Chapter 2
Glossing, Translating, and Occasional Poems

Cædmon's Hymn (*ylda-* and *aeldu*-recensions);
The Metrical Psalms (Paris Psalter, Eadwine's Canterbury Psalter,
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 121); *Gloria I*; *Prayer*; *Durham*

In her discussion of "The Developing Text of Cædmon's *Hymn*," Katherine O'Brien

O'Keeffe notes the existence of a remarkable contrast in the type and amount of textual

variation found between the exemplars of the two main West-Saxon recensions of "Cædmon's

Hymn."[41] On the one hand, there are the six surviving witnesses to the West-Saxon *eorðan*-

recension. In nine lines of text, the witnesses to this version of the poem – five of which are

found within the main text of the West-Saxon translation of Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica*[42] –

show seven variants which O'Keeffe considers to be metrically, syntactically, and semantically

appropriate.[43] On the other hand, there are the five surviving eleventh and twelfth-century

copies of the West-Saxon *ylda*-recension.[44] The witnesses to this text – all of which are found

in manuscripts of the Latin *Historia* – show only one substantive variant among them, the

marginally sensible reading *word* in Winchester, Cathedral I (**W**), line 4b for *ord* in all other

manuscripts. After pointing out that this difference in variation cannot be attributed to

---

[41]O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, pp. 40-41.

[42]The sixth, a marginal recension in the s.xii/xiii Tournai, Bibliothèque Municipale 134 (**To**), is not discussed by O'Keeffe. See below, Chapter 3, pp. 112 ff. and 135 ff.

[43]By my own count there are fifteen substantive variants in this recension of the poem. See Chapter 3, pp. 108-136.

[44]Two witnesses to the *ylda*-text, San Marino CA, Huntington Library, HM 35300 (**SanM**) and Cambridge, Trinity College R.5.22 (**Tr₁**), date from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Neither is of any textual value. In addition to numerous nonsense forms, there is one potentially significant variant, **SanM** *æ*, line 2b, for *and* in all other witnesses. This is almost certainly the result of the scribal misunderstanding of the abbreviation, ⁊. For an example of the opposite mistake – the misunderstanding of *æ* as ⁊, cf. **CUL**_Ffi27

differences in the dates of the surviving manuscripts, in the competence of the scribes responsible for the different recensions or to the use of different translations of Bede's paraphrase of the Hymn by the scribes of the Old English *Historia*, O'Keeffe suggests that the explanation is to be found instead in the nature of the textual environment in which each recension characteristically is copied. As a gloss to Bede's paraphrase in manuscripts of the Latin *Historia*, she argues, the *ylda*-recension shows a textual fixity appropriate to its literate, non-vernacular context; as an integral part of a vernacular text, on the other hand, the *eorðan*-recension shows a variability which she suggests is evidence of its "earlier, purely oral condition."[45]

O'Keeffe does not develop the significance of this contrast any further in her book. As the title of her chapter, "Orality and the Developing Text of Cædmon's *Hymn*," suggests, she is at this point more interested in the evidence of textual fluidity and scribal intervention found among the witnesses of the "developing" main-text *eorðan*-recension than the evidence of textual stability and scribal conservatism among those of the marginal *ylda*-recension. But the observation that differences in the nature and extent of the textual variation found between exemplars of two such closely related texts can be correlated to differences in the textual environment within which each recension characteristically appears is a crucial one, and not least because it calls into question the association O'Keeffe attempts to make between scribal variation and "transitional literacy" – a state she defines as that "between pure orality and pure literacy whose evidence is a reading process which applies oral techniques for the receptions of a message to the decoding of a written text."[46] The fact that two groups[47] of roughly

---

ꝺðelwold **Hickes** *Æðelwold*, in "Durham," l. 14b (discussed below, p. 81). The odd form **Tr₁** *euca*, l. 9b for *frea* in all other manuscripts is presumably to be explained graphically.

[45]O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 40.

[46]O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 41.

contemporaneous scribes could copy different versions of a single well-known poem with such different results suggests that the extent to which a given scribe altered the text of his exemplar had more to do with the conventions of the tradition in which he was working than the nature of his individual literacy. While O'Keeffe's observations concerning the level of substantive variation found between witnesses to the *eorðan*-text suggest that scribes *could* alter their exemplars, the substantive accuracy shown by the witnesses to the marginal *ylda*-text shows that they did not always do so. Rather, the evidence of the witnesses to the *ylda*-recension – and of other texts showing similar patterns of substantive textual accuracy – suggests that Anglo-Saxon scribes could copy to an extraordinary degree of accuracy when they chose or were instructed to do so. As I shall demonstrate in the following pages, such accuracy was the norm for all poems of regular alliterative metre not found as part of "poetic" anthologies like the Exeter, Junius and Vercelli Books, or as fixed constituents to vernacular prose framing texts like the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* or the Old English translation of Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica*. While the poems found outside these contexts belong to a variety of different poetic genres and are found in a variety of different manuscript contexts, the low levels and limited types of substantive textual variation they exhibit indicate the extent to which Old English poetry could be transmitted accurately.

"Cædmon's Hymn" (*ylda*-recension)

Although they produce far less substantive variation than do the scribes of the *eorðan*-recension, there is little reason to assume that the scribes of the *ylda*-recension of "Cædmon's Hymn" were any less able readers of Old English poetry. While the two recensions differ greatly in the amount, nature, and appropriateness of the textual variation they exhibit, the witnesses to both show a similar freedom in the arrangement of their punctuation, especially

---

[47]No scribe is responsible for more than one version of "Cædmon's Hymn." There seems no reason to

when compared with the general consistency of the grammatical pointing found between

witnesses to Bede's paraphrase of the Hymn in the Latin *Historia*.

Table 1: Pointing In Bede's Latin Paraphrase of "Cædmon's Hymn" (adapted from O'Keeffe,
Visible Song, *figure 2)* [48]

	Placement of points by clause (Points follow indicated words)							
Witness	caelestis	creatoris	illius	gloriae	deus	extitit	tecti	creavit
L	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
M						×		
Tib_cii		×				×	×	×
Tib_Axiv	×	×		×	×	×	×	×
Tr_R75	×		×	×		×	×	×
W	×	×		×	×	×	×	×
H	×		×	×		×	×	×
Bd	×	×		×	×	×	×	×
Roy_13CV	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Ld	×		×	×	×	×	×	×
Mg	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Ln	×		×	×	×	×	×	×
Tr_1	×	×		×	×	×	×	×
Hr	×		×	×	×	×	×	×

As O'Keeffe notes, most pre-twelfth-century English copies of the Latin *Historia*

punctuate Bede's paraphrase of the Hymn in a nearly identical fashion (Table 1).[49] Twelve of

the fourteen known English manuscripts of the *Historia* divide the paraphrase into three main

clauses, *nunc... gloriae*, *quomodo... extitit*, and *qui... creavit*.[50] The majority of these

manuscripts then divide these three clauses into a number of regular subdivisions, separating

the four "variations on the direct object" of *laudare* in the first clause (*auctorem regni celestis*,

---

assume that an individual scribe could not have copied texts in different environments, however.

[48]O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 42.

[49]The description of the punctuation of Bede's paraphrase of "Cædmon's Hymn" and of the *eorðan-* and *ylda-* recensions of the vernacular poem in this and the following paragraphs is largely drawn from O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, pp. 42-6. It is treated at length both because I add some additional material to her account and because of the differences in our conclusions.

[50]Citations from the text of the Latin *Historia* are from Bertram Colgrave and R. A. B. Mynors, eds., *Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, Oxford Medieval Texts (Oxford: OUP - Clarendon, 1969). Bede's paraphrase of the Hymn is edited on p. 416.

potentiam creatoris, *consilium illis*, and *facta patris gloriae*), and marking the ends of

dependent clauses (*cum sit aeternus deus*, and *qui primo filiis hominum caelum pro culmine*

tecti) in the second and third.[51]

Table 2: Pointing In "Cædmon's Hymn," West-Saxon eorðan-*recension (adapted from O'Keeffe,* Visible Song, *figure 3)*[52]

	Placement of points by clause (expressed in half-lines)																	
Witness	1a	1b	2a	2b	3a	3b	4a	4b	5a	5b	6a	6b	7a	7b	8a	8b	9a	9b
T₁								×				×						×
B₁														×				×
O																		×
Ca					×		×					×						×

In contrast, only one witness to a vernacular text of "Cædmon's Hymn" employs a

similarly consistent grammatical system of punctuation (Table 2).[53] This manuscript, a tenth-

century copy of the Old English translation of the *Historia* and *eorðan*-recension of the Hymn

in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Tanner 10 (**T₁**),[54] uses points at the ends of lines 4b, 6b, and 9b to

divide the Old English text into its three main sentences, *nu sculon herigean... ór on/stealde*,

lines 1-4b, *he ærest sceop... halig scyppend*, lines 5-6b, and *þamiddungeard... frea ælmihtig*,

lines 7-9b.[55] Of these points, only the last, that marking the end of the poem at line 9b, is

---

[51]O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 44.

[52]O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 43. In adapting O'Keeffe's table, I have eliminated the evidence of **Ld**, **Hr**. These manuscripts, along with **CArms** (a manuscript not included in O'Keeffe's table), form a metrically irregular sub-group of the *eorðan*-recension and are not considered in this study. A second manuscript from the *eorðan*-group not included in O'Keeffe's table is **To**. This is discussed below, Chapter 3, pp. 135 ff.

[53]O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 44. As the points in all witnesses to the Hymn discussed in this section are all found at metrical boundaries (i.e. after the on- or off-verse), it is likely that the punctuation these manuscripts exhibit has a metrical as well as a syntactical function. The essential argument of the following pages – that the individual witnesses to the West-Saxon *ylda-* and *eorðan*-recensions are equally idiosyncratic in their punctuation – remains the same whether this punctuation is considered from a metrical or a syntactical point of view. No single manuscript punctuates all 18 half-lines, no manuscript punctuates according to any metrically or grammatically consistent system, and no two manuscripts show exactly the same pattern of punctuation in their common text.

[54]For a complete list of the manuscripts and sigla used in this dissertation, see Appendix 2 "Manuscripts and Sigla."

[55]O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 44.

found in the three other surviving twelfth-century or earlier manuscripts of the *eorðan-*

recension.[56] The most lightly punctuated of the three, the early eleventh-century Oxford,

Corpus Christi College, 279, pt. ii (**O**), contains no punctuation at all apart from this final

point. A second eleventh-century copy of the recension, Cambridge, Corpus Christi College,

41 (**B₁**) has points at the ends of lines 7b and 9b, the former separating *mann cynnes/ weard*,

the first subject of the final clause of the poem, from its subsequent variants, *écedrihten*, line

8a, and *frea ælmihtig*, line 9b. The fourth and most heavily punctuated witness to the *eorðan-*

recension, Cambridge, University Library, Kk. 3. 18 (**Ca**), uses four points, at the ends of lines

3a, 4a, 6b and 9b. Like **T₁**, this witness uses the point at the end of line 6b to separate the final

clause of the poem from the preceding text. With the point at the end of line 3a, it divides the

first sentence into its component clauses, *nu we sceolan herigean... wera/ wuldor fæder*, lines

1-3a and *swa he wuldres... ord onstealde*, lines 3b-4b, while the point at the of line 4a divides

the second of these two clauses in half, separating the verbal phrase, *ord onstealde*, from its

preceding subject and genitive complement, *swa he wuldres gehwæs / ece drihten*, in lines 3b-

4a.[57]

[56]The text of the Hymn in British Library, Cotton Otho B.xi (**C**) was destroyed in the Cottonian fire but is known to us from Lawrence Nowell's sixteenth-century transcript, preserved as London, British Library, Additional 43703 (**N**). A sixth version of the text survived the middle ages in the margins of a twelfth-century copy of the *Historia* in Tournai, Bibliothèque Municipale, 134, f. 78v. This manuscript was destroyed in World War II; its copy of the Hymn survives in facsimile.

[57]I do not understand O'Keeffe's reading of the syntactic function of the punctuation in this manuscript. In comparing the punctuation of "CUL Kk. 3. 18 [**Ca**] and its probable exemplar [**T₁**]," she suggests that "the later manuscript clearly added points to separate the variant objects, but pays no attention to the full stop wanting after *onstealde*" (pp. 44-5). The "variant objects" of *herigean* are *heofon rices weard* (l.1b), *metodes mihte* (l.2a), *mod ge þanc* (l.2b) and *wera/ wuldor fæder* (l.3a). The first point in this witness occurs *after* the last of these objects and immediately precedes the beginning of the next clause, *swa he wuldres ge hwæs... ord onstealde*.

Table 3: Pointing In "Cædmon's Hymn," West-Saxon ylda-*recension (adapted from O'Keeffe, Visible Song, figure 3)*[58]

Placement of points by clause (expressed in half-lines)

Witness	1a	1b	2a	2b	3a	3b	4a	4b	5a	5b	6a	6b	7a	7b	8a	8b	9a	9b
H		×	×	×	×			×			×				×			
W[59]	?	?	×			?		×					?					×
Mg		×	×	×	×			×			×							×
Ln		×	×	×	×			×		×	×	×						×

Similarly idiosyncratic punctuation is found in the West-Saxon *ylda*-recension, where the four surviving twelfth-century or earlier witnesses for which the punctuation can be recovered[60] contain a total of eleven different points, none of which is found in all four manuscripts (Table 3). With the exception of Winchester, Cathedral I (**W**), the most lightly punctuated of the four, the witnesses to the *ylda*-recension of the poem agree in dividing their text into two principal sentences, *nu... astealde* (lines 1-4b) and *he... ælmihtig* (lines 5a-9b), with a third point at the end of line 6a or 6b being used to separate this material from the problematic lines 7-9.[61] These same witnesses (again excluding **W**) then divide the first sentence of the poem into two main clauses (*nu we sculon herian... wurc wuldor fæder*, lines 1-3a, and *swa he wundra gehwilc... ord astealde*, lines 3b-4b) with a point at the end of line 3a; and the first of these main clauses into its grammatical components with points between the direct objects of *herian* at the ends of lines 1b, 2a and 2b. In the second half of the poem, Oxford, Magdalen College, Lat. 105 (**Mg**) and Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 43 (**H**) place a point at the end of line 6a, separating the core of the second sentence *he ærest gesceop*

---

[58]This table omits the evidence of the illegible **Bd** and late **SanM** and **Tr₁**.

[59]The "Hymn" has been trimmed in this manuscript, destroying the ends of lines 1a, 1b, 4a, and 7a. In addition, the point at the end of line 2a is indistinguishable from the abbreviation for ꝫ in facsimile. It has been included on O'Keeffe's authority.

[60]In addition to the punctuation of the fourteenth- and fifteenth-century **SanM** and **Tr₁**, the following discussion ignores the punctuation of the eleventh-century Oxford, Bodleian Library, 163 (**Bd**). The text of this witness has been badly damaged and its punctuation is irrecoverable.

[61]For a discussion of the problems with ll. 7-9 see below, pp. 27-28. **H** uses an additional point at the end of line 8a to separate the problematic half-lines *middangearde* and *æfter tida*.

ylda bearnum / heofon to hrofe (lines 5a-6a) from the subsequent elaboration of its subject,

halig scyppend (line 6b) and the final "clause" *middangearde... frea ælmyhtig* (lines 7-9).

Oxford, Lincoln College, Lat. 31, ff.14-113 (**Ln**) joins **Mg** and **H** in placing a point at the end

of line 6a, but does so for a different reason. When taken with unique points in this manuscript

at the ends of lines 5b and 6b, the point at the end of 6a serves to break the clause *he ærust*

ge/scop... halig scyppend into its component parts in a fashion similar to that used in the first

main clause of the poem in all three manuscripts: subject, verb and indirect object (*he ærust*

ge/scop   ylda bearnum), in lines 5a-5b; direct object and modifying prepositional phrase

(*heofon to hrofe*) in line 6a; the appositive epithet for the subject, *halig scyppend* in line 6b.

      The punctuation of **W** stands apart from that of the other witnesses to the *ylda-*

recension and is the most difficult to account for. This witness contains three points: one at the

end of the poem after line 9b (also found in **Mg** and **Ln**), and two others at the end of lines 2a

and 5a.[62] The point at the end of line 2a divides the direct objects of *herian* in two, separating

heofonrices we[ard] and *metoḍ des mihte* (lines 2a and 3a respectively) on the one hand from

ond his modgeþanc and *wurc wuldorfæder* (lines 3b and 4a) on the other. While the absence

of a point at the end of the first clause makes it difficult to determine the function of the point

at line 2a precisely, one possibility is that the scribe understood the four objects of *herian* as

referring to essentially two things, God the person and his qualities. In this reading, the

punctuation of lines 1-3 in **W** suggests that *modgeþanc* and *wurc* are to be understood

essentially as repetitions of the first two objects, *modgeþanc* corresponding to *heofonrices*

we[ard] (God the person), and *wurc wuldorfæder* corresponding to *metoḍ des mihte* (his works

---

[62]A point after line 2a is recorded by O'Keeffe (*Visible Song*, Figure 3, p. 43), who appears to have examined
the manuscript in person (p.xi). The point touches against the horizontal stroke of the abbreviation for ⁊
and does not look like an independent mark in facsimile. See Fred C. Robinson, and E. G. Stanley, eds.,
Old English Verse Texts from Many Sources: A Comprehensive Collection, Early English Manuscripts in
Facsimile 23 (Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1991), plate 2.21.

and qualities). With the point after line 5a, the scribe of **W** separates *he* [*æ*]*rest ge sceop*, the subject and verb of the first clause of the second sentence from the rest of its predicate and from *h*[*alig*] *scippend*, an elaboration of *he*. As *ge sceop* is the last recognisable verb in the *ylda*-recension of the poem, it is possible that the **W** scribe understood all the material in lines 5b-9b as belonging to this predicate.

The differences in the arrangement of the punctuation in these five witnesses to the *ylda*-recension suggest two things about the way in which the scribes responsible approached their task. In the first place, the failure of any two witnesses to punctuate in exactly the same way suggests that each scribe added his own punctuation to the text as he worked, and that this punctuation can as a result be understood to reflect the scribe's personal engagement with the poem as he read and copied it. In the second place, the failure of these witnesses to punctuate according to any single grammatical or metrical principal – that is, to mark any single grammatical, syntactic or metrical feature consistently[63] – suggests that the points which do appear serve primarily as a means of clarifying aspects of the text the individual found difficult to understand.[64]

That this was necessary brings us to a third difference between the *ylda*- and *eorðan*-recensions. Not only is the *ylda*-recension transmitted to a higher standard of substantive accuracy and more heavily punctuated than the *eorðan*-text, it also makes far less sense. This is not mentioned by O'Keeffe in her discussion of the differences between the two recensions but is perhaps best seen through a comparison of the *ylda*-text with that of the Northumbrian

---

[63]In contrast, O'Keeffe reports that such systematic punctuation of half-lines is a feature of "late manuscripts of Old English verse" (*Visible Song*, p. 46 fn. 64 and pp. 185-6).

[64]A central argument of O'Keeffe's book, of course, is that the increasing use of punctuation in vernacular texts is the result of the historical movement from "transitional" to "fully literate" modes of reading. As the scribes of the marginal *ylda*- and main-text *eorðan*-recensions of "Cædmon's Hymn" are roughly contemporaneous with each other, however, this developmental model fails to explain the differences in the

aeldu-recension, an earlier and apparently distantly related version[65] found in the two earliest

known manuscripts of the Latin *Historia*, St. Petersburg, Public Library, Lat. Q. v. i. 18 (**L**)

and Cambridge, University Library, Kk. 5. 16 (**M**).[66] For purposes of comparison, I have

reproduced the texts of **H** and **M**:

ylda-recension (H)		*aeldu*-recension (M)
Nu **we** sculon herian heofon ricesweard.		Nuscylun hergę^{a}n hefaenricaes uard
metudes myhte. ꞇhis mod ge þanc.|		metudaes maecti end his modgidanc
wurc wuldor fæder. swa he wundra **ge hwilc**		uerc uuldurfadur| sue he uundra**gihuaes**
ece drihten **ord** astealde.		ecidryctin **or**astelidæ
5 He| ærest **ge sceop** yl*da* bearnū	5	heaerist **scop**____aelda barnū
heofon to hrofe. halig scyppend		hebentilhrofe| halegscepen
middan gearde| man cynnes weard		**thamiddun geard** moncynnæsuard
ece drihten. Æfter **tida**		ecidryctin æfter **tiadæ**
firum **on foldum** frea ælmyhtig		firum **fold^u** freaallmectig|

Ignoring all differences of dialect and orthography, we find the following seven potentially

significant variants:

Line No.	West-Saxon *ylda*-recension	Northumbrian *aeldu*-recension
1a	we	∅
3b	gehwilc	gihuaes
4b	ord	or
5a	gesceop	scop
7a	middangearde	tha middungeard
8b	tida	tiadæ
9a	on foldum	foldu

Of these, the readings of the *ylda*-recension in lines 1a, 4b, 5a, and 9a (*on*), can all be

paralleled from other recensions of the poem and presumably represent variants introduced

into the text at an early date, if not by Cædmon himself.[67] The readings in lines 3b, 7a, 8b and

---

amount of punctuation found in each group of manuscripts. As I suggest below, best explanation may lie in the obvious corruptions preserved in all copies of the *ylda* version.

[65]The standard discussion of the recensional division of "Cædmon's Hymn" is found in Dobbie, *Manuscripts*.

[66]This recension of the poem is discussed in greater detail below, pp. 49-53.

[67]*We* in l. 1a is also found in the three witnesses to the Northumbrian *eordu-recension* and in some versions of the West-Saxon *eorðan*-recension (**Ca B$_1$ To** and the corrected from of **O** [**O^{corr}**]); *ord* for *or*, l.4b, is found in all witnesses to the eorðan text except **T$_1$ N** (both of which read *or*) and **To** (*ær*). **O** has *oor* corrected to **O^{corr}** *oor^d*. *gesceop* (and orthographic variants) is also the reading of the *eorðan*-witnesses **O**

9a (*foldum*), on the other hand, are more problematic. As Dobbie has argued, they are

probably to be understood as corruptions introduced into the *ylda* version of the poem at the

time it was first translated into West-Saxon:

> In l.3, *gehwilc* is quite ungrammatical since a genitive (*gehwæs* in the other texts
> of the Hymn) is required here after *ord*, l.4. In l.7, *middangearde*, as a dative-
> instrumental, has no conceivable relation to its context; and the phrase *on foldum*, l.9,
> as a dative plural, makes no sense here, for *folde*, in the sense of "earth," is not
> recorded in the plural, and in fact could hardly have a plural meaning. The form *tida*,
> in l.8, for *teode* in the *eorðan* group, is apparently not a verb at all, but the accusative
> plural of *tid*, "after periods of time," and the two vowels, *i* and *a*, of *tida* can be
> explained only on the assumption that the word is the result of a misunderstanding of
> *tiadæ*, or a similar form, in the Northumbrian version; *tida* must therefore go back to
> the first rendering of the *ylda* group into the West-Saxon dialect.[68]

In marking their texts, the scribes of the *ylda*-recension appear to have recognised

these difficulties. The corruptions which Dobbie suggests render the poem as a whole difficult

if not impossible to construe – *gehwilc*, line 3b, *middangearde*, line 7a, *tida*, line 8b, and

foldum line 9a – are marked off from the rest of the poem in all twelfth-century or earlier

witnesses except **W**. All scribes except **W** isolate the ungrammatical *wundra gehwilc* with

points preceding and following the clause in which it occurs (lines 3b-4b). The scribes of **H**

Mg and **Ln** set off *middangearde*, line 7a, *tida*, line 8b and *foldum* line 9a, all of which are

found in the last three lines of the poem, with a point after the last readily sensible clause,

interpreted as *He ærest gesceop... heofon to hrofe*, lines 5-6a, in **H** and **Mg**, and *he ærust ge*

scop... halig scyppend, lines 5-6b in **Ln**. As noted above, the scribe of **W** isolates the final

lines of the poem with a point after the last recognisable verb in the text, *ge sceop*, line 5a.

Taken together, this consistency in the substantive details of their common text and

innovation in the interpretative details of their individual punctuation suggest that the scribes

---

and **Ca**; *on foldu* (for *on foldun*, accusative singular), is found in all witnesses to the Northumbrian *eordu*-
text.

[68] Dobbie, *Manuscripts*, pp. 39-40.

of the *ylda*-recension of "Cædmon's Hymn" understood what they were copying, recognised

that their text was flawed, but were unwilling or not allowed to fix its errors. That the scribes

of this recension placed a premium on accuracy of reproduction is also suggested, moreover,

by their general dialectal and orthographic uniformity. In addition to its single substantive

textual variant, the substitution of the stressed **W** *word* for **H Bd Ln Mg** *ord*, line 4, the four

recoverable eleventh and twelfth-century witnesses to the *ylda*-recension contain the following

accidental variants:

Line	Majority Reading (normalised word-division)	Variant Reading (normalised word-division)
1a	**H Mg W** sculon	**Ln** sculun
	H Ln Mg herian	**W** herian| <u>heri</u>
2a	**H Ln Mg** metudes	**W** metoḍdes
	Mg W mihte	**Bd H** myhte; **Ln** michte
3a	**Bd H Mg** wurc	**Ln W** weorc
	Ln Mg W wuldorfæder	**H** wuldorfæder (*with* o *corrected from* u)
3b	**H Mg W** gehwilc	**Ln** gehwylc; **Bd** [gehw]ylc (*with* y *corrected from* i)
4a	**H Mg W** ece	**Ln** eche
5a	**H Mg** ærest	**Ln** ærust; **W** [æ]|ræst
	Ln Mg W gescop	**H** gesceop
6a	**H Ln Mg** heofon	**W** heofẹ°n
	H Ln hrofe	**Mg W** rofe
6b	**H Ln Mg** scyppend	**W** scippend
7a	**H Ln Mg** middangearde	**W** middanear[de]; **Bd** [mid]danea[r]de
7b	**H Bd Mg** mancynnes	**Ln** mankynnes; **W** manncynnes
	H Mg W weard	**Ln** weard (*with* e *erased after* d)
8a	**H Mg W** ece	**Ln** eche
9b	**Bd Ln Mg** frea ælmihtig	**H** frea ælmyhtig; **W** frea ealmihti (*with erasure* [o?] *between* frea *and* ealmihti)

Leaving aside the corrections of minor scribal errors (most of which are found in the work of

the somewhat careless **W** scribe), we are left with twenty variants which might be described as

representing genuine phonological or orthographic differences: four examples of alteration

between *y:i* (lines 2a, 3b, 6b and 9b),[69] five examples of the confusion of medial or final

vowels (*u* and *o*, lines 2a and 3a; *e*, *u*, and *æ*, line 5a; *e* and *o*, line 6a),[70] one example of late

West-Saxon smoothing between *w* and *r* (line 3a),[71] one example of diphthongisation by an

initial palatal (line 5a),[72] one example of the falling together of *ī* and *ig* (line 9b),[73] one

example of a back spelling *ea* for West-Saxon *æ* (line 9b),[74] two examples of the loss of

consonants (*h-*, line 6a and *-g-*, line 7a), one example of the graphic simplification of

geminates (line 7b),[75] and three differences in the orthographic representation of similar sounds

(*k* : *c*, line 7b; and *ch* : *c*, lines 4a and 8a). On the whole, this suggests that the scribes of the

West-Saxon *ylda*-recension were a relatively careful group of copyists, writing a fairly

standard dialect – and it is tempting to attribute the lack of substantive variation they introduce

into their texts to their perhaps unusual interest in preserving the literal details of their

exemplars.

That this was not the principal reason for their substantive accuracy, however, is

demonstrated by the similarly low level of substantive variation found between the two

surviving witnesses to the Old English metrical translation of Psalms 90:16-95:2. Whereas in

the *ylda*-recension of "Cædmon's Hymn," the lack of substantive variation between witnesses

was matched by a similar stability in the accidental details of orthography and dialect, in the

case of Psalms 90:16.1-95:2.1, the substantive stability of the text occurs in the face of

wholesale orthographic and dialectal variation.

---

[69]This is the most common accidental variation in the multiply-attested texts. For a general discussion of the conditions under which it occurs, see Campbell, *OEG*, §§315-318.

[70]See Campbell, *OEG*, §§49 and 377.

[71]Campbell, *OEG*, §321.

[72]Campbell, *OEG*, §181.

[73]See Campbell, *OEG*, §267.

[74]Cf. Campbell, *OEG*, §329.2.

Psalms 90:16-95:2 (Paris Psalter, Eadwine's Psalter)

Parallel texts of the Old English metrical translation of Psalms 90:16.1-95:2.1 survive

in two manuscripts, the Paris Psalter (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Lat. 8824, **PPs**) and

Cambridge, Trinity College, R. 17. 1 (**EPs**), a manuscript known variously as "Eadwine's

Psalter," "The Canterbury Psalter," and "Eadwine's Canterbury Psalter."[76] In both witnesses,

the Old English text appears alongside a Latin version of the Psalms. In **PPs**, Psalms 90:16.1-

95:2.1 are found as part of a continuous prose and verse translation of the Psalter which has

been copied in parallel columns alongside the Roman text in a single hand.[77] In **EPs**, the

equivalent text is found at the appropriate place of an otherwise lexical interlinear gloss to the

Roman version. This Psalter, an elaborate production with three versions of the Latin text in

parallel columns, marginal scholia and Latin glosses, and interlinear Old French and Old

English translations, is the work of numerous scribes.[78] The metrical Old English portion of

the interlinear gloss has been copied in a hand different from those responsible for both the

---

[75]Campbell, *OEG*, §66.

[76]A second brief passage from the metrical translation of the Psalms has been discovered by Patrick P. O'Neill, "Another Fragment of the Metrical Psalms in the Eadwine Psalter," *N&Q* 233 (1988), 434-6. It is found on f.252v, "in the column for Latin glosses on the Gallicanum, to the left of the Romanum text and gloss to Psalm 142:8" ("Another Fragment," p. 435). It is discussed below, pp. 48 and 53-54.

[77]Descriptions of the manuscript and its text can be found in Ker, *Catalogue*, art. 367; and B. Colgrave, ed., *The Paris Psalter* (*MS. Bibliothèque Nationale Fonds Latin 8824*), EEMF 8 (Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1958).

[78]A convenient summary of the various distributions and identifications of the scribes proposed up to 1989 can be found in Philip Pulsiano, "The Scribes and Old English Gloss of Eadwine's Canterbury Psalter," *Proceedings of the PMR Conference: Annual Publication of the International Patristic*, *Mediaeval and Renaissance Conference* 14 (1989): 223-60. See especially the tables on pp. 224-25 and 236. Since the publication of this article, two important studies have appeared: Patrick P. O'Neill, "The English Version," in: *The Eadwine Psalter: Text*, *Image and Monastic Culture in Twelfth Century Canterbury*, Margaret Gibson, T.A. Heslop, and Richard W. Pfaff, eds, Publications of the Modern Humanities Research Association 14 (London: Modern Humanities Research Association, 1992) 121-38; and Teresa Webber, "Codicology and Paleography: 2. The Script," in: *The Eadwine Psalter*, pp. 13-24. The article by Webber is the forthcoming "paleographic study" mentioned by Pulsiano, p. 248.

main Latin text and the lexical glosses proceeding and following. It has been corrected in yet another hand.[79]

Although the parallel text of Psalms 90:16.1-95:2.1 is like the *ylda*-recension of "Cædmon's Hymn" in that it is found exclusively in manuscripts of the Latin text it "translates," it differs from the Hymn in that its two witnesses are separated by a large number of obvious scribal errors and accidental variants. On the one hand, the two manuscripts share one incontrovertible error, **PPs** *nære* (**EPs** *nere*) for expected *wære* (Lat. *est*) in Psalm 93:16.2b, and at least one probable error, **PPs EPs** *þe* for expected *he* in Psalm 94:7.3a.[80] On the other hand, it is clear that the tradition represented by **EPs** has undergone an extensive, though imperfectly accomplished, dialectal and orthographic translation from West-Saxon to the eccentric twelfth-century form of Kentish used throughout the manuscript's lexical glosses:[81] *æ* is used throughout the text as the most common spelling for West-Saxon stressed and unstressed *ă*: **EPs** *oncnæwæn* (**PPs** *oncnawan*), Psalm 93:8.3b; **EPs** *demæ* (**PPs** *dema*), Psalm 93:15.1b; for the second element of the diphthong *ĕa*: **EPs** *þeærfe* (**PPs** *þearfe*), Psalm

---

[79]As these corrections do not appear to have been made with an eye toward preserving the metrical nature of the gloss, they are disregarded in the following discussion. See Peter Baker, "A Little Known Variant Text of the Old English Metrical Psalter," *Speculum* 59 (1984): 263-281, at p. 265.

[80]Baker, "Variant Text," pp. 270-71; Kenneth Sisam and Celia Sisam, "The Psalm Texts," in: *The Paris Psalter*, Colgrave, ed., pp. 15-17 at p. 17. In addition, Baker and the Sisams suggest that the odd word division of the tag *worulda woruld* (**PPs** *woruld aworuld* **EPs** *worul æworł*) in Psalm 91:6.6 in both manuscripts may be derived from an earlier common exemplar (see "Variant Text," p. 270 and "The Psalm Texts," p. 17 and fn. 68). This word-division can be paralleled elsewhere, however, and is equally likely to be the result of chance. Cf. "Gloria I" **Jn₁₂₁** *onworuld aworuld* **CC₂₀₁** *on worlda world*, line 41a.

[81]For a detailed discussion of the forms and dialectal implications of the spellings of the lexical glosses in the Eadwine Psalter, see Karl Wildhagen, *Der Psalter des Eadwine von Canterbury: Die Sprache der altenglischen Glosse. Ein frühchristliches Psalterium die Grundlage*, Studien zur englischen Philologie 13 (Halle: Niemeyer, 1905), pp. 35-208. Although Wildhagen does not include the forms of the metrical portion of the gloss in his dialectal analysis (§7, p. 12), the most common dialectal differences between the two witnesses of the metrical translation are also found in the work of the scribes he does examine.

93:15.2b; **EPs** *ecælle* (**PPs** *ealle*), Psalm 91:8.2b;[82] and for unstressed *e* and *o* in inflectional

endings, prepositions, and pronouns: **EPs** *On/findæn* (for *onfinden*, present subjunctive plural;

PPs *Onfindað*, plural imperative), Psalm 93:8.1a; **EPs** *syndæn* (**PPs** *syndon*), Psalm 92:6.1a.

Conversely, the Kentish spelling *e* is generally preferred to West-Saxon *ǽ*: **EPs** *er* (**PPs** *ær*),

Psalm 94:11.2a; **EPs** *cweð* (**PPs** *cwæð*), Psalm 94:10.3a;[83] Non-Kentish features include: the

use of *io* for both *ĭo* and *ĕo* (obscuring the normal later Kentish distinction between *īo* [from

historical *īo* and *ēo*] and *ĕo* [from historical *ĭo* and *ĕo*]): e.g. **EPs** *sni ome* **PPs** *sneome*

(historical *īo*), Psalm 93:18.3b; **EPs** *stiop cildæ* **PPs** *steopcil/da* (for historical *ēo*), Psalm

93:6.2a[84]; and the use of *i* rather than the *e* for West-Saxon 'festes' and 'unfestes' *y* (**PPs** *y*):

EPs *hige* **PPs** *hyge*, Psalm 94:10.4b; **EPs** *sindon* **PPs** *syndon*, Psalm 93:8.2b.[85]

Other differences separating the two recensions include: the sporadic omission of final

vowels in **EPs**: **EPs** *oðð þe* (**PPs** *oððe þe*), Psalm 91:3.3a; **EPs** *Ahefðe|* (**PPs** *A hefe þe*),

Psalm 93:2.1a; **EPs** *gefultumed|* (**PPs** *geful/tumede*), Psalm 93:15.2a; minim errors and other

graphic mistakes in the use of consonants: **EPs** *þonnne* (for expected *þonne* as in **PPs**), Psalm

91:6.1a; **EPs** *ðeð* (for *þet*, **PPs** *þæt*), Psalm 93:8.1a; **EPs** *Hefre* (for *nefre*, **PPs** *Næfre*), Psalm

93:12.1a; reverse spellings, assimilations and the spurious addition of consonants: **PPs** *geon*

(for **EPs** *geond*), Psalm 90:16.2b; **EPs** *cneowrisse* (for **PPs** *cneorisse*), Psalm 94:9.4a; **EPs** *sin*

---

[82]West-Saxon *ĕa* is also preserved, for example, in Psalm 93:9.1-7 where has **EPs** *ecægana* (**PPs** *eagena*), as well as **EPs** *ealdum, earan, eallū, sealde, gesceawian, healdað, eallum*, and *ðrea* (for **PPs** *ealdum, earan, eallum, sealde, gesceawian, healdað, eallum*, and *þrea*).

[83]West-Saxon *ǽ* is also preserved: **EPs** *æghwer* **PPs** *æghær* (for *æghwær*), Psalm 91:9.3b; **EPs** *æt* **PPs** *æt*, Psalm 93:15.2b;

[84]Campbell, *OEG*, §297. Both examples are given by Baker, "Variant Text," pp. 270-271. For *sniome* see also Sisam and Sisam "The Psalm Texts," p.17.

[85]On the preference for *i* in the lexical glosses to Eadwine's Psalter, see Wildhagen, *Der Psalter des Eadwine*, §72 ("festes" *y*); §§24-27 ("unfestes" *y*). The dialectal differences in the reflexes of the two forms are discussed in Sievers-Brunner, §§31-33, and 21.4 and Campbell, *OEG*, §288. I have found only one example of the Kentish spelling *e* for West-Saxon *y* in the Metrical Psalms: for the *i*-umlaut of *ĕa* in **PPs** *gehw/yrfed*: **EPs** *gewerfeþ* (corrected from *geferfeþ*), Psalm 93:13.1b.

ningrӕ (for **PPs** *synnigra*), Psalm 91:6.2a; **EPs** *urriht* (for **PPs** *unriht*), Psalm 93:13.2a; **EPs** *onworul ӕworł* (for *on woruldӕ woruld*, **PPs** *onworuld aworuld*), Psalm 91:6.6a; **EPs** *meӕh|* (for *meӕht*, **PPs** *miht*), Psalm 93:1.1b; **PPs** *foweor|það* (for *forweorþað*, **EPs** *for weorðӕð*), Psalm 91:8.2b; **EPs** *eӕlre*, corrected from *eӕlle* (for **PPs** *ealra*), Psalm 93:8.2b; **EPs** *ӕghylcne* (for **PPs** *ӕghwylcne*), Psalm 93:1.2b; **PPs** *ӕghӕr* (for *ӕghwӕr*, **EPs** *ӕghwer*), Psalm 91:9.3b; **EPs** *gewerfeþ* corrected from *geferfeþ* (for *gehwerfeþ*, **PPs** *gehw|yrfed*), Psalm 93:13.1b; dittography and eye-skip: **PPs** **heaheh**sta (for *heahesta*, **EPs** *heӕhste*), Psalm 91:7.2a; **EPs** *Forðon is se| **micla god kining**.| ofer eall| manne| godu* (for: *Forðon is se **micla god mihtig drihten ⁊ se micla kining** ofer eall manne godu*; cf. **PPs** *Forðon isse **micla| god mihtig drihten| ⁊se micla cynincg|** ofer eall mannagodu*), Psalm 94:3.1a-2b.

Once these obvious scribal errors and differences of dialect and orthography have been taken into account, twenty-one textual variants occur (in 167 lines of common text) which might conceivably be understood as legitimate alternative readings by subsequent readers.[86] Of these, ten can be attributed on closer inspection to scribal error or other orthographic or phonological causes and six to the influence of the Latin text being glossed. With the exception of these examples of the apparent influence of the Latin text, moreover, none of the apparently genuine substantive alterations has a significant effect on the overall sense or syntax of the passage in which it occurs.

---

[86]The two lists are not mutually exclusive. The twenty-one variants discussed below include some – like the omission of *mihtig drihten ⁊ se micla* from **EPs** 94:3.1a – which have both potentially significant substantive effect on sense, syntax, and metre, and an obviously scribal origin.

Textual Variants

Inflectional Difference (5 examples)

MPs **(PPs/EPs), 91:8.1a**

PPs	**EPs**
1 Þ inu<u>ðine</u> feond fæc|ne drihten	1 hinu <u>ðin**re**</u> feond fæcne| drihten
oneorð|wege ealle foweor|það.	on eorðwege| eælle for weorðæð.
ꝺweorðað to wre|cene wide ealle	ꝺ| weorðæþ to|wrecene wide| eælle
þaþe| unrihtes æror worh|tan;|	ðæ þæunriht es| eror worhtæn|

Quoniam ecce inimici tui domine peribunt et dispergentur omnes qui operantur iniquitatem

    PPs *ðine* is the nominative plural masculine form of the second person possessive adjective *þin*. **EPs** *ðinre* is ostensibly the genitive or dative singular feminine or (with the falling together of *e* and *a* in unstressed syllables) genitive plural. As such, it fails to agree with anything else in the clause.

    The most likely explanation for the **EPs** form is as a back-spelling of the assimilation of *r*. Examples of assimilation involving *r* in this manuscript include: **EPs** *urriht* (**PPs** *unriht*), Psalm 93:13.2a, and **EPs** *eælre* corrected from *eælle* (**PPs** *ealra*), Psalm 93:8.2b.

MPs **(PPs/EPs), 93:2.1a**

PPs	**EPs**
1 <u>A hefe</u> þe onellen. eor|þan dema	1 <u>Ahefðe|</u> onhellen eorðæn demæ.|
gyld ofer| hydigum swa hi ǽr| grame worhton;|	gild ofer hidegum| swæ hi er| græmæ| worhton

Exaltare qui iudicas terram redde retributionem superbis

    The expected form for both manuscripts would be *ahefe* as in **PPs**, although endingless forms are common in Northumbrian.[87] Given the strong southern character of the **EPs** text, *ahef* is probably best explained as a result of the graphic omission of final *e*, perhaps through eyeskip (*ahef**e** ð**e** > ahefðe*). Further examples of the (graphic) omission of final unstressed *e* in this manuscript include: **EPs** *oðð þe* **PPs** *oððe þe* (Psalm 91:3.3a, p. 34, above), and **EPs** *gefultumed\|* **PPs** *geful/tumede* (Psalm 93:15.2a, p. 38 below). The addition or omission of the

---

[87]Sievers-Brunner, §372 Anm.

unstressed syllable falls in the preliminary dip of a Type A-3 line. It has no significant effect

on metre.

MPs (PPs/EPs), 93:8.1a

PPs	**EPs**
1 <u>O nfindað</u> þæt ꝺongeo|tan. þeonfolce nu____ _un|wiseste ealra syndon| dysigehwæt hwygu deopeþæt oncnawan.|	1 <u>On|findæn</u> ðeð. ꝺon geoton| þe onfolce nu unwiseste| eælre sindon||| disige hwethwygu. deope| þet oncnæwæn.

Intelligite nunc qui insipientes estis in populo et stulti aliquando sapite

PPs *Onfindað* is a plural imperative; **EPs** *On|findæn* a plural present subjunctive (with

æ for *e*). While the use of an imperative plural places the first verb of the **PPs** text into closer

agreement with the Latin Psalm, the plural present subjunctive in **EPs** is consistent with the

tense and mood of the second, rhetorically parallel, verb in both witnesses: **EPs** *on geoton* **PPs**

ongeo|tan (with *a* and *o* for *e* respectively).[88] As Baker remarks in his note to the line:

> ...the Latin text reads "Intelligite nunc qui insipientes estis in populo et stulti
> aliquando sapite." Thorpe, Grein, Assmann, and Krapp emend *P*'s *ongeotan* to
> *ongeotað*, so that *Onfindað* and *ongeotað* correspond formally to *Intelligite*. But
> although the imperatives and *estis* show that the Latin text is addressed to the
> *insipientes* and *stulti*, there is no such indication in the OE text; indeed, in 93:8.3,
> *oncnawan* (*P*) and *oncnæwæn* (*EP*) render Latin *sapite*, indicating that the OE
> versifier intended to translate the Latin pl. imperatives with pl. subjunctives. The
> emendation of *ongeotan* to *ongeotað* therefore is probably incorrect...[89]

There are two explanations for this variant. Either the translation of both Latin

imperative plurals by Old English subjunctive plurals is an innovation in the tradition

represented by **EPs** – an innovation which has subsequently but only partially been adopted in

the **PPs** tradition – or the imperative plural in **PPs** represents the innovation (presumably

---

[88]The variant forms *-an* and *-on* for expected *-en* both have parallels elsewhere in the two texts: *a* for *e* is
frequent in unstressed syllables of the Paris Psalter: **PPs** *oncnawan* (**EPs** *oncæwæn*), plural subjunctive,
Psalm 93:8.3; **PPs** *andettan* (**EPs** *an dettæn*), plural subjunctive, Psalm 94:2.2a; **PPs** *singan* (**EPs** *singæn*),
plural subjunctive, Psalm 94:2.3b; *o* for *e* is less frequent in the Eadwine Psalter, but occurs in **EPs**
forwordone (**PPs** *forworde|ne*; past participle of *forweorðan*, strong 3), Psalm 91:6.5a; see also Baker,
"Variant Text," p. 280.

[89]Baker, "Variant Text," p. 280.

through the influence of the accompanying Latin) while the original translator of the Psalms

used plural subjunctives to translate the Latin imperatives. That the second possibility is the

most likely – and that the influence of the Latin text in **PPs** was unconscious – is suggested by

the inconsistency of **PPs**. Had the **PPs** scribe *intended* either to adapt his text to follow the

reading of the **EPs** or to alter his text to make it more like the Latin verses it translates, we

would have expected to find similar changes in *both* verbs.[90]

MPs (**PPs/EPs**), 93:15.2a

PPs	**EPs**
1 N ymðe me drihten| dema usser <u>geful|tumed**e**</u> fægereæt| þearfe wenincga| minsawl sohtehelle;|	1 Nimðe me drihten| demæ usser. <u>gefultumed|</u> fegere æt þeærfe| weninga| minsaul sohte| helle.

Nisi quia dominus adiuvasset me paulominus habitaverat in inferno anima mea

EPs *gefultumed* (for **PPs** *geful/tumede*) is one of three examples of the loss of final *-e*

in the **EPs** version of Psalms 90:16.1-95:2.1, presumably in this case by anticipation of the end

of the manuscript line. The two other examples of the loss of this letter are similarly graphic,

eyeskip being the most likely explanation in each case (**EPs** *oðð þe* : **PPs** *oððe þe*, Psalm

91:3.3a, p. 34, above, and **EPs** *Ahefðe* **PPs** *A hefe þe*, Psalm 93:2.1a, above p. 36).

As the context requires an inflected verb, the **PPs** reading is to be preferred. Both

forms make acceptable metre, however. In **PPs** *geful/tumede* is either Type C-1 line (with

resolution of the second lift) or (with the syncopation of *-um-* after a long syllable) Type C-2.[91]

In **EPs**, *gefultumed* can only be scanned as Type C-2.

---

[90]This sort of linkage is an important feature of the variation between witnesses of multiply-attested poems in the major anthologies. See below, Chapter 4. There is one example among the poems discussed in this chapter, **Jn₁₂₁** *haliges gastes* **CC₂₀₁** *halige gastas*, "Gloria I," l.43b. See below, p. 66

[91]See Campbell, *OEG*, §392. *Gefultumede* is also used as a half-line in both witnesses to Psalm 93:16.4a.

MPs (PPs/EPs), 93:16.1a

PPs	EPs
1 G ific **þæs** sægde. þmin| sylfes fot.	1 Gif ic **ðet**| segde. þ min silfes fot.|
ful sarli|ce asliden nære	ful sarlice. asliden| nere.
þame| mildheortnes mihti|gan drihtnes	þæ me mildheortnes| mihtigan drihtnes
gefultu|mede þicfeorh ahte.|	gefultumede þic| feorh ahte.

Si dicebam motus est pes meus misericordia tua domine adiuvabit me.

    EPs *ðet* **PPs** *þæs* appear to represent genuinely alternative readings. While the accusative is the normal case for the object of *secgan*, the genitive is found with the simple form of the verb on three other occasions in Old English poetry: *Genesis*, lines 2675-6, *Daniel*, line 482 and *Durham* (Cambridge, University Library, Ff. i. 27 version), line 20.[92]

Substitution of Unstressed Words and Elements (3 examples)

MPs (PPs/EPs), 91:8.1a

PPs	EPs
1 **Þ inu**ðine feond fæc|ne drihten	1 **hinu** ðinre feond fæcne| drihten
on eorð|wege ealle foweor|það.	on eorðwege| eælle for weorðæð.
ꞇ weorðað to wre|cene wide ealle	ꞇ| weorðæþ to| wrecene wide| eælle
þaþe| unrihtes æror worh|tan;	ðæ þæunriht es| eror worhtæn|

Nam ecce inimici tui, Domine, Nam ecce inimici tui peribunt;
Dispergentur omnes male agentes

    PPs *Þinu* is the instrumental singular of the demonstrative pronoun *se* and the adverb *nu* 'now'. **EPs** *hinu* is either the nominative plural form of the third person personal pronoun and *nu*, or *hinu* (West-Saxon *heonu*) 'behold'.[93] All three readings make reasonable sense. In **PPs**, *Þi* translates Latin *nam* 'by this; whereas'; if **EPs** *hi* is for the personal pronoun, it agrees with *feond*; if **EPs** *hinu* is for *heonu*, the form correctly translates Latin *ecce*.

---

[92]The examples from *Genesis* and *Daniel* are discussed by Bruce Mitchell, "Some Problems Involving Old English Periphrasis with *Beon*/*Wesan* and the Present Participle," *NM* 77 (1976): 482-3. In his later "List of Verbal Rections" (*OES*, §109) Mitchell omits the Paris Psalter verse from his examples of the possible use of the genitive with *secgan*. Hickes's transcript of the text of *Durham* from the now destroyed London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius D. xx has only the indeclinable relative particle *þe*. The variants in this poem are discussed below, p. 80. A fourth example of genitive with *secgan* (this time with a periphrastic form of the verb) is *Beowulf* 3028-9a: *Swa se secg hwata   secggende wæs* / *laðra spella*. On the variation between the Paris and Eadwine Psalters, see also Baker, "Variant Text," p. 281.

[93]This latter possibility was pointed out to me by Fred C. Robinson.

Baker suggests that **PPs** has the better reading – albeit without recognising the

possibility that **EPs** *hinu* might be for *heonu*.[94] *Þi* occurs in a similar sense on two other

occasions in the metrical Psalms (Psalm 58:3.1 *Þi nu mine sawle*, Lat. *quia*; and Psalm 72:10.1

Þinu fyren fulle   fol/dan æhta, Lat. *ecce*). Baker suggests that the variation between *h* and *þ*

can be explained graphically.[95]

MPs (PPs/EPs), 93:9.6b

PPs	EPs
5 Ᵹ seþe| ege healdeð eallum| þeodum	5 Ᵹ seðe ege healdað. eallum| ðeodum.
Ᵹhis þrea| nesí **bær** for awiht|	Ᵹ his ðrea| nesio **bæ**[96]for awiht|
se þe men læreð| micelne wisdom.|	seðe men læreð micel| ne wisdom|

Qui corripit gentes non arguet qui docet hominem scientiam

EPs *þæ* is presumably for the unstressed adverb *þa* 'then'. **PPs** *þær* is a

locative/temporal adverb 'there/then'. The two words are syntactically and metrically

equivalent and both make good sense in context.

MPs (PPs/EPs), 94:7.2a

PPs	EPs
2 <u>wæ|**run**</u> wehis fælefolc| Ᵹhis fægere sceap	2 <u>**werum**</u> we his fele folc||| Ᵹhis fægere sceæp.|

Quia ipse est dominus deus noster nos autem populus eius et oues pascue eius

EPs *werum* is ostensibly the dative plural of *wer* 'man'. **PPs** *wæ/run* is the plural

preterite indicative of *bēon* 'to be' (with *u* for unstressed *a*). As a verb is required by context,

the **EPs** reading is almost certainly the result of a minim error. Metrically, **PPs** is Type A-

3(2b). As *werum* 'by/to/for men' would be stressed, the equivalent line in **EPs** is unmetrical.

---

[94]Baker, "Variant Text," p. 279.

[95]Baker, "Variant Text," p. 279.

[96]Baker reads *þa*, but the form is ambiguous in facsimile. The descender of the letter looks more like that
used by the scribe for *æ* than that used for an *a*. The upper right bow of the *æ* (assuming it is an *æ*) is
obscured by the descender of the *p* in Latin *corripit* from the preceding manuscript line.

Substitution of Stressed Words and Elements (4 examples)

MPs (PPs/EPs), 93:4.2b

PPs	EPs

1 H ioftust sprecað| unnyt sæcgeað
  ꝼ| woh meldiað   **wyr|ceað** un riht.|
	1 hi oftust sprecæþ. unnyt| secgað
	  ꝼ woh meldiað| ~~wrecæþ|~~ **wyrceæþ|** unriht|

Pronuntiabunt et loquentur iniquitatem loquentur omnes qui operantur iniustitiam

This variant involves the substitution and immediate correction in **EPs** of a verb which, while appropriate to the retributive tenor of Psalm 93 as a whole, is nevertheless semantically and metrically inappropriate to the specific verse in which it occurs. Metrically, **PPs** *wyr/ceað* 'perform' contributes a single long stressed and unstressed syllable to the line. In its uncorrected form, **EPs** *wrecæþ* "avenge" contains only a single resolved stress leaving the Psalm as a whole one syllable too short. Both problems are resolved with the correction to **EPs** *wyrceæð*. Given the graphic similarity between the two words, it is likely that the substitution originally was prompted by metathesis.

MPs (PPs/EPs), 93:18.1a

PPs	EPs

1 N e**æt fyligeð** þé ahwær| facen ne unriht
  ðu||| ge fæstnast   facen| sares.
	1 Ne **et fligeð**| þe æhwe r_____facen ne unriht|
	  þu ge festnæst eæc.| facen sares.

Nunquid adheret tibi sedes iniquitatis qui fingis dolorem in precepto captabunt
in animam iusti et sanguinem innocentem condempnabunt.

Although the **EPs** reading may have its origins in eyeskip or metathesis – **EPs** *et flīgeð* for *etfīligeð* or *etfilgeð* (**PPs** *æt fyligeð*) – both readings are metrically, syntactically and lexically appropriate. In **PPs** (as in the Latin Psalm) God is a sinless being to whom evil things do not 'stick'. In **EPs** he is an avenger from whom evil things cannot 'flee'. While **PPs** is to be preferred because of its similarity to the Latin, both readings make reasonable sense.

The substitution has an insignificant effect on metre. In **PPs**, Psalm 93:18.1a is Type A-1 with polysyllabic anacrusis and a resolved first lift; in **EPs**, the first lift is long by nature.

MPs **(PPs/Eps), 94:10.4b**

PPs	**EPs**
1 N uic feowertig　folce| þyssum 　wintra ri|mes　wunade neah. 　áá. ꝺsymble cwæð　ꝺ|eac swa oncneow＿＿＿ 　_þ| híonheortan　hyge| dys**egedan**.|	1 Nu ic| feow ertig　folce ðyssū| 　wintra rimes.　wunedæ| neah 　áá ꝺsimble cweð.|　ꝺeac ꝺ swa on cneow.| 　þet hi on heo rtan　hige dis**egan**.|

Quadraginta annis proximus fui generationi huic et dixi semper hi errant corde

　　　EPs *disegan* is the present subjunctive plural (with *a* for unstressed *e* in the final

syllable) of *dys(i)gan* 'act foolishly, blaspheme'; **PPs** is the plural preterite indicative (with *a*

for *o*) or subjunctive (with *a* for *e*).　As Baker notes, the **EPs** reading "stands closer to the

reading of the Roman Psalter (*errant*),"[97] while **PPs** makes better metre.　In **PPs**, the line is

Type D-1 line with resolution in both principal lifts; in **EPs**, the line is unmetrical.　Either **EPs**

is the result of the influence of the Latin text, or **PPs** has been altered to improve the metre.

Examples of the graphic influence of the Latin text in **EPs** are discussed below, pp. 43, 44, 45

and 46.　In Psalm 93:8.1a, the Latin Psalm appears to have affected the tense and mood of **PPs**

Onfindað.　See above, p. 37.

MPs **(PPs/Eps), 94:11.3b**

PPs	**EPs**
1 H íwegas mine　wihte| neoncneowan 　þætic| ær on yrre　aðebe|nemde 　gifhíonmi|ne reste　**ricene**| eodon|||	1 hi wegæs mine　wihte| neon cneowan. 　þ ic er on| yrre　æðe be nemde 　gif hi on mine| reste.　**ricenedon**| eodon.||

Ipsi vero non cognoverunt vias meas quibus iuravi
in ira mea si introibunt in requiem meam

　　　PPs *ricene* is an adverb 'instantly'.　**EPs** *ricenedon* is ostensibly the third person plural

preterite of *recenian* 'to pay, recount'.　While both forms are metrically possible, the **EPs** form

is syntactically and sensically impossible.　It is presumably to be explained as eyeskip (*ricene*

eodon > *ricenedon*) or an anticipation of the ending of the next word, *eodon*.

---

[97]Baker, "Variant Text," p. 271.

While the use of an adverb in **PPs** is less obviously wrong than the inflected verb of **EPs**, the passage as a whole does not make much sense in either manuscript. As Mitchell has pointed out, the Old English translation of the passage is based on a misunderstanding of the Latin idiom *iuravi si*, in which the *si* of *iuravi si* has been calqued with Old English *gif* instead of translated by a negative clause.[98] This is a recurring problem in the metrical Psalms. While the translator translates the idiom correctly in Psalm 88:32.1-2, he translates it incorrectly twice more in Psalm 131:1-5.[99] Metrically, **PPs** is a Type A-1 line; **EPs**, with an extra half stress in the medial dip, a Type A*1.

Addition/Omission of Unstressed Words or Elements (4 examples)

MPs **(PPs/Eps), 90:16.3b**

PPs	**EPs**
1 I chine generige ꝺ| his naman swylce____	1 Ic hine| generie ꝺ his næm æn| swilce
_ge|wuldrige geon ealle| werðeoda.	gewul drige| geond eælle weorðeodæ.|
ꝺhimlíf|dagas| langesylle____	ꝺ him lif|dægæs| ꝺ længe| sille
_sw|ylce hím minehælu|| holde æt ywe;|	swilce him mine| helu holde æt ywe||

Eripiam eum et glorificabo eum longitudinem dierum adimplebo eum et oftendam illi salutare meum.

As Baker suggests, the addition of **EPs** ꝺ here and in Psalms 91:1.1b and 94:10.3b is probably to be attributed to the graphic influence of the Latin text.[100] In each case, ꝺ appears directly above the Latin conjunction; in this example, the additional conjunction appears to be in a lighter ink.

The **PPs** reading is to be preferred on syntactic grounds. In **EPs**, ꝺ separates the verb *sille* 'give' from its predicate, *lif|dægæs*. Metrically, the conjunction adds or subtracts an anacrustic syllable from the beginning of a Type A-1 line. See also the following variant and pp. 45 and 46, below.

---

[98]Bruce Mitchell, "Five Notes on Old English Syntax," *NM* 70 (1969), pp. 82-3.

[99]Mitchell "Five Notes," pp. 82-3.

[100]Baker, "Variant Text," p. 265.

MPs (PPs/Eps), 91:1.1b

PPs	EPs
1 G ódisþætmandriht|ne geara andette	1 is[101] ðet| mæn drihtne| Ᵹ geæræ ændette|||
Ᵹ| neodlice his naman| asinge.	Ᵹ neodlice his næmæn æsinge.
þone heahes|tan hæleða cynnes :|	þone heæhestæn| heleðæ cynnes

Bonum est confiteri domino et psallere nomini tuo altissime

As in Psalms 90:16.3b and 94:10.3b, **EPs** Ᵹ is written directly above Latin *et* and is probably to be attributed to the graphic influence of the Latin text.[102] As in the preceding variant, the conjunction in **EPs** separates the verb *ændette* from its predicate. The **PPs** reading is to be preferred as a result. Metrically the addition or omission of Ᵹ adds or subtracts an anacrustic syllable at the beginning of a Type D*1 line. Further examples of the influence of the Latin text on **EPs** can be found in the preceding variant and on pp. 45 and 46, below.

MPs (PPs/Eps), 94:2.1a

PPs	EPs
1 W utun **his** ansyne| ærest secean	1 wutun ansine arest seceæn|
þ we| andettan ure fyre|ne.	þwe an dettæn ure fyrene|
Ᵹwe sealmashī| singan mid wynne.|	Ᵹ we sealmas - him. singæn| mid winne.|

Preoccupemus faciem eius in confessione et in psalmis iubilemus ei

The addition or omission of the possessive adjective *his* occurs on the preliminary dip of a Type C-1 line and has little or no effect on syntax, sense, or metre. While the omission of the possessive adjective moves the **EPs** version further away from the Latin text, the adjective itself is probably not necessary for sense as the identity of the face is clear enough in context.

---

[101]Initial letters and words of the Psalms are frequently missing in this witness, presumably to allow for illumination. See Baker, "Variant Text," p. 264.

[102]Baker, "Variant Text," p. 265.

MPs (PPs/Eps), 94:10.3b

PPs	EPs
1 N uic feowertig folce| þyssum	1 Nu ic| feow ertig folce ðyssū|
wintra ri|mes wunade neah.	wintra rimes. wunedæ| neah
áá. ꝥsymble cwæð ꝺ|eac swa oncneow____	áá ꝥsimble cweð.| ꝺeac ꝺ swa on cneow.|
_þ| híonheortan hyge| dysegedan.|	þet hi on heor tan hige disegan.|

Quadraginta annis proximus fui generationi huic et dixi semper hi errant corde

As in Psalms 90:16.3b and 91:1.1b, the addition or omission of **EPs** ꝺ is probably to be attributed to the graphic influence of the Latin text.[103] While the **EPs** reading is not nonsense, the insertion of a conjunction between the adverbs *eac* and *swa* is awkward. Metrically, **PPs** line 3b is best scanned as a (poor) Type B-2 with alliteration on *eac*. In **EPs**, the equivalent line is probably unmetrical, though scansion as Type E* (with a half-stress on *swa*) is perhaps possible. Further examples of the graphic influence of the Latin text on **EPs** are discussed on pp. 43, 44, and 46.

Addition/Omission of Prefixes (1 example)

MPs (PPs/Eps), 93:13.2b

EPs	PPs
1 H wylc þonne gen a___gehw|yrfed byð.	1 hwilc ðonne gena gewerfeþ| bið
þæt he on| unriht eft ne cyrre|	þ he on urriht eft ne| **on** cyrre.
oððe hwylc nymeðme| þic mán fleo.	oððe wilc nimeð| me þet ic| man fleo.
ꝺmid| riht heortū rædes| þence;	ꝺmid| riht heo rtum| redes ðence

Quo ad usque iustitia convertatur in iudicium et
qui tenent eam omnes qui recto sunt corde.

The addition or omission of the prefix *on-* no significant effect on sense, metre or syntax. Bosworth and Toller give examples of *cyrran* and *oncyrran* being used intransitively with regard to conduct: *hie fram heora unrihtum oncyrron* 'they turned from their injustice' (Blickling Homilies 109.20), [104] and *hi geeacniað heora wita, gif hi ær ende ne cyrrað* 'They

---

[103]Baker, "Variant Text," p. 265.

[104]Cited in B.-T. *oncirran* B II.

will increase their punishments, if they do not reform first at the end' (Homl.S.13).[105] The

prefix falls on the medial dip of a Type A-1 line; its addition or omission is metrically

insignificant.

Addition/Omission of Stressed Words or Elements (2 examples)

MPs (PPs/Eps), 92:7.1a

PPs	**EPs**
1 Þ ingewitnes is weor|cum geleafsum ꝺmid| soðe is swiðegetreowed.|	1 þin ge|witnes is **drihten** weorcū ge|leæfsum. ꝺmid soðe is swiðe| getrewæþ

Testimonia tua domine credibilia facta sunt nimis

The addition of *drihten* takes **EPs** closer to the Latin text of the Psalm, but breaks the

metre. In **PPs**, Psalm 92:7.1a is Type B-1; in **EPs**, the equivalent line is unmetrical. As Baker

suggests, the addition is almost certainly the result of the influence of the Latin text.[106] The

word is written above and slightly to the left of Latin *domine*. For the addition or ꝺ to **EPs**

under similar circumstances, see above, pp. 43, 44, and 45.[107]

MPs (PPs/Eps), 93:18.2a

PPs	**EPs**
1 N eæt fyligeð þé ahwær| facen ne unriht ðu||| ge fæstnast facen| sares.	1 Ne etfligeð| þe æhwe r____facen ne unriht| þu ge festnæst **eæc**.| facen sares.

Nunquid adheret tibi sedes iniquitatis qui fingis dolorem in precepto captabunt
in animam iusti et sanguinem innocentem condempnabunt.

The addition or omission of **EPs** *eæc* (i.e. *eac*) 'also' has a significant effect on metre,

but none on sense or syntax. The adverb is not found in the equivalent portion of the Latin text,

an adjective clause introduced by *qui*, and is a fairly colourless sentence adverb.[108] As the last

word of the half line, *eæc* takes a full stress and serves as the last lift of a Type B-1 verse in

---

[105]Cited in B.-T(S). *cirran* II 3).

[106]Baker, "Variant Text," p. 265.

[107]Baker, "Variant Text," p. 265.

[108]When used alone as a conjunction, *eac* appears at the beginning of the clause – see Mitchell, *OES*, §1740.

EPs. Without the adverb, the **PPs** version is Type A-3. For examples of similar losses of stressed monophthongs from the last lift of Type B- and Type E lines, see pp. "Gloria I," line 48a, p. 70, and "Durham," line 6a, p. 80 below.

Addition/Omission across Line Boundaries (1 example)

MPs (PPs/Eps), 94:3.1a-2b

PPs	EPs
1 F orðon isse **micla| god mihtig drihten|**	1 Forðon is se| **micla god**
⁊se micla cynincg| ofer eall mannagodu	**kining**.| ofer eall| manne| godu

Quoniam deus magnus dominus et rex magnus super omnes deos

The omission of an equivalent for *mihtig drihten ⁊ se micla* from **EPs** is certainly the result of eye-skip ***micla god* > *micla kining***. Both versions make good sense, however, and some metre. In **PPs**, *ofer eall mannagodu* is Type B-1 with the first (alliterative) lift on *manna*. As written, **EPs** *kining.\| ofer eall\| manne\| godu* is a hypermetric Type hB-1 verse. The fact that *kining* is separated by a point from *ofer eall\| manne\| godu* and fails to alliterate, however, suggests that the omission from **EPs** is by error.

Rearrangement of Elements within the Line (1 example)

MPs (PPs/Eps), 93:7.1b

PPs	EPs
1 S ægdan ⁊cwædan þæt| **negesawe**	1 segdæn| ⁊ cweðæn **þge ne| sæwe**
drihten æf|re____dyde swa he wolde|	drihten æfre| dyde swæ he wolde
ne þæt iacobes god on|gitan cuðe.|	ne ðet| iacobesgod____ongitan cuðe.

Et dixerunt non videbit dominus nec intelliget deus iacob

PPs *negesawe* consists of a negative particle and the third person singular preterite subjunctive of (*ge*)*sēon*. **EPs** *ge ne\| sæwe* consists ostensibly of the second person plural personal pronoun, a negative particle, and the plural preterite subjunctive of *sēon*.[109] While

---

[109]Assuming the loss of *-n*, it is possible to read *sæwe* for *sæwen*. See Karl Luick, *Historische Grammatik der englischen Sprache* [1914-40; repr. Oxford, 1964], § 715.3; also Baker, "Variant Text," p. 280.

the **EPs** reading is grammatically possible, it is non-sensical in context. The subject of

gesawe/*sæwe* is *drihten* line 93:7.2a.

The line is Type A-3 in both manuscripts (an unusual type for the off-verse). The

rearrangement has no effect on metre.

Other Glossing Poems
Psalms 142, 9, 1-4; "Cædmon's Hymn" (Northumbrian *aeldu*-recension)

Two other metrically regular multiply-attested poems are found in manuscripts of the

Latin texts they "gloss": the Northumbrian *aeldu*-recension of "Cædmon's Hymn," and a

second, brief fragment from the metrical translation of the Psalms in the Paris and Eadwine

Psalters (Psalm 142:9). [110] Although these poems are obviously ultimately related to those

discussed above, their witnesses are, with the exception of the **PPs** version of Psalm 142:9,

textually independent. The Northumbrian *aeldu*- and West-Saxon *ylda*-recensions of

"Cædmon's Hymn" share some key readings, but a direct connection between the two texts is

ruled out on the grounds of date, dialect, and the existence of a number of recensional

differences. [111] Similarly, while Psalm 142:9 and Psalms 90:16.1-95:2.1 have been copied in

---

[110]Two other versions of "Cædmon's Hymn" are found in copies of the Latin *Historia*. One, a Northumbrian text similar to that of the West-Saxon *eorðan*-recension (the Northumbrian *eordu*-recension) is found in three continental manuscripts of the *Historia*, all of which can be traced to a single insular exemplar: Dijon, Bibliothèque Municipale 574 (**Di**), Paris Bibliothèque Nationale, 5237 (**P₁**), and Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale, 8245-57 (**Br**). The identification of **Br** and a discussion of the relationships between these witnesses can be found in my article, "A Northumbrian Version of 'Cædmon's Hymn' (*eordu*-recension) in Brussels Bibliothèque Royale Manuscript 8245-57, ff. 62r²-v¹: Identification, Edition and Filiation,' forthcoming in *New Essays on the Venerable Bede*, ed. A.A. MacDonald and L. Houwen.

　　　　The second recension of "Cædmon's Hymn" omitted from discussion here is related to the *eorðan*-recension, but is metrically corrupt. It is found in three twelfth-century manuscripts, Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud. Misc. 243 (**Ld**), Hereford, Cathedral Library P. 5. i (**Hr**) and London, College of Arms, M.6 (**CArms**). See Dobbie, *Manuscripts*, pp. 40-43. The relationship of **CArms** to **Ld** and **Hr** has not been noted previously. I am preparing an article on the filiation of all manuscripts of the Hymn discovered since the publication of Dobbie, *Manuscripts*.

[111]Dobbie, *Manuscripts*, pp. 43-48; for a discussion and list of the differences between the two recensions, see pp. 27-28, above.

the same hand and perform the same function in **PPs**, in **EPs**, Psalm 142:9 has been copied in a different probably later hand and glosses a different version of the Latin Psalms.[112]

Despite their different transmission histories, however, the two texts show a similar concern for substantive accuracy. In their thirteen parallel lines, the witnesses to these poems exhibit two potentially significant textual variants, both of which are found within a single line of the *aeldu*-recension of "Cædmon's Hymn." Of these, only one, a dialectal substitution of the unstressed prepositions *til:to*, is not likely to be the result of a graphic error.

"Cædmon's Hymn" (*aeldu*-recension)

The Northumbrian *aeldu*-recension of "Cædmon's Hymn" is found in two early- to mid-eighth-century witnesses, the "Moore Manuscript" (Cambridge, University Library, Kk. 5. 16 [**M**]) and the "Leningrad Bede" (St. Petersburg, Public Library, Lat. Q. v. i. 18 [**L**]). Copied during Bede's lifetime or within a few years of his death, these manuscripts are the earliest known witnesses to both the Latin *Historia* and the vernacular "Cædmon's Hymn." Both are believed to have been copied in Northumbrian scriptoria, and indeed in the case of **L**, perhaps even at Wearmouth-Jarrow itself.[113]

The Hymn is found in a different position in each manuscript. In **L**, it has been copied across the foot of f. 107r – the page on which Bede's paraphrase of the Hymn appears in the Latin text – in the same hand as the main text.[114] In **M**, the poem is found on the last page of the manuscript (f.128v) in a hand contemporary with but not necessarily identical to that of the main text.[115] In this manuscript, the Hymn is followed by a Latin note, *primo cantauit*

---

[112]See below, p. 53.

[113]Ker, *Catalogue*, arts. 25 and 122, dates the Moore Manuscript to "s.viii[1]" and the Leningrad Bede more generally to "s.viii." See also Colgrave and Mynors, *Bede's Ecclesiastical History*, where the manuscripts are dated on internal grounds to "before 737" and "before 747," respectively (pp. xliii-xliv).

[114]Ker, *Catalogue*, art. 122.

[115]Ker, *Catalogue*, art. 25.

caedmon istud carmen, and is surrounded by chronological notes on Northumbrian history,

and glosses to a number of Latin words and phrases, all but one of which are found in

Historia.[116]

Table 4: Pointing In "Cædmon's Hymn," Northumbrian aeldu-*recension (adapted from O'Keeffe,* Visible Song, *figure 3)*

	Placement of points by clause (expressed in half-lines)																	
Witness	1a	1b	2a	2b	3a	3b	4a	4b	5a	5b	6a	6b	7a	7b	8a	8b	9a	9b
L																		×
M												×						

The witnesses to this recension of the Hymn contain only two points, each unique to

the witness in which it occurs (Table 4). In **L**, the sole mark of punctuation comes at the end

of the text after line 9b. In **M**, a point after line 6b separates the third clause of this recension,

thamiddun geard... frea allmectig from the preceding text (Table 2). In her discussion of the

punctuation in the various recensions of "Cædmon's Hymn," O'Keeffe suggests that the light

punctuation these two witnesses exhibit is indicative of the transitional nature of the

responsible scribes' literacy:

> The group consisting of CUL, Kk. 5.16 [i.e. **M**] and Leningrad Q. v. I. 18 [i.e. **L**] stands apart from the West-Saxon versions in several ways. Its antiquity, its closeness to Wearmouth-Jarrow, the exquisite care lavished on its copying (even for the hurried CUL, Kk. 5. 16) make the record which it transmits supremely important. These records show systems of pointing in Latin and Old English at variance with one another. Even discounting CUL, Kk. 5. 16 as a careless copy, and hence of little use for argument, we have the testimony of Leningrad Q. v. I. 18, where the Latin text and Cædmon's *Hymn* are both written by one scribe. The copy of Cædmon's *Hymn* in the Leningrad manuscript is a very careful and correct record in the same way as the text of the *Historia ecclesiastica* is careful and correct. Yet the pointing of the Latin paraphrase is copious while the pointing of the Old English poem is limited to a purely formal terminal point. The points, so useful in Latin are missing precisely because they were thought redundant in Old English, unnecessary either for scansion or sense. In early copies of the *Hymn*, the omission of pointing, a visual cue for

---

[116]For detailed discussions of the layout of this page, see O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, pp. 33-35, Dobbie, *Manuscripts*, p. 12 and Ker, *Catalogue*, art. 25

decoding, is a powerful indication of the still strongly oral component in the *Hymn*'s transmission and reception.[117]

With this last sentence in particular, O'Keeffe attempts to establish a dichotomy between the lightly punctuated (and hence "developing") texts of the *eorðan-* and *aeldu-* recensions of "Cædmon's Hymn," and more heavily punctuated (and hence "literate") witnesses to the *ylda*-recension.[118] Were this dichotomy true, however, we would also expect the *aeldu-* and *eorðan*-recensions to show similar levels of textual variation, especially given the association O'Keeffe makes between "transitional literacy" and the "presence of variant readings which are semantically, metrically and syntactically appropriate."[119] Instead, the witnesses to the *aeldu*-text show a textual stability far more like that of the marginal *ylda*-recension. In their nine parallel (eighteen copied[120]) lines of text, the two witnesses exhibit only two potentially substantive variants, one the result of a substitution of dialectal synonyms, the other a substitution of homographic forms or, perhaps more likely, the result of graphic error and the assimilation of consonants.

---

[117]O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, pp. 45-46.

[118]Cf. the last sentence of the above citation with her discussion of the textual variation in the *eorðan*-recension: "...I would suggest that the variability of text in *AE is a consequence of its environment in a purely vernacular text, a vernacular which, though written, was still heavily influenced by its earlier, purely oral condition," p. 40.

[119]O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 21.

[120]In this study, "copied lines" is used to refer to the total number of metrical lines copied by the scribes of the surviving manuscripts. A six line poem surviving in three witnesses would therefore have eighteen copied lines. An odd number of copied lines means that one or more metrical lines has been added to or omitted from some of the surviving witnesses.

Textual Variants

Substitution of Unstressed Words (1 example)

Cæd(*aeldu*)*, 6a*

L	**M**
5 he ærist scop aeldubarnum[121]	5 heaerist scop____aelda barnū
hefen **to** hrofæ halig sceppend|	heben**til**hrofe| halegscepen.

      The two words are synonyms. The **M** reading is an example of the Anglian use of *til* as a preposition. **L** *to* is found in all dialects. The substitution occurs within the internal dip of a Type A line and has no effect on metre, sense or syntax.

Substitution of Stressed Words (1 example)

Cæd(*aeldu*)*, 6a*

L	**M**
he ærist scop aeldubarnum[122]	heaerist scop____aelda barnū
hefen to hrofæ halig **sceppend**|	hebentilhrofe| haleg**scepen**.

      M *scepen* is either a mistake for *sceppend* (the reading in **L** and, with orthographic and dialectal variation, the witnesses to all other recensions of "Cædmon's Hymn" with the exception of the late **To** and metrically irregular **Ld Hr CArms**) with the assimilation of *nd* and graphic simplification of *-pp-*,[123] or the sole example in Old English of a cognate for OHG *scaffin*, *sceffin* 'judge', Fris *skeppena* 'juryman', from WGmc **skapinaz*.[124] Examples of similar spellings of *-n* for expected *-nd* include, *sceppen* (Psalm 50, line 46), *walden* (Psalm 50, line 31 and Kentish Hymn, line 9), *hælen* and *ðærfen* (both from the Lindisfarne

---

[121]Dobbie, *Manuscripts*, has *ældu barnum* (p. 17; also in the textual apparatus to his edition of the Northumbrian text in *ASPR* 6, p. 105). The *a* and *e* are clearly not joined, however.

[122]See above, fn. 121.

[123]P. Wuest, "Zwei neue Handschriften von Caedmons Hymnus," *ZfdA* 48 (1906): 205-26; Eduard Sievers, "AGS. scepen," *ESt* 44 (1912): 295-96.

[124]Levin L. Schücking, "Altengl. scepen und die sogen. idg. Vokative-reste im Altengl.," *ESt* 44 (1912): 155-57. Summaries of the debate can be found in Dobbie, *Manuscripts*, pp. 13-5; A. H. Smith, ed., *Three Northumbrian Poems: Cædmon's Hymn, "Bede's Death Song" and the Leiden Riddle*, with a bibliography compiled by M.J. Swanton, Revised ed., Exeter Medieval English Texts and Studies (Exeter: U of Exeter, 1978), p. 39.

Gospels),[125] and perhaps also *sceppen*[d] (*Beowulf*, line 106) where the final *d* has been added in a later hand.[126] Examples of the graphic simplification of double consonants are found sporadically throughout the Anglo-Saxon period.[127]

If **M** *scepen* is for *sceppend*, then the variation is accidental and has no effect on sense, metre or syntax. If is intended as *scepen* from Gmc **skapinaz*, then the substitution affects both metre and sense. Where **L** *halig sceppend* is a normal Type A-1 verse, the **M** reading *halegscepen* produces a Type A verse in which the second lift is short and unresolved.[128] As the most commonly cited cognates for OE *scepen* have connotations of judge or jury rather than creator,[129] the alteration if not the result of a scribal error would also presumably have an effect on the sense of the epithet.

Psalms 142, 9, 1-4 (Paris Psalter; Eadwine Psalter)

In addition to the long parallel excepts from Old English metrical translation of Psalms 90:16-95:2, the Paris and Eadwine Psalters also share a second much shorter excerpt from Psalm 142:9, lines 1-4.[130] In **PPs**, the Old English text of Psalm 142:9 occurs as part of the same metrical translation of the Psalms discussed above and below (pp. 32 and 56). It is copied in the same hand as the rest of the metrical translation, and is found in an equivalent place, opposite the corresponding Latin text. In **EPs**, however, the translation of Psalm 142:9

---

[125]Cited by Sievers-Brunner, §286 Anm.4.

[126]Schücking, "Altengl. scepen," p.155; Julius Zupitza, ed., *Beowulf Reproduced in Facsimile from the Unique Manuscript British Museum Ms. Cotton Vitellius A. xv*, Second Edition containing a new reproduction of the manuscript with an introductory note by Norman Davis, EETS no. 245 (London: OUP, 1959), p. 6 fn. 14.

[127]Campbell, *OEG*, §66.

[128]Eduard Sievers, "AGS. scepen," pp. 295-6; examples of the **M** pattern are found, however, e.g. *bordweall clufon*, *Brunanburh*, l. 5b. See Pope, *Seven Old English Poems*, p. 110

[129]Sievers, "AGS. scepen," p. 296

[130]For a discussion and diplomatic transcription of the **EPs** text, see: O'Neill, "Another Fragment," pp. 434-436. The text of this version of the Psalm is otherwise unedited. The only facsimile of f.252v is by M.R. James, *The Canterbury Psalter* (London, 1935).

supplements rather than replaces the interlinear lexical gloss to the Roman psalter in which the metrical translation of Psalms 90:16.1-95:2.1 appears. It has been copied in a different hand, glosses a different version of the Latin text, and shows none of the dialectal peculiarities associated with the interlinear gloss text discussed above.[131]

As was the case with the common text of Psalms 90:16.1-95:2.1, the two witnesses to Psalm 142:9 reproduce their text with a high degree of substantive accuracy – indeed, in this case, they exhibit no substantive variants at all. In contrast to the thorough-going accidental variation found between the versions of Psalms 90:16.1-95:2.1, however, the common text of Psalm 142:9 also shows a minimal amount of accidental variation. In the four lines of text, the two witnesses show only two orthographic variants and one scribal error: **EPs** *glewe* for **PPs** *gleawe* in Psalm142:9.2b; **EPs** *saule* for **PPs** *sawle* in Psalm142:9.4a; and, in a scribal reversal of letters, **EPs** *drithnes* for **PPs** *drihtnes* in Psalm142:9.3a.[132]

Translating and Occasional Poems
"Fragments of Psalms," "Gloria I," "Prayer," "Durham"

The texts discussed thus far have all been alike in that they have been associated with Latin texts and found in predominantly Latin manuscripts. When taken with the generally low level of substantive variation found among their witnesses, this suggests two things about the motivation of the scribes responsible for their preservation. In the first place, it suggests that the poems were chosen less for their intrinsic value as verse than for their functional utility as translations. Although the margins of manuscripts of texts like the *Historia* and the Psalter also were used for collections of verse and miscellaneous texts unrelated to their main texts,[133]

---

[131]For a discussion of the placement of this text, see O'Neill, "Another Fragment," p. 435.

[132]O'Neill, "Another Fragment," p. 435.

[133]**B₁**, a manuscript of the Old English translation of the *Historia*, for example, also contains copies of two multiply-attested poems in its margins in addition to a version of the *eorðan*-recension of "Cædmon's

the close association of the "glossing" poems with the Latin texts of the manuscripts in which they appear suggests that the scribes who copied them did so less because they found them intrinsically appealing or thematically appropriate, than because they recognised a direct connection between these poems and the manuscripts' main texts. Indeed, in the case of the Eadwine and Paris Psalters, it is debatable whether the poetic nature of the verse translations had anything to do with their selection at all. In **EPs**, the metrical text of Psalms 90:16.1-95:2.1 is the only metrical – indeed the only continuous – portion of an otherwise exclusively lexical interlinear gloss[134]; in **PPs**, the metrical translation of Psalms 50-151 follows and completes a prose translation of the first fifty Psalms.

In the second place, the close association between these poems and the Latin texts they "gloss" provides us with a motivation for the scribes' substantive accuracy. Having recognised the appositeness of these poems to the main texts of their manuscripts and having copied them alongside or between the lines of their Latin "originals," the scribes responsible for preserving these poems would have had little reason to introduce internally motivated substantive variants which might move their Old English "gloss" farther away from the "original" Latin. Thus most of the most significant of the twenty-four substantive variants discussed above can be ascribed to the influence of the manuscript's principal Latin text. Of the remainder, the majority involve differences which can easily be attributed to scribal lapses: the addition or omission of non-essential words, the substitution of homographic words and elements, the omission of case-endings, and various graphically or phonologically motivated errors. In very few cases – perhaps five – do the witnesses exhibit what may appear to be alternative readings

---

Hymn" in its main text. Discussions of this manuscript and two of its metrical texts can be found in Chapter 3, pp. 116 ff. and 129 ff. (the *eorðan*-recension of "Cædmon's Hymn"); and Chapter 4, pp. 264-267 (*Solomon and Saturn* I). The third poem, Charm 10, is metrically irregular and not discussed in this study.

[134]The **EPs** texts of Psalm 142:9 is not part of the interlinear gloss. See below, pp. 53-54.

which cannot be easily attributed to Latin influence, scribal error, or other graphic or phonological habit: **PPs** *cyrre* **EPs** *on cyrre*, Psalm 93:13.2a; **PPs** *þæs* **EPs** *ðet*, Psalm 93:16.1a; **PPs** ∅ **EPs** *eæc*, Psalm 93:18.2b; **PPs** *his* **EPs** ∅, Psalm 94:2.1a; and **L** *to* **M** *til*, "Cædmon's Hymn," *aeldu*-recension, line 6b.

To the extent that their variation rarely involves genuinely alternative readings, the poems discussed above conform to an exceptionally high standard of substantive scribal accuracy. But a similar reluctance to introduce significant substantive variation into the text of an exemplar is also found in all other multiply-attested poems which are not found as fixed constituents of vernacular prose framing texts or as part of anthologies like the Exeter, Vercelli, or Junius Manuscripts. Although, in contrast to the "glossing" poems discussed above, these "translating and occasional" texts show a higher incidence of the substitution of genuinely equivalent forms, their substantive variation remains infrequent and relatively insignificant. In 189 lines of common text (378 copied lines), the witnesses to these four poems contain forty-one potentially significant substantive variants, of which sixteen represent genuinely alternative readings which cannot be attributed to scribal error or orthographic, phonological or dialectical difference.

"Fragments of Psalms"

The "Fragments of Psalms" are forty-five excerpts from the metrical Old English translation of the Psalter arranged and copied as part of a vernacular "Office" in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 121 (**Jn$_{121}$**). One fragment, Psalm 69:1, is attested twice in the collection (on ff. 43v and 51r) while the twenty-four fragments drawn from Psalms 51-150 are also found in **PPs**. Probably coincidentally, **Jn$_{121}$** has no fragments in common with the glosses in **EPs**.

There are no marked dialectal or orthographic differences between these two witnesses to the Psalms, although **Jn₁₂₁** shows a slight preference for the loss of medial vowels after long and short syllables in comparison to **PPs**: **Jn₁₂₁** *halgan*: **PPs** *hali/gan*, Psalm 53:1.1a; and four examples involving oblique cases of *mægen*: **Jn₁₂₁** *mægne*: **PPs** *mægene*, Psalm 70.7.1b; **Jn₁₂₁** *mægna*: **PPs** *mægena*, Psalm 79.18.1a; **Jn₁₂₁** *mægne*: **PPs** *mægene*, Psalm 87.13.2b; **Jn₁₂₁** *mægne*:**PPs** *mæge/ne*, Psalm 121:7.1a.[135] In keeping with its nature as a collection of excerpts from the Psalter suitable for an office, the **Jn₁₂₁** version also occasionally drops one or more lines from its version of the Psalm.

There are nine potentially substantive variants in the twenty-four multiply-attested fragments: three inflectional differences, one example of the addition or omission of unstressed words, one substitution of a prefix, two examples of the substitution of unstressed words, one substitution affecting a stressed word or element, and one example of the rearrangement of words within a line. The majority of these variants involve the substitution of syntactically and lexically equivalent forms.

Textual Variants

Inflectional Difference (3 examples)

MPs (**Jn₁₂₁/PPs**), 58:1.3b

Jn₁₂₁	**PPs**
3 alysme fram| laðum þeme **lugeon**.	3 alysme| fram laðum. þeme| **lungre on**___
risanwillað nymþe| þume ræd gife.|	_risan wil|lað. nymðeþu me ræd| geofe;|||

et ab insurgentibus in me libera me

Jn₁₂₁ *lugeon* (**PPs** *lungre on*) appears to be the result of the scribal misapprehension of the poetic adverb *lungre* 'immediately' and the sentence adverb *on*, perhaps as the preterite

---

plural of the strong 2 verb *lēogan* 'deceive, belie, betray'.[136] This makes acceptable sense in

context but is unmetrical. In **PPs**, Psalm 58:1.3b is a Type B-1 line with the *lungre* and *on*

taking stress.

MPs (Jn₁₂₁/PPs), 89:18.3b

Jn₁₂₁	**PPs**
1 G eseoh| þine scealcas swǽsum eagum.	1 B eseohon þinesceal|cas___swæsūeagū
ꞇonþin| agenweorc écedrihten.	ꞇon| þinagen weorc ece| drihten.
ꞇheorabearn| geréce <u>bli**ð**um</u> móde.	ꞇheora be|arngerece____<u>bli**ð**e</u> mode.|

Respice inseruos tuos et in opera tua domine et dirige filios eorum.

     Jn₁₂₁ *bliðum* is dative singular; **PPs** *bliðe* is instrumental singular. This is a common

variation in Old English and has no appreciable effect on sense, metre, or syntax.[137] For a

further example, see "Prayer," line 10b, p. 74, below.

MPs (Jn₁₂₁/PPs), 102:5.4b

Jn₁₂₁	**PPs**
1 Heðe gesige fæste. soðre mildse	1 H eþegesige fæste soðre||| miltse
ꞇðe mild|||heorte mode getrymede.	ꞇðemildhe|orte. mode getry|mede
eart ðu edniwe| éarne gelicost.	eart þu edneo|we earne gelicast|
ongeoguðe. nu. <u>gleaw</u> geworden.|	ongeogoðe nú <u>gleawe</u>| ge worden.

Qui coronat te in miseratione et misericordia; et renouabitur sicut aquile iuuentus tua

     In **Jn₁₂₁**, *gleaw* is an adjective 'keen' serving as the complement of *geworden*, parallel

to *gelicost* in line 3; in **PPs**, the complement of *ge worden* is *gelicast* and *gleawe* is either an

adverb 'keenly' or the weak form of the nominative singular masculine adjective (with *e* for

---

[136]*u* is the normal vowel of the preterite plural of *lēogan*. While *-eon* is an unusual form of the plural ending, the intrusion of *-e-* after palatal consonants occurs sporadically in the corpus: e.g. **PPs** *sæcgeað* (for expected *sæcgað*), Ps. 93:4.1; **PPs** *ecean* (for expected *ecan*), Ps. 102.1.2b; **ChronB** *mecea* (for expected *meca*), *Battle of Brunanburh*, line 40a; **ChronB** *mæcgea* (for expected *mæcga*) *Capture of the Five Boroughs*, line 2a; **ChronB** *cegeað* (**ChronC** *cegeaþ*; for expected *cigað*), *Coronation of Edgar*, line 7b; **ChronA** *myrceon* (for *myrcan* ? [**ChronB**/**ChronC** *myrcum*]), *Death of Edgar*, line 16a. Although the *g* in *lugan* would most likely be velar (Campbell §740), the intrusion of *e* into the **PPs** form may be by graphic analogy (given the scribe's obvious difficulties with the form) or a misinterpretation of *-gre-* as *-ge-*.

[137]Mitchell, *OES*, §1345.

unstressed *a*). As it falls in the internal dip of a Type A-1 line, the variation has no significant

effect on metre.

Substitution of Unstressed Words and Elements (1 example)

MPs (Jn$_{121}$/PPs), 102:4.1a

Jn$_{121}$	**PPs**
1 **S e**alysde þinlíf. leof offorwyrde___	1 **H e**alysde þin lif leof| of for wyrde.
_fylde| þinne willan. fægere mid góde.	fylde| þinne willan fæge|re mid gode.

Qui redemit de interitu uitam tuam, qui sanat in bonis desiderium tuum.

In **Jn$_{121}$**, the subject of the sentence is the nominative singular demonstrative adjective

S e. In **PPs**, it is the nominative singular third person masculine form of the personal pronoun,

H e. In **Jn$_{121}$**, Psalm 102:4.1a is presented formally an adjective clause modifying *drihten*,

Psalm 102:1.1. This is the same syntax as the Latin Psalm. In **PPs**, the equivalent text is

presented as a principal clause. Of the two readings, however, **PPs** is to be preferred. In the

syntactically parallel Psalms 102:3 and 102:5, both **PPs** and **Jn$_{121}$** begin with *he*, despite the

use of the relative pronoun *qui* in the corresponding Latin text.[138] As in the case of the

inflectional variation **PPs** *Onfindað* **EPs** *On/findæn* in Psalm 93:8.1a (discussed above, p. 37),

the **Jn$_{121}$** form is probably to be ascribed to the influence of the Latin text. Had the scribe

responsible for the innovation in the **Jn$_{121}$** tradition intended to alter his text, we would expect

the translation of Psalms 102:3 and 102:5 to begin with *se* as well. Perhaps significantly, the

initial *Q* in Psalm 102:4 is of a different type from that found at the beginning of the preceding

and following verse.[139]

---

[138]The full text of the **Jn$_{121}$** version is edited in Dobbie, *ASPR* 6, as "Fragments of Psalms."

[139]See Robinson and Stanley, *EEMF* 23, plate 28.13 (f.49v: the Latin of Psalm 102:3 begins on manuscript line 14; of Psalm 102:4 on line 17; of Psalm 102:5 on line 21). The two other initial Latin *Q*'s used in the 'Benedictine Office' are of the type found at the beginning of Psalms 102:3 and 102:5. See plates 28.4 (f. 45r/4), 28.9 (f. 47v/7).

Substitution of Prefixes (1 example)

MPs (Jn₁₂₁/PPs), 89:18.1a

Jn₁₂₁	PPs
1 **G eseoh**| þine scealcas swǽsum eagum.	1 **B eseoh**on þinesceal|cas____swæsūeagū
ꝺonþin| agenweorc écedrihten.	ꝺon| þinagen weorc ece| drihten.
ꝺheorabearn| geréce bliðum móde.	ꝺheora be|arngerece____bliðe mode.|

Respice in seruos tuos et in opera tua, domine, *et dirige filios eorum*

     The variation has no significant effect on the sense of the line and none on the metre or syntax (for a discussion of the addition or omission of **PPs** *on* in this Psalm, see p. 62, below). Both words can be used to translate *respice*, although *besēon* is more common.[140]

Substitution of Stressed Words and Elements (1 example)

MPs (Jn₁₂₁/PPs), 89:15.2b

Jn₁₂₁	PPs
1 G ehweorfus hwæthwygu. halig drihten.	1 G ehweorf ushwæ hwi|ga haligdrihten|
wes| ðinum scealcum wel eað **bene**.	wes þinum scealcū| wel eað **beḍe**.|

Conuertere domine aliquantulum et deprecabilis esto super seruos tuos

     The uncorrected form in **PPs**, *eaðmede* 'humble', while generally suited to a religious context, does not fit the specific text of this Psalm. The corrected form, **PPs** *eað beḍe* 'easily entreated', is synonymous with **EPs** form *eað bene*.[141] As the point under the *d* of the **PPs** form suggests, however, the scribe appears to have intended to go further and correct his original form to *eað bene*, but stopped – either because he forgot to complete his correction by adding the *n* or because he recognised that his half-corrected form was synonymous with the reading of his exemplar. The variation does have a slight effect on the metre. **Jn₁₂₁** and the uncorrected **PPs** reading both produce Type D-1 lines; in its corrected form, the **PPs** line is a Type D-2.

---

[140]B.-T(S). *geséon* V (2); *beséon* I (b)

[141]John Douglas Tinkler, *Vocabulary and Syntax of the Old English Version in the Paris Psalter: A Critical Commentary*, Janua linguarum, studia memoriae Nicolai van Wijk dedicata, Series practica 67 (The Hague: Mouton, 1970), p. 35.

Addition/Omission of Unstressed Words and Elements (2 examples)

MPs (Jn$_{121}$/PPs), 60:6.3a

Jn$_{121}$	**PPs**
----	1 H wylc seceð þæt þe| soð fæst byð.
2 S waicnamanþinum. néode singe.	swa| ic naman ðinum. neode singe.
þmin| gehat her agylde.	þæt| **ic** min gehát. hér| agylde.
ofdæge ondæg. swa| hit gedéfe wese.|||	ofdæge| on dǽg. swahit ge|defe wese.|

Jn$_{121}$ *Sic psalmum dicam nomini tuo, deus, in seculam seculi,*
ut reddam uota mea dedie in diem.
PPs *Misericordiam et ueritatem quis requiret eorum; sic psallam nomini tuo,*
deus, in seculum [sic] *seculi, ut reddam uota mea de die in diem.*

With *ic*, **PPs** Psalm 60:6.3-4 is an adverbial clause of purpose or result[142]: '...thus sing I my pleasure unto your name, that I fulfil my promise day by day as is befitting'. The same interpretation may be possible of **Jn$_{121}$**, as Mitchell suggests that "clauses with unexpressed personal pronoun subjects and objects" seem "more common in poetry than in prose."[143] He gives no examples of the non-repetition of pronoun subjects in consecutive or final clauses, however, and it is also possible that a scribe in the **Jn$_{121}$** tradition understood lines 3-4 as an adjective clause modifying *naman*, with *þæt* as the relative marker (instead of the expected masculine form *se þe*, *þæm*, or *þæm þe*).[144]

The addition or omission of *ic* falls on the preliminary drop of a Type A-3 line. It has no appreciable effect on metre.

---

[142]Mitchell, *OES*, §2846.

[143]Mitchell, *OES*, §3968.

[144]For a similar use of *þæt* as a general relative marker in the Psalms, see Psalm 121:2,

MPs (Jn₁₂₁/PPs), 89:18.1a

Jn₁₂₁	**PPs**
1 G eseoh| þine scealcas swǽsum eagum.	1 B eseoh**on** þinesceal|cas___swæsūeagū
ꝺonþin| agenweorc écedrihten.	ꝺon| þinagen weorc ece| drihten.
ꝺheorabearn| geréce bliðum móde.	ꝺheora be|arngerece____bliðe mode.|

Respice in seruos tuos et in opera tua, domine, et dirige filios eorum

The addition or omission of *on* has a minimal effect on sense and syntax. Although *on*

is often found with *besēon*, it is not required: e.g. *beseoh (respice) and gehyr me* (Psalm

12:3).[145] As it occurs on the internal dip of a Type A-1 line the addition has no significant

effect on metre.

Rearrangement of Elements within the Line (1 example)

MPs (Jn₁₂₁/PPs), 69:1.2a

Jn₁₂₁ (f.43v)	**PPs**
1 W es drihtengod. deore fultum	1 W es drihten god. de|ore fultum.
beheald| **drihtenme**. ꝺmehraðe syððan	be he|ald **drihten me** ꝺ| me hraðe syþþan|
geful|tuma æt feorh þearfe.|	ge fultuma æt| feorh þearfe;

Jn₁₂₁ (f.51r)

1 W es drihtengod   deore\| fultum.
   beheald **medrihten**.   ꝺmehraðe\| syððan.
   gefultuma   æt feorh þearfe.\|

Domine Deus, in adiutorium meum intende domine ad adiuuandum me festina

The variation in the order of *drihten* and *me* between **Jn₁₂₁** (f.43v) and **PPs**, and **Jn₁₂₁**

(f.51r) has an important effect on metre but none on sense or syntax. To the extent that the line

is metrical at all, the reading of **PPs** and **Jn₁₂₁** f.43v is a particularly heavy Type D-4 with

anacrusis, *beheald*, *drihten*, and *me* all taking a full stress. **Jn₁₂₁** f.51r, however, is a slightly

more regular Type A-1 with anacrusis. A distinctive feature of all three versions is the use of

the inflected verb *beheald* for alliteration in preference to the stressed noun *drihten*.[146]

---

[145]Cited in B.-T(S). *beséon* I (b).

[146]The more usual pattern, corresponding to the **PPs** and **Jn₁₂₁** f.43v readings without the anomalous
alliteration, is to be seen in Psalms 69:1.1a *Wes drihten god* and 64:6.1a *Gehyr us hǽlend god*. Both are
Type B-1.

"Gloria I"

A translation of the greater doxology, "Gloria I" is found in two witnesses: **Jn$_{121}$** and Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 201 (**CC$_{201}$**), an eleventh-century collection of homilies, laws and miscellaneous religious texts. In **Jn$_{121}$**, the poem has been copied – like the Psalm fragments discussed above – as part of the "Benedictine Office," where is it preceded by the first version of Psalm 69:1 and followed by Psalms and poetic reworkings of the *Pater noster* and Creed.[147] In **CC$_{201}$**, "Gloria I" appears towards the end of the manuscript. It is immediately preceded by an independent translation of the *Pater noster* ("Lord's Prayer II"),[148] and, separated by fifty-five pages of miscellaneous laws, prayers and other texts, a copy of the prose parts of the **Jn$_{121}$** "office" – a translation of the second book of the *De officiis et orationibus canonicarum horarum* by Hrabanus Maurus, *De clericorum institutione*.[149]

The witnesses to "Gloria I" exhibit very few marked orthographic or dialectal differences. **CC$_{201}$** has a tendency towards the devoicing of final stops not found in **Jn$_{121}$**: **CC$_{201}$** *cyninc* for **Jn$_{121}$** *cyning* (3 times: lines 11b, 42a, and 52b); and **CC$_{201}$** *þinc* for **Jn$_{121}$** *þing* (line 19b). This tendency is also responsible for a correction, **CC$_{201}$** *wealdent* corrected to *wealdend*, line 9b. For its part, **Jn$_{121}$** tends to restore medial vowels lost after long and short syllables: **Jn$_{121}$** *woruld*(-) for **CC$_{201}$** *world*(-), (5 times: lines 5a, 15a, 34a, and twice in line 41a); **Jn$_{121}$** *sawule* for **CC$_{201}$** *sawle*, line 55b; **Jn$_{121}$** *geopenod* for **CC$_{201}$** *ge opnod*, line 1b; and **Jn$_{121}$** *oruð* for **CC$_{201}$** *orð*, line 55b.

The two manuscripts each contain an example of the sporadic voicing of medial consonants, **CC$_{201}$** *mildse* for expected *miltse* (as in **Jn$_{121}$**), line 46b, and **Jn$_{121}$** *þan gung* for

[147]The **Jn$_{121}$** versions of these poems have been edited by Dobbie in *ASPR* 6 as "Lord's Prayer III" and the "Creed" respectively.

[148]Ker, *Catalogue*, art. 49.

[149]James M. Ure, *The Benedictine Office: An Old English Text*, Edinburgh University Publications Language, and Literature 11 (Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1957), p. 15.

expected *þancung* (as in **CC₂₀₁**) , line 45b. **CC₂₀₁** has one obvious uncorrected error not in **Jn₁₂₁**, **CC₂₀₁** *heriað heriað* by dittography in line 36a, and the two manuscripts have what appear to be three inflectional errors in common: an oblique forms (-)*frofre* for expected the expected nominative singular (-)*frofor* (two times, lines 13a and 15b), and the use of the strong accusative singular masculine form of *halig* to modify a feminine accusative singular noun *heortlufan* in line 29a, *halig**ne** heortlufan* (both witnesses).

Apart from these minor variants, corrections and common errors, there are twelve potentially significant variants in the two manuscripts: five differences of inflection; three examples of the addition or omission of unstressed words or elements; one example of the substitution of a stressed word or element; one example of the syntactic reinterpretation of elements within the line; and one example of the addition or omission of a half-line. In all but three cases, the variation is between syntactically and semantically equivalent forms, or involves easily explained graphic mistakes, orthographic variants or phonological differences. "Gloria I" is unique among the Glossing, Translating, and Occasional poems, however, in that it contains one example of "linked" variation – that is to say, variants in which complementary and syntactically, metrically, or semantically necessary changes are made to two or more elements in the text.[150]

---

[150]Such linked variants are an important feature of the Anthologised and Excerpted Poems discussed in Chapter 4. See in particular, pp. 228-229.

Textual Variants

Inflectional Difference (5 examples)

Glor I, 5a

Jn₁₂₁

Syþe wuldor ⁊lof. wide| geopenod.
geond ealleþeoda. þanc ⁊wylla|
mægen ⁊mildse. ⁊ealles modes lufu
soð| fæstra sib. ⁊ðines sylfes dom.
5 worulde| gewlitegod. swaðu wealdan miht.
eall eorðan| mægen ⁊uplyfte.
wind ⁊wolcna.

CC₂₀₁

Sy þe wuldor ⁊lof. widege opnod.
geond ealle þeoda. þanc ⁊willa.|
mægen ⁊mildse. ⁊ealles modeslufu.
soð fæs tra sib. ⁊þines-| -silfes dóm.
5 world gewlitegod. swaþu wealdan miht.
eall eorðan -| mægen. ⁊up lifte
wind. ⁊wolcna

The variants **Jn₁₂₁** *worulde* **CC₂₀₁** *world* reflect either a difference in case or a simple variation in declensional forms. As a feminine *i*-stem, *woruld* can be declined with an accusative in -*e* or -∅, although the endingless form is more common in the poem (the accusative singular of *woruld* occurs twice more in "Gloria I" and is endingless in both manuscripts both times: see lines 34a and 41a).

As it falls on one of two medial unstressed syllables in a Type A-1 line, the variant is metrically insignificant.

Glor I, 7b

Jn₁₂₁

7   wealdest| eall onriht.

CC₂₀₁

7   wealdest ealle on riht.|

Jn₁₂₁ *eall* is the object of *wealdan*: "You wield all [things] for the best."[151] **CC₂₀₁** *ealle* is used adverbially with an absolute form of the verb: "You rule entirely for the best."[152] The addition or omission of the ending has little effect on the metre. It falls in the second dip of a Type E* line in both manuscripts and metrical parallels for both lines can be found elsewhere in the corpus, e.g. (for **Jn₁₂₁**) *ēcan līfes blǣd*, *Seafarer* line 79b; (for **CC₂₀₁**) *hrūsan heolstre bewrāh*, *Wanderer*, line 23a.

---

[151]For the use of *eall* as an independent "Pronoun Adjective," see Mitchell, *OES*, §454.

[152]Cf. Chron. 1036: *ða ðe micel weoldan on ðisum lande*, quoted in B.-T., *wealdan* V (d); also III (e), where the following glosses are given: *wylt:presidet*; *wealdendum:imperantibus*.

Glor I, **43b**

Jn₁₂₁

    ꝥ onworuld aworuld   wúnað. ꝺrixað
    cyning| innanwúldre.   ꝺhis þagecorenan.
    héah|þrýnnesse. <u>halig**es** gast**es**</u>.
    wlítige énglas.| ꝺwuldorgyfe.
45 soð esibbe.   sawla þan gung.|
    modes miltse.

CC₂₀₁

    And on worlda world.   wunað ꝺrixað.
    cyninc innan wuldre.| ꝺhis þa ge corenan.
    heah þrymnesse. <u>halige gast**as**</u>.|
    wlitige englas.   ꝺwuldorgife.
45 soðe sibbe.   sawla þáncung.|
    modes mildse.

This is the only variant in the poems discussed in this chapter in which syntactically coordinated and necessary ("linked") changes are made to more than one element in the text. In **CC₂₀₁**, *halige gastas* is nominative plural and subject of *wunað* and *rixað*, line 41b, parallel to *cyninc*, line 42a, *ge corenan*, line 42b, *wlitige englas*, line 44a, *wuldorgife*, line 44b, *sibbe*, line 45a, *þáncung*, line 45b, and *mildse*, line 46a. In **Jn₁₂₁**, *haliges gastes* is (possessive) genitive singular modifying *héah|þrýnnesse*, line 43a. The variation has no effect on metre. The substitution **Jn₁₂₁** *héah|þrýnnesse* **CC₂₀₁** *heah þrymnesse* in line 43a is discussed below, p. 67.

Glor I, **47a**

Jn₁₂₁

          þærisseo mæste lufu.
<u>halig|dom**as**</u> heofonas syndon.
þurhþine écan| æghwær fulle.
swasyndon. þinemihta ofer| middan geard.
50 swutele ꝺgesyne þ ðu hysylf| worhtest.

CC₂₀₁

          þarisseomæste lufu
<u>halig domes</u>|| heofonassyndon
þurh þine écan word æghwar fulle.|
swasynd þine mihta ofer middan eard.
50 swutole. ꝺgesýne| þæt þuhig silf worhtest.

The variation **Jn₁₂₁** *halig|domas* **CC₂₀₁** *halig domes* is the result either of a difference in the interpretation of the syntax of the passage as a whole or of the falling together of *a* and *e* in unstressed syllables. If the **Jn₁₂₁** spelling is not the result of the confusion of unstressed *e* and *a*, then **Jn₁₂₁** *halig|domas* is nominative plural, and is to be read in syntactic apposition to *mæste lufu*, line 46b; if the variation is not intentional, however, the compound is genitive singular and functions as the object of *fulle*, line 48b. As Holthausen notes, the **CC₂₀₁** reading

shows a marked similarity to the *te deum*: *pleni sunt coeli et terra majestatis gloriae tuae*, and

haligdomes is almost certainly to be preferred.[153]

Glor I, 55b

Jn₁₂₁   **CC₂₀₁**

     þuge|cyddest þ.   þugecyddest þ.
 þaðu mihtig god. mán geworhtest.| þaðu mihtiggod| mangeworhtest.
55 ꝝhim ondydest. oruð. ꝝsaw<u>ul</u>.   55 ꝝhim ondydest orð ꝝsaw<u>le</u>.
 sealdest word| ꝝgewitt. ꝝwæstma gecynd. sealdest word -| - ꝝgewitt. ꝝwæst magecynd.
 cyddest þine cræftas| cyddest þine cræftas.

  Jn₁₂₁ *sawul* (adopted by all editors except Ure) is either the nominative singular or an

example of an Anglian endingless accusative singular.[154] If intended for a nominative singular,

it destroys the syntax of the sentence as an accusative is required by the context. **CC₂₀₁** *sawle*

is accusative singular.

  As *sāwol* has a long first syllable, the variation does not affect the metre of the line.

Line 55b is Type A-1 in both manuscripts.

Substitution of Stressed Words and Elements (1 example)

Glor I, 43a

Jn₁₂₁   **CC₂₀₁**

 ꝝ onworuld aworuld wúnað. ꝝrixað   And on worlda world. wunað ꝝrixað.
 cyning| innanwúldre. ꝝhis þagecorenan. cyninc innan wuldre.| ꝝhis þa ge corenan.
 <u>héah|**þrýnnesse**</u> haliges gastes.   <u>heah **þrymnesse**</u>. halige gastas.|
 wlítige énglas.| ꝝwuldorgyfe.   wlitige englas. ꝝwuldorgife.
45 soðesibbe. sawla þan gung.   45 soðe sibbe. sawla þáncung.|
 modes miltse.   modes mildse.

  The origin of this variant probably lies in the superficially liturgical appearance of the

immediate context, compounded by the etymological confusion of *þrymness* and *þrynness* in

late Old English.[155] At a purely lexical level, **Jn₁₂₁** *héah|þrýnnesse* 'Holy Trinity' is an

[153]F. Holthausen, Review of *Bibliothek der angelsächsichen Poesie*, ed. Christian W. M. Grein, *Anglia Beiblatt* 8 (1894): 192-198, 224-234, at p. 196.

[154]Sievers-Brunner, §252 Anm.2 and §254.2.

[155]For a discussion of the development of *þrymnys* in the sense 'Trinity' and its subsequent confusion with *þrynnes*, see Roberta Frank, "Late Old English *Þrymnys* 'Trinity': Scribal Nod or Word Waiting to be

appropriate choice for lines 41-46a. The remaining words and tags in these lines (all cited in their **Jn₁₂₁** form), *haliges gastes*, *onworuld aworuld*, *cyning innan wuldre*, *gecorenan* and *wlitige englas*, are all perfectly suited to a discussion of God and the Holy Trinity. As Roberta Frank has argued recently, moreover, *þrymnys* 'mightiness' (**CUL_Ffi27** *heah þrymnesse*) had become increasingly associated with *þrynnys* 'trinity' in late Old English.

The sense and syntax of the passage make clear, however, that lines 41-46a are concerned not with the makeup and nature of the Holy Trinity, but more generally with the inhabitants and perquisites of heaven. The words the **Jn₁₂₁** scribe appears to have associated with the Holy Trinity refer instead to the hosts of angels and souls in heaven. While **Jn₁₂₁** *héah|þrýnnesse* can be construed as an example of the analogical extension of *-e* to the nominative singular of feminine nouns (examples are reported by Campbell from all dialects except Kentish),[156] or, more regularly, as an oblique singular (**CUL_Ffi27** *heah þrymnesse* is dative or genitive singular), neither construction makes much sense in the local context of **Jn₁₂₁**. As a nominative plural, *héah|þrýnnesse* "High Trinities," would be too much of a good thing. But it makes just as little sense to speak in the dative or genitive singular of the "High Trinity *of the Holy Spirit*," **Jn₁₂₁** *héah|þrýnnesse haliges gastes.*

A better reading is to follow **CC₂₀₁** and take the nouns in lines 42-46a as roughly appositive to each other, serving together as the subjects of the plural verbs *wunað ⁊rixað* in line 41b. In this reading *heahþrymnesse* is genitive or dative singular '(chosen bands) of high mightiness' or '(live and rule) through high mightiness', while *gecorenan*, *halige gastas* (as in **CUL_Ffi27**), and *wlitige englas* are all understood to refer to the hosts of angels and serve with

---

Born," in Joan H. Hall, Nick Doane and Dick Ringler, eds., *Old English and New: Studies in Language and Linguistics in Honour of Frederic G. Cassidy* (New York: Garland, 1992), pp. 97-110.

[156]Campbell, *OEG*, §592.f.

cyninc innan wuldre, ⁊*wuldorgife*, *soðe sibbe*, and *sawla þáncung* as the subject of the two

verbs in line 41b.[157]

Addition/Omission of Unstressed Words and Elements (3 examples)

Glor I, 23b (2 variants)

Jn₁₂₁	**CC₂₀₁ 20-23**
20 þusettest on| foldan. swyðe feala cynna.	20 þu settest onfoldan. swiðe fela cynna.|
⁊tosyndrodosthig.| syððon onmænego.	⁊tosyndrodesthig. siððan onmanega
þugewrohtest éce gód.| ealle gesceafta.	þuge worhtest. écegod| ealle gesceafta.
onsyx dagum. ⁊onþone| seofoðan þugerestest.	onsixdagū. seofoðan þuge restest.

The variation **Jn₁₂₁** ⁊*onþone/ seofoðan* : **CC₂₀₁** *seofoðan* involves two independent

additions or omissions, both of which affect metre and syntax.

The first is the addition or omission of the conjunction *ond*. In **Jn₁₂₁** the clause

⁊*onþone/ seofoðan þugerestest* is related to the preceding clause *þugewrohtest... onsyx dagum*

syndetically. In **CC₂₀₁**, the relationship of the equivalent clauses *þuge worhtest... onsixdagū*

and *seofoðan þuge restest* is asyndetic.   While the **CC₂₀₁** reading more "abrupt" as Ure has

suggested, both forms of parataxis are common.[158]

The second addition or omission involves the preposition and definite article, **Jn₁₂₁**

onþone **CC₂₀₁** ∅. In **Jn₁₂₁** an attempt appears to have been made to distinguish between

duration of time and point in time through use of contrasting dative and accusative

prepositional objects: **Jn₁₂₁** *onsyx dagum* (dative, duration of time), line 23a, **Jn₁₂₁** *onþone/*

seofoðan (accusative, point in time), line 23b. This is at odds with the conventional account of

the idiom, in which the accusative is said to represent duration-in-time, and the dative,

point-in-time. As Bruce Mitchell notes, however, this "classical" pattern does not always

---

[157]Dobbie and Ure read *heahþry**mn**esse haliges gastes* "with the high might of the Holy Ghost" for l. 43b, mixing the **Jn₁₂₁** and **CC₂₀₁** readings.

[158]Ure, *Benedictine Office*, p. 122. For a discussion of both forms of parataxis, see Mitchell, *OES*, §§ 1690-78 (asyndetic parataxis) and §§1712-39 (syndetic parataxis with *ond*).

hold,[159] and the scribe of **Jn₁₂₁** or an exemplar may have found it sufficient simply to establish a grammatical distinction between the two phrases. The omission of *on þone* from **CC₂₀₁** is an example of the non-repetition of elements which can supplied from a coordinate clause, in this case, the preposition, demonstrative article and (as in **Jn₁₂₁**) noun *dæge*.[160]

Metrically, the **CC₂₀₁** reading is to be preferred, although most editors read **Jn₁₂₁**.[161] While the line is Type A-1 in both witnesses, **Jn₁₂₁** *ꝺonþone* adds an unusually heavy four-syllable anacrusis.

Glor I, 31a

Jn₁₂₁	**CC₂₀₁**
31 ꝺnu ꝺsýmble. þinesoðan weorc.	31 Andnusymle þine soðan weorc.
ꝺðinmy-|cele miht. manegum swytelað.	ꝺþin micele miht manegū| swutelað.
swaþine| cræftas héo. cýðaþ wíde.	swaþine cræftas híg cyðað wide.
ofer éalle wóruld.| éce stándeþ.	ofer ealle world| ece standað.

The addition or omission of *ond* in line 31a has little if any effect on metre, sense or syntax; the line is a Type A-3 in both manuscripts.

Addition/Omission of Stressed Words and Elements (1 example)

Glor I, 48a

Jn₁₂₁	**CC₂₀₁**
þærisseo mæste lufu.	þarisseomæste lufu
halig|domas heofonas syndon.	halig domes|| heofonassyndon
þurhþine écan| æghwær fulle.	þurh þine écan **word** æghwar fulle.|
swasyndon. þinemihta ofer| middan geard.	swasynd þine mihta ofer middan eard.
50 swutele ꝺgesyne þ ðu hysylf| worhtest.	50 swutole. ꝺgesýne| þæt þuhig silf worhtest.

The omission of *word* from **Jn₁₂₁** is almost certainly the result of a scribal error, perhaps by anticipation of the end of the manuscript line: *word* is necessary for sense and syntax, though the line is a metrically acceptable Type A-3 with the omission. For similar

---

159 Mitchell, *OES*, §§1177, 1207, 1387-8 and 1421-4.

160 Mitchell, *OES*, §§3869-71, especially 3871.

161 Dobbie, *ASPR* 6, p. 75; Ure, *Benedictine Office*, pp. 83 and 122. Holthausen for his part assumes the loss of material after *gerestest* and rearranges **Jn₁₂₁** as a Type B-1 line followed by a defective verse ("Zur Textkritik altenglischer Dichtungen," *ESt* 37 [1907]: 198-211, at 202):

examples of the loss of monosyllables from the final stress of Type B and E lines, see Psalm

83:18.2a (**PPs** ∅ **EPs** *eæc*, p. 46 above); and "Durham," line 6a (**Hickes** ∅ **CUL**_{Ffi27} *is*, p. 80

below).

Addition/Omission Corresponding to a Metrical Unit (1 example)

Glor I, 13b

Jn₁₂₁

 Þueart frofra fæder. ꝺfeorh hyrde.|
 lifes latteow. leohtes wealdend.
10 asýndrod| framsynnum. swaðinsunumære.
 þurh| clæne gecynd cyning oferealle.
 beald||| gebletsod. bóca láreow.
 heah hige frofre| **ꝺh alig gast**.

CC₂₀₁

 Ðu éart frofra fæder. ꝺfeorh hyrda
 lifes laððeow. leohtes| wealdend.
10 asundrod fram sinnū. swaþinsunu mære.|
 þurh clæne gecynd. cyninc ofer ealle.
 bealdgebletsod.| boca lareow.
 heah hige frofre.

Lines 8-13 consists of a series of epithets for God the Father, God the Son (and, in

Jn₁₂₁, God the Holy Spirit), arranged around the second person singular substantive verb *eart*,

line 8a. The omission of *ꝺh alig gast* by the scribe of **CC₂₀₁** is presumably the result of simple

oversight, perhaps through anticipation of the Latin verse immediately following the line in

both manuscripts. The omission corresponds to a metrical unit.

Reinterpretation of Existing Text (1 example)

Glor I, 26a

Jn₁₂₁

 þawæs geforðad þin| fǽgere wéorc.
25 ꝺðusúnnan dæg; sýlf halgó|dest.
 ꝺgemǽrsodest hine mánegum tohélpe|

CC₂₀₁

 þawæs| geforðod þin fægere weorc.
25 ꝺþusunnan dæg silf halgodest.
 ꝺþumærsodest hine manegum tohelpe.

The origin of this variant seems to be the reinterpretation of the verbal prefix *ge-* by

the scribe of **CC₂₀₁** as an 'incorrect' nominative plural form of the second person pronoun *ge*.

In **Jn₁₂₁** the verb of the clause *ꝺgemǽrsodest hine mánegum tohélpe* is *gemǣrsian*, and the

subject the same as that of line 25, but not repeated.[162] In **CC₂₀₁**, the verb is *mǣrsian*, and the

subject, *þu*, is repeated in both lines. This is less usual syntax, but still acceptable: Mitchell

---

 Jn₁₂₁ 23-*24a on syx dagum and on þone seofoðan þu
         gerestest...

gives poetic examples of this construction from *Beowulf*, lines 1748-52, *Judgement Day* I, line 22 and *Judgement Day* II, lines 24-5.[163]

The variant has no effect on metre.

"Prayer"

"Prayer," a rhetorically sophisticated petition for divine grace, is preserved in two manuscripts, the "Lambeth Psalter," London, Lambeth Palace Library 427, ff.1-209 (**LPs**), and London, British Library, Cotton Julius A. ii, ff.136-144 (**Jul_{Aii}**). **LPs** is an eleventh-century Psalter with Psalms and Canticles of the Gallican version and a continuous interlinear gloss.[164] The manuscript contains two other glossed Latin texts: a prayer "O summe deus consolator omnium," which has been added to ff.141-2 in a "space left blank by the scribe after Ps. 108,"[165] and a form of confession "Confiteor tibi domine pater celi et terræ," copied between the Psalms and Canticles on ff. 182v-183v.[166] To these, the first fifteen lines of "Prayer" have been added in a blank space after the confession on f. 183v.[167] As the poem stops with the end of a sentence, it is impossible to say on internal grounds whether the break at the foot of f.183v is deliberate. Dobbie, noting that all but the first of the Canticles have rubricated titles, has suggested that the manuscript is defective at this point and that the last 63 lines of "Prayer" and the title of the first Canticle were copied on leaves which have since been lost.[168] Ker's

---

[162]Mitchell, *OES*, §1715.

[163]Mitchell, *OES*, §1714-15.

[164]The manuscript is described by Ker, *Catalogue*, art 280; Dobbie, *ASPR* 6, pp. lxxxvi-vii; Max Förster, "Die altenglischen Beigaben des Lambeth Psalters," *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*, 132 (1914): 328-335.

[165]Ker, *Catalogue*, art. 280.

[166]Ker, *Catalogue*, art. 280.

[167]Ker, *Catalogue*, art. 280.

[168]Dobbie, *ASPR* 6, p. lxxxvi.

foliation does not suggest any missing pages at this point,[169] however, and it is perhaps just as likely that the scribe of the Canticles omitted the first title while that of "Prayer" decided to end his text with the last word of the sentence he could get on f. 183v.

Jul$_{Aii}$ ff. 136-142 is a twelfth-century collection of notes and translations bound in the post-medieval period with an unrelated copy of Ælfric's *Grammar*.[170] Both parts of the collection were damaged in the Cottonian fire of 1731, ff.136-142 being almost completely destroyed. "Prayer" was the first item in the manuscript where it was followed by *Adrian and Ritheus* (ff.137v-140),[171] notes on a variety of subjects (f.140v),[172] translations of the distichs of Cato and miscellaneous apophthegms (ff.141-4v).[173]

In their fifteen common lines, the two witnesses to "Prayer" share two apparent errors, both involving faulty alliteration (lines 2 and 7). **Jul**$_{Aii}$ also has one obvious error not in **LPs**, **Jul**$_{Aii}$ *þeo on* for **LPs** *þeon*, line 11b (probably by dittography). Apart from the missing text of lines 16-79, the two manuscripts exhibit four potentially significant substantive variants: one difference of inflection, two examples of the addition or omission of unstressed words, and one substitution of a stressed, homographic synonym.

---

[169]Ker, *Catalogue*, art. 280.

[170]Ker, *Catalogue*, art. 159.

[171]James E. Cross, and Thomas D. Hill, ed., *The Prose Solomon and Saturn and Adrian and Ritheus*, McMaster Old English Studies and Texts 1 (Toronto: UTP, 1982).

[172]On "the two thieves, the measurements of Noah's ark, the Church of St. Peter, the temple of Solomon, and the world, and the number of bones, &c., in the human body," Ker, *Catalogue*, art. 159. Max Förster has proposed that these notes are an extension of the preceding Dialogue of Adrian and Ritheus ("Zu Adrian und Ritheus," *ESt* 23 [1897]: 433-4). For a counter-argument, see Cross and Hill, *The Prose Solomon and Saturn*, p. 16.

[173]The distichs have been edited (with variants from **Jn**$_{121}$), by R.S. Cox, "The Old English Distichs of Cato," *Anglia* 90 (1972): 1-29.

Textual Variants

Inflectional Difference (1 example)

Pr, 10b

| **LPs** | **Jul**_{Aii} |

Textual Variants

Inflectional Difference (1 example)

***Pr*, 10b**

LPs   **Jul$_{Aii}$**

  Eala frea brihta   folces| scyppend.   Æla frea beorhta.   folkes scippend.

  Gemilda þin mod   me togode.   Gemilsa þyn| mod.   me to gode.

10 Syle| ðine are **þinum** earminge   10   sile þyne are.   **þyne** earminge.|

Alternation between dative and instrumental singular. The variation has no effect on sense, metre or syntax.[174] For an example of a similar variation, see Psalm 89:18.3b, p. 58, above.

Substitution of Stressed Words and Elements (1 example)

***Pr*, 9a**

LPs   **Jul$_{Aii}$**

  Eala frea brihta   folces| scyppend.   Æla frea beorhta.   folkes scippend.

  Gemilda þin mod   me togode.   **Gemilsa** þyn| mod.   me to gode.

10 Syle| ðine are þinum earminge   10   sile þyne are.   þyne earminge.|

The two words are synonyms, homographs, and metrically and syntactically equivalent. The substitution has no effect on sense, metre, or syntax and is probably unconscious.

Addition/Omission of Unstressed Words and Elements (2 examples)

***Pr*, 14a (2 variants)**

LPs   **Jul$_{Aii}$**

  Sebið earming   þeon| eorðan her   Se byð earming.   þeo on eorðan her.

  dæges ⁊nihtes   deoflū compað   dæiges ⁊ nihtes.| deoflon campað.

  ⁊his| willan wyrcð   wahim þære myrigðe.   ⁊ hys willan wyrcð.   wa him þære| mirigðe.

  þonne hand| lean   hafað ⁊sceawað   þonne **he ða** handlean.   hafað ⁊ sceawað.

15 butan he þæs yfles   ærge swice||| 15   bute he þæs yfeles.   ær geswyce.

There are two independent additions or omissions in this line. The first, the addition/omission of *he* is an example of the non-repetition of personal pronouns "when the same subject serves for more than one simple sentence or coordinate clause."[175] The second,

---

[174]Mitchell, *OES*, §1345.

[175]Mitchell, *OES*, §1505; examples corresponding to both witnesses are given in §§1690-1702, and §§1712-17 and 1752.

the addition or omission of the unstressed sentence adverb *ða*, has little or no effect on sense, metre or syntax.

As the material added to **LPs** or omitted from **Jul$_{Aii}$** falls in the preliminary dip of a Type A-3 line, neither variant has a significant effect on metre.

"Durham"

The youngest Old English poem composed in a regular metre, "Durham" is known to have survived the Anglo-Saxon period in two twelfth-century manuscripts[176]: Cambridge, University Library, Ff. i. 27 (**CUL$_{Ffi27}$**), and London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius D. xx (**Vit$_{Dxx}$**). This second manuscript was almost completely destroyed in the Cottonian fire, and the poem is known to modern scholars exclusively from the *editio princeps* in Hickes's *Thesaurus* (**Hickes**).[177] The poem followed by a life of St. Cuthbert in both manuscripts.[178]

In their twenty-one lines of common text, the two witnesses to "Durham" exhibit eleven potentially significant variant readings: five inflectional variants, one example of the substitution of an unstressed word or element, one example of the substitution of a stressed word or element, one example of the addition or omission of unstressed words or elements,

---

[176]Donald K. Fry recently has argued that a third manuscript copy of the poem was known to Francis Junius in the seventeenth century ("A Newly Discovered Version of the Old English Poem 'Durham,'" in Joan H. Hall, Nick Doane and Dick Ringler, eds, *Old English and New: Studies in Language and Linguistics in Honour of Frederic G. Cassidy*, pp. 83-96). Since Junius's transcript of this 'third' manuscript (Fry's **J1**) contains many of the same errors found in his transcript of an early edition of **CUL$_{Ffi27}$** (Fry's **J2**), and since the principal differences between **J1** and the known texts of **CUL$_{Ffi27}$** and **Vit$_{Dxx}$** (i.e. **Hickes**) involve readings in which **J2** exhibits a nonsense reading, the most likely explanation is that **J1** is an emended transcription of **J2**, made by Junius before he had a chance to compare his conjectures with the original manuscript. A third transcript of the poem (British Library, Harley 7567; Fry's **JC**) appears to be a direct transcription of **CUL$_{Ffi27}$**. I am preparing an article discussing the relationship of **J1** to **CUL$_{Ffi27}$** at greater length.

[177]George Hickes, *Linguarum Veterum. Septentrionalium Thesaurus Grammatico-Criticus et Archæologicus* I and II (Oxford, 1705), I, pp. 178-179.

[178]Ker, *Catalogue*, arts. 14 and 223. A full list of the contents of **CUL$_{Ffi27}$** can be found in Charles Hardwick and H. Luard, eds. *Catalogue of Manuscripts Preserved in the Library of the University of Cambridge* (Cambridge and London, 1857; München: Kraus, 1980), II, art. 1160, pp. 318-329.

one example of the addition or omission of stressed words or elements, one example of the syntactic reinterpretation of existing material, and one example of rearrangement within the line. Very few of these variants represent genuine alternative readings, however, particularly in the case of the five differences of inflection, four of which involve the addition or loss of a final unstressed vowel and may be better understood as an indication of the extent to which unstressed syllables had weakened in the north of England by the twelfth-century. In addition, numerous apparent mistakes in both versions of the poem suggest that the scribes of the surviving witnesses were not fully able to follow the sense of what they were reading. This is particularly true of the nonsensical correction **CUL**_{Ffi27} *fₒola* (for **Hickes** *feola*), line 5a.

Textual Variants

Inflectional Difference (5 examples)

Dur, 4a

Hickes 6-10[179]	**CUL**_{Ffi27}
Weor ymb eornað.|	weor. ymbeor|nad.
Ean yðum <u>strong</u>.| And ðerinne wunað.|	eayðum. <u>strong**e**</u>. ⁊ ðer inne wu|nað
Fisca feola kinn.| On floda gemong.|	5 fₒola fisca. kyn. onfloda ge mon|ge.

Hickes *strong* is an endingless nominative plural feminine adjective agreeing with *ean*,[180] while **CUL**_{Ffi27} *stronge* is either an adverb or a nominative plural strong adjective in *e*, agreeing with *ea* (for a discussion of the variation **Hickes** *ean yðum* **CUL**_{Ffi27} *eayðum*, see the following entry). In **Hickes**, the line is a heavy Type E with *ēan*, *ȳðum* and *strong* all taking a full stress; **CUL**_{Ffi27} is a Type A*, in which *ȳðum* takes a half-stress as the second element in a compound.

---

[179]Hickes prints the text of "Durham" in short lines. Line numbers for **Hickes** refer to the printed lines in his edition. These do not always correspond to modern editorial half-lines.

[180]On the use of endingless forms in all cases of Northumbrian adjectives, see Campbell, *OEG*, §638. Campbell reports that endingless forms are more common in the singular than plural, however.

Dur, **4a**

Hickes 6-10	**CUL**Ffi27

Weor ymb eornað.| weor. ymbeor|nad.

<u>Ea**n**</u> yðum strong.| And ðerinne wunað.| <u>ea</u>yðum. stronge.   ꝸ ðer inne wu|nað

Fisca feola kinn.| On floda gemong.| 5 f̣ola fisca. kyn.   onfloda ge mon|ge.

       Hickes *ean* is an inflected nominative plural parallel to the singular *Weor* and modified by *strong*, 'streams strong in waves.' In **CUL**Ffi27, *ea* is the first part of a dative plural compound *ēaȳðum*, '(in) river-waves', and *stronge* an adverb modifying *ymbeor|nad*: 'the Weir goes about strongly with river waves'. As a compound, *ēaȳðum* takes one full and one half stress, *stronge* takes a full stress, and the line is to be scanned as a Type A*. As simplices in **Hickes**, *ēan*, *ȳðum*, and *strong* all take a full stress.

Dur, **5b**

Hickes 6-10	**CUL**Ffi27

Weor ymb eornað.| weor. ymbeor|nad.

Ean yðum strong.| And ðerinne wunað.| eayðum. stronge.   ꝸ ðer inne wu|nað

Fisca feola kinn.| On floda **gemong**.| 5 f̣ola fisca. kyn.   onfloda **ge mon|ge**.

       The alternation is between the accusative and dative with *on*. Both patterns are found elsewhere in the corpus, although the **Hickes** reading *on* + Genitive Plural Noun + *gemong* is the more common. Parallels to **Hickes** (all with nouns denoting groups of people) include: *on clænra gemang*, Elene 108a, *on clænra gemong*, Juliana 420a, *on feonda gemang*, Elene 118b, *in heardra gemang*, Judith 225a, *on sceaðena gemong*, Judith 193b; the only parallel to the **CUL**Ffi27 reading in the Anglo-Saxon poetic records is: *on wera gemange* Andreas 730b. A more common construction with *gemonge* is Dative Noun + *on* + *gemonge*. Examples include: *godum on gemange*, Psalm 81.1b; *halgum on gemonge*, Christ 1660a, *wyrtum in gemonge*, Phoenix, 265b, *magum in gemonge*, Juliana 528a; *leodum in gemonge* Riming

Poem, 41b, *werum on gemonge*, Exeter Riddle 31, 4a, and *eorlum on gemonge*, Exeter Riddle

31, 11b.[181]

If the **CUL$_{Ffi27}$** form is not an example of the spurious addition of -*e*, the variant does

have an effect on the metre: *on flōda gemong* (**Hickes**) is a Type B-2 line, *on flōda gemonge*

(**CUL$_{Ffi27}$**) a Type A-1 with anacrusis.

Dur, 6a

Hickes 1-12	**CUL$_{Ffi27}$**
Is ðeos burch breome.| Geond breoten rice.|	Is ðeos burch. breome geond breoten| rice
Steopa gestaðolad.| Stanas ymb utan.|	steppa ge staðolad stanas ymbu|tan
Wundrum gewæxen.| Weor ymb eornað.|	wundrū. ge wæxen. weor. ymbeor|nad.
Ean yðum strong.| And ðerinne wunað.|	eayðum. stronge. ꝼ ðer inne wu|nað
Fisca feola kinn.| On floda gemong.|	5 fẏola fisca. kyn. onfloda ge mon|ge.
And <u>ere</u> gewexen.| Wuda festern mycel.|	ꝼ <u>ðærge</u> wexen is wuda fæstern| micel.

There are two possibilities for this variation. The first is that **Hickes** *ðere* is a back

spelling of *ðær* with the spurious addition of a final -*e*. The second is that the **Hickes** form is a

dative singular feminine form of the demonstrative pronoun "in that [place]," with the

feminine noun *burch*, line 1a as antecedent.[182] Whether or not the **Hickes** reading is

intentional, the variant falls on the initial dip of a Type A-3 line and has little effect on metre.

Dur, 20b

Hickes 32-37	**CUL$_{Ffi27}$**
Eardiað æt ðem eadige.| In inðem mynstre.|	Eardiæð. ætðem eadige in| inðem minstre
Unarimeda reliquia.|	un arimeda. reliquia.|
Ðær monige wundrum gewurðað.|	20 ðe monia wund rumge. wurðað.
Ðe **writa** seggeð.|	ðes| ðe **writ**. seggeð.
Mid ðene drihtnes werdomes bideð.|	midd ðene drihnes.| werdomes. bideð.|||

The variation **Hickes** *writa* **CUL$_{Ffi27}$** *writ* is between the singular and plural of the

neuter strong noun *writ* (with **Hickes** -*a* for -*u*), 'writings' vs 'writ'. As **Hickes CUL$_{Ffi27}$**

seggeð can be singular or plural (with *eð* for expected *að*), both readings make acceptable

---

[181]All citations are drawn from J.B. Bessinger, ed., *A Concordance to the Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records* (Ithaca and London: Cornell, 1978).

[182]On the use of the dative to denote place where, see Mitchell, *OES*, §1416. As Mitchell notes, this is a rare usage and "a preposition + the dative is usual even in the early texts."

sense and syntax. The variation has a minimal effect on metre as both versions involve Type

C-1 lines: in **Hickes** the first stress is resolved; in **CUL_Ffi27** it is long by position.

Substitution of Unstressed Words and Elements (1 example)

Dur, 20a

Hickes 32-37	**CUL_Ffi27**
Eardiað æt ðem eadige.| In inðem mynstre.|	Eardiæð. ætðem eadige in| inðem minstre
Unarimeda reliquia.|	un arimeda. reliquia.|
Ðær monige wundrum gewurðað.|	20 **ðe** monia wund rumge. wurðað.
Ðe writa seggeð.|	ðes| ðe writ. seggeð.
Mid ðene drihtnes werdomes bideð.|	midd ðene drihnes.| werdomes. bideð.|||

     The two readings are syntactically and metrically equivalent. *Ðe* and *ðær* are used

"interchangeably" in Old English to introduce "adjective clauses of place."[183]

Substitution of Stressed Words and Elements (1 example)

Dur, 17b

Hickes 25-31	**CUL_Ffi27**
Is ðerinne mid heom.| Æðelwold bisceop.|	IS ðer inne midd heom.| ꟻðelwold , biscop.
And breoma bocera Beda.| And Boisil abbet.|	15 ꟻbreoma bocera. be|þ.ᵈa ꟻboisil abbot.
Ðe clæne Cuðberchte.| On gicheðe.	ðe clene cudberte on| gecheðe
Lerde lustum.| And he **his** lara wel genom.|	lerde. lustum. ꟻhe **wis** lara| welgenom.

    Hickes *his* is the third person possessive pronoun. For alliterative reasons, the

CUL_Ffi27 form is most likely the result of a graphic confusion of *w* and *h*. As the genitive

plural of an otherwise unattested compound 'wise-teachings', **CUL_Ffi27** *wis lara* adds a non-

alliterating lift to the beginning of the off-verse. In **Hickes**, *his* is unaccented. Neither version

is metrically orthodox.

---

[183]Mitchell, *OES*, §2474.

Addition/Omission of Unstressed Words and Elements (1 example)

Dur, 20b

Hickes 32-37	**CUL_{Ffi27}**

<table>
<tr><td>Eardiað æt ðem eadige.| In inðem mynstre.|</td><td>Eardiæð. ætðem eadige   in| inðem minstre</td></tr>
<tr><td>Unarimeda reliquia.|</td><td>un arimeda. reliquia.|</td></tr>
<tr><td>Ðær monige wundrum gewurðað.|</td><td>20 ðe monia wund rumge. wurðað.</td></tr>
<tr><td style="text-align:right">Ðe writa seggeð.|</td><td style="text-align:right">ðes| ðe writ. seggeð.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Mid ðene drihtnes   werdomes bideð.|</td><td>midd ðene drihnes.| werdomes. bideð.|||</td></tr>
</table>

The variation has little effect on sense or metre, and the two forms are probably syntactically equivalent. The use of the genitive with *secgan* is unusual but not unprecedented. The addition/omission falls on the preliminary stress of a Type B line and is metrically insignificant. For another example of the variation between the cases with this verb, see Psalm 93:16.1a (p. 39 above).

Addition/Omission of Stressed Words and Elements (1 example)

Dur, 6a

Hickes 11-12	**CUL_{Ffi27}**

<table>
<tr><td>And ðere gewexen.| Wuda festern mycel.|</td><td>6 &#7; ðærge wexen is   wuda fæstern| micel.</td></tr>
</table>

The omission of *is* from **Hickes** is almost certainly a mistake. The context requires a finite, singular verb and *gewexen* can only be construed as a past participle or plural preterite. As it takes stress in **CUL_{Ffi27}**, the addition or omission of *is* also affects the metre. **Hickes** is a Type A-3, **CUL_{Ffi27}** a Type B-1. For further examples of the loss of monosyllables from the final stress of Type B and E lines, see Psalm 93:18.2a (p. 46) and "Gloria I," line 48a (p. 70).

Reinterpretation of Existing Material (1 example)

Dur, 14b

Hickes 25&26	**CUL**_Ffi27
Is ðerinne mid heom.| Æðelwold bisceop.|	14 IS ðer inne midd heom. ⁊ðelwold. biscop.

The **CUL**_Ffi27 reading is by the misapprehension of *æ* as ⁊. For an example of the opposite mistake in a late manuscript, cf. **SanM** *æ* **Bd H Ln Mg Tr₁ W** ⁊, "Cædmon's Hymn" (*ylda*-recension), line 2b.[184]

Rearrangement within the Line (1 example)

Dur, 5a

Hickes 6-10   **CUL**_Ffi27

	Weor ymb eornað.|		weor. ymbeor|nad.
Ean yðum strong.|	And ðerinne wunað.|	eayðum. stronge.	⁊ ðer inne wu|nað
Fisca feola kinn.|	On floda gemong.|	5 **f͗ola fisca. kyn**.	onfloda ge mon|ge.

Both manuscripts make equally good sense (with the exception of the erroneous correction *f͗ola* in **CUL**_Ffi27). In **CUL**_Ffi27, line 5a is Type C-1; in **Hickes**, the equivalent verse is best scanned as a Type A-1 with full stress on *feola* and *Fisca* and a half-stress on *kinn*.

Conclusion

The poems discussed in this chapter all demonstrate one thing: that Anglo-Saxon scribes were able to copy Old English poetry to an extremely high standard of substantive accuracy whenever they chose or were required to do so. The most accurate of these scribes are those responsible for "Glossing" poems like the *ylda-* and *aeldu*-recensions of Cædmon's Hymn and the fragments from the metrical translation of the Psalms preserved in the Paris and Eadwine Psalters. Presumably as a result of the functional nature of the contexts in which they are found, the witnesses to these poems exhibit almost no genuinely alternative readings, even in circumstances which would seem to encourage scribal intervention – an apparently corrupt

---

[184]The **SanM** text is reproduced in facsimile in Robinson and Stanley, *EEMF* 23, pl. 2.19

original in the case of the West-Saxon *ylda*-recension of "Cædmon's Hymn," and a thorough-going dialectal translation in that of the common text of the Paris and Eadwine Psalters.

The remaining texts – "Fragments of Psalms," "Gloria I," "Prayer," and "Durham" – are only slightly less "accurate" than the Glossing poems. While most of the substantive variants these poems exhibit can be attributed to scribal error or orthographic, phonological, or dialectal difference, these poems do show a slightly higher incidence of sensibly, metrically and semantically acceptable alternatives – graphically similar and/or synonymous words and elements, syntactically equivalent case endings and/or conjunctions. While the fact that the "Fragments of Psalms" and "Gloria I" are translations of Latin texts might account for their generally high level of substantive textual accuracy, the fact that similarly low levels of substantive variation are found between the witnesses to the "Occasional" poems "Prayer" and "Durham" suggests instead that such accurate transmission was the norm for all Old English poetry not preserved as constituents to vernacular prose framing texts like the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* and Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica*, or as part of the major anthologies. How these last two groups of poems differ from the "Glossing, Translating, and Occasional" poems is the subject of the following two chapters. Chapter Three, "Fixed Context Poems," looks at the variation found among the witnesses to poems like the *Battle of Brunanburh*, the Metrical Preface to the Old English Translation of the *Pastoral Care*, and the version of "Cædmon's Hymn" preserved in copies of the Old English version of Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica*. The – much more significant – variation found between the witnesses to the poems of the "poetic anthologies" is discussed in Chapter Four, "Anthologised and Excerpted Poems."

Appendix
Psalm 117:22 and "Menologium" lines 60-62 (PPs and ChronC[1])

A fourth multiply attested fragment from the metrical translation of the Psalms (in this case three lines from Psalm 117:22) survives in **PPs** and the early eleventh century London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. i (**ChronC**). In **PPs**, the text appears in the Old English column opposite the appropriate section of the Latin text.[185] In **ChronC**, the Psalm appears as a three line quotation (lines 60-62) in the "Menologium," a verse account "of the seasons and festal days of the Christian year" copied (with "Maxims II") by the first *Chronicle* scribe (**ChronC[1]**) immediately before the beginning of the *Chronicle* proper.[186]

While the sample is too small to allow us to draw any definitive conclusions, a simple comparison of the amount and nature of the variation exhibited by Psalm 117:22 and the various fragments from the Metrical Translation of the Psalms discussed in the preceding chapter suggests that the **ChronC[1]** scribe copied his text less conservatively than his colleagues. In its three multiply attested lines, the common text of Psalm 117:22/"Menologium" lines 60-62 shows three substantive variants: one substitution of unstressed words, one substitution of a stressed element, and one example of the addition or omission of a prefix. In 267 lines, the three fragments from the metrical translation of the Psalms discussed in the preceding chapter show one similar example of the substitution of a stressed word[187]: **PPs** *eað beḑe* (corrected from *eaðmede*) **EPs** *eað bene*, Psalm 89:15.2b and

---

[185]The **PPs** version of the Metrical Translation of the Psalms is discussed above, pp. 32 ff.

[186]For an account of the placement of the "Menologium," and its relationship to the subsequent *Chronicle*, see Dobbie, *ASPR* 6, pp. lx-lxi.

[187]As mentioned above, pp. 55-55, the majority of substitutions of stressed words in the "Glossing, Translating and Occasional" poems involve graphic error or the influence of the surrounding Latin.

one somewhat similar example of the addition or omission of prefixes: **PPs** *cyrre* **EPs** *on cyrre*, Psalm 93:13.2b.

Similar amounts and types of textual variation are found among the more innovative witnesses to the "Fixed Context" poems discussed in Chapter Three. This might suggest that the **ChronC** text of the "Menologium" should be classified with the work of such innovative "Fixed Context" scribes as that of the Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 41 (**B₁**) version of "Cædmon's Hymn" or the London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. vi (**ChronB**) version of the *Battle of Brunanburh*[188] – were it not that the **ChronC¹** scribe appears to have been a relatively conservative copyist of the *Chronicle*'s opening annals (as we have no other witnesses to "Maxims II" or the rest of the Menologium, and as the *Chronicle* poems in **ChronC** are all copied by later scribes, we have no material with which we can compare the **ChronC¹** scribe's verse performance directly).[189] As none of the variants between **PPs** and **ChronC¹** have a particularly significant effect on sense, syntax, or metre, and as the most significant variant –involving the substitution of stressed elements **ChronC¹** -*warum* **PPs** -*tudrum* – involves the use of a more common word in **ChronC¹** for a nonce form in **PPs**, it is perhaps just as likely that the **ChronC¹** version of Psalm 117:22 has undergone the same kind of memorial trivialisation responsible for such modern "familiar" quotations as "blood, sweat, and tears" (for Churchill's "blood, toil, tears and sweat"),[190] "money is the root of all evil" (for

---

[188]These poems, scribes, and manuscripts are discussed in greater detail in Chapter 3.

[189]A brief discussion of the relationship between the **ChronC¹** version of the early *Chronicle* entries and its probable exemplar (**ChronB**) can be found Simon Taylor, ed, *MS B. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A Collaborative Edition* 4 (Cambridge: Brewer, 1983), pp. xxxviii-xxxix.

[190]First statement as Prime Minister, May 13, 1940.

the King James translation, "the love of money is the root of all evil"),[191] and "gilding the

lily" (for Shakespeare's "to gild refinèd gold, to paint the lily").[192]

Textual Variants

Substitution of Unstressed Words (1 example)

MPs (PPs/ChronC[1] [*Men*]), 117:22.1b/60b

ChronC[1]   **PPs**

       þǣn dream gerist᛫
   welǀ wide gehwær᛫ swa se witega sang.
60 Þis is se dæg᛫ **þæne**ǀ drihten ús.   1 Þ is ys se dæg **þehine**ǀ drihten us.
   wisfæst worhte᛫ wera cneorissū.   wisfæǀst ge worhte wera cneorissum
   eallūǀ eorðwarum᛫ eadigū tóblisse.   eallǀum eorðtudrumǀ eadgum toblisse᛫

        The substitution **ChronC[1]** *þǣn* (i.e. *þone*) **PPs** *þehine* has no significant effect on

sense, syntax, or metre. Both forms are found introducing adjective clauses in Old English.[193]

The variants fall on the preliminary dip of a Type B-1 line in both manuscripts.

Substitution of Stressed Words and Elements (1 example)

MPs (PPs/ChronC[1] [*Men*]), 117:22.3a/62a

ChronC[1]   **PPs**

       þǣn dream gerist᛫
   welǀ wide gehwær᛫ swa se witega sang.
60 Þis is se dæg᛫ þæneǀ drihten ús.   1 Þ is ys se dæg þehineǀ drihten us.
   wisfæst worhte᛫ wera cneorissū.   wisfæǀst ge worhte wera cneorissum
   eallūǀ <u>eorð**warum**</u>᛫ eadigū tóblisse.   eallǀum <u>eorð**tudrum**</u>ǀ eadgum toblisse᛫

        The substitution **ChronC[1]** *-warum* **PPs** *-tudrum* has a limited effect on sense and

metre. In **PPs**, the first syllable of *-tudrum* is long, and the verse is Type D*1; in **ChronC[1]**,

the first syllable of *warum* is short, and the verse is Type D*2. As both words can be

translated approximately as 'inhabitants of earth', the substitution has no significant effect on

sense. The **PPs** form is a nonce occurrence.

---

[191] 1Tim 6:7.

[192] *King John* IV.ii.11. I am grateful to Pauline Thompson of the Dictionary of Old English for this and the preceding example.

[193] Mitchell, *OES*, §§ 2185 ff. and 2122 ff.

Addition/omission of Prefixes (1 example)

MPs (PPs/ChronC**¹** [*Men*]), 117:22.2a/61a

ChronC¹   **PPs**

þǣn dream gerist⁊
wel| wide gehwær⁊ swa se witega sang.
60 Þis is se dæg⁊   þæne| drihten ús.
wisfæst <u>worhte</u>⁊ wera cneorissū.
eallū| eorðwarum⁊ eadigū tóblisse.

1 Þ is ys se dæg þehine| drihten us.
wisfæ|st **ge** <u>worhte</u> wera cneorissum
eall|um eorðtudrum| eadgum toblisse⁊

The addition or omission of *ge-* has no significant effect on sense or syntax and a
minor effect on metre. In **ChronC¹**, *wisfæst worhte* is Type A-2a; in **PPs**, the equivalent verse
is Type A*. *Gewyrcan* (as in **PPs**) and *wyrcan* (as in **ChronC¹**) are synonyms.