

This is a working paper, intended for publication in due course in the second volume of plant-name studies by the Anglo-Saxon Plant-Name Survey (<http://www.arts.gla.ac.uk/sesll/EngLang/ihsll/projects/plants.htm>). Alaric would appreciate any comments you may have about it! Depending on what Alaric's allowed to do after publication, this working paper may be replaced with a preprint, or removed from the Web entirely, so please bear in mind that its URL is not stable. Full publication details, when available, will be found via <http://www.alarichall.org.uk>.

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

Alaric Hall

1. Introduction

This article has two main purposes. In the first instance, it picks up from its companion in this volume (Hall forthcoming), 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 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*. 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. The second purpose is to provide the full ASPNS examination owing to the interesting and challenging Old English word *tunsingwyr*t, which this investigation identifies as a key term, as well as the rarer *wodewistle* and *wudeleac*. At the same time, the article also probes some related issues, including Ælfric of Eynsham's use of Latin and the textual history of the *Old English Herbarium*.

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).

Although it is hard to be sure how representative this evidence is, the shift in scholarly practice 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* and excepting subsequent glossary-production, Ælfric seems to have been the next Anglo-Latin writer 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*, s.v. *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, where according to Ælfric’s source, chapter 6 of Sulpicius Severus’s *Vita sancti Martini*, ‘aliquamdiu radicibus vixit herbarum: quo tempore helleborum, uenenatum, ut ferunt, gramen, in cibum sumpsit’ (‘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’; ed. Fontaine 1967–69, I 266). Fortunately, Martin is able to avert his death by prayer. In lines 196–200 of Ælfric’s rendering (ed. Skeat 1881–1900, IV 232), this event appears as

Martinus þa on þære tide on his mete pigde
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 both Anglo-Saxon flora, and conceptualisation within Anglo-Saxon culture (Hall forthcoming), 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 forthcoming), there has been

surprisingly little work on Ælfric's code-switching. Brookes has now 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, ed. Zupitza 1880, 310–11) contain no other references to *elleborus*, it seems unlikely that he had no access to information or earlier vernacular glosses on the word. Indeed, earlier in Ælfric's *Life of Martin* (lines 140–42; ed. Skeat 1881–1900, IV 228), Bishop Hilarion

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

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.

The evidence at the centre of this article derives from the *Old English Herbarium*, which was probably composed in the tenth century, and translated *ellborum album* as *tunsingwyrt*. 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., *tunsingwyrt* 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 *tunsingwyrt*'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—*lungwyrt*, *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 principle 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 De Vriend 1984, lv–lxi; Hofstetter 1983; cf. Van Arsdall 2002, 68–118). The date and place of its composition is 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, then, 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 (2002, 103–4; Ker 1957, 332–33 [no.264]; for references to more recent work see Hall 2007, 96–97). D’Aronco, meanwhile, has suggested the late tenth century, shortly before our oldest manuscript, BL. Harley 585, with one of the Benedictine monasteries of Winchester being the likeliest place (2007, 46). The *Old English Herbarium* is important here partly because it provides, in its translation of the material on *elleborum album*, our most detailed description of *tunsingwyr*t. 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), 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 *tunsingwyr*t occurs in the Old English translation of the *Liber medicinae ex herbis feminis* which comprises part of the *Old English Herbarium*—there being chapter 140 (ed. De Vriend 1984, 180, 182). The contents list entry reads ‘Herba elleborus albus þæt is tunsingwyr’t’ (ed. De Vriend 1984, 23), while the main text gives

CXL. Tunsingwyr

1. Ðeos wyr

þe man elleborum album & oðrum naman tunsingwyr

nemneð & eac sume men wedeberge hatað byð cenned on dunum, & heo hafað leaf leace gelice; þysse wyrte wyrtruman man sceal niman onbutan midne sumur & eac swa some þa wyr

ealle for ðy heo is to læcedomum wel gecweme; þæt is to lufigenne on ðysse wyrte þæt heo hafað gehwædne wyrtruman & 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 wyrtruman lange & hearde & swyfe bittere on byrgincge, & hy habbaþ to ðam swypllice mihte & frecenfulle þæt hy foroft hrædlice þone man forþilmiap.

140. *Tunsingwyr*.

1. This plant, which is called *elleborum album*, and by another name *tunsingcwyr*t (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 in that 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 feminis* 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), MS 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: ‘Albumque est in similitudinem caepae, folia angustiora habet; nascitur in montuosis locis; radices eius colligi debent circa aestiva solstitia’ (‘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’; ed. 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 has its 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 forthcoming, §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 (cf. 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 / Elleborus albus tunsing-vyrt’ (ed. Lindheim 1941, 13 [nos 148–49]). 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 (ed. Stracke 1974, 37–44):

543. *Elleborus albus* .i. tunsingwyr. 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 pillitrica .i. uelatrum *confectio*.
 633. *Elleborum melinum* uel *nigrum* .i. testalia.
 777. *Helliborum* .i. yediberige.

Establishing the origins and significance of these various attestations is beyond the scope of the present paper (though for number 633 see Rusche 2001, 78–80). However, the first of the glosses listed, with the distinctive lemma *elleborus albus* coupled with the distinctive gloss *tunsingwyr*, 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 *tunsingwyr*—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’) not an obvious translation. More importantly, most entries in the *Herbarium* follow the formula found in, for example, section 131, ‘Ðeos wyrte þe man basilica & oðrum naman nædderwyrte nemneþ byð cenned ...’ (‘This plant, which is named *basilica* and by another name *nædderwyrte*, is grown...’; ed. De Vriend 1984, 168); the tag used to introduce extra names, & 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 ‘þas wyrte þe man *ebulum* & oðrum naman ellenwyrte nemneþ & eac sume men wealwyrte hatað’ (‘those plants which one calls *ebulum* and, by another name, *ellenwyrte*’; ed. De Vriend 1984, 136 [§93]), whose additional name is consistent with the Canterbury plant-name gloss *ebulum*: *wealhwyrte* (cf. Corpus, ed. Hessels 1890, 45 [E 11]; Laud, ed. Stracke 1974, 36 [no. 522]). Likewise, ‘ðas wyrte þe man *cynoglossam*

& oðrum naman ribbe nemneþ & hy eac sume men *linguam canis* hateþ' ('these plants which people call *cynoglossa* and by another name *ribbe*; and some people also name them *linguam canis*'), echos not only Canterbury plant-name glosses like *cinoglossa: ribbe* but also *canes lingua: ribbe* (cf. Corpus, ed. Hessels 1890, 32, 26 [C 411, C 28]; Laud, ed. 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 BL. Cotton Vitellius C.iii), along with its close counterpart BL. Harley 585, leave spaces for the vernacular word in this section, giving only the Latin heading *elleborum album* (ed. De Vriend 1984, 202, 204); gaps of this kind occur in a number of entries. However, the later BL. Harley 6258 B (ed. De Vriend 1984, 203, 205, whose round brackets indicate marginal titles and/or damaged letters) gives

CLIX. Ellebo(rum album) tunsig(wyrt). Wið liferseocnyssse nim þas wyrt þe man elleborum album ꝥ oprum naman tunsingwyrt nemneð úedriúede to duste úecnucode, sile drincan on wyrme wætere, þas d(uste)s sýx cu(cule)res fulle, hit úelac/nad þalifr(e), þat sylfe ys fangenlice (*f(ramigendlic) V.*) læcedom on wine úeþiúed aúeon 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 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 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 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: a Latin collection called the *Curae herbarum* (on which see Collins 2000, 156–58), one manuscript of which—Bibliothèque National 13955—includes (ed. Hofstetter 1983, 342–43)

Elleborum nigrum uel epipactinum Ad curam iectoris herba suprascripta si sicca tundatur et cribrata ad modum coclearis ex [*Jeg. 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 cold water, it works wonders. From the living herb there will be a remedy against all poisons.

The *Old English Herbarium* evidently originally had one entry for *elleborum album* (§140), while another (§159) dealt with *elleborum nigrum*. While he had identified *elleborum album* as *tunsingwyr̥t*, the translator did not have a vernacular word for *elleborum nigrum*, so left a gap. Subsequently, *elleborum album* was written for *elleborum nigrum* (a stage represented by all the manuscripts of the *Old English Herbarium*), and then a later copyist again (represented by Harley 6258 B) added the translation *tunsingwyr̥t* on the basis of section 140. In Vitellius the illustration accompanying section 159 ‘has some resemblance [to *Veratrum album*], but is *Scilla*’ (Cockayne 1864–68, I 287 n. a), the plant accordingly being identified with *Urginea maritima* and *Scilla maritima* L. by De Vriend (1984, 323) and subsequently with *Urginea maritima* alone (Van Arsdall 2002, 219). Neither plant is 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. lungwyr̥t*’ (ed. Stracke 1974, 37 [nos 543–44]) 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 *lungwyr̥t* had been added. Unfortunately, although *lungwyr̥t* has an apparent Old High German cognate *lungwurz* (see Björkman 1901–5, II 294), and although this gloss is paralleled by a series of Middle English glosses on *elleborus*, *lungwyr̥t* is attested only here in Old English (cf. Bierbaumer 1975–79, III 164–65), and its later English forms are applied to a wide range of plants (see *MED*, s.v. *long-wort*; *Oxford English Dictionary* [hereafter *OED*], s.v. *lungwort*; Hunt 1989, index s.v. *Lungwort*). It may bear some relation to the ‘*lungenwyr̥t seo biþ geolu ufeward*’ (‘*lungenwyr̥t* whose upper part is yellow’) mentioned in Bald’s Leechbook I, section 38 (ed. Wright 1955, f. 35r), which seems to be golden lungwort, *Hieracium murorum* L. (Bierbaumer 1975–79, 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*.

To recap this argument schematically, I present the following table, marking each successive (putative) alteration to the text in **bold** type:

	chapter 140	chapter 159
Lost text used for Durham-Laud (c. 900?)	Ʒeos wyr̥t þe man elleborum album (elleborus albus) & oðrum naman tunsingwyr̥t nemneð	nim þas wyr̥t þe man elleborum nigrum & oþrum naman [blank] nemneð
Text represented by Vitellius C. iii (MS C11)	Ʒeos wyr̥t þe man elleborum album & oðrum naman tunsingwyr̥t nemneð & eac sume men wedeberge hatað	nim þas wyr̥t þe man elleborum album & oþrum naman [blank] nemneð
Text of Harley 6258 B (C12)	(Ʒ)eos wyr̥t þæt man elleborum album & oþrum nama tunsingwyr̥t & sume men	nim þas wyr̥t þe man elleborum album & oþrum naman tunsingwyr̥t

	wedeberge h(atað)	nemneð
--	-------------------	--------

Figure 1: the development of the *Old English Herbarium* texts on *elleborus*

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

3. Glossing *elleborus* as *tungsingwyrt*

I have discussed already the indebtedness of the Durham-Laud glossaries to the *Old English Herbarium*, and their inclusion of a gloss *elleborus albus: tungsingwyrt*. 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. Ælfric Bata composed a series of Latin colloquies as teaching aids. At the end of his twenty-fifth colloquy, preserved only in Oxford, St. John's College, MS. 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 of 2003, on a common source). The dialogue (ed. and trans. Gwara–Porter 1997, 156–57) runs

<F>ratres mei, dicite mihi nunc, habetis aliquod uiridarium, 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: Gwara–Porter 1997, 157 n. 304), but Frankish, and that he 'Bona sepe antidota et ungenta facit' ('often makes good medicines and ointments') for allcomers, the text continues (ed. and trans. Gwara–Porter 1997, 156–59):

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 multaholera, que tibi anlice 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 the vegetables that can be eaten just about every day, if they're cooked: cabbage, parsley, mallow, thyme, celery, garlic, mint, dill, and savoury. 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 (like *saturagia*, *rubia* and *rapa*, translated by Gwara respectively as 'savoury', 'rubia' and 'rape') an addition to Ælfric's list. 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 (§7). However, the manuscript of Ælfric Bata's text itself, Oxford, St John's College, MS. 154, has glosses for *elleborus* on both occasions when the word appears, reading in the first instance 'tunsing' and in the second 'tunsincwyr't' (ed. Gwara–Porter 1997, 158; Napier 1900, 229 [no. 378]). As I discuss shortly, *tunsingwyr't* was clearly a common word rather than a scholarly coining, so Ælfric Bata's glossator could have simply adduced *tunsingwyr't* 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 the glossator indeed did 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 *medewyr't*) and *rapa* (glossed with *næp*; ed. Gwara–Porter 1997, 158). Although *medewyr't* is well-attested in Old English medical texts, *rubia: medewyr't* is unique (the closest parallel seems to be the Antwerp-London Glossary, considered further below, giving 'Rubia mæddre'; ed. Kindschi 1955, 111). The gloss *rapa: næp* is also paralleled by Antwerp-London ('*Rapa næp*'; ed. Kindschi 1955, 112; cf. Björkman 1901–5, I 233, II 273 for Old High German examples), but Antwerp-London does not contain the word *tunsingwyr't*, instead glossing *elleborus* with *wodewistle*, as I discuss below. The Durham Plant-Name Glossary includes the lemma *rapa* with no gloss (ed. Lindheim 1941, 17 [no. 286]), but where it came from is not immediately clear. It is possible, then, that *elleborus: tunsingwyr't* 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, Hall forthcoming), unparalleled in this context, included by the main scribe of BL. Royal 12. C.xxiii. To the title of the riddle (in this manuscript 'DE ELLEBORO') he added the gloss 'tunsinwyr't (ed. Stork 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, then the scribe may have added it mechanically to the riddle, whether or not *tunsingwyr't* actually denoted a plant which fitted Aldhelm's description (which is of woody nightshade). If he invented the gloss, however, then the match between gloss and riddle could provide important evidence for the meanings of *tunsingwyr't*. 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 Stork 1990, 48, 52–54), it is not haphazard. The scribe made only six vernacular glosses on riddles' titles, the others being 'MILLEFOLIUM: wearwe'; 'TRUTINA: wegan'; 'SOLSEQUIUM: goldwyr't'; 'DE CREBELLO QUO FURFURAE A FARINA SEQUESTANTUR: syfeda'; and 'DE EBULO: wælwyr't' (ed. Stork 1990, 162, 163, 164, 187, 219 [riddles 49, 50, 51, 67, 94]; cf. 52–54). 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* (ed. Pheifer 1974, 33, 34 [nos 623, 639]; ed. De Vriend 1984, 128 [§90]; cf. Björkman 1901–5, I 226). The gloss 'DE EBULO: wælwyr't' enjoys a similar distribution (ed. De Vriend 1984, 136 [§93]; see above and Hall forthcoming, §4). More telling is the gloss 'SOLSEQUIUM: goldwyr't': this seems to be paralleled in Old English (and later English) only in the *Nomina herbarum Grece et Latine* listed in Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale, 1828–30, in the form 'Solsequia golde' (ed. Rushe 1996, 554–66 [no. 467]). Both the Brussels manuscript and 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' (ed. Steinmeyer–Sievers 1879–1922, III 522), and the plant-name *golde* is much better attested in Old German than in Old English (Björkman 1901–5, II 268; *Althochdeutsches Wörterbuch*, s.v. *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 Anglicise *golde* and to make its identity as a plant-name clear in a new glossarial context by adding *-wyr't*. However, although the Brussels text contains representatives of *ebulus: wælwyr't*, *millefolium: gearwe* and *solsequium: goldwyr't*, it does not contain *elleborus: tunsingwyr't* (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*, and chose not to use it, which tells us that the gloss *tunsingwyr̃t* 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.¹ These points show clearly that the Royal scribe's use of *tunsingwyr̃t* may derive from a manuscript related somehow to the *Old English Herbarium*, but it is not possible to be sure of this.

4. *tunsingwyr̃t* outside glosses

Although it is far from certain, the considerations above permit the suggestion that almost all our attestations of *tunsingwyr̃t* are textually closely related. Moreover, *tunsingwyr̃t* survived into Middle English only in the early Middle English textual descendants of Anglo-Saxon materials (*Middle English Dictionary* (hereafter *MED*, s.v. *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 *tunsingwyr̃t* is simply a gloss-word. However, we have two attestations of *tunsingwyr̃t* which can reliably be considered independent of this tradition. Both occur in Bald's Leechbook I. The first comes in section 28 (ed. Wright 1955, f. 26r):

Wip banece tuningwyr̃t . beolone . wealwyr̃t ealde grut & eced . heorotes smer̃a op̃pe gate . op̃pe gose meng tosomne lege þonne on . Wip banece eft to drenc̃e elene . cneowholen . wealwyr̃t . hune . clufþung gecnuwa do on wæter þæt ofer yr̃ne beþe to fyre swiðe þone ece þweah mid þy wætere do þæt þriwa on dæg . wyr̃c þonne sealf̃e of tuniigwyr̃te of eolonan . of þunge . of wermode do ealra emfela wylle swiðe .

Against bone-ache/thigh-pain: *tuningwyr̃t*, 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 *tuniigwyr̃t*, 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, *tuniigwyr̃t*, must be a scribal error, presumably for *tuningwyr̃t* by the omission of a minim. Both of the occurrences of *tunsingwyr̃t* here, then, have it as an ingredient for salves against 'bone-ache' (defined by the *Dictionary of Old English*, s.v. *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 work, *tungilsinwyr̃t*, comes in section 47, entitled 'Læcedomas wið þeoradlum' (apparently 'remedies for inflammatory illnesses'; f. 44r), and listed in the contents as 'Læcedomas & drencas & sealf̃a wip þeoradlum moniges cynnes' ('Remedies and drinks and

¹ 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 *weolcsille* (ed. Stork 1990, 227), a gloss belonging to the Épinal-Erfurt-Corpus tradition, where *wedeberge* is also found.

salves against ‘inflammatory illnesses, of many kinds’; f. 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 (ed. Wright 1955, f. 45v):

Oxa lærde þisne læcedom . genime wealwyr̥t & clufþung & cneowholen & efelastan & camecon & tungilsinwyr̥t . VIII . brune bisceopwyr̥t . & attorlaþan & reade netlan . & reade hofan . & wermod & gearwan . & hunan & dolgrunan . & dweorgedwostlan do ealle þas wyr̥ta 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 *tungilsinwyr̥t*; 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 *tunsingwyr̥t* 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 *tunsingwyr̥t*, and for showing variation in the form of this words which looks, in some cases, more like variation in spoken language than scribal corruption, against suggesting the broad currency of the term.

5. The etymology of *tunsingwyr̥t*?

Thus we have three main forms of the word *tunsingwyr̥t*. 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 *tunsingwyr̥t*. 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 Campbell 1959, §450; cf. §474.5; Smith 1956, s.v. *-ing* §2; and De Vriend 1984, lxx). Meanwhile, the first remedy in Bald’s Leechbook has the form *tuningwyr̥t*; and Oxa’s remedy—whose association with a named individual affords the tantalising if unprovable possibility of detecting a specifically idiolectal form of the word—gives *tungilsinwyr̥t*. Of these three forms, *tunsingwyr̥t* is ostensibly much the better attested, and it is no surprise that it has become the standard dictionary headword form (cf. Kitson 1988, 109). But the prospect that all the attestations of this form are textually related raises the possibility that their value as witnesses to common Anglo-Saxon usage is no more significant than that of each of the forms from Bald’s Leechbook. The *tunsingwyr̥t* 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 e.g. Smith 1956, s.v. *-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; 2003, 165; see also Kitson 1988, 107–11). Deciding which of these etyma might have been present in *tuningwyr*t when it was first coined is probably impossible. All the same, it is worth discussing possible interpretations and etymologisations 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 etymologise (whether or not the etymology is actually correct). *Tun* and *Tuna* are attested as a monothematic Old English personal names (*Prosopography of Anglo-Saxon England*, s.vv.), so a personal name like ***Tuning* deriving originally from a monothematic personal name coupled with the patronymic suffix *-ing* (for which see Smith 1956, s.v. *-ing*³, esp. §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 *tuncæ*se, *tunhofe*, *tunmelde*, *tunminte* and *tunnæp* (Bierbaumer 1975–79, I 133–34, II 117–18, III 233–34; cf. *MED*, s.vv. *toun-cresse*; *tun-hōve*), where it presumably carries *tun*’s old sense of ‘enclosure’—as in the common, apparently Anglian, compound *leactun* (‘vegetable garden’; Bosworth–Toller 1898, s.v. *leac-tun*; cf. Banham 2003, 125–26; *MED*, s.v. *leigh-toun*; the West Saxon equivalent seems to have been *wyr*ttun). 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, s.v. *tūning*; cf. *-ing*¹ §§iii, iv respectively; *MED*, s.v. *tīning*).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 (cf. *haguporn* ‘hawthorn, whitethorn’, etymologically ‘enclosure thorn’), or perhaps one which, like *tuncæ*se, 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, s.v. *-ing*⁴). The origins and precise significance of this element are rather vexed; it is common only 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-Seebolt assumed this to contain the

2 I dispense with the word *tunincel*~**tynincel* ‘small *tun*’ (< *tun* + *incgel*). This is reasonably securely attested (Bosworth–Toller 1898, s.v. *tūnincel*; Smith 1956, s.v. *tūnincel*), 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 on place-names in *-tun*—as for example *Glædtuninga weg*, literally the ‘road of the people of Glædtun’ (Watts 2004, s.v. *Glatton*), and a certain lexical status for a word *-tuningas* is implied by Bosworth and Toller’s use of that form as a headword (1898, s.v.). 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 (e.g. Icelandic *Íslendingur* ‘an Icelander’), this is much rarer in Old English (Smith 1956, s.v. *-ingas* §§4, 7d).

element *tungol* ('star'), presumably in a putative reference to star-like flowers, translating it 'star in herb' (1936, 169). 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 *wyrt* 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 *witmæres wyrt*, which in the form that we have can hardly contain anything else, while in the minds of at least some Old English-speakers, *æðelferðingwyrt* and probably the rarer forms *simæringwyrt* (more usually *smeringwyrt*) and *siwardes wyrt* also contained personal names (see Kitson 1988, 109–11). It is not impossible that this was the original form of *tunsingwyrt*, 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 (e.g. *Cyneburgingctun*, now Kemerton in Gloucester; Smith 1956, s.v. *-ing-*⁴ at §§1, 4b), which would have produced a fertile set of analogues (albeit toponymic) for reinterpreting *tuningwyrt* or *tunsingwyrt* as *tungilsin(g)wyrt*. Kitson considered it 'almost certainly a scribal error for *tunsingwyrt*' (1988, 109), 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 *tunsingwyrt*, 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 saw the word as a contraction of *tungilsinwyrt* (1864–68, II 409); 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 and Toller (1898, s.v. *tunsing-wyrt*) pointed to the unique Somerset place-name *Tunsing* attested in charter S 626 (as listed in Kelly 1999). Conceivably, then, *tunsingwyrt* either takes its name from this place (or another of the same name), or was folk-etymologised 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 *tunsingwyrt* 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 *tuningwyrt* and *tungilsinwyrt* as folk etymologies, the most likely form to

be original is the obscure *tunsingwyrt*. But this is far from certain. *Tunsingwyrt* affords an intriguing glimpse into a world of linguistic variation which resists neophilological etymologisations.

6. What was *tunsingwyrt*?

Tunsingwyrt 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, this meaning for *elleborum* cannot readily be assumed *a priori* for Anglo-Latin. One or two hints as to the denotation of *tunsingwyrt* can be gleaned from the *Old English Herbarium*. Whereas our Latin text says 'Albumque est in similitudinem caepae, folia angustiora habet' ('and the white [hellobore] has the appearance of an onion; it has narrower leaves'), the Old English text reads 'Ðeos wyrt þe 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 1975–79, I 93, II 76–77, III 157–58; Markey 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 alliums' 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 (ed. De Vriend 1984, 230, 232 [no. 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' (ed. 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 *tunsingwyrt*, or conversely because they denoted something within the semantic field of *elleborus albus* which was not covered by *tunsingwyrt*. Moreover, *suffunie* is unfortunately

³ Cockayne 1864–68, II 409; Bosworth–Toller 1898, s.v. *tunsing-wyrt*; Clark Hall 1960, s.v. *tunsingwyrt*; Bierbaumer 1975–79, I 133–34, II 118, III 234; cf. Van Arsdall 2002, 210.

mysterious. It must be related to a number of counterparts for *elleborus (niger)*, to at least some extent textually interrelated, identified by Hunt in later medieval manuscripts, with forms such as ‘gallice syfonye’, ‘suffonie, cloftunge’ and ‘gallice suffonie’ (1989, 106). 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.

The reflexes of *hramsa* seem prototypically to denote wild garlic (*Allium ursinum* L.), as do most of its Indo-European cognates (*OED*, s.vv. *rams*, *ramson*; *MED*, s.v. *ramse*; cf. Markey, this volume, §6.2.1). In Old English, *hramsa* 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 (e.g. ed. Pheifer 1974, 6 [nos 59, 60, 63]; see also 63; Björkman 1901–5, I 225). But it seems likely that *hramsa* denoted wild garlic (cf. Bierbaumer 1975–79, III 142–43); and if medieval Ireland is anything to go by, it was an important wild food-plant (Kelly 2000, 308; Carey 1988, 72). 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 n. 1), as this may also denote wild garlic (*Dictionary of Old English*, s.v. §1), and there may be some synonymy. If so, there may be some connection between the association of *hramsa* and *elleborum* on the one hand, and *elleborus* and the curing of madness in Classical tradition (for which see Hall forthcoming, §3).

The glossing of *elleborum album* with *hramsa* correlates broadly with the evidence of *wudeleac*. *Wudeleac* appears to be a unique form (cf. *MED*, s.v. *wōde* §4a; Hunt 1989, index s.v. *Wild Garlic*). The first element is ostensibly Old English *wudu*, which means ‘wood, timber’, but as the first element of compounds often means ‘wild-’ (cf. perhaps Middle English *wilde garlek*, *MED*, s.v. *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’; ed. Lindheim 1941, 12 [no. 116]; see further §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, taking *wudeleac* as a synonym of *ramese*, interpreted it too as *allium ursinum* (1975–79, III 267). 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 BL., Cotton Vitellius C III (ed. D'Aronco–Cameron 1998, f. 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 an 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 Antwerp, Plantin-Moretus Museum M 16.2 and its *disiectum membrum* BL 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 Porter 1999, esp. 181–88; Lazzari 2003; Ker 1957, 1–3 [no. 2]). In the section devoted to plant-names, he included the entry '*Elleborum, wodewistle † Uoratum*' (ed. 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

4 In view of the fact that confusion between the letters *wynn* and *þorn* is not uncommon in the transmission of Old English texts, it is tempting to connect attestations of *wodewistle* with attestations of *wodepistle* (occurring principally in chapter 111 of the *Old English Herbarium* as an equivalent of *carduum silvaticum*, apparently *Sonchus oleraceus* L.; ed. De Vriend 1984, 154; cf. Stracke 1974, 30 [no. 320]; Lindheim 1941, 11 [no. 102]). Indeed, Wright's edition of the Antwerp-London Glossary gave '*Elleborum, uel ueratum, wodepistle*' (1884, col. 135 [no. 42]), while the *Middle English Dictionary* affords good evidence for later confusion of *wodepistle* with *wodewistle* (s.v. *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.

London-Antwerp 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*' (Gwara–Porter 1997, 60–64, at 64; cf. 66–67). 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' (Gwara–Porter 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 *tunsingwyr* 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's *Etymologiae*, where he found the equivalent *veratrum* (on his use of Isidore see Porter 1999, 183–86). For the vernacular gloss *wodewistle*, however, he turned to an older glossing tradition, first attested in the Épinal-Erfurt Glossaries, which includes (to quote Épinal) 'cicuta uuodaeuistlae' (ed. 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' (ed. Kindschi 1955, 112). This is attested in most manuscripts alongside *cicuta: wodewistle*, as in Épinal's entry 'cicuta hymblicae' (ed. Pheifer 1974, 14 [no. 248]; cf. Wotherspoon this volume, §4). 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 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. hemlock (*Conium maculatum*) and cowbane (*Cicuta virosa*)' (*MED*, s.v. *whistle* §e; Hunt 1989, index s.vv. *Wode-Thistle*, *Wode-Whistle*; cf. s.v. *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, s.v. *dung*). This fits in turn with the dramatic effects of ingesting hemlock (see Wotherspoon this volume). 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*, s.v. *whistle*, v.; De Vries 1964, s.vv. *hvísl*, *hvíska*). 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* (this volume, §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.

Although lexicographical expertise does not necessarily come hand in hand with botanical expertise, and the Antwerp-London glossator's alteration to his received textual tradition was doubtless partly a matter of editorial convenience, it seems clear 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. He must have had access to the gloss *elleborus: wedeberge*. If he had noticed this gloss, he evidently 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 it could have encouraged him to insert *wodewistle*, whose first element was obviously identical with the *wede-* of *wedeberge*.

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 *tunsingwyr̥t*, 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

⁵ Bosworth–Toller 1898, s.v. *hwistle*; Toller 1921, s.v. *hwistle*; *OED*, s.v. *whistle*; *MED*, s.v. *whistle*; *Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue*, s.v. *Quhissil(l)*.

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—that *the Old English Herbarium* was the origin of all of our *elleborus: tunsingwyr*-type glosses, and 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.

However, the main focus of this article has been the problematic word *tunsingwyr*. I have analysed the textual relationships of our attestations of this word in detail, finding that of its three forms *tuningwyr*, *tungilsinwyr* and *tunsingwyr*, 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 show that it is unlikely to denote *Veratrum album* L. The most likely interpretation suggested by the evidence is that *tunsingwyr* denoted an allium—and if so, probably wild garlic. *Tunsingwyr* 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.

Works cited

Althochdeutsches Wörterbuch. 1968–. (Berlin: Akademie Verlag)

Banham, Debbie. 2003. 'Be hlafulum and wyrtum: Food Plants in Anglo-Saxon Society and Economy', in *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*, ed. by C. P. Biggam (Amsterdam: Rodopi), pp. 119–31

Bierbaumer, Peter. 1975–79. *Der botanische Wortschatz des Altenglischen*, 3 vols, Grazer Beiträge zur Englischen Philologie, 1–3 (Bern: Lang)

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, *The Church in Anglo-Saxon Society* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005)

Bosworth, J. and T. Northcote Toller. 1898. *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary* (London: Oxford University Press)

Brookes, Stewart. Forthcoming. 'Reading Between the Lines: The Liturgy and Ælfric's *Lives of Saints* and Homilies', *Leeds Studies in English*, 42

- Campbell, A. 1959. *Old English Grammar* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- Carey, John. 1980. 'Sequence and Causation in *Echtra Neraí*', *Ériu*, 39: 67-74.
- Clark Hall, John R. 1960. *A Concise Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*, 4th rev. edn by Herbert D. Meritt (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Cockayne, Oswald (ed.). 1864–66. *Leechdoms, Wortcunning and Starcraft of Early England*, The Rolls Series, 35, 3 vols (London: Longman and others)
- Collins, Minta. 2000. *Medieval Herbals: The Illustrative Traditions* (London: British Library)
- 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)
- D'Aronco, Maria Amalia. 2007. 'The Transmission of Medieval Knowledge in Anglo-Saxon England: The Voices of Manuscripts', in *Form and Content of Instruction in Anglo-Saxon England in the Light of Contemporary Manuscript Evidence: Papers Presented at the International Conference, Udine, 6-8 April 2006*, ed. by Patrizia Lendinara, Loredana Lazzari, and Maria Amalia D'Aronco, *Textes et Études du Moyen Âge*, 39 (Turnhout: Brepols): 35–113
- Dendle, Peter. 2001. 'Lupines, Manganese, and Devil-Sickness: An Anglo-Saxon Medical Response to Epilepsy', *Bulletin of the History of Medicine*, 75: 91–101
- De Vriend, Hubert Jan (ed.). 1984. *The Old English Herbarium and Medicina de Quadrupedibus*, The Early English Text Society, 286 (London: Oxford University Press)
- De Vries, Jan. 1961. *Altnordisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Leiden: Brill)
- Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources*. 1975– (London: Oxford University Press)
- Dictionary of Old English*. 1988– (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies for the Dictionary of Old English Project, Center for Medieval Studies, University of Toronto)
- Dictionary of the Older Scottish Tongue*. 1931–2002 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press; Oxford: Oxford University Press); accessed from <<http://www.dsl.ac.uk/>>, 11–12–2005
- 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
- Gwara, Scott (ed.) and David W. Porter (trans.). 1997. *Anglo-Saxon Conversations: The Colloquies of Ælfric Bata* (Woodbridge: Boydell)
- Hall, Alaric. 2007. *Elves in Anglo-Saxon England: Matters of Belief, Health, Gender and Identity*, Anglo-Saxon Studies, 8 (Cambridge: Brewer, 2007)
- Hall, Alaric. Forthcoming. 'Madness, Medication and Self-Induced Hallucination: *Elleborus* (and Woody Nightshade) in Anglo-Saxon England, 700–900', for *From Seaweed to Juniper: Anglo-Saxon Plant-Studies*, ed. by Carol Biggam

- 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: Brewer)
- Kastovsky, Dieter. 1992. 'Semantics and Vocabulary', in *The Cambridge History of the English Language, Volume 1: The Beginnings to 1066*, ed. by Richard M. Hogg (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 290–408
- 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. 1999. *The Electronic Sawyer: An Online Version of the Revised Edition of Sawyer's 'Anglo-Saxon Charters', Section One [S 1-1602]* (British Academy/Royal Historical Society Joint Committee on Anglo-Saxon Charters):
<<http://www.trin.cam.ac.uk/chartwww/eSawyer.99/eSawyer2.html>>, accessed 28–11–2005
- 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)
- Middle English Dictionary*. 1952–2001. (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press); accessed from <<http://ets.umdl.umich.edu/m/mec/>>, 11–12–2005
- Napier, Arthur S. (ed.). 1900. *Old English Glosses, Chiefly Unpublished*, Anecdota Oxoniensia, Mediaeval 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*. 1989. 2nd edn (Oxford: Clarendon Press); accessed from *OED Online* <<http://dictionary.oed.com/>>, 11–12–2005
- 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*. 2005. <<http://www.pase.ac.uk/>>, accessed 12–12–2005
- Rusche, Philip Guthrie (ed.). 1996. 'The Cleopatra Glossaries: An Edition with Commentary on the Glosses and their Sources' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Yale University)
- Rusche, Philip G., 'The Laud Herbal Glossary and English-Celtic Contacts: A Reappraisal', *Cambrian Medieval Celtic Studies*, 42 (Winter 2001), 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 ((Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer, 2008), pp. 128–44
- and the Laud Herbal Glossary', forthcoming for *Health and Healing in the Medieval Garden*, ed. by Peter Dendle and Alan Touwaide
- Sauer, Hans. 2003. 'The Morphology of the Old English Plant-Names', in *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*, ed. by C. P. Biggam (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2003), pp. 161–79
- Skeat, Walter W. (ed.). 1881–1900. *Aelfric's Lives of Saints: Being a Set of Sermons on Saints' Days Formerly Observed by the English Church*, Early English Text Society, 76, 82, 94, 114, 2 vols (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner)
- Smith, A. H. 1956. *English Place-Name Elements*, English Place-Name Society, 25–26, 2 vols (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Steinmeyer, Elias von and Eduard Sievers (ed.). 1879–1922. *Die althochdeutschen Glossen*, 5 vols (Berlin: Weidmann)
- Stork, Nancy Porter (ed.). 1990. *Through a Gloss Darkly: Aldhelm's Riddles in the British Library MS Royal 12.C.xxiii*, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, Studies and Texts, 98 (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies)
- Stracke, J. Richard (ed.). 1974. *The Laud Herbal Glossary* (Amsterdam: Rodopi)
- Van Arsdall, Anne, *Medieval Herbal Remedies: The Old English Herbarium and Anglo-Saxon Medicine* (New York: Routledge 2002)
- 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, Irene. Forthcoming. 'Old English *hymlic* / *hemlic*', for *From Seaweed to Juniper: Anglo-Saxon Plant-Studies*, ed. by Carol Biggam
- 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)

APPENDIX A1: TUNSINGWYRT CATALOGUE

CNo.	Source	Short Title & Reference	Spelling
1	Herbarium	Lch I (HerbHead) 140.0	tunsingwyr̃t
2	Herbarium	Lch I (Herb) 140.0	Tunsingwyr̃t, tunsincgwyr̃t
3	Herbarium	Lch I (Herb) 159.0	tunsig(wyr̃t)
4	Herbarium	Lch I (Herb) 159.1	tunsingwyr̃t
5	Glossary: Durham	DurGI (Lindheim) 149	tunsing-vyr̃t
6	Glossaries: Laud	CollGI 26 (Stracke) 543	tunsingwyr̃t
7	Ælfric Bata: Colloquies (G)	OccGI 28 (Nap) 42	tunsing
8	Ælfric Bata: Colloquies (G)	OccGI 28 (Nap) 378	tunsincwyr̃t
9	Aldhelm: Riddle 99 (G)	AldÆ 2 (Nap) 63	tunsinwyr̃t
10	Bald: Leechbook I	Lch II (1) 28.1.1	tuningwyr̃t
11	Bald: Leechbook I	Lch II (1) 28.1.5	tuniigwyr̃te
12	Bald: Leechbook I	Lch II (1) 47.3.1	tungilsinwyr̃t

APPENDIX A2: RELATED CITATIONS

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

APPENDIX A3: DATES AND LOCATIONS

Source	Date	Location
Herbarium	?c. 900 (MSS and some attestations later)	unknown
Glossary: Durham	MS s. xii	Durham
Glossaries: 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 B1: WUDELEAC CATALOGUE

CNo.	Source	Short Title & Reference	Spelling
1	Glossaries: Laud	CollGI 26 (Stracke) 543	wudeleac

APPENDIX B3: DATES AND LOCATIONS

Source	Date	Location
Glossaries: Laud	MS s. xii	Canterbury

APPENDIX C1: WODEWISTLE CATALOGUE

CNo. Source	Short Title & Reference	Spelling
1 Glossary: Antwerp 4	AntGl 4 (Kindschi) 31	wodewistle
		BrGl 1 (Wright-Wülcker) D2.1
		1. [0049 (1.49)] <i>Cuculus</i> geac . ciculus <i>tucos</i> .
		2. [0396 (8.46)] Cicuta hymelic.
		3. [0403 (8.53)] Cicuta wodewistle.
		(Wright-Wülcker) D2.1
		1. [0403 (8.53)] <i>Cicuta</i> wodewistle .
		CorpGl 2 (Hessels) D4.2
		1. [1596 (3.397)] <i>Cicuta</i> wodewistle .
		EpGl (Pheifer) D7
		1. [0192 (192)] cicuta hymblicae.
		2. [0255 (255)] cicuta uuodaeuistlae.
		??? Others?XXXXX

APPENDIX C3: DATES AND LOCATIONS

Source	Date	Location
Glossary: Antwerp 4	s. xi ¹	Abingdon