



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

This is a repository copy of *Elleborus in Anglo-Saxon England, 900–1100: Tunsingwyr and Wodewistle*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/78178/>

Version: Published Version

Article:

Hall, ATP (2013) *Elleborus in Anglo-Saxon England, 900–1100: Tunsingwyr and Wodewistle*. *Leeds Studies in English*, new se. 70 - 93.

Reuse

Unless indicated otherwise, fulltext items are protected by copyright with all rights reserved. The copyright exception in section 29 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 allows the making of a single copy solely for the purpose of non-commercial research or private study within the limits of fair dealing. The publisher or other rights-holder may allow further reproduction and re-use of this version - refer to the White Rose Research Online record for this item. Where records identify the publisher as the copyright holder, users can verify any specific terms of use on the publisher's website.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

Leeds Studies in English

New Series XLIV

2013

Magic and Medicine
Early Medieval Plant-Name Studies

Edited by

Carole Biggam

Editorial assistant
Alaric Hall

Leeds Studies in English

<www.leeds.ac.uk/lse>

School of English
University of Leeds

2013

Leeds Studies in English

<www.leeds.ac.uk/lse>

Leeds Studies in English is an international, refereed journal based in the School of English, University of Leeds. *Leeds Studies in English* publishes articles on Old and Middle English literature, Old Icelandic language and literature, and the historical study of the English language. After a two-year embargo, past copies are made available, free access; they can be accessed via <<http://www.leeds.ac.uk/lse>>.

Editorial Board: Catherine Batt, *Chair*
Marta Cobb
Victoria Cooper, *Editorial Assistant*
Alaric Hall, *Editor*
Paul Hammond
Ananya Jahanara Kabir
Oliver Pickering
Slavica Ranković
N. Kivilcim Yavuz, *Reviews Editor*

Notes for Contributors

Contributors are requested to follow the *MHRA Style Guide: A Handbook for Authors, Editors, and Writers of Theses*, 2nd edn (London: Modern Humanities Research Association, 2008), available at <<http://www.mhra.org.uk/Publications/Books/StyleGuide/download.shtml>>.

Where possible, contributors are encouraged to include the digital object identifiers or, where a complete free access text is available, stable URLs of materials cited (see *Style Guide* §11.2.10.1).

The language of publication is English and translations should normally be supplied for quotations in languages other than English. Each contributor will receive a free copy of the journal, and a PDF of their article for distribution. Please email all contributions to <lse@leeds.ac.uk>.

Reviews

Copies of books for review should be sent to the Editor, *Leeds Studies in English*, School of English, University of Leeds, Leeds LS2 9JT, United Kingdom.

Contents

Abbreviations	vi
An Introduction to Anglo-Saxon Plant-Name Studies and to this Special Issue	1
C. P. Biggam	<i>University of Glasgow</i>
‘Garlic and Sapphires in the Mud’: ‘Leeks’ in their Early Folk Contexts	10
Tom Markey	<i>University of Michigan</i>
Madness, Medication — and Self-Induced Hallucination? <i>Elleborus</i> (and Woody Nightshade) in Anglo-Saxon England, 700–900	43
Alaric Hall	<i>University of Leeds</i>
Elleborus in Anglo-Saxon England, 900–1100: <i>Tunsingwyr</i> t and <i>Wodewistle</i>	70
Alaric Hall	<i>University of Leeds</i>
Old English <i>Hymlic</i> : Is it Hemlock?	94
Irené Wotherspoon	<i>University of Glasgow</i>
Old English <i>Hyme</i> le: An Occasional Flavour of Hops	114
Irené Wotherspoon	<i>University of Glasgow</i>
Biting the <i>Bulut</i> : A Problematic Old English Plant-Name in the Light of Place-Name Evidence	137
Richard Coates	<i>University of the West of England, Bristol</i>
What was <i>Lybcorn</i> ?	146
Audrey Meaney	
Old English <i>Safene</i> : Untangling Native and Exotic Junipers in Anglo-Saxon England	206
C. P. Biggam	<i>University of Glasgow</i>
Glossary of Medical Terms	242
Index	244

Abbreviations

ADS	Archaeology Data Service
ASPNS	Anglo-Saxon Plant-Name Survey
BML	British Medieval Latin
BSBI	Botanical Society of the British Isles
CGL	<i>Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum</i>
CNo.	Catalogue Number
COD	<i>Concise Oxford Dictionary</i>
DMLBS	<i>Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources</i>
DOE	<i>Dictionary of Old English</i> (Toronto)
DOEPN	<i>Dictionary of Old English Plant Names</i> (online)
DOEWC	<i>Dictionary of Old English Web Corpus</i> (online)
DOI	Digital Object Identifier; <i>Dictionary of the Irish Language Based Mainly on Old and Middle Irish Materials</i>
DOST	<i>Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue</i>
DSL	<i>Dictionary of the Scots Language</i> (online)
EDD	<i>English Dialect Dictionary</i>
EPNE	<i>English Place-Name Elements</i> (A. H. Smith)
Gk, Gr.	Greek
HTOED	<i>Historical Thesaurus of the Oxford English Dictionary</i>
IPA	International Phonetic Alphabet
LAE	<i>Linguistic Atlas of England</i>
Lat	Latin
MCOE	<i>Microfiche Concordance to Old English</i>
ME	Middle English
MED	<i>Middle English Dictionary</i>
MHG	Middle High German
MLG	Middle Low German
ModE	Modern English
ModIce	Modern Icelandic
ModLG	Modern Low German
ODEE	<i>Oxford Dictionary of English Etymology</i>
OE	Old English
OED	<i>Oxford English Dictionary</i>
OF	Old French
OHG	Old High German
OI	Old Irish
OIce	Old Icelandic
OLD	<i>Oxford Latin Dictionary</i>
ON	Old Norse
OS	Old Saxon
PASE	<i>Prosopography of Anglo-Saxon England</i> (online)
PIE	Proto-Indo-European
PN W	<i>Place-Names of Wiltshire</i> (J. E. B. Gover et al.)
PN Wo	<i>Place-Names of Worcestershire</i> (A. Mawer et al.)

RCHM(E)	Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments (of England)
TLL	<i>Thesaurus Linguae Latinae</i>
spp.	species (botanical, singular)
ssp.	species (botanical, plural)
TOE	<i>Thesaurus of Old English</i>
VEPN	<i>Vocabulary of English Place-Names</i>

Short Titles

Old English source texts may be indicated by short titles assigned by the *Dictionary of Old English* and *Microfiche Concordance to Old English*, which refer to specific editions of the texts. They occur particularly in the appendices, and examples include: Lch II (1); Med 3 (Grattan-Singer). The key to these references can be found at the DOE website under ‘Research Tools’ then ‘List of Texts’. See <http://www.doe.utoronto.ca>.

Botanical Latin

Plant-names in botanical Latin aim to provide an international identification for a particular plant or group of plants. They are followed by abbreviations indicating the botanist who assigned and/or reassigned the name, and the most common abbreviation is ‘L.’ indicating ‘Linnaeus’, the famous Swedish botanist. Examples include: *Bellis perennis* L. (daisy); *Betula pendula* Roth. (silver birch).

Dates

Manuscript dates are often given in a form beginning ‘s.’ (for *saeculo* ‘in the century’). Some examples follow:

- s. xiⁱⁿ beginning of the 11th century
- s. xi¹ first half of the 11th century
- s. xi^{med} middle of the 11th century
- s. xi² second half of the 11th century
- s. xi^{ex} end of the 11th century

Elleborus* in Anglo-Saxon England, 900–1100: *Tunsingwyrt* and *Wodewistle

Alaric Hall

1. Introduction

This article picks up from the one above, to consider our evidence for the meanings of the Anglo-Latin plant-name *elleborus* and its vernacular equivalents from around 900 to the end of the period covered by the Anglo-Saxon Plant-Name Survey (ASPNS), around the end of the eleventh century. In doing so, it completes the methodological experiment outlined in the companion piece of examining Old English plant-names by investigating the full range of vernacular glosses and translations associated with a particular Latin lemma, in this case *elleborus*. One result of this is that I provide the full ASPNS examination owing to the interesting and challenging Old English word *tunsingwyrt*, which this investigation identifies as a key term, as well as the rarer *wodewistle* and *wudeleac*. I offer the novel argument that *Tunsingwyrt*, far from denoting *Veratrum album* L. as has previously been thought, in fact denotes wild garlic. The later material considered here proves to be more heterogeneous than the early evidence addressed in the companion piece, giving a useful perspective on the semantic range of *elleborus*, but a less clear picture of plant-use in Anglo-Saxon culture. While continuing to show the usefulness of the method developed in my first article, then, this second study also explores its limits in the face of less focused data. Nonetheless, a range of useful insights emerge from taking this approach, to which I would not otherwise have been inspired. I make a new contribution to the textual history of the Old English *Herbarium*, finding evidence that our manuscripts imply a lost text closer to the Latin original of the *Herbarium* than any surviving text (Section 2, summarised in Table 1). I investigate carefully whether the glosses studied here were coined as gloss-words or whether they were members of the common lexicon — a difficult problem, which has not been addressed thoroughly enough in our studies of Old English vocabulary. In passing, the article also makes a contribution to Old English dialectology by suggesting that there is a complementary dialectal distribution of *leactun* (Anglian) and *wyrttun* (West Saxon), both meaning ‘vegetable/herb garden’ (Section 5, n. 12). Finally, as I discuss below, we can see the division in Anglo-Saxon approaches to the word *elleborus* as reflecting a shift in Anglo-Saxon scholarly practice and tradition somewhere around 900.

The division of my contributions on the subject of *elleborus* into two articles covering two periods reflects the fact that there seems to be almost no overlap between the early understandings of *elleborus*, attested mainly in material associated with Canterbury, and the understandings evidenced by texts composed later, and associated with the Anglo-Saxon monasticism of the later tenth and earlier eleventh centuries. This does not reflect an absolute hiatus in scribal and scholarly traditions: there are late manuscripts of the glosses discussed in my first article which bear witness to continuous copying of earlier material. However, an Old English translation, now known as the Old English *Herbarium*, was made, probably in the tenth century, of several Latin herbal texts. The Old English *Herbarium* seems to have drawn little on previous Anglo-Saxon plant-name scholarship, suggesting that whoever was behind it was, through necessity or design, making a clean break from earlier scholarly traditions. This came to be widely copied, and influential in later Anglo-Saxon medical writing. Thus my assessments of the understanding of *elleborus* in the later Anglo-Saxon period affords a contribution to our wider narrative of transition in Anglo-Saxon scholarly traditions around the ninth century. It is of course beyond my present scope to discuss in detail the dramatic, if gradual, changes in Anglo-Saxon scholarly life between the early heyday of Anglo-Saxon Christianity and the later tenth century, and whether these changes should be associated more with Vikings, changing patterns of aristocratic patronage, or the internal dynamics of the Anglo-Saxon Church (see generally Blair 2005: 121–34; 291–367). But the history even of so small a point as the vernacular glossing of a Latin plant-name does have a contribution to make to these wider narratives.

The shift in scholarly practice regarding *elleborus* from Aldhelm’s time to the later Anglo-Saxon period is exemplified by Ælfric of Eynsham. Writing three centuries after Aldhelm’s composition of the riddle *Elleborus*, Ælfric seems to have been the next Anglo-Saxon author to use the word *elleborus*, in the Old English account of the life of St Martin in his *Lives of Saints*, composed between 995 and 1002 (the attestation is omitted from the *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources* (DMLBS), under *helleborus*, perhaps because of the vernacular context). Early in his career, driven from his monastery by Arian heretics, Martin withdraws to the island of Gallinaria which lies off the Italian coast in the Ligurian Sea where, according to Ælfric’s source, Chapter 6 of the *Vita sancti Martini* by Sulpicius Severus: ‘he subsisted for a while on the roots of herbs; at which time he consumed in his food *helleborus*, which is, it is said, a poisonous grass’ (*aliquamdiu radicibus vixit herbarum: quo tempore helleborum, uenenatum, ut ferunt, gramen, in cibum sumpsit*; Severus 1967–9: I.266). Fortunately, Martin is able to avert his death by prayer. In lines 196–200 of Ælfric’s rendering (Ælfric of Eynsham 1881–1900: IV.232), this event appears as

*Martinus þa on þære tide on his mete þigde
þa ættrian wyrt . þe elleborum hatte .
and þæt attor sona hine swiðe þreade
fornean to deaðe . ac he feng to his ge-bedum .
and eall seo sarnys him sona fram ge-wát .*

Martin at that time consumed in his food
the poisonous plant which is called *elleborum*,
and that poison immediately afflicted him greatly,
almost to death. But he turned to his prayers,
and all the illness immediately left him.

The main point of interest for us here is that Ælfric considered it appropriate to leave *elleborum* in its Latin form, glossing it merely as an *ættrig wyrt* (‘poisonous plant’): whereas we can infer

behind Aldhelm’s use of *elleborus* a vigorous and assertive equation of this Mediterranean plant with Anglo-Saxon flora, Ælfric pointedly implies that *elleborus* is a foreign plant denoted by a foreign word.

Beyond ‘the observation that the inclusion of Latin is a characteristic feature of Ælfric’s later writings, a sign of a more educated target audience’ (Brookes 2011: 17), there has been surprisingly little work on Ælfric’s code-switching. Brookes has shown that Ælfric made careful and extensive use of antiphonal quotations in order to show his audience how his homilies and to a lesser extent his saints’ lives elucidated the Latin liturgy, but, as Brookes has emphasised, this still does not explain other examples of code-switching, as here (and as it happens, Ælfric’s *Life of St Martin* rather surprisingly lacks any liturgical quotation). Ælfric may not have kept *elleborus* in Latin simply for want of a translation: although his surviving works (most obviously the list of *nomina herbarum* in his class-glossary: Ælfric of Eynsham 1880: 310–11) contain no other references to *elleborus*, he surely had access to information or earlier vernacular glosses on the word. Indeed, earlier in Ælfric’s *Life of Martin* (Ælfric of Eynsham 1881–1900: IV.228, lines 140–2), Bishop Hilarion

bead him þæt he wære
gehadod to exorcista . þæt we hatað halsigend
þe ðe bebyt deoflum . þæt hi of gedrehtum mannum faran.
ordered him to be
consecrated as an *exorcista* — which we call a *halsigend* (healer),
one who commands devils that they should depart from afflicted people.

Here Ælfric was evidently not without a vernacular synonym for *exorcista*, since he glosses it, but he still chose to maintain the Latin word. Presumably he chose to keep *exorcista* in Latin as a technical, ecclesiastical term. Although in the present state of knowledge it is hard to be sure, it seems likely that *elleborus* for Ælfric, too, was a foreign word for a foreign denotee, and that his refusal to translate it indicates both his belief that it was not to be found in Britain, and his dissatisfaction with any existing glosses available to him. Though the tenth-century Benedictine reform movement in Anglo-Saxon England was immensely keen on Aldhelm’s poetry, Ælfric seems to be marking a break here from earlier Anglo-Saxon scholarship. This article argues that the tenth-century handlings of *elleborus* generally represent a different culture of translation and representation of Mediterranean scientific culture in Anglo-Saxon England from the culture we see in earlier evidence.

The evidence at the centre of this article derives from the Old English *Herbarium*, which was probably composed in the tenth century, and translated *elleborum album* as *tunsingwyr̥t*. The analysis gives some insights into the early history of this translation: some of the plant-names it contains have probably been added by later redactors. Previously identified as *Veratrum album* L., *tunsingwyr̥t* emerges as likely to have denoted an allium, perhaps wild garlic (*Allium ursinum* L.), and therefore to have been a (partial) synonym of a number of other Old English words. Although *tunsingwyr̥t*’s etymology remains intractable, it is possible to chart the likely channels of folk-etymologisation which produced its attested variant forms. However, the texts of the period also bring several other names into the orbit of *elleborus*. These — *lungwyr̥t*, *hramsa*, *wudeleac* and *wodewistle* — are considered more briefly. *Hramsa* and *wudeleac* support the interpretation of *elleborus albus* as wild garlic, but *wodewistle* suggests an alternative tradition in which it was interpreted as a hollow-stemmed umbellifer, probably hemlock (*Conium maculatum* L.).

2. The text of the Old English *Herbarium*

For *elleborus*, as for many other plant-names in the later Anglo-Saxon period, the principal source of information — for us and for Anglo-Saxon readers — is the text known now as the Old English *Herbarium*. This is a translation of a compilation of Latin texts, made either by the translator himself or by some earlier scholar (see Hofstetter 1983; De Vriend 1984: lv–lxi; compare Van Arsdall 2002: 68–118). The date and place of its composition are not clear. De Vriend’s suggestion of eighth-century Northumbria (1984: xlii) lacks evidence, and if it is correct, then the text seems neither to have had any influence on medical writing in the ensuing century or two, nor to retain any dialectal or archaic linguistic features. Van Arsdall advocated a date shortly after the creation of our main vernacular medical texts, Bald’s *Leechbook* and *Leechbook III*, probably compiled in the late ninth century and surviving in a mid tenth-century manuscript (Ker 1957: 332–3, no. 264; Van Arsdall 2002: 103–4. For references to more recent work on the leechbooks see Hall 2007: 96–7). D’Aronco, meanwhile, has suggested the late tenth century, shortly before our oldest manuscript (London, British Library, Harley 585), with one of the Benedictine monasteries of Winchester being the likeliest place (D’Aronco 2007: 46; compare Meaney, this volume, Section 12.2). The Old English *Herbarium* is important to this article partly because it provides, in its translation of the material on *elleborum album*, our most detailed description of *tunsingwyr̥t*. It is also a key text, however, because it represents the fount of a textual tradition which also formed the basis for entries in the Durham Plant-Name Glossary and the Laud Herbal Glossary (on whose relationships with the Old English *Herbarium* see Rusche 2008; compare Meaney, this volume, Section 12.2), and which seems to have been a largely *de novo* exercise in translation from Latin, uninfluenced by earlier English traditions. The textual history of this passage is rather complex, so the purpose of this section is to elucidate it to facilitate the use of the *Herbarium*’s evidence in the subsequent sections of this article.

The key attestation of *tunsingwyr̥t* occurs in the Old English translation of the *Liber medicinae ex herbis femininis* which comprises part of the Old English *Herbarium* — there being Chapter 140 (De Vriend 1984: 180, 182). The contents list entry reads *Herba elleborus albus þæt is tunsingwyr̥t* (De Vriend 1984: 23), while the main text gives

CXL. *Tunsingwyr̥t*

1. *Ʒeos wyr̥t þe man elleborum album & oðrum naman tunsingwyr̥t nemneð & eac sume men wedeberge hatað byð cenned on dunum, & heo hafað leaf leace gelice; þysse wyr̥t wyr̥truman man sceal niman onbutan midne sumur & eac swa some þa wyr̥t ealle for ðy heo is to læcedomum wel gecweme; þæt is to lufigenne on ðysse wyr̥t þæt heo hafað gehwædne wyr̥truman & na swa rihtne þæt he be sumum dæle gebyrged ne sy; he byþ breap & tidre þonne he gedriged byð, & þonne he tobrocen byþ (h)e rycþ eal swylce he smic of him asende, & he byð hwonlice bitterre on byrgincge; þon(ne) beoð þa maran wyr̥truman lange & hearde & swyþe bittere on byrgincge, & hy habbaþ to ðam swyþlice mihte & frecenfulle þæt hy foroft hreadlice þone man forþilmiap.*

140. *Tunsingwyr̥t*.

1. This plant, which is called *elleborum album*, and by another name *tunsingwyr̥t* (and also some people call it *wedeberge*) is grown on hills/mountains, and it has leaves like a leek/allium; one must take this plant’s roots around midsummer, and also some of the whole plant, because it is well suited to remedies. One should note about this plant that it has a small root, and that it is not so straight [i.e. running parallel to the ground?] that it may not be buried to some extent; it is brittle and crumbly when it has been dried, and

when it is crushed it smells just as though it sends smoke from itself, and it is somewhat bitter to the taste. Then the larger roots are long and hard and very bitter to the taste, and they have the great and dangerous power that they very often choke the person swiftly.

The Latin source for this entry is something of an oddity. The bulk of the *Liber medicinae ex herbis femininis* was composed in the Late Antique period (Collins 2000: 154). However, the entry for *elleborum album* does not occur in the main and longest version, but rather in a divergent tradition preserved, in its earliest manuscript, in the northern Italian manuscript Lucca, Biblioteca Statale (*olim* Biblioteca Governativa) 296, apparently of the tenth century (Collins 2000: 158). The Old English text is generally a close translation of its source, except in the opening sentence, which introduces the passage differently and differs slightly in its details from the opening in Lucca: ‘And the white [hellebore] bears a similarity to the onion, having narrower leaves; it grows in mountainous places; its roots should be collected around the summer solstice’ (*Albumque est in similitudinem caepae, folia angustiora habet; nascitur in montuosis locis; radices eius colligi debent circa aestiva solstitia*; De Vriend 1984: 181, 183).

The textual status of the vernacular equivalents of *elleborum album* attested in this text of the Old English *Herbarium*, *tunsingwyr*t and *wedeberge*, also have their complexities. *Tunsingwyr*t occurs in no earlier glosses, and indeed occurs in this precise form in no text predating the Old English *Herbarium*, so for these reasons alone is likely to be original to the translation. But as I have discussed in the companion article to this one (Hall in this volume, Section 3), the use of *wedeberge* to gloss *elleborus* is widely attested in texts originating in a seventh-century Canterbury glossary, whose lemmata seem most likely to derive from Dioscorides’s *De materia medica*. It is clear that the translation *wedeberge* in the Old English *Herbarium* could come from this textual tradition. On the other hand, although I am not aware that the point has been demonstrated in print, the Old English *Herbarium* seems generally to translate Latin plant-names independently of earlier glosses (compare Van Arsdall 2002: 103–4). So there is an *a priori* case that *wedeberge* was introduced, implicitly in this scenario from the common Old English lexicon, by the translator of the Old English *Herbarium*.

The textual history of the Old English *Herbarium* here is elucidated by the Durham-Laud glossary — which suggests that the translation *wedeberge* was not original to the Old English *Herbarium*. Durham’s entries for *elleborus* run *Elleborus vedeberige uel thung* and *Elleborus albus tunsing-vyrt* (Lindheim 1941: 13, nos 148–9). These two entries seem likely to correspond respectively to Durham’s two main sources: the aforementioned Canterbury plant-name glossary whose lemmata derive ultimately from Dioscorides’s *De materia medica*, and the Old English *Herbarium*. The latter gloss must be from the *Herbarium*, sharing as it does both its Latin term and Old English equivalent. The form *elleborus* found in the glossary instead of the form *elleborum* in the main texts of our Old English *Herbarium* manuscripts and in Lucca is not a cause for concern: the Old English *Herbarium*’s contents list gives *elleborus albus*, and this could underlie the forms in the glossaries. The former gloss, then, is likely to derive directly from the Dioscorides glossary in which the gloss *elleborus wedeberge* first originated, because otherwise this major source would be left unrepresented. The Laud Herbal Glossary utilises more sources than Durham, mostly involving only Greek and/or Latin, and accordingly *elleborus* occurs there several times (Stracke 1974: 37–44):

- 543. *Elleborus albus* .i. *tunsingwyr*t. *uel* suffunie. *uel* wudeleac. *uel* ramese
- 544. *Elleborus niger* .i. *lungwvrt*.
- 563. *Eptapilon* .i. *elleborum*. *uel* *centauria minor*.
- 585. *Elleborum* .i. *plumumdaria*.
- 632. *Elleborum leucum*. *uel* *album* .i. *sudor de oue subtitilla*. *Erba pullitrica* .i. *uelatrum*

confectio.

633. *Elleborum melinum uel nigrum .i. testalia.*

777. *Helliborum .i. yediberige.*

Establishing the origins and significance of all these various attestations is beyond the scope of the present paper (though for no. 633 see Rusche 2001: 78–80). However, the first of the glosses listed, with the distinctive lemma *elleborus albus* coupled with the distinctive gloss *tunsingwyr̃t*, must come from the *Herbarium*, albeit with much material not present in other manuscripts. As this entry emphasises, the Laud compiler did not hesitate to include multiple glosses for his lemmata, so if his copy of the *Herbarium* had given the gloss *wedeberge* as our surviving manuscripts do, he would surely have included it. Accordingly, the last gloss listed — Laud’s version of the *elleborus wedeberge* gloss — is likely to be from a source other than the *Herbarium* (doubtless, ultimately, the Canterbury Dioscorides glossary). These glossaries, then, suggest that the early copy or copies of the Old English *Herbarium* which originally furnished lemmata to Durham-Laud translated *elleborum album* with *tunsingwyr̃t* — as do our surviving manuscripts — but not with *wedeberge*, since *wedeberge* is absent from those Durham-Laud entries which probably derive from the *Herbarium*.

The idea that the translation *wedeberge* was not original to the textual tradition of the Old English *Herbarium* is supported by internal evidence. It is worth noting that the *Herbarium* description of *elleborus albus* mentions neither madness nor berries, so *wedeberge* (‘madness-berry’) is not an obvious translation. More importantly, most entries in the *Herbarium* follow the formula found in, for example, Section 131: ‘This plant, which is named *basilica* [for *basilica*, as in MSS V and Ca] and by another name *nædderwyr̃t*, is grown...’ (Deos wyr̃t þe man basilica & oðrum naman nædderwyr̃t nemneþ byð cenned ...; De Vriend 1984: 168). The tag used to introduce the extra name *wedeberge*, ‘and also some people [name it] X’ (& eac sume men X), occurs only about a dozen times. This tag may in some cases, then, reflect later additions. Although by no means all the extra names so tagged can be associated with the Canterbury plant-name glossary which seems to have given rise to the *elleborus wedeberge* tradition, there are parallels: thus the *Herbarium* mentions ‘those plants which one calls *ebulum* and, by another name, *ellenwyr̃te*, and also some people call them *wealwyr̃t*’ (*þas wyr̃te þe man ebulum & oðrum naman ellenwyr̃te nemneþ & eac sume men wealwyr̃t hatað*; De Vriend 1984: 136, Section 93), whose additional name is consistent with the Canterbury plant-name gloss *ebulum wealhwyr̃t* (compare the Corpus Glossary: Hessels 1890: 45, E 11; the Laud Glossary: Stracke 1974: 36, no. 522). Likewise, ‘these plants which people call *cynoglossa* and by another name *ribbe*; and some people also name them *linguam canis*’ (*ðas wyr̃te þe man cynoglossam & oðrum naman ribbe nemneþ & hy eac sume men linguam canis hateþ*) echoes not only Canterbury plant-name glosses like *cinoglossa ribbe* but also *canes lingua ribbe* (compare the Corpus Glossary: Hessels 1890: 32, 26, C 411, C 28; the Laud Glossary: Stracke 1974: 29, nos 280, 298). At some point between the inception of its textual history and our earliest manuscripts, which are of the eleventh century, a redactor of the Old English *Herbarium* observed, presumably reading other glossaries, that some people called *elleborus* ‘wedeberge’, and added a note to this effect.

Elleborum album occurs also in another chapter of the Old English *Herbarium*: Chapter 159. Although this does not include a vernacular gloss, an examination sheds light on the character of the earliest texts of the *Herbarium*. The manuscript which De Vriend took as his main text (the sumptuously illustrated London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius C.iii, referred to by De Vriend as MS V), along with its close counterpart, British Library, Harley 585, leave

spaces for the vernacular word in this section, giving only the Latin heading *elleborum album* (De Vriend 1984: 202, 204); gaps of this kind occur in a number of entries. However, the later manuscript, London, British Library, Harley 6258 B (De Vriend 1984: 203, 205) gives the following (round brackets indicate marginal titles and/or damaged letters):

CLIX. *Ellebo(rum album) tunsig(wyrt)*.

Wið liferseocnysse nim þas wyrt þe man elleborum album 7 oþrum naman tunsingwyrt nemmeð zedriȝede to duste zecnucode, sile drincan on wyrme wætere, þas d(uste)s sýx cu(cule)res fulle, hit zelac/nad þa lifr(e), þat sylfe ys fangenlice [f(ramigendlic) in MS V] læcedom on wine zep(i)z ed aȝeon ealle attra.

159. *Elleborum album: tunsigwyrt*.

Take this plant, which is called *elleborum album*, and by another name *tunsingwyrt*, for a liver-illness. Give it, dried and pounded to powder, to drink in warm water — six spoonfuls of that powder. It heals the liver. That too is a dangerous [‘beneficial’ in MS V] remedy against all bad fluids when consumed in wine.

It is first necessary to establish the origin of the extra attestations of *tunsingwyrt* in MS Harley 6258 B. As De Vriend’s edition implies, it is more likely that a copyist added these to the tradition of Harley 6258 B on the basis of Chapter 140 than that another removed them from the tradition of MS Cotton Vitellius C.iii to leave a gap. It seems likely then, that the plant described in Chapter 159 was originally without an Old English name. If so, however, it seems odd that a text should have two entries for *elleborum album*, one with an Old English translation and one without. This disjunction is explained by the Latin source for this passage, identified by Hofstetter (1983: 342–3): a Latin collection called the *Curae herbarum* (on which see Collins 2000: 156–8), one manuscript of which — Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Lat. 13955 — includes

Elleborum nigrum uel epipactinum Ad curam iectoris herba suprascripta si sicca tundatur et cribrata ad modum coclearis ex [leg. cocleari sex] aqua calida bibatur mire facit. Ex uiuo herba aduersus omnia uenena medicamen erit.

Elleborum nigrum or *epipactinum*. For pain of the liver, the above mentioned herb, if, made dry, it is pounded; sieved to the measure of six spoons; and drunk with warm water, it works wonders. From the living herb there will be a remedy against all poisons.

This shows that Chapter 159 of the Old English *Herbarium* was not originally about *elleborum album*, but *elleborum nigrum*. The Old English *Herbarium* evidently originally had one entry for *elleborum album* (Chapter 140), while another (Chapter 159) dealt with *elleborum nigrum*; the two entries originated in different Latin texts but were brought together either by the scholar behind the Old English *Herbarium* or by an editor of the Latin text which he translated. While he had identified *elleborum album* as *tunsingwyrt*, the translator did not have a vernacular word for *elleborum nigrum*, so left a gap. Subsequently, *elleborum album* was written in Chapter 159 for *elleborum nigrum* (a stage represented by all the manuscripts of the Old English *Herbarium*), and then a later copyist again (represented by MS Harley 6258 B) added the translation *tunsingwyrt* on the basis of Chapter 140. In MS Vitellius C.iii, the illustration accompanying Chapter 159 ‘has some resemblance [to *Veratrum album*], but is *Scilla*’ (Cockayne 1864–6: I.287, note a), the plant accordingly being identified with *Urginea maritima* (L.) Bak. (also known as *Scilla maritima* L.) by De Vriend (1984: 323) and, subsequently, also by Van Arsdall (2002: 219). The plant is not native to Britain, making the lack of an Old English translation unsurprising. Here, then, we see the same hesitation over finding English equivalents for *elleborus* as Ælfric of Eynsham exhibited in his homily on St Martin. *Elleborum nigrum* simply could not be translated.

It is not unlikely that the Laud Herbal Glossary entry *Elleborus niger .i. lungwyr*t (Stracke 1974: 37, nos 543–4) derives ultimately from a text of the Old English *Herbarium* in which the reading *elleborum nigrum* still remained in Chapter 159, to which the translation *lungwyr*t had been added. Unfortunately, although *lungwyr*t has an apparent Old High German cognate *lungwur*z (see Björkman 1901–5: II.294), and although this gloss is paralleled by a series of Middle English glosses on *elleborus*, *lungwyr*t is attested only here in Old English (compare Bierbaumer 1975–9: III.164–5), and its later English forms are applied to a wide range of plants (see MED under *long-wort*; OED under *lungwort*; Hunt 1989: index under *Lungwort*). It may bear some relation to the ‘*lungenwyr*t whose upper part is yellow’ (*lungenwyr*t *seo biþ geolu ufeward*) mentioned in Bald’s *Leechbook* (Bk I, Section 38; Wright 1955: folio 35r), which seems to be golden lungwort, *Hieracium murorum* L. (Bierbaumer 1975–9: I.98); but it could equally be a calque on *pulmonaria* (*Pulmonaria* L.). Without more certainty about these variables, it is hard to adduce this gloss usefully in elucidating *elleborus*. I recap this argument schematically as table 1, marking each successive (putative) alteration to the text in **bold** type.

	Chapter 140	Chapter 159
Lost text used for Durham-Laud (c.900?)	Ʒeos wyrt þe man elleborum album (elleborus albus) & oðrum naman tunsingwyrt nemneð	nim þas wyrt þe man elleborum nigrum & oþrum naman [blank] nemneð
Text represented by MS Vitellius C. iii (MS from s.xi)	Ʒeos wyrt þe man elleborum album & oðrum naman tunsingwyrt nemneð & eac sume men wedeberge hatað	nim þas wyrt þe man elleborum album & oþrum naman [blank] nemneð
Text of MS Harley 6258 B (MS from s.xii)	(Ʒ)eos wyrt þæt man elleborum album & oþrum nama tunsingwyrt & sume men wedeberge h(atað)	nim þas wyrt þe man elleborum album & oþrum naman tunsingwyr t nemneð

Table 1: the transmission of the Old English *Herbarium*. Each successive (putative) alteration to the text is marked in **bold** type.

The only Old English translation of *elleborus* which was certainly originally included in the Old English *Herbarium* was *tunsingwyr*t, translating *elleborum album*. In one textual tradition, *elleborum nigrum* may have acquired the translation *lungwyr*t.

3. Glossing *elleborus* as *tunsingwyr*t

I have discussed already the indebtedness of the Durham-Laud glossaries to the Old English *Herbarium*, and their inclusion of a gloss *elleborus albus tunsingwyr*t. It is worth entertaining the possibility that other glosses of this kind are also textually related to the *Herbarium*. Two arise as glosses on the work of a pupil of Ælfric of Eynsham’s, Ælfric Bata, who composed a series of Latin colloquies as teaching aids. At the end of his twenty-fifth colloquy, preserved only in MS Oxford, St. John’s College 154, Ælfric Bata included a list of plant-names based

on that in Ælfric of Eynsham's *Glossary* (or perhaps, if we accept Lazzari's arguments (2003), on a common source). The dialogue (Ælfric Bata 1997: 156–7) runs

Fratres mei, dicite mihi nunc, habetis aliquod uiridiarium, aut habetis herbas aliquas in uiridario uestro?

Etiam, domine, habemus.

Quis exercet eas?

Hortulanus monasterii et medicus senioris nostri, qui eas omni anno plantat ac circumfodit et rigat.

My brothers, tell me now, do you have a garden? Do you have any herbs in your garden?

Yes, we do, sir.

Who tends them?

The gardener of the monastery, our abbot's doctor. He plants, cultivates, and waters them all year round.

Having established that the *hortulanus* is neither English nor Greek (presumably in an allusion to the Greek etymology of many plant-names; Ælfric Bata 1997: 157, note 304) but Frankish, and that he 'often makes good medicines and ointments' (*Bona sepe antidota et unguenta facit*) for all-comers, the text continues (Ælfric Bata 1997: 156–9):

Cuius generis herbas habetis?

Multae herbae ualde boni generis et mali ac diuersi semper crescunt in nostro uiridario.

Quales?

[...]

Ibi crescunt primitus illa holera, quae pene cotidie mandi possunt, si erunt cocta: caula uel magudaris, petrocilinum, malua, cerpillum, apium, algium, menta, anetum, saturagia. Crescit quoque ibi libestica, sandix, dilla, febrebugia, simphoniaca, rubia, rapa, auadonia, aprótamum, eliborum, senitia [...] et cetera multa holera, que tibi anglice non possum edicere.

What sort of plants do you have?

Many plants, both good and bad, of different sorts are always growing in our garden.

What sort?

[...]

First growing there are those vegetables that can be eaten just about every day, if they're cooked: cabbage, parsley, mallow, thyme, celery, garlic, mint, dill, and savory. Also growing there are lovage, woad, sorrel, feverfew, henbane, rubia, rape, mullein, wormwood, hemlock, groundsel [...] And there are a lot of other plants I can't name for you in English.

Eliborum here is an addition to Ælfric of Eynsham's list (like *saturagia*, *rapa*, and *rubia*, translated by Gwara respectively as 'savory', 'rape', and 'rubia' though I am not aware of *rubia* as an English word: it is more usually translated 'madder'). If we are to take Ælfric Bata at his word we may conclude that *elleborus* grows in monastic gardens, and can be named in Old English. It is not apparently intended for eating, so in view of his prior discussion, a medicinal purpose seems likely. We cannot be sure, however, both since Ælfric Bata's garden contains *herbae ... boni generis et mali*, and since, at the end of the day, the list is primarily an exercise in vocabulary rather than a necessarily accurate description of a monastic garden.

Ælfric Bata's texts are not in themselves very informative, but they lead us down avenues of closely related vernacular glosses. Gwara translated *elleborum* as 'hemlock' on the basis of the Antwerp-London Glossary, which seems to have some connection with Ælfric Bata's circle, and I examine this evidence at the end of the present study (Section 7). However, the

manuscript of Ælfric Bata's text itself, MS Oxford, St John's College 154, has glosses for *elleborus* on both occasions when the word appears, reading in the first instance *tunsing* and in the second *tunsincwyrt* (Napier 1900: 229, no. 378; Ælfric Bata 1997: 158). As I discuss shortly, *tunsingwyrt* was clearly a common word rather than a scholarly coining, so Ælfric Bata's glossator could have simply adduced *tunsingwyrt* from his day-to-day knowledge of Old English. On the other hand, he could in theory have referred to a manuscript of the Old English *Herbarium* or a derived glossary and drawn the gloss from there; our glossed manuscript of the *Colloquy* was at Durham around the twelfth or thirteenth centuries (Ker 1957: 437, no. 362), and if it was produced there, then the antecedents of the Durham Plant-Names Glossary would probably have been available. Unfortunately, there seems to be no secure evidence as to whether or not Ælfric Bata's glossator did indeed use such a glossary. We can look to his handling of Ælfric Bata's other additions to Ælfric of Eynsham's list of plant-names: *saturagia* (not, unfortunately, glossed), *rubia* (glossed with *medewyrt*) and *rapa* (glossed with *næp*) (Ælfric Bata 1997: 158). Although *medewyrt* is well attested in Old English medical texts, *rubia medewyrt* is unique (the closest parallel seems to be the Antwerp-London Glossary, considered further below, giving *Rubia mæddre*; Kindschi 1955: 111). The gloss *rapa næp* is also paralleled by Antwerp-London (Kindschi 1955: 112; compare Björkman 1901–5: I.233, II.273 for Old High German examples), but Antwerp-London does not contain the word *tunsingwyrt*, instead glossing *elleborus* with *wodewistle*, as I discuss below. The Durham Plant-Name Glossary includes the lemma *rapa* with no gloss (Lindheim 1941: 17, no. 286), but where it came from is not immediately clear. It is possible, then, that *elleborus tunsingwyrt* in the Ælfric Bata glosses is related to the Old English *Herbarium*, but the gloss could equally well represent the glossator's personal translation.

A similar situation holds for a late tenth-century gloss on Aldhelm's riddle *Elleborus* (the poem at the centre of the companion piece to this one, see Hall in this volume), unparalleled in this context, included by the main scribe of MS London, British Library, Royal 12.C.xxiii. To the title of the riddle (in this manuscript 'DE ELLEBORO') he added the gloss *tunsinwyrt* (Aldhelm 1990: 227, Riddle 99). The question of whether this gloss was inherited from a glossary or the Old English *Herbarium* is particularly important: if it was inherited, then the scribe may have added it mechanically to the riddle, whether or not *tunsingwyrt* actually denoted a plant which fitted Aldhelm's description (which is probably of woody nightshade). If he invented the gloss, however, then the match between gloss and riddle could provide important evidence for the meanings of *tunsingwyrt*. A reasonable case can be made for copying rather than invention here, though again it proves impossible to be very sure.

Although the main scribe's Old English glossing is not consistent in the manuscript (tellingly, a second glossator added another forty-four mainly marginal Old English glosses; see Aldhelm 1990: 48, 52–4), it is not haphazard. The scribe made only six vernacular glosses on riddles' titles, the others being 'MILLEFOLIUM wearwe'; 'TRUTINA wegan'; 'SOLSEQUIUM goldwyrt'; 'DE CREBELLO QUO FURFURAE A FARINA SEQUESTANTUR syfeda'; and 'DE EBULO wælwyr't' (Aldhelm 1990: 162, 163, 164, 187, 219; Riddles 49, 50, 51, 67, 94; compare 52–4). Although glosses were not added to all those titles involving plants (contrast Riddles 45, *De urtica*; 76, *De melario vel malo*; and 77 *De ficulnea*), the scribe evidently took a disproportionate interest in glossing plant-names in the vernacular. 'MILLEFOLIUM wearwe' is surely an error for *gearwe*, a gloss found in many manuscripts, English and German, including both the Épinal-Erfurt Glossary and the Old English *Herbarium* (Pheifer 1974: 33, 34, nos 623, 639; De Vriend 1984: 128, Chapter 90; compare Björkman 1901–5: I.226). The gloss

‘DE EBULO wælwyr̄t’ enjoys a similar distribution (De Vriend 1984: 136, Chapter 93; see Hall in this volume, Section 4). More telling is the gloss ‘SOLSEQUIUM goldwyr̄t’: this seems to be paralleled in Old English (and later English) only in the *Nomina herbarum Grece et Latine* listed in MS Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale, 1828–30, in the form *Solsequia golde* (Rusche 1996: 554–66, no. 467). Both the Brussels manuscript and MS Royal 12.C.xxiii were written at Christ Church, Canterbury, so the distinctive similarity is unsurprising. Although the Brussels manuscript is probably later than the Royal, its plant-name glossary could represent a tradition from which the Royal gloss derives. We have a close Old High German parallel to the Brussels gloss, *Fleotropia* [i.e. *Heliotropia*] *Golde* (Steinmeyer and Sievers 1879–1922: III.522), and the plant-name *golde* is much better attested in the Old German dialects than in Old English (Björkman 1901–5: II.268; *Althochdeutsches Wörterbuch*, under *golda*). This hints that Brussels may show German influence — plausible in tenth- to eleventh-century Canterbury — with Royal 12.C.xxiii making an attempt to anglicize *golde* and to make its identity as a plant-name clear in a new glossarial context by adding *-wyr̄t*. However, although the Brussels text contains representatives of *ebulus wælwyr̄t*; *millefolium gearwe* and *solsequium goldwyr̄t*, it does not contain *elleborus tunsingwyr̄t* (or any other gloss on *elleborus*). We are left with a general probability that the scribe of Royal 12.C.xxiii used other glossaries, but no single text which survives. Other glosses show that he almost certainly had access to the older gloss *wedeberge*: some of the plant-name glosses probably come from the same textual tradition as *wedeberge*; moreover, our scribe glossed the word *conquilio* in the second line of the riddle with *weolcscille* (Aldhelm 1990: 227), a gloss belonging to the Épinal-Erfurt-Corpus tradition, where *wedeberge* is also found. But he chose not to use *wedeberge*, which tells us that the gloss *tunsingwyr̄t* was probably to at least some extent a preferred choice rather than simply a mark of desperation, and is generally consistent with the sense outlined at the beginning of this article that later Anglo-Saxon scholarship was defining itself as distinct from earlier Anglo-Saxon work. These points show clearly that the Royal scribe’s use of *tunsingwyr̄t* may derive from a manuscript related somehow to the Old English *Herbarium*, but it is not possible to be sure of this.

4. *Tunsingwyr̄t* outside glosses

Although it is far from certain, the considerations above permit the suggestion that almost all our attestations of *tunsingwyr̄t* are textually closely related. Moreover, *tunsingwyr̄t* survived into Middle English only in the early Middle English textual descendants of Anglo-Saxon materials (MED, under *tunsing-wurt*), so we have no later correlates. Likewise, it has no cognates in other languages. These details would all point to the idea that *tunsingwyr̄t* is simply a gloss-word. However, we have two attestations of *tunsingwyr̄t* which can be reliably considered independent of this tradition. Both occur in Bald’s *Leechbook* I. The first comes in Section 28 (Wright 1955: folio 26r):

Wiþ baneece tuningwyr̄t . beolone . wealwyr̄t ealde grut & eced . heorotes smera oþþe gate . oþþe gose meng tosomne lege þonne on . Wiþ baneece eft to drence elene . cneowholen . wealwyr̄t . hune . cluffþung gecnuwa do on wæter þæt ofer yrne beþe to fyre swiðe þone ece þweah mid þy wætere do þæt þriwa on dæg . wyr̄c þonne sealfe of tuniigwyr̄te of eolonan . of þunge . of wermode do ealra emfela wylle swiðe .

Against bone-ache/thigh-pain: *tuningwyr̄t*, henbane, dwarf elder, old meal and vinegar; hart’s fat or goat’s, or goose’s; mix together and then apply. Against bone-ache/thigh-pain also: elecampane, butcher’s broom, dwarf elder, horehound, (celery-leaved) buttercup as

a drink. Pound, put in water which runs over [it]; steam that ache well with that liquid; do so three times a day. Then make a salve from *tuniigwyr*t, from elecampane, from *þung* [denoting a range of toxic plants], from wormwood. Use the same amount of each; boil well.

Since the orthography of this manuscript does not make use of combinations like *ii*, the latter form here, *tuniigwyr*t, must be a scribal error, presumably for *tuningwyr*t by the omission of a minim. Both of the occurrences of *tunsingwyr*t here, then, have it as an ingredient for salves against ‘bone-ache’ (defined by the DOE, under *bān-ece*, as ‘pain in the thigh (-bone), sciatica’). Although not much can be made of the point, this is not a symptom for which I have seen *elleborus* prescribed in ancient and medieval texts. The second attestation, in what must surely be a variant form of the same word, *tungilsinwyr*t, comes in Section 47, entitled *Læcedomas wið þeoradlum*, (apparently) ‘remedies for inflammatory illnesses’ (folio 44r), and listed in the contents as ‘Remedies and drinks and salves against ?inflammatory illnesses, of many kinds’ (*Læcedomas & drenca*s & *sealfa wiþ þeoradlum moniges cynnes*; folio 4v). It is noteworthy for being one of only two remedies explicitly ascribed to named Anglo-Saxons — in this case an otherwise unknown Oxa — and seems likely to be independent in its origin from the remedy just quoted. At any rate, no Latin original seems to have been identified for it. The remedy in question runs (Wright 1955: folio 45v):

*Oxa lærde þisne læcedom . genime wealwyr*t & *clufþung* & *cneowholen* & *efelastan* & *camecon* & *tungilsinwyr*t . VIII . *brune bisceopwyr*t . & *attorlaþan* & *reade netlan* . & *reade hofan* . & *wermod* & *gearwan* . & *hunan* & *dolgrunan* . & *dweorgedwostlan do ealle þas wyrta on wylisc ealo* & *drince þonne nigon dagas* & *blod læte*.

Oxa taught this remedy. Take dwarf elder and ?buttercup and butcher’s broom and *efenlaste* and ?hog’s fennel and *tungilsinwyr*t; 9 dark betonies and *attorlaðe* and purple deadnettle and purple ivy and wormwood and yarrow and horehound and pellitory-of-the-wall and pennyroyal; put all these plants in Welsh ale and drink it then for nine days and let blood.

Our attestations of *tunsingwyr*t in medical texts occur in lists of ingredients too long for much to be inferred about them from their medical applications. We might only note that the plant does not seem to have been prominent in Anglo-Saxon medicine, at least under this name. Still, the *Leechbook* evidence is important for establishing the broader (West-Saxon) currency of the word *tunsingwyr*t, and for showing variation in the form of this word which looks, in some cases, more like variation in spoken language than scribal corruption, again suggesting the broad currency of the term.

5. The etymology of *tunsingwyr*t

Thus we have three main forms of the word *tunsingwyr*t. All three are similar enough to one another, and different enough from other Old English plant-names, that they must surely be seen as variant forms of the same word. But their differences are noteworthy. The Old English *Herbarium* tradition and its possible relatives show forms focusing on *tunsingwyr*t. The spelling variation in the *-ing-* element in this tradition, with the forms *-in-* and *-inc(g)-*, is common enough, reflecting scribal and phonetic variation (relevant comparisons are provided by Smith 1956, under *-ing* Section 2; Campbell 1959: Section 450, compare Section 474.5; and De Vriend 1984: lxx). Meanwhile, the first remedy in Bald’s *Leechbook* has the form *tuningwyr*t; and Oxa’s remedy — whose association with a named individual affords the tantalising if unprovable possibility of detecting an idiolectal form of the word — gives *tungilsinwyr*t. Of

these three forms, *tunsingwyr*t is ostensibly much the better attested, and it is no surprise that it has become the standard dictionary headword form (compare Kitson 1988: 109). But the prospect that all the attestations of this form are textually related raises the possibility that they are no more valuable as witnesses to common Anglo-Saxon usage than each of the forms from Bald's *Leechbook*. The *tunsingwyr*t form could have survived substantially unchanged in the textual tradition not because it corresponded to the precise variants used by the scribes in day-to-day life (assuming that they ever did use it), but because the written variant with which they were presented was accorded more prestige.

The element *-ing(-)* occurs in a wide range of Old English word-forms, from a range of etymological sources and with various meanings (see, for example, Smith 1956, under *-ing*; Kastovsky 1992: 386, 388) and, as Sauer has emphasised, the element poses problems in all three plant-names containing it (the others being *æðelferðingwyr*t and *smeringwyr*t; Sauer 2003: 165; see also Kitson 1988: 107–11). Deciding which of these etyma might have been present in *tunsingwyr*t when it was first coined is probably impossible. All the same, it is worth discussing possible interpretations and etymologizations of the word because even if they are not correct, they may indicate the bases for folk-etymologies which encouraged the attested range of variants.

Of our attested forms, *tuning-* is much the easier to etymologize (whether or not the etymology is actually correct). *Tun* and *Tuna* are attested as monothematic Old English personal names (PASE), so a personal name like ***Tuning*, deriving originally from a monothematic personal name coupled with the patronymic suffix *-ing* (for which see Smith 1956: under *-ing*³, especially Section 2), is possible. Another viable interpretation is some formation on *tun-* 'settlement, estate, enclosure'. In itself, *tun-* is not uncommon in plant-names, occurring in *tuncerse*, *tunhofe*, *tummelde*, *tunminte* and *tunnæp* (Bierbaumer 1975–9: I.133–4, II.117–18, III.233–4; compare MED, under *toun-cresse*; *tun-hōve*), where it presumably carries *tun*'s old sense of 'enclosure' — as in the common compounds *leactun* and *wyrttun* 'vegetable garden'.¹ One viable etymon of *tuningwyr*t may therefore be the noun *tyning*, etymologically meaning 'enclosure' if from *tun*, or 'the act of enclosing' if from the verb *tynan* 'enclose, close' (Smith 1956, under *tūning*; compare *-ing*¹ Sections iii, iv respectively; MED, under *tūning*).² If *tyning* is from *tun*, then the *i*-mutation variant *tuning* (caused by either the failure of *i*-mutation or its later cancelling by analogy with *tun*) is not unlikely. This would either imply that *tuningwyr*t was a plant with which one made enclosures (compare *haguborn* 'hawthorn, whitethorn', etymologically 'enclosure thorn'), or perhaps one which, like *tuncerse*, grew within an enclosure. Another option, with similar implications, is to assume that we have *tun* followed by the connective element *-ing-* (on which see Smith 1956, under *-ing*⁴). The origins and precise significance of this element are rather vexed; it is common only

¹ Bosworth 1898, under *leac-tun*, *wyr-tun*; compare Markey, this volume: 32 n. 27; Banham 2003: 125–6; MED, under *leigh-toun*. It seems not to have been noted before that *leactun* appears in Anglian texts and *wyrttun* in West Saxon: they may, then, be distinctively dialectal terms existing in a complementary distribution.

² I dispense with the word *tunin*cel-**tynin*cel 'small *tun*' (from *tun* + *incgel*). This is reasonably securely attested (Bosworth 1898, under *tūin*cel; Smith 1956, under *tūin*cel), but to assume that it was reduced such as to produce *tuningwyr*t is dubious. Likewise, the use of the suffix *-ingas* (broadly 'people, dwellers') often appears in place-names in *-tun* — as for example *Glaetuninga weg*, literally the 'road of the people of Glædtun' (Watts 2004, under *Glutton*), and a certain lexical status for a word *-tuningas* is implied by Bosworth's use of that form as a headword (1898). But this seems an unlikely source for *tuningwyr*t, both because it is initial there, and because although *-ingas*-type names frequently produced singular forms in the Scandinavian languages (for example, Icelandic *Íslendingur*, 'an Icelander'), this is much rarer in Old English (Smith 1956, under *-ingas*, Sections 4, 7d).

in place-names, but this does not rule it out, either as a genuine etymon of *tuningwyr*t or as a component in folk-etymology inspired by place-names. In this case, *tuningwyr*t can be understood effectively as **tunwyr*t ‘enclosure-plant’.

*Tungilsinwyr*t is the next easiest form to interpret. Erhardt-Siebold (1936: 169) assumed this to contain the element *tungol*, ‘star’, presumably in a putative reference to star-like flowers, translating it ‘star in herb’. But this does not explain the *s* of *tungils-*, while the *-i-* there would also be anomalous, and the preposition *in* ought to cause the element *wyr*t to appear in the dative (as *wyrte*). The only viable interpretation seems to me to take the first element as a personal name — of which **Tungils* would be an unattested but theoretically possible example — almost certainly followed by a phonetic variant of the connective particle *-ing-*. A plant name beginning in an Old English personal name would be paralleled by *witmaeres wyr*t, which, in the form that we have it, can hardly contain anything else, while in the minds of at least some Old English-speakers, *æðelferðingwyr*t and probably the rarer forms *simæringwyr*t (more usually *smeringwyr*t) and *siwardes wyr*t also contained personal names (see Kitson 1988: 109–11). It is not impossible that *Tungilsinwyr*t was the earlier form of *tunsingwyr*t, of which the other forms are reductions. But it seems more probable that the analogy went the other way, an obscure or rare first element being reinterpreted as a similar-sounding personal name. Much the commonest context for *-ing-* as a connective particle in Old English is in place-names, and of these most take a personal name as their first element (for example, *Cyneburgingctun*, now Kemerton in Gloucestershire; Smith 1956, under *-ing-*⁴ at Sections 1, 4b), which would have produced a fertile set of analogues (albeit toponymic) for reinterpreting *tuningwyr*t or *tunsingwyr*t as *tungilsin(g)wyr*t. Kitson (1988: 109) considered it ‘almost certainly a scribal error for *tunsingwyr*t’, and since we can hardly be dealing here with a slip of the pen, he was presumably imagining a scribe accidentally writing a personal name in a lapse of concentration. But it is at least as likely that we are dealing with a spoken variant.

Turning to *tunsingwyr*t, it is the *-s-* here which is problematic. It cannot belong to the *-ing-* element (contrast variants such as *-ling(-)*), while although *-s-* makes appearances in Old English derivational morphology, no stem in *tuns-* is attested. If we can assume that all our attestations are textually related, it would be possible to suggest that the *-s-* originated merely as a scribal error in some early text of the Old English *Herbarium* — though its uncorrected transmission in so many later manuscripts would in that case be surprising. Cockayne (1864–6: II.409) saw the word as a contraction of *tungilsinwyr*t; this is plausible insofar as plant-names are more liable than most lexical classes to irregular phonological changes, but is not particularly inviting — and it is at least as easy, as I have suggested, to argue for the reverse process. Bosworth (1898, under *tunsing-wyr*t) pointed to the unique Somerset place-name *Tunsing* attested in charter S626 (as listed in Kelly 1999). Conceivably, then, *tunsingwyr*t either takes its name from this place (or another of the same name), or was folk-etymologized to seem as if it did. We might imagine that the translator of the Old English *Herbarium* had connections with a speech-community which knew a place called Tunsing where *tunsingwyr*t grew (or was grown) in large quantities. While this is merely speculative, no more convincing etymon is forthcoming.

One is tempted to borrow the text-critical principle of *fortior lectio difficilior* here. Since it is relatively easy to explain *tuningwyr*t and *tungilsinwyr*t as folk etymologies, the most likely form to be original is the obscure *tunsingwyr*t. But this is far from certain. *Tunsingwyr*t affords an intriguing glimpse into a world of linguistic variation which resists neophilological etymologizations and suggests a complexity and diversity of plant-naming in Anglo-Saxon

culture more like that uncovered by modern dialectologists than attested by our limited Anglo-Saxon texts (compare Biggam, this volume, Section 1).

6. What was *tunsingwyr*?

Tunsingwyr has hitherto been considered an accurate rendering of *elleborum album*'s Classical meaning, being identified therefore as *Veratrum album* L.³ However, as the companion article to this one emphasises (Hall, in this volume), this meaning for *elleborum* cannot readily be assumed *a priori* for Anglo-Latin. One or two hints as to the denotation of *tunsingwyr* can be gleaned from the Old English *Herbarium*. Whereas our Latin text says *Albumque est in similitudinem caepae, folia angustiora habet*, 'and the white [hellebore] has the appearance of an onion; it has narrower leaves', the Old English text reads *Ʒeos wyr* *Ʒe man elleborum album 7 oðrum naman tunsincgwyrt nemneð ... hafað leaf leace gelice*, 'this plant, which is called *elleborum album*, and by another name *tunsincgwyrt*, has leaves like an allium'. Although our Latin manuscripts are too few for the direction of change to be certain, it seems likely that the Old English text shows the alteration of the Latin text, from saying that the plant is like an onion, but with narrower leaves, to saying that the plant's leaves are like those of an allium (for this meaning of *leac* see Bierbaumer 1975–9: I.93, II.76–7, III.157–8; Markey, in this volume). This broadens the range of plants which might fit the description of *elleborum album*, and this broadening may reflect efforts to attempt to identify it with a plant or plants of the British Isles. The implication of *hafað leaf leace gelice* may be that, although the leaves are like an allium's, the plant is in fact not an allium; but it is hard to be sure of this. The similarity envisaged may have been of shape, or may have been a reference to leaks' distinctively squishy leaves. At any rate, the only allium in the Old English *Herbarium* seems to be the onion (*Allium cepa* L.), *bulbus* in the Latin, with no Old English translation given (De Vriend 1984: 230, 232, Chapter 184), so a translator with an Anglo-Saxon cultural background, in which alliums were prominent, might have been tempted to adduce one to fill the gap. A further factor may have been the illustration of *elleborum album* which the translator of the Old English *Herbarium* doubtless had before him, discussed below.

Further perspectives on this evidence are afforded by the long Laud Herbal Glossary entry *Elleborus albus .i. tunsingwvrt. uel suffunie. uel wudeleac. uel ramese* (Stracke 1974: 37, no 543). Although the glossary is late — mid-twelfth-century — parts probably derive from, or at least reflect, late Anglo-Saxon plant-naming, and the unique list of vernacular glosses given here is valuable. It is problematic: the extra glosses could have been added because they were synonyms of *tunsingwyr*, or conversely because they denoted something within the semantic field of *elleborus albus* which was not covered by *tunsingwyr*. Moreover, *suffunie* is unfortunately mysterious. It must be related to number of counterparts for *elleborus (niger)*, to at least some extent textually interrelated, identified by Hunt (1989: 106) in later medieval manuscripts, with forms such as *gallice syfonye; suffonie, cloftunge; and gallice suffonie*. I have not succeeded in tracing this word in Old French or Anglo-Norman dictionaries, but these texts, at any rate, invite us to add *suffunie* to the list of French words in the Laud Herbal Glossary given by Stracke (1974: 208). *Wudeleac* (ostensibly from **wuduleac*) and *ramese* (from *hramsa*) are more illuminating.

³ Cockayne (1864–6: II.409); Bosworth (1898, under *tunsing-wyr*); Clark Hall (1960, under *tunsingwyr*); Bierbaumer (1975–9: I.133–4, II.118, III.234); compare Van Arsdall (2002: 210).

The reflexes of *hramsā* seem prototypically to denote wild garlic (*Allium ursinum* L.), as do most of its Indo-European cognates (OED, under *rams*, *ramson*; MED, under *ramse*; compare Markey, in this volume, Section 6.2.1). In Old English, *hramsā* is most prominently attested in textually-related glosses on a group of three lemmata which seem to be derivatives of the Latin *acidula* ‘bitter, sour’, and which are not very revealing (for example, Björkman 1901–5: I.225; Pfeifer 1974: 6, nos 59, 60; see also 63). But it seems likely that *hramsā* denoted wild garlic (compare Bierbaumer 1975–9: III.142–3); and if medieval Ireland is anything to go by, it was an important wild food-plant (Carey 1988: 72; Kelly 2000: 308). It is worth noting that one of the plants most often prescribed in the Old English medical texts against what Dendle called ‘mental or behavioral disturbance of a clearly malefic or demonic character’ is *cropleac* (Dendle 2001: 91, note 1), as this may also denote wild garlic (DOE, *crop-lēac* 1 ‘crow garlic’), and there may be some synonymy. If so, there may be some connection between the association of *hramsā* and *elleborum* on the one hand, and *elleborus* and the curing of madness in Classical tradition (for which see Hall in this volume, Section 3).

The glossing of *elleborum album* with *hramsā* correlates broadly with the evidence of *wudeleac*. *Wudeleac* appears to be a unique form (compare MED, under *wōde* 4a; Hunt 1989: index under *Wild Garlic*). The first element is ostensibly Old English *wudu*, which means ‘wood, timber’, but as the first element of compounds often means ‘wild-’ (compare perhaps ME *wilde garlek*, MED, under *wilde* 6a); either meaning would describe the habitat of wild garlic perfectly well. Unique as it is, the word could be a coining by a glossator, who simply wished to identify the *elleborus albus* as a ‘wood-/wild-allium’. Whether a gloss-word or not, it is also possible that earlier in the textual tradition, the first element was not *wude-* but *wode-* (the scribal alteration of *wode-* to *wude-* is attested, for example, in the Durham Plant-Name Glossary entry *Cicuta heomlic uel vude vistle*; Lindheim 1941: 12, no. 116; see further Section 7 below). This interpretation resonates tantalisingly with the *elleborus wedeberge* glosses; if it is right, the glossator may have wished to convey that *elleborum album* was an allium which healed or caused madness. But this interpretation is less economical than assuming that we are indeed dealing with a ‘wood-/wild-allium’. Bierbaumer (1975–9: III.267), taking *wudeleac* as a synonym of *ramese*, interpreted it too as *allium ursinum*. This is not unlikely; it is at any rate clear that both denoted alliums.

It is evident that someone in the textual tradition underlying the Laud Herbal Glossary associated *elleborum album* with alliums, and specifically probably with wild garlic. It would be interesting to know whether these additional glosses entered the tradition as additions to a text of the Old English *Herbarium* itself or as additions to a glossary excerpted from it; the latter suggestion is perhaps more likely, but it is hard to be certain. The evidence is, at any rate, broadly consistent with the association in the Old English *Herbarium* of the leaves of *elleborum album* with those of a *leac*. This evidence is also consistent, moreover, with the illustration of *elleborum album* in our one illustrated text of the *Herbarium*, the eleventh-century MS London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius C.iii (D’Aronco and Cameron 1998, folio 60v). The illustration is damaged in its middle section, but enough survives for it to be clear that although the illustration can plausibly be understood to have originated in a depiction of *Veratrum album* L., it looks considerably more like wild garlic. The illustration clearly depicts a bulb or cluster of bulbs, which is not consistent with *Veratrum album*, and the flowers could readily be taken for those of wild garlic (or similar alliums). Admittedly, it shows several flowering stalks arising from a single bulb, which would be unusual for wild garlic and its relatives, but this is a point which is far from evident when the plant is seen growing

in the dense patches which it is liable to form. Without an investigation of the manuscript history of this illustration, it is hard to be sure whether the gloss *tunsingwyrt* reflects an illustration appearing to depict wild garlic, or whether the illustration reflects the work of a copyist influenced by the translation *tunsingwyrt*, ‘wild garlic’. Either scenario, however, militates in favour of identifying *tunsingwyrt* as a synonym for wild garlic. If this is correct, then *tunsingwyrt* demands to be understood as part of a wider study of the Old English lexicon of alliums, and the evidence for their use in medicine.

7. *Wodewistle*

There remains one Old English gloss on *elleborum*, and it brings us back to Ælfric Bata’s scholarship. This occurs in another list of herbs, written by the second of the two scribes who, in the earlier part of the eleventh century, compiled the texts now known as the Antwerp-London Glossary (as marginalia in MS Antwerp, Plantin-Moretus Museum, M 16.2 and its *disiectum membrum* MS London, British Library, Additional 32,246). Basing his work — like Ælfric Bata — either on Ælfric of Eynsham’s class-glossary or on some shared source, the scribe composed a large Latin-English class glossary which Porter labelled ‘article 6’ and Ker called ‘d’ (see Ker 1957: 1–3, no. 2; Porter 1999: especially 181–8; Lazzari 2003). In the section devoted to plant-names, he included the entry *Elleborum wodewistle* [ue]t *Uoratrum* (Kindschi 1955: 112).⁴ This list of plant-names shares with Ælfric Bata’s several words not found in Ælfric of Eynsham’s class-glossary, *elleborum* among them. The Antwerp-London Glossary and Ælfric Bata’s *Colloquy* also share some other obscure items of vocabulary, while two glosses ‘give unique, idiosyncratic meanings matching the context of Bata’s *Colloquies*’ (in Ælfric Bata 1997: 60–64, at 64; compare 66–7). These points led Porter to conclude — with due circumspection — that there is ‘sufficient connection to suspect Bata’s participation in the extensive glossarial activity to which the Antwerp-London manuscript is evidence’ (in Ælfric Bata 1997: 64). There is a possibility, then, that Antwerp-London provides an interpretation of *elleborus* with which Ælfric Bata would have been familiar — perhaps more familiar, indeed, than with the *tunsingwyrt* gloss provided to his own texts.

It appears that the Antwerp-London glossator, faced with the prospect of glossing *elleborum* (which was not already covered by Ælfric of Eynsham’s glosses), turned first to Isidore of Seville’s *Etymologiae*, where he found the equivalent *veratrum* (on his use of Isidore, see Porter 1999: 183–6). For the vernacular gloss *wodewistle*, however, he turned to the old Canterbury glossing tradition, first attested in the Épinal-Erfurt Glossaries, which includes (to quote Épinal) *cicuta uuodaeuistlae* (Pheifer 1974: 12, no. 185); like *elleborus wedeberge*, the gloss must go back to a seventh-century glossary, probably the Dioscorides glossary. That the Antwerp-London glossator was using this tradition is fairly clearly demonstrated by the gloss which immediately follows the *elleborum* gloss: *Cicuta hemlic* (Kindschi 1955: 112). This is

⁴ In view of the fact that confusion between the letters *wynn* (*IBF*?) and *þorn* (*þ*) is not uncommon in the transmission of Old English texts, it is tempting to connect attestations of *wodewistle* with attestations of *wodeþistle* (occurring principally in Chapter 111 of the Old English *Herbarium* as an equivalent of *cardium silvaticum*, apparently *Sonchus oleraceus* L.; Lindheim 1941: 11, no. 102; De Vriend 1984: 154; compare Stracke 1974: 30, no. 320). Indeed, Wright’s edition of the Antwerp-London Glossary gave *Elleborum uel ueratrum wodeþistle* (1884, column 135, no. 42), while the MED affords good evidence for later confusion of *wodeþistle* with *wodewistle* (under *wōde-thistel* c). That there were originally two different words, however, seems beyond doubt, and I make no attempts here to emend current readings of our manuscripts.

attested in most manuscripts alongside *cicuta wodewistle*, as in Épinal's entry *cicuta hymblieae* (Pheifer 1974: 14, no. 248; compare Wotherspoon on *hymlic* in this volume, Section 5.2). It appears that the Antwerp-London glossator received this tradition and saw an opportunity both to reduce duplication in the vernacular glossing of *cicuta* and to add a vernacular gloss to *elleborum*.

The gloss *cicuta hemlic* is apparently unproblematic. *Cicuta* usually denotes hemlock, *Conium maculatum* L., though Kitson has shown that its semantic range extended beyond this to other umbellifers (1988: 104–6); *hemlic* and its reflexes seem likewise to have denoted hemlock throughout the history of English, along with other umbelliferous plants of similar appearance (see Wotherspoon, in this volume). The use of *wodewistle* as a gloss for *cicuta* likewise seems straightforward. *Wodewistle* is attested in Middle English (admittedly partly in textual traditions deriving from Anglo-Saxon ones) denoting 'any of several hollow-stemmed plants, esp[ecially] hemlock (*Conium maculatum*) and cowbane (*Cicuta virosa*)' (MED, under *whistle* e; Hunt 1989: index under *Wode-Thistle*, *Wode-Whistle*; compare *Wode-Wort*). This makes sense etymologically: *wodewistle* is not precisely paralleled in other Germanic languages, but the only Old High German plant-name beginning in a cognate of *wod* appears to be *wotich*, which also glosses only *cicuta* (Björkman 1901–5: II.279); likewise, Holthausen adverted to the Low German *woden-dung*, which also denoted hemlock (1934, under *ðung*). This fits in turn with the dramatic effects of ingesting hemlock (see Wotherspoon on *hymlic* in this volume, Section 6.2). For its part, the element *-wistle* seems to derive from a Germanic root **hwis-*, which, unparalleled elsewhere in Indo-European languages, has been taken as an onomatopoeic formation denoting sounds in the field of whispering (*whisper* being another reflex of the root), hissing and whistling (OED, under *whistle* v.; De Vries 1964, under *hwísl*, *hwíska*). The primary sense of the simplex *hwistle*, etymologically and throughout attested English, seems accordingly to be a musical pipe, so its use in the plant-name presumably represents the extension of this denotation to plants with pipe-like stems, or stems from which one might make pipes.⁵ As it happens, the opposite process is attested for *cicuta* in Classical Latin, whose denotation was extended from hemlock to other kinds of tubes, including musical pipes. As Wotherspoon has pointed out, there may be some connection between this polysemy and the use of *-hwistle* in Old English glosses for *cicuta* (Wotherspoon, in this volume, Section 5), but this is not a necessary inference, and we could as easily be dealing with semantic changes taking place independently of influence from Latin. Either way, there are good reasons for understanding *wodewistle* normally to have denoted hemlock and plants like it.

The *Dictionary of Old English Plant-Names* suggests that the use of *wodewistle* to gloss *elleborus* 'has to be a confusion with *wēdeberie*'. The glossator very likely had access to the gloss *elleborus wedeberge*. But I am not convinced of the confusion: despite having cognate first elements, the two words are very different, nor are they adjacent in surviving glossaries in a way that might have encouraged eye-skip. Conceivably the glossator noticed the gloss, chose not to repeat it (presumably because *wedeberge* was an unfamiliar gloss-word, and/or because it evidently did not denote the plant which he had in mind), but was encouraged by it to insert *wodewistle*, whose first element shares its root with the *wede-* of *wedeberge*. Alternatively, he perhaps simply thought of *elleborus* as meaning 'poisonous plant, plant causing madness'

⁵ Bosworth (1898, under *hwistle*; also Toller 1921, under *hwistle*); OED under *whistle*; MED under *whistle*; DOST under *Quhissil(l)*.

— in interpretation not so far from Ælfric’s in his account of St Martin — and identified it on these grounds with hemlock or umbellifers like it (as Wotherspoon has discussed, *wodewistle* could be taken as another umbellifer, cowbane (*Cicuta virosa* L.)). Lexicographical expertise does not necessarily come hand in hand with botanical expertise; the Antwerp-London glossator’s alteration to his received textual tradition was doubtless partly a matter of editorial convenience; and it seems plausible that to him *elleborum* denoted hemlock or something very like it. Whether the Antwerp-London glossator considered *wodewistle* to denote something distinct from *hemlic*, and more appropriate to *elleborus*, is not clear. He liked to conflate his sources to provide multiple glosses for each lemma (Porter 1999: 185), so his decision not to include both *wodewistle* and *hemlic* as glosses for *cicuta* may be significant, encouraging the idea that they had slightly different denotations.

8. Conclusions

The understandings of *elleborus* in later Anglo-Saxon England prove to have varied, from Ælfric’s implicit assertion around 1000 that *elleborus* had no vernacular Old English counterpart, to the association by the translator of the Old English *Herbarium*, perhaps around 900, of *elleborus albus* with *tunsingwyrt*, which seems to have denoted an allium such as wild garlic, to the use of the gloss *wodewistle*, denoting hemlock or some similar plant, by the Antwerp-London glossator in the earlier eleventh century. The first conclusion to this piece, then, was that the term *elleborus* produced diverse responses, and although there is plenty of evidence — albeit often inconclusive — that glossators had access to others’ work in this period, it is clear that different scholars nonetheless arrived at different interpretations, hinting at a rather lively intellectual milieu. Meanwhile, the early scholarly tradition mapped in the companion article to this one was, in this particular instance, largely discarded, being perpetuated only in glossaries, and even then only in the most inclusive ones.

In the course of my analyses I have contributed minor insights into matters which deserve fuller study. I have probed Ælfric’s use of Latin words in his Old English texts. I have shown the possibility — while also finding no strong evidence to prove it — that the Old English *Herbarium* was the origin of all of our *elleborus tunsingwyrt*-type glosses. This points to the Old English *Herbarium* as a watershed in Anglo-Saxon scholarship on plants and plant-names, and this would be consonant with our evidence for renewed vigour in learning in Wessex and Mercia extending from around the reign of Alfred the Great through the tenth century. I have also shown more certainly that with careful use of glossaries derived from the *Herbarium* we can discern a lost early version of this text which is subtly different from our surviving manuscripts, and closer to its Latin original.

However, the main focus of this article has been the problematic word *tunsingwyrt*. I have analysed the textual relationships of our attestations of this word in detail, finding that of its three forms *tuningwyrt*, *tungilsinwyrt* and *tunsingwyrt*, all of our attestations of the latter may be textually related, leaving no form with a strong claim to being a more popular variant than the others. However, although the word is not attested outside Old English (except in textually-related Middle English material), there is at least enough evidence to show that this word was a member of the common lexicon rather than a mere gloss-word. Working out its denotation is difficult: I have at least shown that it is unlikely to denote *Veratrum album* L. The most likely interpretation suggested by the evidence is that *tunsingwyrt* denoted an allium — and if so, probably wild garlic. *Tunsingwyrt* might now be incorporated into a fuller study of

Anglo-Saxon alliums, which, if undertaken, will provide new insights both into the use of that plant, and into the meanings of *helleborus* for a good number of later Anglo-Saxon scholars.

Appendix A: *Tunsingwyrt* catalogue

<i>CNo.</i>	<i>Source</i>	<i>Short Title & Reference</i>	<i>Spelling</i>
1	Herbarium	Lch I (HerbHead) 140.0	<i>tunsingwyrt</i>
2	Herbarium	Lch I (Herb) 140.0	<i>Tunsingwyrt,</i> <i>tunsincgwyrt</i>
3	Herbarium	Lch I (Herb) 159.0	<i>tunsig(wyrt)</i>
4	Herbarium	Lch I (Herb) 159.1	<i>tunsingwyrt</i>
5	Glossary: Durham	DurGl (Lindheim) 149	<i>tunsing-vyrt</i>
6	Glossary: Laud	CollGl 26 (Stracke) 543	<i>tunsingwyrt</i>
7	Ælfric Bata: Colloquies (G)	OccGl 28 (Nap) 42	<i>tunsing</i>
8	Ælfric Bata: Colloquies (G)	OccGl 28 (Nap) 378	<i>tunsincwyrt</i>
9	Aldhelm: Riddle 99 (G)	AldÆ 2 (Nap) 63	<i>tunsinwyrt</i>
10	Bald: Leechbook	Lch II (1) 28.1.1	<i>tuningwyrt</i>
11	Bald: Leechbook	Lch II (1) 28.1.5	<i>tuniigwyrte</i>
12	Bald: Leechbook	Lch II (1) 47.3.1	<i>tungilsinwyrt</i>

Appendix A1: *Tunsingwyrt* catalogue

<i>CNo.</i>	<i>Related</i>	<i>Context</i>
1	2, 3, 4, 5, 6, ?7, ?8, ?9	Translation of <i>elleborus (albus)</i>

Appendix A2: Related citations

<i>Source</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Location</i>
Herbarium	?c.900 (MSS and some attestations later)	unknown
Glossary: Durham	MS s. xii	Durham
Glossary: Laud	MS s. xii	Canterbury
Ælfric Bata: Colloquies (G)	glosses s. xi	?Durham
Aldhelm: Riddle 99 (G)	gloss s. x ex.	Canterbury
Bald: Leechbook	Mostly compiled c.900; MS c.950	?Winchester

Appendix A3: Dates and locations

Appendix B: *Wudeleac* catalogue

<i>CNo.</i>	<i>Source</i>	<i>Short Title & Reference</i>	<i>Spelling</i>
1	Glossary: Laud	CollGl 26 (Stracke) 543	<i>wudeleac</i>

Appendix B1: *Wudeleac* catalogue

Elleborus in Anglo-Saxon England, 900–1100

Source	Date	Location
Glossary: Laud	MS s. xii	Canterbury

Appendix B3: Dates and locations

Appendix C: Wodewistle catalogue

CNo.	Source	Short Title & Reference	Spelling
1	Glossary: Épinal	EpGl (Pheifer) 255	<i>uuodaeuistlae</i>
2	Glossary: Erfurt	ErfGl (Pheifer) 248	<i>uuodeuuislae</i>
3	Glossary: Corpus 2	CorpGl 2 (Hessels) 3.397	<i>wodewistle</i>
4	Glossary: Antwerp	AntGl 4 (Kindschi) 31	<i>wodewistle</i>
5	Glossary: Brussels 1	BrGl 1 (Wright-Wülcker) 8.53	<i>wodewistle</i>
6	Glossary: Durham	DurGl (Lindheim) 116	<i>vudevistle</i>

Appendix C1: Wodewistle catalogue

CNo.	Related	Context
1	2, 3, ?4, ?5, 6	Gloss on <i>cicuta</i> or, in 4, <i>elleborum</i>

Appendix C2: Related citations

Source	Date	Location
Glossary: Épinal	c.675 × 700	Canterbury
Glossary: Erfurt	c.675 × 700	Canterbury
Glossary: Corpus 2	MS s. viii/ix	Canterbury
Glossary: Antwerp	s. xi ¹	Abingdon
Glossary: Brussels 1	s. xi ¹	Christ Church, Canterbury
Glossary: Durham	MS s. xii	Durham

Appendix C3: Dates and locations

References

- Ælfric of Eynsham. 1880. *Ælfric's Grammatik und Glossar*, ed. by Julius Zupitza. Sammlung englischer Denkmäler in kritischen Ausgaben 1. Berlin: Weidmann.
- Ælfric of Eynsham. 1881–1900. *Ælfric's Lives of Saints: being a set of sermons on saints' days formerly observed by the English Church*, ed. by Walter W. Skeat. Early English Text Society, 76, 82, 94, 114. 2 vols. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner.
- Ælfric Bata. 1997. *Anglo-Saxon conversations: the Colloquies of Ælfric Bata*, ed. by Scott Gwara and trans. by David W. Porter. Woodbridge: Boydell.
- Aldhelm. 1990. *Through a gloss darkly: Aldhelm's riddles in the British Library ms Royal 12.C.xxiii*, ed. by Nancy Porter Stork. Pontifical Institute of medieval Studies, Studies and Texts 98. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of medieval Studies.

- Althochdeutsches Wörterbuch*. 1968–. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Banham, Debbie. 2003. 'Be hlafum and wyrtrum: food plants in Anglo-Saxon society and economy', in Biggam (2003), 119–31.
- Bierbaumer, Peter. 1975–9. *Der botanische Wortschatz des Altenglischen*. Grazer Beiträge zur Englischen Philologie 1–3. 3 vols. Bern: Herbert Lang; Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Biggam, C. P., ed. 2003. *From earth to art, the many aspects of the plant-world in Anglo-Saxon England: proceedings of the first ASPNS symposium, University of Glasgow, 5-7 April 2000*. Costerus New Series 148. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi.
- Björkman, E. 1901–5. 'Die Pflanzennamen der althochdeutschen Glossen', *Zeitschrift für deutsche Wortforschung* 2 (1901), 202–33; 3 (1902), 263–307; 6 (1904–5), 174–98.
- Blair, John. 2005. *The Church in Anglo-Saxon society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bosworth, Joseph. 1898. *An Anglo-Saxon dictionary based on the manuscript collections of the late Joseph Bosworth*, ed. and enlarged by T. Northcote Toller. [Also] *Supplement* by T. Northcote Toller [1921], with revised and enlarged addenda by Alistair Campbell [1972]. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brookes, Stewart. 2011. 'Reading between the lines: the liturgy and Ælfric's *Lives of Saints* and homilies', *Leeds Studies in English* new series 42: 17–28.
- Campbell, A. 1959. *Old English grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Carey, John. 1988. 'Sequene and causation in *Echtra Nerai*', *Ériu* 39: 67–74.
- Clark Hall, J. R. 1960. *A concise Anglo-Saxon dictionary*. 4th ed., with a supplement by Herbert D. Meritt. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cockayne, Oswald, ed. 1864–6. *Leechdoms, wortcunning and starcraft of early England*. *Rerum Britannicarum Medii Aevi Scriptores* 35. 3 vols. London: Longman, Green etc.
- Collins, Minta. 2000. *Medieval herbals: the illustrative tradition*. London: British Library; Toronto and Buffalo: University of Toronto Press.
- D'Aronco, M. A. 2007. 'The transmission of medical knowledge in Anglo-Saxon England: the voices of manuscripts', *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. by Patrizia Lendinara, Loredana Lazzari and Maria Amalia D'Aronco, 35–113. *Textes et Études du Moyen Âge* 39. Turnhout: Brepols.
- D'Aronco, M. A. and M. L. Cameron, ed. 1998. *The Old English illustrated pharmacopoeia: British Library Cotton Vitellius C.III*. *Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile* 27. Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger.
- De Vriend, Hubert Jan, ed. 1984. *The Old English Herbarium and Medicina de quadrupedibus*. *Early English Text Society, Original Series* 286. London, New York and Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- De Vries, Jan. 1961. *Altnordisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Leiden: Brill.
- Dendle, Peter. 2001. 'Lupines, manganese, and devil-sickness: an Anglo-Saxon medical response to epilepsy', *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 75: 91–101.
- Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British sources* (DMLBS). 1975–, ed. by R. E. Latham and D. R. Howlett. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dictionary of Old English* (DOE). 1988–, ed. by Angus Cameron, Ashley Crandell Amos, Antonette diPaolo Healey et al. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of medieval Studies.
- Dictionary of Old English plant names* (DOEPN), <http://oldenglish-plantnames.org>
- Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue* (DOST). 1931–2002. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; London: Oxford University Press. Accessed from <http://www.dsl.ac.uk>.
- Erhardt-Siebold, Erika von. 1936. 'The hellebore in Anglo-Saxon pharmacy', *Englische Studien* 71: 161–70.
- Falileyev, A. and G. Isaac. 2003. 'Leeks and garlic: the Germanic ethnonym *Cannenefates*, Celtic **kasn-* and Slavic **kesn-*', *NOWELE* 42: 3–12.

Elleborus in Anglo-Saxon England, 900–1100

- Hall, Alaric. 2007. *Elves in Anglo-Saxon England: matters of belief, health, gender and identity*. Anglo-Saxon Studies 8. Cambridge: Brewer.
- Hall, Alaric (in this volume). 'Madness, medication and self-induced hallucination: *elleborus* (and Woody Nightshade) in Anglo-Saxon England, 700–900'.
- Hessels, J. H., ed. 1890. *An eighth-century Latin-Anglo-Saxon glossary preserved in the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge (MS No. 144)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hofstetter, Walter. 1983. 'Zur lateinische Quelle des altenglischen Pseudo-Dioskurides', *Anglia* 101: 315–60.
- Holthausen, F. 1934. *Altenglisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Germanische Bibliothek 4; Reihe (Wörterbücher) 7. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Hunt, Tony. 1989. *Plant names of medieval England*. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer.
- Kastovsky, Dieter. 1992. 'Semantics and vocabulary', *The Cambridge history of the English language, volume 1: the beginnings to 1066*, ed. by Richard M. Hogg, 290–408. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kelly, Fergus. 2000. *Early Irish farming: a study based mainly on the law-texts of the 7th and 8th centuries AD*. Early Irish Law Series 4. Dublin: School of Celtic Studies, Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.
- Kelly, S. E. and S. M. Miller, ed. 1999. *The electronic Sawyer: an online version of the revised edition of Sawyer's 'Anglo-Saxon charters', section one [S 1–1602]*, for the British Academy/Royal Historical Society Joint Committee on Anglo-Saxon Charters. Accessed at <http://www.esawyer.org.uk/about/index.html>.
- Ker, N. R. 1957. *Catalogue of manuscripts containing Anglo-Saxon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Kindschi, Lowell. 1955. 'The Latin-Old English glossaries in Plantin-Moretus MS 32 and British Museum MS Additional 32,246'. Unpublished doctoral thesis, Stanford University.
- Kitson, Peter. 1988. 'Two Old English plant-names and related matters', *English Studies* 69: 97–112.
- Lazzari, Loredana. 2003. 'Il Glossario latino-inglese antico nel manoscritto di Anversa e Londra ed il Glossario di Ælfric: dipendenza diretta o derivazione comune?', *Linguistica e filologia* 16: 159–90.
- Lindheim, Bogislav von, ed. 1941. *Das Durhammer Pflanzenglossar: lateinisch und altenglisch*. Beiträge zur englischen Philologie 35. Bochum-Langendreer: Poppinghaus.
- Meaney, Audrey (in this volume). 'What was *lybcorn*'?
- Middle English dictionary* (MED). 1952–2001, ed. by Sherman M. Kuhn, Hans Kurath and Robert E. Lewis. 17 vols. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. Accessed at <http://quod.lib.umich.edu/m/med/>.
- Napier, Arthur S., ed. 1900. *Old English glosses, chiefly unpublished*. Anecdota Oxoniensia, medieval Series 11. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Nokes, Richard Scott. 2004. 'The several compilers of Bald's *Leechbook*', *Anglo-Saxon England* 33: 51–76.
- Oxford English dictionary online* (OED). 2000–, chief editor J. Simpson. Accessed at <http://dictionary.oed.com/>.
- Pheifer, J. D., ed. 1974. *Old English glosses in the Épinal-Erfurt Glossary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Porter, David W. 1999. 'On the Antwerp-London Glossaries', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 98: 170–92.
- Prosopography of Anglo-Saxon England* (PASE). 2005. Accessed at <http://www.pase.ac.uk/>.
- Rusche, Philip G., ed. 1996. 'The Cleopatra Glossaries: an edition with commentary on the glosses and their sources'. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Yale University.
- Rusche, Philip G. 2001. 'The Laud Herbal Glossary and English-Celtic contacts: a reappraisal', *Cambrian Medieval Celtic Studies* 42: 72–82.
- Rusche, Philip G. 2008. 'The sources for plant names in Anglo-Saxon England and the Laud Herbal Glossary', *Health and healing in the medieval garden*, ed. by Peter Dendle and Alan Touwaide,

Alaric Hall

- 128–44. Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer.
- Sauer, Hans. 2003. 'The morphology of the Old English plant-names', in Biggam (2003), 161– 79.
- Severus, Sulpicius. 1967–9. *Vie de Saint Martin*, ed. by Jacques Fontaine. Série des Textes Monastiques d'Occident 22–4; Sources Chrétiennes 133–5. 3 vols. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.
- Smith, A. H. 1956. *English place-name elements*. English Place-Name Society 25–6. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Steinmeyer, Elias von and Eduard Sievers, ed. 1879–1922. *Die althochdeutschen Glossen*. 5 vols. Berlin: Weidmann.
- Stracke, Richard, ed. 1974. *The Laud herbal glossary*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Van Arsdall, Anne. 2002. *Medieval herbal remedies: the Old English Herbarium and Anglo- Saxon medicine*. New York: Routledge.
- Watts, Victor, ed. 2004. *The Cambridge dictionary of English place-names based on the collections of the English Place-Name Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wotherspoon, Iréné (in this volume). 'Old English *hymlic*: is it hemlock?'
- Wright, C. E., ed. 1955. *Bald's Leechbook: British Museum, Royal Manuscript 12 D. xvii*. Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile 5. Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger.