Book Reviews/Comptes Rendus

Carl T. Berkhout and Milton McC. Gatch, edd. *Anglo-Saxon Scholarship, the first three centuries*. Boston: G.K. Hall and Co., 1982. pp. xii, 197, \$25.00.

The papers contained in *Anglo-Saxon Scholarship, the first three centuries* were mostly given during sessions of the 13th Conference on Medieval Studies at Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, May 1978. To the eight original contributions, the editors have added two new papers by Michael Murphy and T.H. Leinbaugh. They have also contributed a good index to the volume and a very useful select bibliography of the subject. The publishers have presented the book in reduced photo-offset typescript, and if the page occasionally seems pale to the eye, all is well on close inspection.

Interest in Anglo-Saxon scholarship from the Renaissance to its revival in the nineteenth century has waxed and waned in our time. Until the appearance of this volume most of us have gone for information to Eleanor N. Adams, *Old English Scholarship in England from 1566-1800*, a Yale dissertation published in 1917. Dr. Adams did her work well, and while scholars have made discoveries in the meantime and have written articles on specific subjects, no one has attempted the same kind of general overview. The present editors give us both less and more than Dr. Adams did in 1917. They state in their introduction, "Just as no effort has been made to make these papers uniform in method, state, or level of difficulty, so also no attempt has been made to make this volume a history of Anglo-Saxon or even Old English scholarship. Many important figures are untouched or barely touched; Matthew Parker, Francis Junius, Humfrey Wanley, and Benjamin Thorpe leap to mind" (p. xi).

Even after these caveats, both editors and contributors manage to give us a good idea of the wide variety of manuscript collectors, antiquaries, religious pamphleteers, lawyers and university scholars who looked at, commented on, and sometimes forged Old English texts. Although some of the contributors carry their work to the middle of the nineteenth century, I will assume that readers of this journal will be more interested in the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century essays, rather than those on the later period.

Michael Murphy, the first contributor, gives us a low-key review of the three centuries in question. While I would gladly trade this essay for one dealing with one of the lacunae mentioned above, it has its uses for readers out of reach of Adams.

By contrast, the second contributor, Ronald Buckalew, is all industry and footnotes. With great toil he has unearthed Laurence Nowell's transcript of AElfric's Grammar and Glossary, and goes on to discuss its use by Nowell himself and William Lambarde. He then compares it with an AElfric glossary copied by John Leland and concludes that both were copied from lost, though probably not the same, exemplars.

In "AElfric's *Sermo de Sacrificio in Die Pascae*: Anglican Polemic in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries," T.H. Leinbaugh discussed the AElfrician sermon that has the honour of being the first Old English text to appear in print. Members of the Archbishop Matthew Parker's circle published the sermon in 1566 in a treatise called *A Testimonie of Antiquitie*. It was used to support the archbishop's contention that the English church held independent views on the doctrine of transubstantiation from very early days. Leinbaugh outlines the controversy, and points out that some of the mistranslations of the text must have been deliberate as they support the translators' point of view more strongly than the original did.

With economy of style, Peter Baker disentangles several misattributions to Byrhtferth of Ramsey made by Renaissance scholars. The chain of error leads from John Leland through John Bale to John Herwagen. While Baker lets them off gently, he tells a fascinating story of how partial understandings get passed on and lead to complete mystification.

In another brief essay, Sue Hetherington picks up where Buckalew left off and tells of the hand-written glossaries and dictionaries leading from Nowell through John Joscelyn, Sir Henry Spelman, and Sir Simonds d'Ewes to William Somner and the publication of his *Dictionarium* in 1659. Professor Hetherington has published more fully on this subject in her monograph of 1980.

The remaining essays can be noted briefly. Sandra Glass writes on the Saxonists' influence on seventeenth-century English literature and concludes it was slight unless we can make more of the Junius-Milton connection. Both Sarah H. Collins and Shaun F.D. Hughes write about the Elstobs, brother and sister, and other figures among the Oxford Saxonists at the end of the seventeenth century. Hughes (p. 120) implies that Thomas Jefferson learned his Anglo-Saxon from Joseph Bosworth's grammar, although Jefferson was well past his learning years when the grammar first appeared in 1823. Richard Payne and Gretchen Ackerman move from the eighteenth into the nineteenth century and deal with the rediscovery of Old English poetry by literary historians, and the often stormy relationships between John Mitchell Kemble and Sir Frederic Madden.

In their introduction, the editors, Berkhout and Gatch, say "The purpose of this volume of essays is to stimulate new research in the history of Anglo-Saxon scholarship" (p. xi). Whether or not the stimulus has come from these Kalamazoo papers, scholars are working in the papers of the Renaissance antiquaries, are learning their interests and copying habits, and occasionally have recovered texts otherwise lost. The recent article by Angelika Lutz on the study of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle in the sixteenth century (*Anglia* 100 [1982], 301-56) is an excellent example of what can be done.

† ANGUS CAMERON, *University of Toronto*