this work will benefit scholars in a variety of fields, and although it is not entirely persuasive, it both tests and respects understanding of the stone sculptures and forces readers to acknowledge the importance of questioning accepted claims. It effectively demonstrates how different disciplines can combine ideas and focus on a subject, such as these two often studied monuments, and presents them in a new light, offering fresh interpretations and insight with theoretical sophistication.

MR-O

The festschrift honoring George Hardin Brown, *Cross and Culture in Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. Jolly et al. (see sec. 2), presents four essays dealing with archaeological and material cultural themes in the section of the volume titled “The Cross as Image and Artifact” (see also Numismatics entries for essays by Gannon and Blackburn). Carol Neuman de Vegvar offers “In Hoc Signo: The Cross on Secular Objects and the Process of Conversion,” 79–117. De Vegvar begins with an overview of the cross in the early and late-antique church, from decoration to the sign of the cross on the person; she also covers some elements of daily life and the use of the sign of the cross in marking possessions by the laity, even on secular objects. Turning to Anglo-Saxon England, de Vegvar notes the evidence indicating use of the cross both as a gesture and as a physical sign on material objects seemingly used to ward off evil in the form of elves. The remainder of the article focuses on the use of the cross as a mark on physical objects such as helmets, pendants, cups and goblets, and tableware. The latter is of particular interest to this writer; crosses on utensils seems to coincide with the making the “sign of the cross” as a gesture at mealtime, in part at least

since food and spoons, cups, and horns were thought to be particularly susceptible to demonic influence and an unaware Christian might ingest such a demon if the creature were not warded off. Thus, the sign of the cross is not simply a mark of Christian identity, even in the early period of Christianization of the Anglo-Saxons. It was also a mark of protection, a talisman against evil.

Following Neuman de Vegvar are Gale Owen-Crocker and Win Stephens with "The Cross in the Grave: Design or Divine?" (118–52). This article begins by disabusing the reader of a long and widely held notion: the presence of grave goods does not necessarily indicate a pagan burial; even in Christian Rome in the fourth century it was not uncommon to bury the Christian dead with grave goods. The authors note that the inclusion of grave goods was a practice that continued throughout the Anglo-Saxon period, though after the seventh century the practice declined and seems to have been more reserved for high status individuals. As a result, the majority of grave goods dating to our period come from before or during the early conversion period. Objects with inscribed crosses have been found in many of these ostensibly pagan graves, and the authors wish to examine a selection of those objects to address whether these graves might reflect a remembered artistic style, an appreciation of balanced design, a result of continental influence, or might reflect some form of Christian belief. After examining a number of such artifacts, complete with multiple diagrams and a few black and white photographs, the authors conclude that the presence of the cross and other Christian symbols cannot wholly be put to other explanations but originated in Christian art and indicate a probable Christian presence. One example of this is in Kent, in which glass grave goods inscribed with the cross and Chi-Rho have been found dating to before the Augustinian mission, suggesting a continued Christian presence there in the pre-Augustine, post-migration period of the fifth and sixth centuries. If this is the case in this situation, then it opens up this interpretation as a possibility in other places and kingdoms in Britain during the same period.

LS

Gale Owen-Crocker's "The Bayeux Tapestry: The Voice from the Border," *Signs on the Edge*, ed. Keefer and Bremmer [see sec. 6], 235–258, sets the border decoration of this embroidery into the understanding of other borders in medieval art, a contextualization that helps to emphasize key issues of the ways in which borders comment on the central narrative, the interplay of geometric and zoomorphic representation, issues

of facture, iconographic parallels in textiles and manuscripts, with all of the attendant issues of connotations of luxury and opulence. One of the most interesting elements of this article is Owen-Crocker's analysis of the production process as a planned whole, suggesting through the stitch placement that the disjunction between top/bottom border, inscriptions, and main scene resulted at the time of the cartoon's application to the linen. Her analysis focuses on plants and animals primarily, looking at the ways in which composition (heraldic adorning, opposition, color and direction) can be read to emphasize certain portions of the narrative (such as above the advancing Normans). In using naturalism, heraldic-style abstraction, and fanciful hybrids, Owen-Crocker sees not a single consistent rebellious point of view but digs aimed at the elite of both cultures and "anti-Norman ironies to be appreciated by the abbey community at Canterbury who knew the illustrated manuscripts in their own and neighboring library as well as the Tapestry designer did" (253).

In "The Interpretation of Gesture in the Bayeux Tapestry," *Anglo-Norman Studies* 29 (2007 for 2006): 145–78, Gale Owen-Crocker considers the gestural vocabulary of the Tapestry. Considering figures with both hands occupied, those who gesture with the unoccupied hand, and figures who use both hands to gesture, Owen-Crocker finds a limited vocabulary of gestures which draw clearly on manuscript models (which has been discussed in many other fora), Classical theater, ritual contexts, monastic sign language, and some spontaneous mundane gestures in order to create a very clear context of meanings associated with those gestures. Owen-Crocker goes on to catalog gestures but to draw attention to the ways in which the pointing finger is a gesture that can cross visual lines, such as when the figure points to an inscription, thus creating a connection between the narrative reality and the visual presentation experienced by a viewer. Similarly, gestures can create a narrative continuity between scenes. Her analysis of the common open-handed gesture as one of speech (using the appearance of the messenger who delivers the news to William about Harold) is provocative as it argues for the opening scene being one of Harold speaking to Edward rather than the emphasis being placed on Edward's pointing gesture. The mysterious and controversial scene of Ælfgva and the cleric is discussed in detail but not resolved, with the author sketching the further ambiguities of the cleric's cupping gesture (which she associates with the Raising of Lazarus) and her acquiescing gesture (taken from Roman stage manuals and associated with Hope in Prudentius). Ultimately, this

is a study forming part of the analysis of the performative theatricality of the Tapestry as a work of art, drawing meaning from and perpetuating meaning in its community.

FA

f. Numismatics

Mark Blackburn's "Crosses and Conversion: The Iconography of the Coinage of Viking York ca. 900" appears within the Cross as Image and Artifact section in *Cross and Culture in Anglo-Saxon England, 172–200*. The coinage of Viking York according to Blackburn displays a deliberate program of design influenced by political agendas, which is not necessarily displayed in other early medieval coinage nor can be wholly attributed to cultural influences from the south of England or the continent. After a brief review of the establishment of the two kingdoms of the Danelaw, Blackburn notes the details on the coinage, and the control that the Vikings exercised over the mint at York. These details coupled with that control strongly suggests that given the imagery on the coins, often innovative, containing over forty different combinations, considerable care was exercised in the production of these coins and their iconography. The remainder of the article examines the cross as a symbol on these coins, noting that there are multiple forms: the Greek cross, the cross-crosslet design, patriarchal cross, the cross on stepped pedestal, and the Christogram. Blackburn then also examines other enhancements that emphasize the cross on the coins as well as cruciform inscriptions and liturgical inscriptions. There are black and white photos that illustrate each item the author examines. Blackburn concludes that the designs were not merely copied from coinage in the south, but rather drew on iconography current in York; too many of these coins are original designs and not copies or even look-alikes. Taken together, the Viking leaders of York seem to have quickly perceived the advantages of accepting Christianity as a political and cultural tool to garner acceptance by their Anglo-Saxon, Carolingian, and British neighbors and trading partners.

LS

Mark Blackburn's "Currency under the Vikings; Part 3: Ireland, Wales, Isle of Man and Scotland in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries," *British Numismatic Jnl* 77: 119–49, should clearly be read in conjunction with the wealth of material on the North Sea economy that was published this year, as it is a study of the interaction between the Vikings and the coin economies they found in place as they raided and traded. The article not only plays out

the geographic distinctions but also chronological ones, with very useful literature summaries in each area. Blackburn's analysis is sensitive to hoard consistencies as a means of determining issues of indigenous coin circulation, the place of coinage in hoards of hacksilver and bullion versus display hoards with whole ornaments; the distribution of these coin hoards in the tenth century seems to cluster in the Midlands, where coinless hoards are almost absent. The distinctions between Ireland (and Wales, along a similar but much smaller sample size), with its increase in the decline of Danelaw coinage as well as a continuation of coins from Scandinavian York (939–954) and a noted increase in Anglo-Saxon coins after mid-century and the Isle of Man, with its late Viking presence but substantial wealth and established coin economy, are interesting, suggesting that north-west England was a circulatory route (Cuerdale particularly). Scotland completes the picture with a very different scenario because of the mixed hoards of the second half of the tenth century, suggesting less movement away from a bullion economy. The article finishes with very useful appendices of the coins from hoards and single finds in these areas.

William N. Clarke and David Symons present a tentative analysis of "The Mint of Aylesbury," *British Numismatic Jnl* 77: 173–89. With the acquisition of a new coin, it was a useful time to reassess the output of this relatively minor mint. The authors are careful not to draw too many firm conclusions from the tiny corpus of twenty-eight coins (cataloged in an appendix at the end). What is most interesting across the period for moneying activity (from Æthelred II Crux coins ca. 991–997 to the several series made under Edward the Confessor, mainly Radiate/Small Cross ca. 1044–1046 but through to Facing Busts ca. 1062–1065) is the weight analysis of coins from Aylesbury. The Crux issues are heavier, suggesting that they are later in the series and may possibly show the opening of the Aylesbury mint to replace nearby Buckingham for some reason. The weights of the eight coins in the Cnut Quatrefoils, ca. 1017–1023, suggest a possible chronology of the four moneyers; the five dies are distributed between London A (3), Oxford (1), and Winchester (1). The weights in the series of Radiate/Small Cross issued by Leofwine suggest a strong adherence to the 1.00g standard; Leofwine's connection to the Buckingham issues from periods on either side of the Aylesbury issues (ca. 1038–40 and ca. 1050–1053) argue as well for a connection between the mints. Hidden rather than highlighted by the authors, the suggestions that the Aylesbury mint might not have filled the need for Danegeld production but rather was a local mint

overshadowed by another nearby mint, and a mint operating as an issue of town status rather than actual need for coin are intriguing possibilities in search of larger sample confirmation.

Kristin Bornholdt Collins and Elina Screen, in "New Moneyers in Æthelred II's Benediction Hand Type," *British Numismatic Jnl* 77: 270–76, have published a preliminary study as part of a larger analysis on three hoards from the Dublin area from 1993 to 1994. The aims look to broaden our understanding of the issue of Hand-type coins from the reign of Æthelred II and their circulation in the Dublin economy prior to 995. The authors focus on the Benediction Hand type as twenty-eight new coins from seven new moneyers substantially update Kenneth Jonsson's catalogue of the 1980s. These new moneyers change our expectations of the size of the issue and the location of issuing mints, since only two of the seven fall into Jonsson's patterns of southern mints (Canterbury, London, Rochester) while the rest confirm substantial activity in the series in Chester and the continued dearth of material from north-eastern mints like Lincoln and York. The more complete picture that begins to emerge about the Benediction Hand is that it is indeed its own distinct type and a larger issue than once thought but correspondingly short-lived, advancing our picture of Æthelred II's coinage and cycles of recoinage in the early stages of his reign.

FA

In *Cross and Culture in Anglo-Saxon England* Ed. Jolly et al. [see sec. 2], Anna Gannon contributes "A Chip off the Rood: The Cross on Early Anglo-Saxon Coinage" 153–71). Gannon gives an overview of crosses on early Anglo-Saxon coinage with a focus on the Silver Series pennies. Her argument is that the cross was not a pattern, but a metaphor deliberately employed. She draws connections and parallels between the coinage and the Anglo-Saxon high monuments with crosses or in cruciform shape; one example is the coins that depict a figure with a cross in the right hand, while in the left the figure holds a bird, recalling the figure on the Bewcastle Cross with the same objects in the same hands. She argues that coins with the inhabited vine scroll on them recall some of the high status, monumental crosses, and they have Eucharistic overtones. Gannon then suggests that the coins that invoke this image and its message serve as "chips off the Rood" with all the implications that the connection to those powerful monuments involve."

LS

D.M. Metcalf investigates a curious puzzle in "Runic Sceattas Reading EPA, Types R1 and R2," *British Numismatic Jnl* 77, 49–70. The traditional understanding of these short-lived (700–710) sceattas has argued that they should be seen as a transition between East Kentish Series C and East Anglian series R, with the thorny question of which region is the originating source. Metcalf's article forces us to take a new look at the series, noting first a very conscious and careful copying of the C1 (rather than the C2) series that makes the R1 and R2 distinct from the many unofficial copies circulating at the time and perhaps partly explaining the continuity of the R3 *epa* runic inscription. The distribution patterns are significantly different from either Series C or Series R and very diffuse; Metcalf draws a number of possible scenarios to explain these finds, including minting scenarios for the small concentrations in Lincolnshire and Wessex, and more importantly die linking between specimens hundreds of miles apart, which might argue for minting further north or west, and distribution scenarios, where the idea of R1–2 as royal, versus ecclesiastical, coinage or trade patterns through London might account for distribution patterns. It is an article that matches distribution analysis against theoretical conclusions; it is not for a generalist. There is a standard catalogue of these sceattas at the end.

John Naylor's "The Circulation of Early-Medieval European Coinage: A Case Study from Yorkshire, c. 650–c. 867," *Medieval Archaeology* 51: 41–61, pairs modern quantitative and regression analysis with very specific regional analysis (Tees to the Humber east of the Pennines, or roughly the southern Northumbrian kingdom of Deira). The period is fascinating for the region as it is marked by considerable political shifts in the eighth century alongside the growing presence of the Church, which comes to an abrupt end with the Viking invasion of York; the distribution of coin types and loss can help us better understand the ways in which Anglo-Saxons used money at a time of a developing market economy. Naylor uses Reece's theories of coin loss, arguing that here in Deira "variations in patterns of coin loss can be interpreted in the coinage circulating (patterns follow the regional mean) or in the level of activity on the site (patterns deviate from the regional mean)." The earliest phase of gold thrymsas cluster around York, and they are primarily Southern issue (King Aldfrith, 685–705); the period also sees a large number of Early Continental Intermediate phase issues, minted in the Low Countries and found along Roman roads and the Humber, suggesting little local minting and consistent long-distance trade with toll and trading stops along the way. Conversely,

Secondary phase issues (ca. 710–760/90), particularly series Y, tend to be almost exclusively locally minted, confirming a recessionary period with less trade. The ninth century sees regionally produced, debased coinage—low-value pennies with a high brass content—but a very wide and heavier distribution pattern, suggesting increased monetary use with an interruption between 867 and around 900. After the general distribution analysis, Naylor focuses on specific dated styca coinage made in fifteen sites (Burton Fleming, Cotnam, Kilham, North Ferriby, South Newbald, Thwing in Humberside, Fishergate, ‘near Malton’ 1 and 2, ‘near York’, Ryther, Sherburn, Staxton, Whitby, and York). This analysis confirms the coin loss patterns: coins remaining in long circulation in the early period, local production increasing under Eadberht (737–758), decline and debasement in the late eighth century, changing with Offa of Mercia’s silver pennies. Naylor’s article is notably readable for non-numismatists, and highlights that in this region of Yorkshire, although we see expected growth in monetary use, we also see cycles of growth and decline pointing to patterns of long-distance vs. local trade, quality of mint issue, and monetary economy vs. other modes of exchange.

FA

Elina Screen’s study of ‘Anglo-Saxon Law and Numismatics: A Reassessment in the Light of Patrick Wormald’s *The Making of English Law*,’ *British Numismatic Journal* 77: 150–72, returns to coinage references in Anglo-Saxon laws while taking into account Wormald’s research on the laws. Screen states that since R. S. Kinsey’s consideration of coinage laws in connection with numismatics in the late 1950s, wider discussion of this topic has been virtually absent. Thus, Screen takes a thematic approach to explore the transmission and purpose of the laws, while also contextualizing laws concerning transactions and forgery. Drawing on a number of primary sources from Anglo-Saxon England, the author seeks to unravel the bundle of assumptions that plague readers’ perceptions of the nature of the Anglo-Saxon state and its economy. By reinforcing her work with references to Wormald’s sophisticated study, Screen aims to remove “the layers of assumptions interposed over the centuries by the transmission process and past study of the laws” (163). The article observes Anglo-Saxon law and coinage on ideological and practical levels, concluding that between coinage and written laws, altogether, along with “recent analyses of the purposes of legislative activity, royal intentions in legislating on the use of coinage fit well into the framework of law as a reflection of royal, Christian

ideology and the general purpose of legislation in creating an ordered, peaceful Christian society” (163). An exhaustive appendix dealing with references to coinage and the use of coinage in the laws is an additional feature in this thought-provoking article. Ultimately, Screen sheds new light on numismatics and Anglo-Saxon law, while also demonstrating that careful consideration is necessary in understanding the context of Anglo-Saxon “legislation within contemporary royal thought on Christian society” (164).

MR-O

Lord Stewartby and D.M. Metcalf examine an unusual Secondary phase silver sceatta from the first half of the eighth century in “The Bust of Christ on an Early Anglo-Saxon Coin,” *The Numismatic Chronicle* 167: 179–183. While Byzantine coins with the bust of Christ date to the reign of Justinian II (685–95, 705–11) and are repeated in imitation of this model from early on, Northern coins do not follow this Mediterranean type except in isolated instances (such as Sven Estrithson, Denmark, 1047–74). The sceatta is marked with a facing head, and a clear cross with three visible terminals behind the head; the reverse has a stylized bird facing to the left, a snake between its feet. The authors cite Anna Gannon’s work on iconography, suggesting the imagery of bird and snake indicates the struggle between good and evil or Christ’s victory over death. They further contextualize the appearance of busts of Christ on coins, citing the Quinsextine Council of 692 as prompting iconographic change away from non-human representations of Christ. The coin is part of the varied series known as Series Q, likely before 720 to just after 730 in the first block of the series, likely in the workshop of a single die cutter, though from what mint site is unclear (likely west Norfolk). The authors clearly concur with Gannon with the proliferation of Christian imagery on early Anglo-Saxon coinage, and suggest that the coin fits with a picture of minting that extended to the cultural centers of minsters in the eighth century, perhaps at a site like Medeshamstede (Peterborough) or the foundation at North Elmham (near Dereham).

FA

g. Miscellaneous

In ‘Old English Runic Inscriptions: Textual Criticism and Historical Grammar,’ (in *Beowulf and Beyond*, ed. Sauer and Bauer [see sec. 4b] 69–87), Alfred Bammesberger scrutinizes earlier reconstructions and interpretations of inscriptions and offers corrections based on Old English grammar, while also shedding light on new interpretations of the inscriptions. Anglo-Saxonists

interested in inscriptions and those who concentrate their studies on more linguistic aspects of Anglo-Saxon studies will benefit from Bammesberger's thought-provoking investigation of inscriptions contained on the Harford Farm Brooch, the Brandon Antler, the Overchurch Stone, and the Ruthwell monument. In the case of the Brandon Antler runic inscription, the line *wohs wildum deoræ an* (or possibly *deoræ on*) may indicate that the text originated in the riddle tradition, while the word *fusæ* in its line sequence within the Ruthwell Crucifixion poem, is likely to have an adverbial function.

MR-O

Donata Bulotta presents a detailed (and somewhat thickly written) linguistic analysis in "Anglo-Saxon female clothing: Old English *cyrstel* and *tunece*," *Rivista di cultura classica e medioevale* 49(2): 307–325. The value of this article is in applying a new field of study to the very fragmentary archaeological record of textiles from the Middle Saxon period in order to overcome that barrier to understanding garment appearance and cultural significance. Looking at the specific terms *cyrstel* and *tunece* first in etymology and then in their literary instances, Bulotta focuses on the references that connect the garment to women specifically, using the female version of the Benedictine Rule (Wintenny Version), women's wills, and Ælfric's *Life of Saint Agnes*, as well as general non-gendered or male gendered references in West Saxon, Northumbrian, and Mercian translations of the Gospels. The analysis of *cyrstel* in the Benedictine context suggests that it was part of the typical clothing of nuns: "*mentel, cyrtel, meon, hose, gyrdel, seax, greffe, needle, sceat...*"; the related distinction between *nunne* and cloistered nun or *mynce* is interesting for the discussion of *cyrstel* as a bequeathed item. Bulotta's analysis of will details particularly suggests that the *cyrstel* tended to be brightly colored, while the *tunece* is almost always described as dark, and often of a rougher fabric. There is some visual analysis of these items, but they are not illustrated in the text and so are quite hard to follow. The evidence leads Bulotta to conclusions of connotation in Anglo-Saxon dress that suggest an austerity introduced with Christianity manifested itself in the *tunece* and the showy worldliness of secular culture lay vested in the *cyrstel*.

Sally Crawford and Gillian Shepherd are the editors of an interdisciplinary collection, *Children, Childhood and Society* (Oxford: Archaeopress). The collection is a welcome addition to the field of childhood studies, as scholars attempt to articulate what role childhood as a concept of social identity had for various cultures; it

amply illustrates that any attempt to categorize a culture of childhood must be historically and geographically specific. The essays in the collection look at the historiography of childhood studies for ancient Rome (Mary Harlow, Ray Laurence, and Ville Vuolonto), the material culture of Greek funerary kraters of the Geometric period (Gillian Shepherd) and the grave cache at Assiros Toumba in Macedonia (Diana and K.A. Wardle), literary depictions of slave children and questions of Roman sexuality (Niall McKeown), the perception of children in the myth narratives and economic grounding of ancient Mesopotamia (Alasdair Livingstone). Readers of YWOES will find a few of the essays more relevant to the field. Chris Callow, in "Transitions to Adulthood in Early Icelandic Society," looks at the way this Scandinavian/Viking derived culture focused heroic saga literature (generally ninth- to eleventh-century stories) and legal codes on the liminal state of teenagers (twelve to sixteen, up to age twenty for boys; less age specific for girls). In "Vital Resources, Ideal Images and Virtual Lives: Children in Early Bronze Age Funerary Ritual," Paul Garwood begins to look at the social and religious contexts of child burials in Britain, ca. 2500–1500 BCE, as distinct from adult barrow remains; he notes contextual shifts in each of three periods (1: 2500–2150 BCE, 2: 2150–1800 BCE; and 3: 1800–1500 BCE) for the age group buried, the deposition of grave goods in number and kind, the relationship to adult burial in space and kind (satellite, mounds, ring cairns). Grave goods that are missing—such as toys—have recently been argued to demonstrate a lack of social differentiation in children, but although there is a more restrictive range of grave goods there is often a strong gendering of body and goods positioning mimicking adult cultural practice. Garwood's analysis focuses on Dorset, because of its high rates of excavation and good conditions, where he notes a marked increase in child burials in Period 2 (ca. 2150 BCE–1800 BCE) over Period 1 (ca. 2500–2100 BCE) in all age groups but where the deposition of each age group reveals interesting emphasis shifts on age groups receiving formal rites (notably under one year, four to eight, and over twelve). Period 2 also associates graves of children under two with food vessels and handled beakers but children four to nine with objects like flint artifacts (and in higher incidence than age two to four or nine to twelve); children over twelve are associated with very adult contexts—metal items and jewelry. Garwood also draws attention to the absence of combined burials and the spatial arrangement (which associates children over ten with adult type burials). Garwood suggests a movement

from less formalized funerary practices on the whole to a socialization of the funerary process which used them as constructions of social identity, thus explaining some of the decreased incidence of child burial as part of this process of politicization that excluded children. The last essay of particular interest for our readers is Sally Crawford's "Companions, Co-incidences or Chattels?: Children in the Early Anglo-Saxon Multiple Burial Ritual." Crawford opens with a summary of practice that also clearly sets her scholarly perspective, noting that inhumation cemeteries seem to represent small communities of three or four households over a short period of one or two hundred years with a strong correlation between gender and grave goods as an expression of social status and affiliations; the phenomenon of children in graves containing multiple bodies placed simultaneously is very high for the early Anglo-Saxon period (ca. fifth to seventh centuries), striking for the absence of child burials in overall proportion to mortality rate progressions. Like Garwood, she sees a cultural transition through gendered grave goods that associates children over ten to twelve as adults. As Nick Stoodley has convincingly argued (*Burial in Early Medieval England and Wales*, 2002), multiple burials were themselves social constructions with weighted meanings; Crawford suggests that the simultaneity of these burials (death at the same time or very shortly related) was itself a conscious choice that broke with apparent custom. She draws particular attention to Empingham II, where nine of thirty-one children under ten are in multiple burials; while there is some skewing of pregnant mothers, she notes many other instances which clearly do not fall into this category. One of the most interesting sections is her reading of other possible relationships (care givers, read out of hagiographies, for instance), the very real question of how we might read prone burials for children (as distinct from adult and/or criminal prone burials), and the suggestion of children as part of ritual or social status given their burial positioning in relation to physically impaired women in very wealthy, high status graves (Edix Hill 13, 18, 84). What Crawford points to is an interpretation of children as having fluctuating social value that should be seen as potentially relevant to how we understand the associated adult burial—they may belong to parents in any number of value contexts (lineage, slave/object, ritual/spiritual/totemic).

FA

Understanding husbandry techniques in early medieval Europe has been given attention recently on account

of a new method of combining Sr isotope, O isotope, and elemental composition of tooth enamel unearthed from animal and human remains at two archaeological sites in central England. In "Anglo-Saxon Animal Husbandry Techniques Revealed Through Isotope and Chemical Variations in Cattle Teeth," J.A. Evans, S. Tatham, et al. (*Applied Geochemistry* 22: 1994–2005) direct attention to two neighboring Anglo-Saxon settlements in Rutland, England to determine the Sr concentration and isotope composition of tooth enamel from domesticated animals, in an attempt to provide new insights into animal husbandry methods in Anglo-Saxon England. Located on a sixth- to seventh-century site in Empingham and a tenth- to twelfth-century settlement in Ketton, the team's examination of cattle, pig, and sheep tooth enamel is compared with that of human remains in order to determine feeding patterns and additional particulars relating to animal husbandry techniques applied during the period. This essay provides the complete results of Evans's et al. investigation and outlines the methodology used throughout their research. Supplementing the report are a number of useful appendices in the form of tables, figures, and charts delineating comparative tooth enamel Sr ratios from cattle teeth and adult human remains, and illustrating various Sr isotope and concentration data from animal and human teeth, respectively. Further to this, a valuable diagram outlining the sampling strategy used for the sectioned and un-sectioned animal tooth enamel provides readers with a clear view of how the tooth sampling tests were conducted. This type of research "demonstrates the power of combining isotope and elemental composition of teeth composition data to investigate the life history of domestic animals to derive information about the animal husbandry methods and hence lifestyles of historical, and pre-historical communities which reared them" (2003). Although reference to other areas where it might be beneficial to carry out this type of research is somewhat lacking, the overall report is clear with a meticulous overview of the results of the investigation.

MR-O

While the collection of essays edited by Sue Hamilton, Ruth Whitehouse, and Katherine I. Wright, *Archaeology and Women: Ancient and Modern Issues* (Walnut Creek, Calif.: Left Coast Press), is interesting as demonstrating feminist approaches to the material of the field and as historiography, there are two essays of particular appeal to readers of *YWOES*. Sue Harrington's essay, "Stirring Women, Weapons and Weaving: Aspects of Gender Identity and Symbols of Power in

Early Anglo-Saxon England" (335–352), is a look at the gendered construction of social power through grave goods, questioning a generalized trend in the field to characterize men's graves based on weapons and female graves on jewelry. Questioning the restrictive nature of sex/gender and ascriptions of social power/powerlessness, Harrington looks at graves where women were buried with sword-like weaving beaters, as at Edix Hill, Barrington Grave 18, where the sword is itself a converted item from its original weapon function by the addition of an elongated finger grip and rounding of the edges and its burial position is identical to that of a male weapon position. There is a thorough discussion of loom technology for those unfamiliar with the material object of the sword shaped or spear shaped weaving beater used to beat the weft threads into position; what Harrington suggests from the 132 extant sword-shaped weaving beaters is that they are found only in female graves and show patterns of geographic migration of technology (particularly linking Scandinavian and England in the sixth century and skirting heavily Romanized areas). The question of the status that might be conveyed by such a distinctive tool has long been in question, as Harrington summarizes in a literature review: Sonia Chadwick Hawkes (1958) argued that they were debased because they were no longer masculine weapons but that they retained the idea of luxury/high status because of their material, while Ursula Koch (1977) and Vera Evison (1987) argued against them as status items because of their rarity in well-endowed graves. Harrington then moves into her methodology of study of sword-shaped beaters in England, showing a strong clustering in East Kent (Dover Buckland, Finglesham, Bifrons, Ozengell, Sarre) in sixth century graves; while the Edix Hill grave shows a re-purposed sword, the East Kent objects are purpose made but following the same patterns of facture as male weapons. Further, the textile evidence suggests a strong association with Scandinavia, and the patterns are strongest in this period of the late sixth to early seventh centuries. What Harrington leads the reader to is a critical reevaluation of the way in which we read these weaving swords, arguing that their deposition in female burials in comparison to male weapon sword burials and the connections to patterns of Germanic weaving technology and textile output should suggest that these were strong markers of ethnic and social identity constructed from and for the receiving community. The second essay of interest in this collection is Sue Ballard's "Warriors and Weavers: Constructing British Iron Age Identities in Museums" (167–182), which is a feminist analysis of how museums construct

(or fail to construct) gender in their presentation of the period; it emphasizes problems of gender roles, cultural/economic issues (especially social issues such as polygyny and concubinage and childhood mortality rates) and their intersection with archaeological record (roundhouse or *broch* construction) that are part of the current display concerns in a way that the traditional, essentializing construction of the Celtic warrior was not. Ballard's analysis grounds the problem in extensively cited scholarship, and suggests areas for opening discussion with those who construct museum displays.

FA

John Hines's "Changes and Exchanges in Bede's and Cædmon's World" (in *Cædmon's Hymn and Material Culture*, ed. Frantzen and Hines (see sec. 4b under *Cædmon's Hymn*, 191–220) combines the disciplines of discourse theory, archaeology, social context, and a Welsh analogue: "... the story of Cædmon is a rich example of the powerful connective and interactive valency between language, literature, society, and material life as elements of the cultural whole." In archaeological terms, Hines talks about the construction of Wearmouth-Jarrow, drawing largely on the work of Rosemary Cramp, making observations of the site's economic importance and the economic boom of the Northumbrian Renaissance. He also deals with the archaeology done at the Whitby site, noting especially the inscribed and carved stones, and lingering in description over other artifacts found there.

LS

The edited collection *West Over Sea: Studies in Scandinavian Sea-Borne Expansion and Settlement Before 1300*, ed. Beverley Ballin Smith et al., [see sec. 2], contains one essay pertaining to this section in *YWOES*. In "Anglo-Saxon Inscriptions Found Outside the British Isles" (69–80) Elisabeth Okasha examines descriptions of thirteen specific inscriptions contained on portable items of religious and secular nature, dating from ca. 600 to ca. 1100 and found in modern day France, Belgium, Germany, Italy, Sweden, and Norway. The objects range from miniature to medium-sized wooden and copper gilded reliquaries to large items like a wooden altar, and whale-bone caskets, from hard objects such as hooked tags and a bronze pot fragment to soft textiles like leather sheaths. Okasha asserts that collectively, their workmanship is Anglo-Saxon and contends that "evidence may take the form of the text's being in Old English and /or carved in Anglo-Saxon runes (69), while others that contain Latin "form an

integral part of an object of Anglo-Saxon manufacture” (69). In the paper, Okasha explores how the inscriptions came to reside outside of modern day Britain, considering their respective places of origin, and she contemplates whether the artifacts were first created on the island and subsequently taken abroad. She further analyzes their continued existence, and ponders whether these items had a higher likelihood of survival being outside of the British Isles rather than within them. Finally, Okasha queries the higher percentage of religious objects that have survived and scrutinizes whether the objects’ survival is related to their current location. While she suggests several interesting and plausible theories to address the queries she raises she is unable to provide definitive answers regarding the objects’ origins.

J.C. Stevenson, R. Kendall et al. succinctly outline the presence of osteoarthritis in skeletal remains from the Middle Anglo-Saxon cemetery at Sedgeford, England. “Using Rasch Analysis to Describe the Development Sequence of Osteoarthritic Change for Individuals from a Middle Anglo-Saxon Cemetery,” *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* Suppl. 44: 225, reports on the development of osteoarthritis in the archaeological population which most likely adhered to “a particular trajectory reflecting both unique and shared etiological factors” (225). By applying a Rasch analysis, a stochastic mathematical model used in a wide range of disciplines and particularly useful in the social sciences, the team of researchers typified the osteoarthritic changes in samples taken from 117 adult, skeletal remains from the Sedgeford cemetery. Results of the investigation concluded that osteoarthritis was most evident in the “spine and hip regions followed by elbows, shoulders, wrists, knees, hands [and] ankles” (225). Only individuals in which age and sex could be determined were used in the study, and further analyses “indicated which variables were less informative and which individuals were ‘outliers’ with perhaps unique status” (225). Specific details regarding further analyses of the remains are not provided in this report. Given the brevity of the report, which provides a somewhat terse summary of overall results of the investigation, the lack of detail is understandable and warranted since this article appears in the abstracts section of the journal. Undoubtedly, the lengthier report to come will provide further details outlining the methodology of the investigation and offer a more comprehensive catalog of the results of the analysis, however, this succinct summary presents some remarkable findings and provides readers with a compelling case for future use of analytical methods

like the Rasch analysis to further our understanding of Anglo-Saxon communities.

MR-O

Works Not Seen

- Anthony, Sian, with contributions by Lucy Cramp et al. “Early Medieval Features at West Lear’s Farm, Chard Junction Quarry, Thorncombe, Dorset.” *Proc. of the Dorset Natural History and Archaeological Society* 128 (2007): 69–78, ill.
- Aston, Mick. “An Archipelago in Central Somerset: The Origins of Muchelney Abbey.” *Somerset Archaeology and Natural History* 150 (2007): 63–71, ill.
- Bain, Kate, with contributions from James Greig and Stephanie Rátkai. “Late Saxon and Medieval Derby: Excavations at King Street Derby, 2004.” *Derbyshire Archaeological Jnl* 126 (2006): 46–81, ill.
- Bapty, Ian. “Look on My Works: Finding Offa.” *British Archaeology* 97 (Nov/Dec 2007): 20–25, ill.
- Barnes, Michael P., and R. I. Page. *The Scandinavian Runic Inscriptions of Britain*. Runrön 19. Uppsala: Institutionen för nordiska språk, Uppsala universitet, 2006. 453 pp. ill.
- Bowles, Christopher R. *Rebuilding the Britons: The Postcolonial Archaeology of Culture and Identity in the Late Antique Bristol Channel Region*. BAR British Series 452. Oxford: John and Erica Hedges, 2007. viii, 184 pp. ill.*
- Campbell, Ewan. *Continental and Mediterranean Imports to Atlantic Britain and Ireland, AD 400–800*. CBA Research Report 157. York: CBA, 2007. xx, 163 pp. ill. + plates.
- Capon, Les. “Saxon Activity at 15–17 Long Acre, City of Westminster.” *London Archaeologist* 11.7 (Winter 2006): 171–76, ill.
- Caruana, Ian. “The Anglo-Saxon Pot in the Senhouse Museum, Maryport.” *Trans. of the Cumberland & Westmorland Antiquarian & Archaeological Society* 3rd ser. 7 (2007): 224–25, ill.
- Cessford, Craig, with Alison Dickens. “Ely Cathedral and Environs: Recent Investigations.” *Proc. of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society* 96 (2007): 161–74, ill.
- Cherryson, Annia Kristina. “Disturbing the Dead: Urbanisation, the Church and the Post-Burial Treatment of Human Remains in Early Medieval Wessex, c. 600–1100 AD.” *ASSAH* 14 (2007): 30–42, ill.
- Coatsworth, Elizabeth. “Cushioning Medieval Life: Domestic Textiles in Anglo-Saxon England.” *Medieval Clothing and Textiles* 3 (2007): 1–12.
- Coatsworth, Elizabeth, and Gale R. Owen-Crocker. *Medieval Textiles of the British Isles AD 450–1100*:

- An Annotated Bibliography*. BAR British Series 445. Oxford: Archaeopress, 2007. xi, 201 pp. ill.
- Colman, Fran. *Royal Coin Cabinet, Stockholm. Part V. Anglo-Saxon Coins: Edward the Confessor and Harold II, 1042–1066*. Sylloge of Coins of the British Isles 54. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press and Spink and Son, 2007. vii, 215 pp. ill. + plates.
- Crabtree, Pam. "Animals as Material Culture in Middle Saxon England: The Zooarchaeological Evidence for Wool Production at Brandon." *Breaking and Shaping Beastly Bodies*. Ed. Pluskowski. pp. 161–69, ill.
- Crépin, André. "Faire, faire, faire' dans les inscriptions anglaises du Haut Moyen Âge." *Poètes et artistes*. Ed. Cassagnes-Brouquet et al. [see sec. 4]. pp. 67–73.
- Davis, Graeme, *The Early English Settlement of Orkney and Shetland*. Edinburgh: John Donald, 2007. xi, 132 pp. + map.*
- Deeves, Simon. "Excavation of an Iron Age and Saxon Site at South Willesborough, Ashford." *Archaeologia Cantiana* 127 (2007): 237–47, ill.
- Eaglen, Robin J. *The Abbey and Mint of Bury St Edmunds to 1279*. The British Numismatic Society Special Publications Series 5. London: Spink, 2006. xiv, 357 pp. ill. + plates.
- Ecclestone, Martin, et al., eds. *The Land of the Dobunni: A Series of Papers Relating to the Transformation of the Pagan, Pre-Roman Tribal lands into Christian, Anglo-Saxon Gloucestershire & Somerset, from the Symposia of 2001 and 2002*. n.p. [Gloucester?]: Committee for Archaeology in Gloucestershire of the Bristol and Gloucestershire Archaeological Society, 2003. iv, 88 pp. ill. + maps.*
- Emery, Phillip A., with a major contribution by Elizabeth Rutledge, and contributions from Martin Allen et al. *Norwich Greyfriars: Pre-Conquest Town and Medieval Friary*. East Anglian Archaeology 120. Dereham: Norfolk Museums and Archaeology Services, 2007. xvii, 274 pp. ill.
- Fenton-Thomas, Chris, with contributions from Alan Vince et al. "Excavations at the Gardens, Sprotborough, South Yorkshire." *Yorkshire Archaeological Jnl* 79 (2007): 231–310. [Anglo-Saxon phases discussed pp. 237–38 and 260–61]
- Gautier, Alban. "Avant le hall anglo-saxon: Modèles insulaires et évolution des valeurs (V^e–VI^e siècles)." *Hortus Artium Medievalium* 13 (2007): 333–44, ill.
- Härke, Heinrich. "Invisible Britons, Gallo-Romans and Russians: Perspectives on Cultural Change." *Britons in Anglo-Saxon England*. Ed. Higham [see sec. 6]. pp. 57–67, ill.
- Hamilton, Derek; Mike Pitts, and Andrew Reynolds. "A Revised Date for the Early Medieval Execution at Stonehenge." *Wiltshire Archaeological and Natural History Magazine* 100 (2007). 202–03. [AD 660 × 890]
- Hardy, Alan; Bethan Mair Charles, and Robert J. Williams, with contributions by Martin Allen et al. *Death and Taxes: The Archaeology of a Middle Saxon Estate Centre at Higham Ferrers, Northamptonshire*. Oxford Archaeology Monograph 4. Oxford: Oxford Archaeology, 2007. xvii, 250 pp. ill.
- Harrison, Susan, and Tom Williamson. "The Supposed Saxon Earthworks at Rendlesham." *Proc. of the Suffolk Institute of Archaeology and History* 41.3 (2007): 351–54, ill. [not Saxon but a 19th-c. plantation bank]
- Heighway, Carolyn. "Daylesford, Gloucestershire: A Forgotten Minster in the Kingdom of the Hwicce." *Church Archaeology* 10 (2006): 101–04, ill.
- Hindmarch, Erlend, and Melissa Melikian. "Baldred's Auldham: An Early Medieval Chapel and Cemetery." *Church Archaeology* 10 (2006): 97–100, ill.
- Hoggett, R. S. "Changing Beliefs: The Archaeology of the East Anglian Conversion." Ph.D. Diss., Univ. of East Anglia, 2007. *Index to Theses* 56 (2007): 13329.
- Holloway, James. "Creating Identities of Death: Charcoal Burial in Early Medieval England." *Archaeological Review from Cambridge* 22.1 (April 2007): 6–23, ill.
- Keefer, Sarah Larratt. "A Matter of Style: Clerical Vestments in the Anglo-Saxon Church." *Medieval Clothing and Textiles* 3 (2007): 13–39, ill.
- Keith-Lucas, Fiona, with A. Vaughan-Williams and Peter Moore. "Saxon and Medieval Newham." *London Archaeologist* 11.9 (Summer 2007): 244–47, ill.
- Laing, Lloyd. "Romano-British Metalworking and the Anglo-Saxons." *Britons in Anglo-Saxon England*. Ed. Higham [see sec. 6]. pp. 42–56, ill.
- Leaf, Helen. "Medieval Bone Flutes in England." *Breaking and Shaping Beastly Bodies*. Ed. Pluskowski. pp. 11–17, ill.
- Leahy, Kevin. *The Anglo-Saxon Kingdom of Lindsey: The Archaeology of an Anglo-Saxon Kingdom*. Stroud: Tempus, 2007. 224 pp.*
- Lewis, Mary E., and Rebecca Gowland. "Brief and Precarious Lives: Infant Mortality in Contrasting Sites from Medieval and Post-Medieval England (AD 850–1859)." *American Jnl of Physical Anthropology* 134 (2007): 117–29, ill. [infant burial in Anglo-Saxon cemeteries]
- Lewis, Michael. "A New Date for 'Class A, Type 11A' Stirrup Strap Mounts, and Some Observations on Their Distribution." *MA* 51 (2007): 178–84, ill.
- Lewis, Michael John. "Identity and Status in the Bayeux Tapestry: The Iconographic and Artefactual Evidence." *Anglo-Norman Studies* 29 (2007): 100–20, ill.
- Lindberger, Elsa. *Uppsala University Coin Cabinet: Anglo-Saxon and Late British Coins*. Ed. Mark

- Blackburn and Harald Nilsson. *Sylloge of Coins of the British Isles* 52. Oxford and New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 2006. viii, 124 pp. ill. + plates.*
- Malim, Tim, with contributions by Rebecca Casa Hatton et al. "A Romano-British Temple Complex and Anglo-Saxon Burials at Gallows Hill, Swaffham Prior." *Proc. of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society* 95 (2006): 91–114, ill. + plates.
- Manning, Pru, and Peter Stead. "Excavation of an Early Christian Cemetery at Althea Library, Padstow." *Cornish Archaeology* 41–42 (2002–03): 80–106, ill.
- McClain, Aleksandra. "Medieval Cross Slabs in the North Riding of Yorkshire: Chronology, Distribution and Social Implications." *Yorkshire Archaeological Jnl* 79 (2007): 155–93, ill.
- McClendon, Charles B. *The Origins of Medieval Architecture: Building in Europe, AD 600–900*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2007. [x], 264 pp. ill. [esp. ch. 4, "The Christianization of Anglo-Saxon England," pp. 59–84, ill.]
- Müldner, Gundula, and Michael P. Richards. "Stable Isotope Evidence for 1500 Years of Human Diet at the City of York, UK." *American Jnl of Physical Anthropology* 133 (2007): 682–97, ill.
- Naismith, Rory. "An Offa You Can't Refuse? Eighth-Century Mercian Titulature on Coins and in Charters." *Quaestio Insularis* 7 (2006): 89–118, ill.
- Newton, Andrew A.S., with Nina Crummy and Carina Phillips. "Mid-Saxon Burials at Barnwell Road, Cambridge." *Proc. of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society* 96 (2007): 127–34, ill.
- Owen-Crocker, Gale R. "British Wives and Slaves? Possible Romano-British Techniques in 'Women's Work.'" *Britons in Anglo-Saxon England*. Ed. Higham [see sec. 6] pp. 80–90.
- _____. "Dress and Authority in the Bayeux Tapestry." *Aspects of Power and Authority in the Middle Ages*. Ed. Bolton and Meek [see sec. 1]. pp. 53–72, ill.
- Penn, Kenneth, and David Whitmore, with contributions by Francesca Boghi et al. "A Seventh-Century Burial at Bayfield." *Norfolk Archaeology* 45 (2007): 212–21, ill.
- Pluskowski, Aleksander, ed. *Breaking and Shaping Beastly Bodies: Animals as Material Culture in the Middle Ages*. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2007. vi, 239 pp. ill.
- Points, Guy. *Yorkshire: A Gazetteer of Anglo-Saxon & Viking Sites*. King's Lynn: Rihtspell, 2007. xii, 434 pp. ill.
- Potter, John F. "An Analysis of Ecclesiastical Stone Cut Backs." *Church Archaeology* 10 (2006): 57–80, ill.
- _____. "A Geological Review of Some Early Borderland Churches." *Shropshire History and Archaeology* 80 (2005): 1–16, ill.
- _____. "A Review of Some Early West Sussex Churches." *Sussex Archaeological Collections* 145 (2007): 81–96.
- Redknap, M., and J.M. Lewis, with contributions by Gifford Charles-Edwards et al. *A Corpus of Early Medieval Inscribed Stones and Stone Sculpture in Wales. Volume 1: Breconshire, Glamorgan, Monmouthshire, Radnorshire, and Geographically Contiguous Areas of Herefordshire and Shropshire*. Cardiff: Univ. of Wales Press, 2007. xxi, 631 pp. ill. + plates.
- Redknap, Mark. "Crossing Boundaries—Stylistic Diversity and External Contacts in Early Medieval Wales and the March: Reflections on Metalwork and Sculpture." *Crossing Boundaries / Croesi Ffiniau: Proceedings of the XIIth International Congress of Celtic Studies 24–30 August 2003, University of Wales, Aberystwyth*, ed. Patrick Sims-Williams and Gruffydd Aled Williams, *Cambrian Medieval Celtic Studies* 53/54 (Aberystwyth: Dept. of Welsh, Univ. of Wales, Aberystwyth, 2007. pp. 23–86, ill. + plates.
- Reed, Michael F. "Intercultural Dialogue in Late Saxon Norwich: The St Vedast Cross." *Quaestio Insularis* 7 (2006): 119–37, ill.
- Rogers, Penelope Walton. *Cloth and Clothing in Early Anglo-Saxon England, AD 450–700*. CBA Research Report 145. York: CBA, 2007. xx, 289 pp. ill.
- Sayer, D. "Community, Kinship and Household: An Analysis of Patterns in Early Anglo-Saxon Inhumation Cemeteries." Ph.D. Diss., Univ. of Reading, 2007. *Index to Theses* 57 (2007): 7788.
- Spoerry, Paul, and Mark Hinman, with contributions by Paul Blinkhorn and Adrian Popescu. "Early Saxon and Medieval Remains adjacent to the Round Moat, Fowlmere." *Proc. of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society* 96 (2007): 135–42, ill.
- Stephens, Winifred. *Early Medieval Glass Vessels Found in Kent: A Catalogue of the Glass Vessels of European Migrants to Kent, from approximately AD 450–700, in Museums, Archaeological Trusts and Societies, and Private Collections*. BAR British Series 424. Oxford: Archaeopress, 2006. iv, 234 pp. ill. + plates.
- Vince, Alan. "Pottery Production and Use in Northern England in the 5th to 12th Centuries." *Arts and Crafts in Medieval Rural Environment. Ruralia VI: 22nd–29th September 2005. Szentendre–Dobogókő, Hungary*. Ed. Jan Klápště and Petr Sommer. Turnhout: Brepols, 2007. pp. 251–64, ill.
- Waites, Brian. *Monasteries and Landscape of the North York Moors and Wolds*. Stroud: Tempus, 2007. 255 pp. ill. [esp. Part 1 ch. 2, "The Domesday Landscape," pp. 27–40, ill.]
- Webley, Leo, with contributions by Paul Booth et al. "Prehistoric, Roman and Saxon Activity on the Fen

- Hinterland at Parnwell, Peterborough." *Proc. of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society* 96 (2007): 79–114, ill.
- Williams, Howard. "The Emotive Force of Early Medieval Mortuary Practices." *Archaeological Review from Cambridge* 22.1 (April 2007): 107–23, ill.
- Woolhouse, Thomas, with contributions from Peter Thompson et al. "Anglo-Saxon and Medieval Boundaries and Burials at the Former Oblic Engineering Site, Church Street, Litlington." *Proc. of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society* 96 (2007): 115–26, ill.
- Wright, James. "An Anglo-Saxon Settlement at Cherry Orton Road, Orton Waterville, Peterborough." *Proc. of the Cambridge Antiquarian Society* 95 (2006): 115–20, ill.

Abbreviations

| | |
|--------|--|
| AB | <i>Analecta Bollandiana</i> |
| ANQ | <i>[formerly] American Notes and Queries</i> |
| AntJ | <i>Antiquaries Journal</i> |
| ArchJ | <i>Archaeological Journal</i> |
| ASE | <i>Anglo-Saxon England</i> |
| ASSAH | <i>Anglo-Saxon Studies in Archaeology and History</i> |
| BAR | <i>British Archaeological Reports</i> |
| BN | <i>Beiträge zur Namenforschung</i> |
| CCM | <i>Cahiers de civilisation médiévale</i> |
| CSASE | <i>Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England</i> |
| DAEM | <i>Deutsches Archiv für Erforschung des Mittelalters</i> |
| DAI | <i>Dissertation Abstracts International</i> |
| EHR | <i>English Historical Review</i> |
| ELN | <i>English Language Notes</i> |
| EME | <i>Early Medieval Europe</i> |
| ES | <i>English Studies</i> |
| JEGP | <i>Journal of English and Germanic Philology</i> |
| JEH | <i>Journal of Ecclesiastical History</i> |
| JEPNS | <i>Journal of the English Place-Name Society</i> |
| JTS | <i>Journal of Theological Studies</i> |
| MA | <i>Medieval Archaeology</i> |
| MAI | <i>Medieval Abstracts International</i> |
| MÆ | <i>Medium Ævum</i> |
| MLR | <i>Modern Language Review</i> |
| MP | <i>Modern Philology</i> |
| MRTS | <i>Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies</i> |
| MS | <i>Mediaeval Studies</i> |
| N&Q | <i>Notes and Queries</i> |
| NM | <i>Neuphilologische Mitteilungen</i> |
| NOWELE | <i>North-Western European Language Evolution</i> |
| OEN | <i>Old English Newsletter</i> |
| PBA | <i>Proceedings of the British Academy</i> |
| PQ | <i>Philological Quarterly</i> |
| RB | <i>Revue Bénédictine</i> |
| RES | <i>Review of English Studies</i> |
| SELIM | <i>Revista de la Sociedad Española de Lengua y Literatura Inglesa Medieval</i> |
| SN | <i>Studia Neophilologica</i> |
| SP | <i>Studies in Philology</i> |

OLD ENGLISH NEWSLETTER

Research in Progress Report

Each year, the editors of the *Old English Newsletter* solicit information concerning current research, work completed, and forthcoming publications. The Research in Progress reports are an important collaborative enterprise, recording information of common interest to our colleagues. Please complete the form below (type or print clearly) and return it to Heide Estes, Department of English, Monmouth University, West Long Branch, NJ 07764 (fax 732-263-5242 or email hestes@monmouth.edu). If the subject of your project is not obvious from the title, please add a note indicating its best classification. For dissertations, please provide the name of the director.

Name _____

Address _____

Academic Affiliation (if not given above) _____

a = article, b = book or monograph, d = dissertation; IP = in progress, C = completed, TBP = to be published in/by

1. Research in progress (aIP, bIP, dIP):

2. Research completed (aC, bC, dC):

3. Research forthcoming (TBP):

How to Contact the Old English Newsletter

All correspondence regarding the editing of *OEN*, including submissions, and all business correspondence, including publication information, subscriptions, back orders, or change of address, should be sent to:

R. M. Liuzza
Editor, *Old English Newsletter*
Department of English, University of Tennessee
301 McClung Tower
Knoxville TN 37996-0430
phone: 865-974-6970 / fax: 865-974-6926
e-mail: rliuzza@utk.edu

For information on the *Old English Newsletter Subsidia* series, please contact:

Old English Newsletter Subsidia
Medieval Institute, Western Michigan University
1903 W. Michigan Avenue
Kalamazoo, MI 49008-5432
phone: 269-387-8832 / fax: 269-387-8750
e-mail: mdvl_oen@wmich.edu
www.wmich.edu/medieval/mip/journals/oensubsidia.html

Communications about the *Year's Work in Old English Studies* should be sent to:

Daniel Donoghue
Department of English
Barker Center, Harvard University
Cambridge MA 02138
phone: 617-495-2505 / fax 617 496-8737
email: dgd@wjh.harvard.edu

Communications about the annual *Old English Bibliography*, including citations and offprints, should be sent to:

Thomas N. Hall
Department of English
356 O'Shaughnessy Hall
University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, IN 46556
e-mail: thall8@nd.edu

To submit abstracts of papers given at conferences for the annual Abstracts feature write to:

Dana Oswald
Department of English
University of Wisconsin, Parkside
900 Wood Road, P.O. Box 2000
Kenosha WI 53141-2000
email: oswald@uwp.edu

Information about research in progress, including current research, work completed, and forthcoming publications, should be sent to:

Heide Estes
Department of English
Monmouth University
West Long Branch, NJ 07764
fax: 732-263-5242
email: hestes@monmouth.edu

OLD ENGLISH NEWSLETTER
DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH
UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE
301 MCCLUNG TOWER
KNOXVILLE, TN 37996-0430