6 Ursula Lenker, **Die westsächsische Evangelienversion und die Perikopenordnungen im angelsächsischen England. [The 'West Saxon Gospels' and the Gospel-Lectionary in Anglo-Saxon England.]** Dissertation, München (Prof. Helmut Gneuss). Texte und Untersuchungen zur Englischen Philologie, 20. München: Fink, 1997, xxiii + 548 pp., DM 128.00.

Although Anglo-Saxon studies during the past few decades have concentrated increasingly on the liturgy of the church as a rewarding field for interdisciplinary and intercultural research, the reading of the Gospel of the day, one of the central elements of the eucharistic service, remains a neglected subject. Little is known about the different types of liturgical lection-systems used in the Anglo-Saxon church since the still fundamental studies of Frere (1934) and Klauser (1935) focus on Continental sources of the eighth and ninth centuries. Thus, it has been neither possible to determine the precise liturgical background to Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies* nor to interpret the function of the liturgical rubrics added to two manuscripts of the first translation of the Vulgate Gospels into a vernacular, the late tenth-century *West Saxon Gospels (WSG)*. In Cambridge, University Library, Ii. 2. 11 (A; s. xi^{med}; Exeter) and the fragments in New Haven, Beinecke Library, Beinecke 578 (F; s. xi^{in}; Kent?), rubrics are inserted which indicate on which liturgical day a specific text was commonly read in the Mass. Thus e.g., the rubric 'Ðis sceal on frigedæg innan þære easterwucan. Undecim discipuli habierunt in galileam' records Matth 26,18 to be read on the Friday after Easter. The evidence of 199 such insertions in A and a single rubric in F convinced Grünberg, one of the editors of the *WSG*, that '[t]he A-text of the four West-Saxon Gospels served the purpose of liturgical reading. ... served as such a lectionary, but with the unique distinction of being in the vernacular' (1967: 369).

Yet, this employment of an Old English text in the Mass would have been revolutionary in the context of the medieval Western churches: the use of the vernacular in the eucharistic service became one of the main objectives of future church reformers. Hence in this study, the function of the liturgical rubrics was analysed on the basis of a comparison with the ample material recorded in over sixty Anglo-Saxon witnesses. These documents can be divided into five broad groups: marginal notes in Gospelbooks, Gospellists added to Gospelbooks, Gospel-lectionaries, missals and Latin and Old English exegetical homilies (pp. 94–125). The witnesses document that, from the ninth century onwards, Roman rites ousted various other traditions which are recorded in Northumbrian sources of the seventh and eighth centuries; among these, a basically Neapolitan system adapted in England for the use of the Northumbrian church was predominant (pp. 133–

46). The two Roman systems chosen later correspond to the types which Chavasse (1952) has established for the development of other liturgical books, such as sacramentaries and antiphonaries. Ælfric's homilies and the rubrics to the *WSG* agree – together with the majority of sources of the tenth and eleventh century – with Chavasse's type 3, a stage of liturgical development also recorded in the *Gelasiana Mixta* sacramentaries of the eighth century. It later served as the basis for the readings in the *Missale Romanum* (pp. 147–74).

In this study, the analyses of the manuscripts and their traditions are documented in two detailed reference sections: Part B (pp. 298–383) provides an inventory which lists the reading(s) of each manuscript for almost 500 days of the liturgical year, by reference to the selected lesson(s) and their respective manuscript(s). On this basis, Part C provides a full description of the manuscripts and their traditions (pp. 385–500). Apart from the general lines of development sketched above, these analyses allow further conclusions, which can briefly be summarized as follows:

(1) For an evaluation of the actual liturgical practice of the Anglo-Saxons, it is necessary to bear in mind that documents from Gospelbooks – marginal notes (19) and capitularies (17) – are most numerous among our surviving sources. The transmission of these mostly sumptuous *Codices*, however, follows very specific paths which lead to their overrepresentation (about a quarter of all surviving illuminated Anglo-Saxon manuscripts are Gospelbooks). Terminological evidence from booklists, the *Monasteriales Indicia* and Ælfric's *Pastoral Letters* (pp. 123–32) and the fact that fragments of full lectionaries survive from the eighth, tenth, and eleventh centuries suggest that full lectionaries were much more important for Anglo-Saxon liturgical practice than today's evidence indicates. These lectionaries were, however, nondurable, utilitarian manuscripts made for everyday use and were easily discarded when the liturgical tradition changed (pp. 182–7, 193–5). Only scraps of them have made their way to the twentieth century. Gospelbooks, on the other hand, were primarily regarded as objects of worship and not books or documents for the liturgy and were thus preserved in their magnificence. For the liturgical systems in use, however, lectionaries, homiliaries, and missals carry much more weight.

(2) While the general line of development from non-Roman to the Roman types 2 and 3 is apparent (cp. the table p. 177), the closer evaluation shows that liturgical uniformity was unheard of in the early Middle Ages. The surviving Anglo-Saxon sources of type 3 can thus only tentatively be classified into four subgroups, which, however, reflect different degrees of conformity and distinctiveness (p. 188–202). The liturgical tradition of the rubrics in A belongs to a system which was most probably in use at the time of their insertion: it is not only recorded in a Gospellist (London, BL, Cotton

Tiberius A. ii; s. ix/x, Liège; Qe) but also in exclusively liturgical books such as the Gospel-lectionary Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. xvii. 20 (s. xi, Canterbury?), the 'Leofric Missal' (Oxford, Bodleian Library, Bodley 579; s. xi^{med}, Exeter) and the 'New Minster Missal' (Le Havre, BM, 330; s. xi^{2}, Winchester).

(3) The insertion of the rubrics in manuscripts A and F of the *WSG* is a later addition in one branch of manuscript transmission and is thus not connected with the original translation project. Linguistic evidence, such as the specific forms *þuresdæg, þæge and ucan* (pp. 212–24), suggests that the rubrics originated in the South-West of England, probably Exeter, at the very end of the Old English period. The Old English technical vocabulary for the church year shows the rubrics to have been composed by a liturgical expert (pp. 224–35). Their exemplar must have been a Gospellist or Gospel-lectionary, as the Latin text in the rubrics does not agree with the textual tradition of the Vulgate Gospels but with that of lectionaries (pp. 236–45 for the text-linguistic analysis).

(4) The provision of parallel passages from another of the Synoptic Gospels (technically called *Concordia*) in addition to or instead of the commonly chosen lessons renders not only the liturgical use of the manuscript as a Gospel-lectionary unlikely, but also suggests a Continental exemplar. Among the Anglo-Saxon sources, *Concordia* only occurs in A; it is, however, similarly found in Continental Gospellists (pp. 271–9).

(5) In sum, Bishop Leofric's Exeter (1050–72) is assumed to be a very likely place of origin for the combination of the vernacular Gospels with liturgical lections. Leofric is known to have brought liturgical books from the Continent, in particular from the area around Liège. Intriguingly, one of the closest relatives of A, the capitulary 'Qe', records a Liège tradition (pp. 195–9, 286–90). As the Cathedral in Exeter was a secular institution, much emphasis was put on preaching.

(6) The function of the liturgical rubrics in A is connected to the homiletic context as is indicated by their textual and formal resemblance to the liturgical rubrics found in Latin and Old English homiliaries. Moreover, only exegetical homilies show a use of *Concordia* items (cp. Ælfric's use of parallel passages in order to clarify and exemplify his exegesis; pp. 282–6). With the help of the rubrics, the text of the *WSG* could have been used as the first part of a vernacular homily, i.e. the translation of the Latin pericope into Old English, or served as an aid for the composition of an exegetical homily. The rubrics in the manuscripts A and F of the *WSG* thus do not give evidence for the reading of the Gospel in the vernacular – at the liturgically proper time for the Gospel during the performance of the Mass. Yet, the text of the *WSG* may indeed have been read to the congregation: instead of or as part of a homily.

References:

Chavasse, Antoine. 1952. "Les plus anciens types du lectionnaire et de l'antiphonaire romains de la messe. Rapports et date". *Revue Bénédictine*, 62. 1–91.

Frere, Walter Howard. 1934. *Studies in Early Roman Liturgy. 2: The Roman Gospel-Lectionary.* Oxford.

Grünberg, Madeleine. 1967. *The West-Saxon Gospels: A Study of the Gospel of Saint Matthew with Text of the Four Gospels.* Amsterdam.

Klauser, Theodor. 1935. *Das römische Capitulare Evangeliorum. Texte und Untersuchungen zu seiner ältesten Geschichte. 1: Typen.* Münster.

7 Ernst Leisi, **Problemwörter und Problemstellen in Shakespeares Dramen. [Problem Words and Problem Passages in Shakespeare's Dramas.]** Tübingen: Stauffenburg, 1997, 462 pp., DM 148.00 (hardcover), DM 96.00 (paperback).

This is a new *Shakespeare Dictionary*, with emphasis on precise and extensive definitions based on modern semantics. It is a by-product of the English–German Edition in progress: "Englisch–deutsche Studienausgabe der Dramen Shakespeares" (Berne and Tübingen 1976ff.), of which the author is one of the general editors. A thorough treatment of the whole of Shakespeare's vocabulary – approximately 26,000 words (graphemes) – welcome as it might be, would need years and years of labour and result in unwieldy volumes. The author has therefore made a selection and lists only what he calls *Problem Words*, i.e. words that have caused discussions among editors and lexicographers, or are inadequately explained in current editions. The selection, however, is by no means narrow, the number of these Problem Words being 972.

The *First Part* of the dictionary contains the Problem Words, listed alphabetically, the (German) definitions being based on the author's previous research work on English and especially Shakespearean semantics. The following innovations may be mentioned: The definitions of all words (except form words) are based on the semantic analysis of all their contexts; i.e. no definition has simply been copied from previous dictionaries. For other methodological details, see the Introduction and the author's earlier books (especially *Praxis der englischen Semantik*). Due account is taken of such features as connotations, slang meanings, collocations, homophony, word combinations, emendation problems, etc.

As a result, many definitions will be found to differ considerably from those given in current editions and/or dictionaries. This applies to difficult as well as to seemingly simple words, such as *stewed prunes, fashion, damned, ha, indifferent, model, grey, meteor, question, old,* etc.