

## Chapter 4

# Anthologised and Excerpted Poems

*Exeter Riddle 30a/b; Exeter Riddle 35/The Leiden Riddle; Solomon and Saturn; Dream of the Rood/Ruthwell Cross Inscription; Soul and Body I and II; Daniel and Azarias*

The poems we have discussed thus far have all had two things in common. In the first place, all have belonged to what Elliott Van Kirk Dobbie has called the “Anglo-Saxon Minor Poems,” a group of verse texts “most of them short, which are scattered here and there in manuscripts not primarily devoted to Anglo-Saxon poetry.”<sup>475</sup> Although they make up the greater part of the corpus of multiply attested Old English verse, these poems are a decided minority in the corpus of Old English poetry as a whole, the greatest part of which survives in unique copies in one or another of four principal anthologies: the Exeter Book, Junius Manuscript, Vercelli Book, and *Beowulf* Manuscript.

The second thing these poems have had in common has been that their variation, with one or two exceptions, has been relatively insignificant in both type and amount. In some cases, most notably those of the Metrical Epilogue to the *Pastoral Care* and the marginal recensions of “Cædmon’s Hymn,” the surviving witnesses have shown little or no substantive variation whatsoever. In others, the variation, while more frequent, has been of relatively limited effect, restricted to the occasional graphic error, addition or omission of semantically or syntactically superfluous forms, and the addition, omission or substitution of synonyms, homographs and syntactically equivalent inflectional endings. Even at its most profligate, as

---

<sup>475</sup>Dobbie, “Preface,” *ASPR* 6, p. v. While not all the poems discussed in Chapters 2 and 3 are found in this volume of the *ASPR*, all fit the definition. The metrical portions of the Paris Psalter are edited in *ASPR* 5: *The Paris Psalter and the Metres of Boethius*.

in certain witnesses to the *eorðan*-recension of “Cædmon’s Hymn” and the early *Chronicle* poems, the variation these texts have exhibited almost never has been such as to suggest the existence of a coherent scribal interpretation. While a few of the variants we have seen have had important implications for our understanding of the passages in which they occur, only two – both involving relatively insignificant changes in the endings of adjective and noun pairs<sup>476</sup> – have required the scribe to make semantically, syntactically, or metrically coordinated changes to more than one element in his text. Thus, the addition or omission of *we* in the first line of the West-Saxon *eorðan*-recension of “Cædmon’s Hymn,” while it exerts a fundamental influence on our interpretation of the syntax of the poem’s opening lines, nevertheless requires the scribes responsible for copying the text to do no more than add or omit a single unstressed element in the first half-line. The remaining “differences” all involve the interpretation of grammatically ambiguous but graphically identical forms found in all versions of the text<sup>477</sup>:

**T<sub>1</sub>**

1 Nu sculon herigean heofon|rices weard  
meotudes meahte ȝhis modgeþanc  
weorc| wuldor fæder

Now the works of the Wonder-Father must  
praise the Guardian of Heaven, the strength of  
the Creator and his thought.

**B<sub>1</sub>**

1 Nuweherigan sculon| heofonrices weard  
metodes mihte| ȝhismod geþanc  
weorc wuldor godes|

Now we must praise the Guardian of  
Heaven, the might of the Creator and his  
thought, the work of the Wonder-God

In contrast, the poems to be discussed in this chapter – Exeter Riddle 30 a and b, Exeter Riddle 35 and the Leiden Riddle, the *Dream of the Rood* and the Ruthwell Cross Inscription, *Solomon and Saturn* I a and b, *Soul and Body* I and II, and the common text of *Daniel* and *Azarias* – share neither of these principal characteristics. Like the majority of Old English poems, these texts are all found with at least one witness in an anthology or

<sup>476</sup>These variants are discussed above, Chapter 2, p. 66, and Chapter 3, p. 161.

<sup>477</sup>This variant is discussed above, Chapter 3, p. 133.

compilation: the Exeter Book in the case of Riddle 30a and b, Riddle 35, *Soul and Body* I and *Azarias*; the Vercelli Book in that of *Soul and Body* II and the *Dream of the Rood*; the Junius Manuscript in the case of *Daniel*; and, in the case of *Solomon and Saturn* I, a now fragmentary collection of verse and prose dialogues between the two main characters, Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 422. Moreover, all six poems show a substantive textual variation that is both more frequent and more significant than that found among the witnesses to the minor poems. With forty-three substantive variants in 127 copied lines in two witnesses,<sup>478</sup> for example, the least variable of these “Anthologised and Excerpted” texts, *Solomon and Saturn* I, varies approximately 7% more frequently than the most variable of the minor poems, the West-Saxon *eorðan*-recension of “Cædmon’s Hymn” (fifteen variants in 54 copied lines in six witnesses). In addition, the Anthologised and Excerpted texts also exhibit a variation that is more significant than and often of a type rarely if ever found in the minor poems: syntactically significant differences of inflection, substitutions of graphically and lexically dissimilar words and elements, variation in word order, and variants involving the addition, omission, substitution, or rearrangement of entire lines and half-lines.<sup>479</sup>

Above all, however, the Anthologised and Excerpted poems differ from the minor poems in the extent to which the variation they exhibit reflects a decided interpretation of the text being transmitted. In some cases, this involves the consistent choice of key words or

---

<sup>478</sup>The term “copied lines” is used here and elsewhere to refer to the total number of metrical lines copied by the scribes of all surviving witnesses. A six-line poem copied in three manuscripts, therefore, would have eighteen copied lines. An odd number of copied lines indicates that one or more lines is not reproduced in one or another witness.

<sup>479</sup>The differences can also involve relatively insignificant variation as well. For example, all Anthologised and Excerpted poems except the *Dream of the Rood*/Ruthwell Cross Inscription exhibit variants in which a prepositional phrase in one witness is replaced by a bare case ending in the other. These rarely have any significant effect on sense or syntax, but are found only twice in the minor poems discussed above: Ps 89:18.1a, “Gloria I,” 23b. See above, Chapter 2, pp. 62 and 69.

syntactical forms.<sup>480</sup> In others, it involves the adaptation of the text to its surrounding material or physical context.<sup>481</sup> Its most obvious manifestation, however, is to be seen in the greater frequency and significance of grammatically, syntactically, or metrically coordinated (“linked”) variants. All Anthologised and Excerpted texts with the exception of Exeter Riddle 30a/b and the common text of the *Dream of the Rood*/Ruthwell Cross Inscription exhibit such linked variants, many of which involve changes to such interpretively important features as number, person, tense or mood.

This can be best illustrated by an example. The following passage from the common text of *Daniel* and *Azarias* comes from the beginning of Azarias’s prayer to God from Nebuchadnezzar’s furnace. While the two versions are almost identical in their vocabulary and syntactic structure, a series of linked changes in tense, number, person, and the relationship between the component clauses (underlined and in bold face) gives the speech a very different character in each witness:

***Azarias* (Exeter Book [E])**

wepæs lifgende  
 worhton inwo|rulde eacþon wom dydon.  
 ylðran usse inofer hygdū|  
 þinbibodu bræcon burg sit tende  
 20 had ofer hogedon| halgan lifes  
wurdon weto wrecene geond widne grund|  
 heapum to<sup>h</sup>worfne hylða lease  
wæs ure lif geond lon|ða fela  
 fracuð ȝgefræge fold buendū  
 25 nubu usic be|wræce inþas wyrrestan  
 eorð cyninges æht gewealda  
 in| hæft heoro grimmes sceolon weþær hæþenra  
 þrea nyd || [strip of c. 4 ll. missing from MS]

***Daniel* (Junius Manuscript [J])**

295 weðæs lifgende.  
 worhton onworulde.| eac ðon wóm dyde.  
 user ylðran. for ofer|hygdum.  
 bræcon bebodo. burhsittendū|  
 had ofer hogedon. halgan lifes.  
 300 siendonwe|| towrecene. geond widne grund.  
 heapum tohwor|fene. hylde lease.  
is user lif. geond landafela.|  
 fracuð ȝgefræge. folca manegum.  
baus éc| bewræcon. toþæs wyrrestan.  
 305 eorð cyninga.| æhta gewealde.  
 onhæft heoru grimra ȝwe| nu hæðenra.  
 þeow ned þoliað.

<sup>480</sup>For examples see R. T. Farrell, ed., *Daniel and Azarias* (London: Methuen, 1974), pp. 34-36; Douglas Moffat, ed. and trans., *The Old English Soul and Body* (Wolfeboro NH: D.S. Brewer - Boydell & Brewer, 1990), p. 78, note to lines 95-97a.

<sup>481</sup>See below, pp. 241-244.

We, living in the world, brought this about. Our forefathers, city-dwellers, also broke your commands in pride, despised the calling of a holy life. We were exiled throughout the wide earth, scattered in flocks, lacking protection. In many lands our way of life was held in contempt and notoriety by many peoples. Now you have exiled us into the power of this most terrible earth-king, into the bondage of the savage one, where we must... oppression of heathens...

We, living in the world, brought this about. Our forefathers also broke the commands for the city dwellers on account of pride, despised the calling of a holy life. We are exiled throughout the wide earth, scattered in flocks, lacking protection. In many lands our way of life is held in contempt and notoriety by many peoples who have exiled us as chattels into the power of this most terrible of earth-kings, into the bondage of savages, and now we endure slavery of heathens.

In the passage from *Daniel* (**J**), Azarias is speaking as a representative of the Jewish people. His use of the present tense for the verbs in lines 300a and 302a (*siendon* and *is*) indicates that he sees the Babylonian exile as his principal problem. In lines 304-307, this emphasis on the oppression of his people is maintained by the use of the plural *bewraecon* (line 304a), the genitive plural adjective *heoru grimra* (306a), and the presentation of lines 304-306a as an adjective clause modifying *folca manegum* (303b). In this version of the text, Azarias petitions God for help in Nebuchadnezzar's furnace by reminding him of the 'slavery' (*beow ned*, 307a) of his people as a whole under the rule of that 'most terrible of earthly kings' and his 'savage' henchmen.

In the equivalent passage from *Azarias* (**E**), however, Azarias's petition is more directly concerned with his personal predicament in the furnace. With his use of the preterite for the verbs of lines 21a and 23a (*wurdon* and *wæs*) Azarias speaks in this version of the Diaspora as an accomplished historical fact. With the introduction of *nu*, *þu* and the second person singular *be/wræce* in line 25a, he turns to consider his own situation. With the singular adjective *heoro grimmes* (line 27a), he indicates that the 'oppression' (*brea nyd*, line 28a) he is suffering comes from the hands of a single 'savage' and 'most terrible earthly king'; his use of *nu*, *þu*, and *be/wræce* suggests that he sees this oppression as the almost syllogistic development of God's punishment of the disobedience of his forefathers. In this version of the

poem, Azarias's petition is as an individual who is being punished for the sins of previous generations.

As we shall see in the following pages, the distinctive nature of both the context in which the Anthologised and Excerpted poems were transmitted and the variation they exhibit suggest that they were transmitted to yet a third standard of accuracy, one in which the persons responsible for selecting and transmitting the texts took an active role in shaping and adapting their contents. Where the minor poems were found in primarily functional contexts – as glosses and translations, constituents of vernacular prose works, or occasional pieces preserved in otherwise non-poetic contexts – the Anthologised and Excerpted poems generally are found in unique, more-or-less thematically organised manuscripts or monuments. Where the minor poems showed a textual variation that was both relatively infrequent and of generally limited significance, the witnesses to the Anthologised and Excerpted texts show a variation that is both more frequent and suggests the relatively intelligent involvement of the persons responsible for giving them their current form. While the variants they exhibit are not always of equal poetic value, or even always equally metrical or sensible, the frequency with which these variants occur and the extent to which they reflect a coherent interpretation of the text or passage in which they are found suggest that they are part of a relatively deliberate pattern of textual adaptation and revision. In collecting, excerpting and transmitting the Anthologised and Excerpted poems, the persons responsible for the surviving witnesses show themselves to have been willing participants in the poetic process. Today we would describe them as poets.

The only other scholar to recognise the existence of a systematic distinction in the amount and nature of the textual variation shown by different types of multiply attested poems is Alan Albert Jabbour. Writing in an undeservedly ignored 1969 Duke dissertation and

summarising his results in a slightly better known article from the *Chaucer Review*,<sup>482</sup> Jabbour used differences similar to those discussed above in the type and amount of the textual variation exhibited by the multiply attested poems to divide the corpus into two main groups: a “control” group consisting of poems which he believed “can be said with certainty to be scribally transmitted,”<sup>483</sup> and a second group – the definition of which formed the focus of his dissertation – of which the substantive variation contrasted “so strikingly with the variants of the control group, both in frequency and in type, that memorial transmission at some stage of the line of descent seems the best explanation.”<sup>484</sup> To his “control” group belonged all the poems discussed in Chapters Two and Three with the exception of certain witnesses to the *eorðan*-recension of “Cædmon’s Hymn”; to his memorial group belonged *Soul and Body I and II*, the common text of *Daniel* and *Azarias*, and, less certainly, the *Dream of the Rood*/Ruthwell Cross Inscription, Exeter Riddle 30a/b, Exeter Riddle 35/the Leiden Riddle, and a number of other, metrically irregular, poems not discussed in this study.<sup>485</sup> *Solomon and Saturn*, which varies less frequently than the members of Jabbour’s core “memorial texts” but more frequently and significantly than those of his “control” group, remained unclassified.<sup>486</sup>

With the exception of “Cædmon’s Hymn,” Jabbour’s “control” and “memorial” groups correspond almost exactly with the division between “minor” and “Anthologised and Excerpted” poems proposed above. But while the final division is similar, Jabbour’s attempt to establish a direct relationship between the amount and type of variation a given poem

---

<sup>482</sup> Alan Albert Jabbour, “The Memorial Transmission of Old English Poetry: A Study of the Extant Parallel Texts,” diss., Duke U, 1969; “Memorial Transmission in Old English Poetry,” *ChR* 3 (1969): 174-90. As far as I am aware, Peter Baker is the only person to cite Jabbour’s dissertation directly (“A Little Known Variant Text of the Old English Metrical Psalter,” *Speculum* 59 [1984]: 263-81).

<sup>483</sup> Jabbour, diss., p. 51.

<sup>484</sup> Jabbour, diss., p. iv.

<sup>485</sup> Jabbour, diss., p. 12.

<sup>486</sup> Jabbour, diss., p. 184.

exhibits and the technical means by which it is assumed to have been transmitted gives a misleading picture of the nature of the differences between his two groups of poems. Not all the poems Jabbour suggests can be said “with certainty” to be scribally transmitted are found in unambiguously scribal contexts. Indeed, many of the most accurate members of his “control group” are found in contexts which, were it not for their lack of substantive variation, would almost certainly lead to their being classified as “memorial”. As Katherine O’Brien O’Keeffe has pointed out, for example, most witnesses to the marginal West-Saxon *ylda*-recension of “Cædmon’s Hymn” appear to have been transmitted independently of the Latin texts they gloss. While the six witnesses to this text are all found in a similar context as a gloss to the Latin version of Bede’s *Historia ecclesiastica*, and, with one variant in fifty-four copied lines, exhibit an extremely low level of substantive textual variation, the manuscripts in which they are found all belong to different branches of the main Latin text, and, in five out of the six cases, were copied by scribes working at least a quarter century before the Old English text was added.<sup>487</sup>

Likewise, some of the witnesses to Jabbour’s “memorial” group show the type of minor graphic errors and unusual forms most characteristic of scribal transmission. In most cases, these are less evidence of a common textual origin for the surviving witnesses than evidence that the surviving manuscripts are not themselves direct transcriptions of memorial performances. Three of the six texts, however, show what appear to be *common* errors or difficulties in their witnesses – suggesting the existence of a closer scribal relationship than the extensiveness of their variation might otherwise indicate. For two of these three poems, the common difficulties are restricted to a single example: the unusual non-West-Saxon spelling

---

<sup>487</sup>O’Keeffe, *Visible Song*, pp. 35-36.



*onhæbbe* (for expected West-Saxon *onhebbe*) in the case of Riddle 30, line 7a,<sup>488</sup> and the nonsense words *dream* and *dry* (for expected *dreor*) in that of *Solomon and Saturn*, line 44a.<sup>489</sup> For the third, *Soul and Body* I and II, however, the evidence is more plentiful. As P. R. Orton and Douglas Moffat have argued,<sup>490</sup> the witnesses to this poem exhibit many common errors, unusual forms and metrically suspicious lines, including the nonsensical forms *drugu* and *druh* for the expected *druge* in line 17a<sup>491</sup>; an unusual example of an apparently unstressed *eft* before the alliterating syllable in line 62b (Exeter Book [E]) and 67b (Vercelli Book [V]): E *ʒeft sona fromðe* V *ʒeft sona fram þe*<sup>492</sup>; and a probably common substitution of *acen(ne)da* ‘the begotten one’ for *ancen(ne)da* ‘the only begotten one’ in E 48a/V 51a.<sup>493</sup>

A second more important problem with Jabbour’s argument, however, is theoretical: in attempting to associate the amount and nature of the textual variation his “memorial” and “control” groups exhibit with the technical means by which they are supposed to have been transmitted, Jabbour implicitly assumes that Anglo-Saxon scribes invariably were interested in the accurate reproduction of their exemplars. In Jabbour’s terms, an accurate text is a scribal text, and a memorial text innovative. As we have seen in Chapters Two and Three, however, this is a dubious assumption. While the lack of substantive variation exhibited by the witnesses to some of the minor poems suggests that some scribes were indeed interested in

<sup>488</sup>Roy Michael Liuzza, “The Texts of the OE Riddle 30,” *JEGP* 87 (1984): 1-15, esp. p. 3.

<sup>489</sup>Robert J. Menner, ed., *The Poetical Dialogues of Solomon and Saturn*, Monograph Series 13 (New York: MLA, 1941), p. 3. As Menner notes, “the evidence of the spelling appears to confirm the view that neither manuscript was copied from the original.”

<sup>490</sup>P. R. Orton, “The Old English *Soul and Body*: A Further Examination,” *MÆ* 48 (1979): 173-97; Douglas Moffat, “The MS Transmission of the OE *Soul and Body*,” *MÆ* 52 (1983): 300-302; *Soul and Body*, pp. 8-9; also: Moffat, “A Case of Scribal Revision in the OE *Soul and Body*,” *JEGP* 86 (1987): 1-8.

<sup>491</sup>Kenneth Sisam, “The Authority of Old English Poetical Manuscripts,” *Studies in the History of Old English Literature* (Oxford: OUP - Clarendon, 1953): 29-44, at p. 34; also Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 67. Attempts to read the forms as a corruption of an otherwise unattested noun meaning ‘dust’ are unlikely in the face of a parallel passage from *Genesis A* 888a, *Hwæt druge þu, dohtor*. See Krapp, *ASPR* 2, p. 126.

<sup>492</sup>Orton, “A Further Examination,” pp. 177-8.

producing substantively accurate copies of their exemplars, highly innovative but undoubtedly scribal versions of poems like the Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 41 (**B**<sub>1</sub>) witness to the West-Saxon *eorðan*-recension of “Cædmon’s Hymn”<sup>494</sup> and the London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. vi (**ChronB**) versions of the *Battle of Brunanburh* and *Capture of the Five Boroughs*,<sup>495</sup> demonstrate that other scribes were willing to introduce much greater substantive variation.

It is here, however, that the nature of the contexts in which the members of Jabbour’s “memorial” and my “Anthologised and Excerpted” poems are found becomes so important. For not only do these poems exhibit distinctive amounts and types of substantive variation, they are also found in equally distinctive material contexts – contexts which suggest that literal accuracy was less important to the persons responsible for transmitting these poems than contextual appropriateness. Just as the relative lack of substantive textual variation found between the witnesses to the translating and occasional poems discussed in Chapter Two could be explained by an appeal to the functional nature of the contexts in which those poems were found; and just as the nature of the textual variation found between the witnesses to the Fixed Context poems discussed in Chapter Three could be tied to the nature of the scribe’s performance in the prose framing texts with which those poems were copied; so too the frequent and often highly significant variation exhibited by the witnesses to the Anthologised and Excerpted texts can be explained by an appeal to the highly individual nature of the contexts in which these poems are found. If the variation among the witnesses to the minor

---

<sup>493</sup>Moffat, “MS Transmission”, pp. 300-301. As Moffat points out, **E** is later corrected to *a,cenda*.

<sup>494</sup>Jabbour tentatively includes the **B**<sub>1</sub> text of “Cædmon’s Hymn” with the memorial poems, apparently under the impression that the poem appears in the manuscript’s margins (diss., pp. 199-200). In fact, the **B**<sub>1</sub> recension of Hymn is part of the main-text of this manuscript – a copy of the Old English translation of the *Historia* – and is certainly copied from a written exemplar. See also Chapter 3, pp. 116 ff. above.

<sup>495</sup>See above, Chapter 3, pp. 150 ff., 187-201.

poems discussed in Chapters Two and Three can be described as being primarily a technical problem, among the Anthologised and Excerpted poems, this variation becomes a poetical art.

The strongest evidence to suggest that the persons responsible for transmitting the Anthologised and Excerpted poems were interested in more than the mere reproduction of the text at hand is to be seen in the extent to which the contexts in which these poems are found imply their active and intelligent selection. For the scribes of the minor poems discussed above, the “decision” to copy a given text in a given context is invariably impersonal: they copy it because they find it useful, have space for it, or find it already present in their exemplar. The fact that all six twelfth-century and earlier copies of the West-Saxon *ylda*-recension of “Cædmon’s Hymn” are found in the margins of manuscripts of Bede’s Latin *Historia*, for example, simply tells us that the scribes responsible for copying them all recognised the appropriateness of the poem as a gloss to Bede’s Latin paraphrase. Similarly, the presence of copies of “Prayer” in a blank space in the Lambeth Psalter (**LPs**) and as part of a collection of miscellaneous notes in Cotton Julius A. ii (**Jul<sub>aii</sub>**) tells us little more than that the scribes responsible saw these manuscripts as handy places for recording their common text. In the case of the Fixed Context poems discussed in Chapter Three, the “decision” to copy a given poem is even more limited. While it appears that the scribes of these poems may occasionally have been willing to omit or substitute prose summaries for verse texts originally found in their exemplars – an explanation which presumably accounts for the omission of all four of the metrically regular poems from London, British Library, Laud Misc. 636 (**ChronE**) and the omission of the *Coronation of Edgar* and *Death of Edgar* from London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. iv (**ChronD**)<sup>496</sup> – there are no examples of these scribes taking any

<sup>496</sup>For a discussion of the omission of these poems from these witnesses to the *Chronicle*, see Dobbie, *ASPR* 6, p. xxxvi; also Dorothy Whitelock, ed., *English Historical Documents: c.500-1042* (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1955), pp. xii-xiv.

more decisive action with these poems, extracting them for inclusion in another collection, for example, or replacing the poem in their exemplars with a different text on a similar subject. Indeed, the closest we get to exceptions to this help prove the rule. While the scribe of the West-Saxon *eorðan*-text of “Cædmon’s Hymn” in Tournai, Bibliothèque de la Ville, 134 (To) is unique among his colleagues in that he copies the poem outside of its usual position in the main text of the Old English translation of Bede’s *Historia ecclesiastica*, his ‘innovation’ involves nothing more than moving the poem to the margins of a Latin version of Bede’s text<sup>497</sup> – an already well-established context for copies of the vernacular Hymn. Likewise, while the scribe of the *eorðan*-recension “Cædmon’s Hymn” in Oxford, Corpus Christi College, 279 (O) appears to have tried to rewrite his text so as to make it more like the marginal *ylda*-recension, he does so only by correction and after first copying a relatively conservative version of the text found in his exemplar.<sup>498</sup>

In contrast, the Anthologised and Excerpted poems are all found in contexts which invariably suggest the more intelligent involvement of the persons responsible for their selection and transmission. The person who first thought of including the *Dream of the Rood* among the poetry and homilies now making up the Vercelli Book,<sup>499</sup> for example, was clearly responding to different elements of the poem than the rune master who decided to carve an excerpt from it along the edges of the Ruthwell Cross. Likewise, where the scribe responsible for copying the marginal version of the first ninety lines of *Solomon and Saturn I* in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 41 emphasises the poem’s depiction of the magical nature

---

<sup>497</sup>See above, Chapter 3, pp. 112 ff.

<sup>498</sup>See above, Chapter 3, pp. 115 ff.

<sup>499</sup>It is unimportant whether this was the Vercelli scribe himself or that of some earlier collection used by the scribe of the surviving manuscript. See below, pp. 287-291.

of the letters of the *Pater noster* by placing it among his collection of charms and loricis,<sup>500</sup> the scribe who copied the complete text of the poem as the first of the prose and verse dialogues between the two characters collected in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 422 appears to have been attracted to the text on primarily generic grounds.<sup>501</sup>

In addition, the persons responsible for collecting and transmitting the Anthologised and Excerpted poems show themselves to have been willing to adapt, extend, or excerpt their texts as necessary to fit the contexts in which they were to appear. With the exception of “Prayer” and the metrical translation of the Psalms, all the poems discussed in Chapters Two and Three were transmitted as complete, discrete, texts. The Metrical Psalms, like the Latin text they translate, appear to have been copied on a verse-by-verse basis as required by the context in which they are found.<sup>502</sup> The shorter text of “Prayer,” which ends after only 15 lines, may be the result of a defective exemplar or manuscript, or simply lack of space.<sup>503</sup> In contrast, the majority of the Anthologised and Excerpted poems have been excerpted from, inserted into, or joined with other prose or verse works in at least one of their witnesses. As mentioned above, the *Dream of the Rood* appears in its long form as a dream-vision copied among the poems and homilies of the Vercelli Book. In its shorter form, it appears as a greatly abridged inscription on the Ruthwell Cross. *Solomon and Saturn* I appears in one witness combined with other dialogues between the two wise men, and in the other as a fragment collected among other charms and loricis. The common text of *Daniel* and *Azarias* is found

---

<sup>500</sup>Raymond J. S. Grant, *Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 41: The Loricis and the Missal*, Costerus: Essays in English and American Language and Literature, n.s. 17 (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1978), p. 26. Marie Nelson, “King Solomon’s Magic: The Power of a Written Text,” *Oral Tradition* 5 (1990): 20-36.

<sup>501</sup>For a discussion of the “Legend of Solomon” in medieval literature, see Menner, *Solomon and Saturn*, pp. 21-70.

<sup>502</sup>See the discussions above, Chapter 2, pp. 32 ff., 48 ff. 53 ff., and 56 ff.

<sup>503</sup>See above, Chapter 2, pp. 72 ff.

as an integral part of two otherwise apparently unrelated biblical narratives.<sup>504</sup> The text of *Soul and Body* appears in the Exeter Book as an apparently complete poem, and in the Vercelli Book as the first part of what seems to have been intended as a two-part dialogue between the Soul and the Blessed and Damned Bodies.<sup>505</sup>

Above all, however, the variation these poems exhibit often can be tied to differences in the contexts in which their witnesses are found. Where the substantive variation exhibited by the minor poems rarely lent itself to any explanation other than the incompetence, misapprehension, or personal preference of the scribe responsible for its introduction, the substantive variation exhibited by the witnesses to the Anthologised and Excerpted poems often can be shown to be related to differences in the contextual circumstances in which each copy is found. At first glance, for example, the textual variation between Exeter Riddle 35 (**E**) and the Leiden Riddle (**Leid**) seems fairly similar to that found between the Northumbrian *aeldu*-recension of “Cædmon’s Hymn” in Cambridge, University Library, Kk. 5. 16 (**M**) and the most innovative version of the West-Saxon *eorðan*-recension in the main text of Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 41 (**B<sub>1</sub>**). Both sets of witnesses are separated by similar differences in geography, dialect and codicological position, and both sets of witnesses exhibit a relatively large number of substantive variants. Like the **M** text of “Cædmon’s Hymn,” the **Leid** text of Riddle 35 is Northumbrian, early, and found on the last page of a Latin manuscript containing the text it translates. Like the **B<sub>1</sub>** version of “Cædmon’s Hymn,” the **E** text of Riddle 35 is late West-Saxon and part of the main text of a vernacular manuscript.<sup>506</sup>

---

<sup>504</sup>See below, pp. 359-362.

<sup>505</sup>Moffat, *Soul and Body*, pp. 41-44; Orton, “Disunity in the Vercelli Book *Soul and Body*,” *Neoph* 63 (1979): 42-44.

<sup>506</sup>For a discussion of the contexts in which these texts are found, see above, pp. 49-52, 116-120, and below pp. 255-257.

Despite these similarities, however, the two poems show vastly different patterns of textual variation. Leaving aside accidental differences of dialect and orthography, the **M** and **B<sub>1</sub>** versions of “Cædmon’s Hymn” exhibit ten significant substantive variants<sup>507</sup>:

**M**

Nu scylun hergēn hefaen ricaes uard  
metudæs maecti end his modgidanc  
uercuuldur fadur| sue he uundragihuaes  
eci dryctin orastelidæ  
5 heaerist scop aeldabarnū  
heben til hrofe| halegscepen.  
thammiddungeard\_\_\_moncynnæs uard  
ecidryctin æfter tiadæ  
firum fold^\_\_\_frea allmectig|

Now the works of the Wonder-Father must praise the Guardian of Heaven, the strength of the Creator and his thought, as he, the Eternal Lord, appointed the beginning of each of wondrous things: he, the Holy Creator, first created heaven as a roof for the children of men; he, the Guardian of Mankind, the Eternal Lord, the Almighty Ruler, then afterwards fashioned the middle earth, the world, for men.

**B<sub>1</sub>**

Nu weherigan sculon heofonrices weard  
metodes mihte| ʒhismod geþanc  
weorc wuldor godes| swahe wund ra fela  
écedrihten ord| astealde  
5 he ærest sceop eorðan bear|num  
heofon tohrofe halig scvp|pend  
þemiddan gearð mann cynnes| weard  
écedrihten æfter teode|  
fyrum foldan frea ælmihtig.

Now we must praise the Guardian of Heaven, the might of the Creator and his thought, the work of the Wonder-God, as he, the Eternal Lord, appointed the beginning, many of wondrous things: he, the Holy Creator, first created heaven as a roof for the children of the earth; he who, the Guardian of Mankind, the Eternal Lord, the Almighty Ruler, then afterwards fashioned the middle earth, the world, for men.

The **E** and **Leid** versions of Riddle 35, on the other hand, exhibit sixteen substantive variants, including a number of types rarely found outside of the Anthologised and Excerpted poems<sup>508</sup>:

**Leid**

Mec seueta[.] uong uundrumfreorig  
obhis innaðae| \aerist ce[nd]/<sup>509</sup>  
Uuat icmecbiuorthæ uullanfliusū  
herū.ðerh hehcraeft hygiðon\c[...]/|  
5 Uundnae. menibiaðueflæ niic uar phafae\_\_\_  
\_niðerih ðrea[.]ungiðrae.| ðr&me hlimmith.  
Nemehrutendo \_\_\_hrisil scelfath\_\_\_  
\_ne mec ouana| aam sceal cnyssa  
Uyrmas mec niauefun uyrdicraeftum|  
10 ðaði goelu godueb\_\_\_geatūfraetuath.|  
Uilmechuc<sup>h</sup>trae suaeðeh\_\_\_uidæ ofaer eorðu\_  
\_hatan mith| \heliðum hyhtlicgiuæ/<sup>510</sup>  
Nian oegun icme aerig faerae egsanbrogū  
ðehði ni||...n sip nliudlicae obcocrum|||

**E**

M ec se wæta wong wundrum freorig  
ofhis innaþe ær|ist cende  
ne wat ic mec be worhtne wulle flysum  
hæ|rum þurh heah cræft hyge þoncum min.  
5 wundene me| ne beoð wefle neic wearp hafu  
neþurh þreata geþræ|cu bræd mene hlimmeð  
ne æt me hrutende hrisil| scribeð  
nemec o hwonan sceal amas cnyssan  
wyr|mas mecne á wæfan. wyrda cræftum  
10 þape geolo god|webb geatwum frætwað  
wile mec mon hwæpre seþeah| wide ofer eorþan  
hatan forhæleþū hyht lic gewæde.|  
saga soð cwidum searo þoncum gleaw  
wordum wis||fæst hwæt þis ge wædu sv :7

<sup>507</sup> A discussion of the variation within each of these recensions is found above, pp. 52 (*aeldu*-recension) and 129-134 (*eorðan*-recension).

<sup>508</sup> These variants are catalogued below, pp. 257-264.

<sup>509</sup> **Leid** *aerist ce[nd]* is written above the first manuscript line over *innaðae*.

Me the moist earth amazingly chill first brought forth from its interior. I know myself, in [my] mind's deliberations, to be made with the fleeces of wool, by outstanding craftsmanship, with hairs. There are not woofs woven about me; nor do I have warps; nor does the weight thrum for me through strain of pressure<sup>511</sup> upon it; nor do the resounding shuttles shake me; nor does the loom-sley have to thump me anywhere. Those worms which decoratively embroider the yellow silk did not spin me with the skills of Fate. Yet even so, [one] is pleased along with heroes from wide across the earth to call me a confidence-inspiring garment. I do not dread the flight of arrows, in the terror of peril, though it [i.e. an arrow] be [taken] eagerly from the quiver.

Me the moist earth amazingly chill first brought forth from its interior. I know myself, in my mind's deliberations, not to be made with the fleeces of wool, not, by outstanding craftsmanship, with hairs. There are not woofs woven about me; nor do I have warps; nor does the thread thrum for me through the strain of the pressures upon it; nor does the resounding shuttle slide towards me; nor †does loom-sleys†<sup>512</sup> have to thump me anywhere. Those worms which decoratively embroider the yellow silk did not spin me with the skills of the Fates. Yet even so, one is pleased to call me a confidence-inspiring garment far and wide over the earth in the presence of heroes.

Say in true words, man clever in cunning, wise in words, what this garment may be

What is significant for our purposes, however, is the relationship between these variants and the contexts in which the different witnesses to each poem are found. In the case of the two versions of “Cædmon’s Hymn,” there is no obvious relationship at all. Other than dialect, there is nothing in the Northumbrian *aeldu*-text of the Hymn which might prevent it from being used in the Old English translation of Bede’s *Historia*; and there is nothing in the **B**<sub>1</sub> version of the West-Saxon *eorðan*-text of the Hymn which might make it unsuitable as a gloss to Bede’s paraphrase of the poem in manuscripts of the Latin *Historia* – as the use of a closely related version of the Hymn in just such a position in **To** demonstrates.<sup>513</sup>

The same kind of interchangeability is not found, however, between the two witnesses to Riddle 35. While the majority of the substantive variants separating the two copies are either errors or appropriate to either context, the variant readings in the poem’s final two lines are closely tied to contextual differences between the two manuscripts. As one might expect of a poem found in its position, the last two lines of the **Leid** version of Riddle 35 (*Nian oegun icme aerig faerae egsanbrogū ðehði ni/[...n sip ni]udlicae obcocrum* ‘I do not dread the

<sup>510</sup>**Leid** *hēliðum hyhtlicgiuæ* is written above the line, after *geatūfraetuath*.

<sup>511</sup>The sense of **Leid** *ðrea[.]un* is obscure. See below, p. 258.

<sup>512</sup>The problem of agreement in **E** 8b is discussed below, p. 259.

<sup>513</sup>The placement of the Hymn in this manuscript is discussed above, Chapter 3, pp. 112 ff.



flight of arrows, in the terror of peril, though it [i.e. an arrow] be [taken] eagerly from the quiver’) are a relatively close translation of the final line of Aldhelm’s original *De lorica* riddle (*Spicula non vereor longis exempta faretris* ‘I do not fear darts drawn from long quivers’). In **E**, these last two lines have been replaced with a common riddling formula: *saga soð cwidum searo þoncum gleaw /wordum wis||fæst hwæt þis ge wædu sy* ‘say in true words, man clever in cunning, wise in words, what this garment may be’.<sup>514</sup>

In competent hands, contextually driven variation like that found between the two versions of Riddle 35 can result in the production of completely new poetic texts. In addition to being much shorter than the Vercelli text of the *Dream of the Rood* (**V**), for example, the Ruthwell Cross Inscription (**R**) is also a very different poem, constructed on different principles and with a markedly different interest in the Crucifixion. In selecting the text for his cross,<sup>515</sup> the Ruthwell rune master not surprisingly concentrates on those elements of the *Dream of the Rood* which emphasise the immediate drama and visual power of the Crucifixion, eliminating all traces of the Vercelli dreamer and his vision in the process. In Section 2, this involves the removal of lines from the middle of the Vercelli version of the common text, in which the Cross refers the dreamer to his still visible wounds:

---

<sup>514</sup>See below, p. 262.

<sup>515</sup>The discussion that follows assumes that the Ruthwell rune master was excerpting a longer poem – presumably one which looked like that in the Vercelli Book – rather than the other way round. That this was the case is suggested by the fact that Section 3 of the Ruthwell Cross Inscription begins with an off-verse. It is also possible, of course, that the person responsible for putting the Vercelli version in its current form expanded the poem from an original that looked something like the Ruthwell Inscription. In this case, characteristic features of the Vercelli version – such as the dream-vision, and the metaphor of Christ-as-hero are to be attributed to this scribe or performer. The difference has no effect on the argument presented here.

**R**

2.1 [āhōf] ic riicnae kyniNc  
 heafunæs h/afard hælde ic ni dorstæ.  
 Bismærædu uNket men bā ætgad[re] |  
 ic [wæs] miþ blōdæ [b]istēmi[d]  
 bi[goten of]

I [raised up] a powerful  
 King, Lord of the heavens. I dared not bend. Men  
 humiliated us both together, I [was] all soaked with  
 blood [issuing...]

**V**

Rod wæs icaræred. ahof ic ricne cyning  
 45 heofona| hlaford. hylðan me nedorste.  
**burh drifan hime mid| deorcan næglū.**  
**on me syndon þa dolg ge siene**  
**opene inwid|hlemmas.**  
**ne dorste ic hira nænigū sceððan**  
 bysmeredon hie| unc butu ætgædere.  
 eall ic wæs mid blode bestemed.  
 begoten of| þæs guman sidan.  
 siððan he hæfde his gast onsended.

I was reared up as a cross; I raised up a powerful  
 King, Lord of the heavens. I dared not bend myself  
 over. **They pierced me with dark nails: the**  
**wounds are visible upon me, gaping malicious**  
**gashes. I did not dare harm any of them.** They  
 humiliated us both together. I was all soaked with  
 blood issuing from the man's side after he had sent  
 forth his spirit.

Between Sections 2 and 3, the rune master likewise eliminates approximately six and a half lines recounting the moment of Christ's death.<sup>516</sup> While the image of the darkening clouds in these lines is both arresting and in keeping with the rune master's emphasis on the visual impact of the Crucifixion, the removal of these lines in which the Cross speaks in the first person both streamlines the Ruthwell narrative – in his version of the text, Christ ascends the cross in Section 1, is Crucified in Sections 2 and 3, and is buried in Section 4 – and keeps the reader's attention focused on the Crucifixion as an image throughout the middle section of the inscription. Where the Vercelli version of the lines is full of movement – Christ suffers, shadows go forth, creation weeps – in the Ruthwell Inscription, the Crucifixion is presented, appropriately enough, as an object which can be raised up (Section 2.1) and approached and worshipped by others (Section 3.2), but remains itself essentially passive:

<sup>516</sup>Michael Swanton reports a gap of approximately forty runes down the south east margin of the shaft (*The Dream of the Rood* [Manchester: Manchester UP, 1970]). This is approximately equivalent to two hypermetrical lines or four regular long lines. The "missing" text of 50-56a in the *Dream of the Rood* would require approximately 175 runes.

## R

2.1 [āhōf] ic riicnae kyniNc  
 heafunæs h/afard hælde ic ni dorstæ.  
 Bismærædu uNket men bā ætgad[re] |  
 ic [wæs] miþ blōdæ [b]jistēmi[d]  
 bi[goten of]

....

3.1 [+] krist wæs on rōdi  
 Hweþræ þēr fūsæ feorran kwōmu  
 æþþilæ til ānum ic þæt al bih[eald]  
 Sār[æ] ic wæs mi[b] sorgum gidræ[fi]d  
 h[n]ag [ic....]

2.1 I [raised up] a powerful  
 King, Lord of the heavens. I dared not bend. Men  
 humiliated us both together, I [was] all soaked with  
 blood [issuing...]

....

3.1 Christ was on the cross.  
 Yet the noble ones, eager, came together there from  
 afar, nobles together; all this I witnessed. I was  
 sorely oppressed with anxieties... [I] bowed...

## V

Rod wæs icaræred. ahof ic ricne cyning  
 45 heofona| hlaford. hylðan me nedorste.  
burh drifan hime mid| deorcan næglū.  
on me syndon þa dolg ge siene  
opene inwid|hlemmas.  
ne dorste ic hira nænigū sceððan  
 bysmeredon hie| unc butu ætgædere.  
 eall ic wæs mid blode bestemed.  
 begoten of| þæs guman sidan.  
 siððan he hæfde his gast onsended.  
 50 **Feala| ic onþam beorge gebiden hæbbe**  
**wraðra wyrða. ge seah ic weruda| god**  
**þearle þenian þvstro hæfdon**  
**be wrigen mid wolcnum wealdendes hræw.**  
**scirne sciman sceadu forð eode.**  
 55 **wann| under wolcnum weop ealge sceaft**  
**cwiðdon cyninges fyll|** crist was onrode  
 hwæðere þær fuse feorran cwoman  
 to| þam æðelinge icþæt eall be heold.  
 Sare ic wæs mid gedrefed|  
 hnag ic hwæðre þam secgū to handa  
 60 eað mod elne mycle|

I was reared up as a cross; I raised up a powerful  
 King, Lord of the heavens. I dared not bend myself  
 over. They pierced me with dark nails: the wounds  
are visible upon me, gaping malicious gashes. I did  
not dare harm any of them. They humiliated us both  
 together. I was all soaked with blood issuing from  
 the man's side after he had sent forth his spirit.  
**Many cruel happenings I have experienced on that**  
**hill. I saw the God of hosts violently racked.**  
**Darkness with its clouds had covered the corpse of**  
**the Ruler; a gloom, murky beneath the clouds,**  
**overwhelmed its pure splendor. All creation wept;**  
**they lamented the King's death:** Christ was on the  
 cross.

Yet the eager ones came there from afar to the  
 Prince: all this I witnessed. I was sorely oppressed  
 with anxieties; nonetheless I bowed to the hands of  
 those men, obedient with much fortitude.

It is in Section 1, however, that the context in which the *Dream of the Rood* is found  
 has its greatest effect on the contents of the poem itself. As John Pope suggests in the notes to  
 his student edition of the *Dream of the Rood*, lines 39-43 of the Vercelli Book version of the  
 poem serve to bring out “the heroic aspect of the action, an aspect which the [Vercelli] poet is

all along at pains to emphasise as proper to Christ in his divine nature.”<sup>517</sup> In this version of the poem, Christ is referred to as a *geong hæleð* and described as *strang ʒstið mod*; he ‘ascends’ the ‘high’ gallows and ‘wants’ to redeem man-kind. But while this emphasis on the heroic nature of Christ’s action is appropriate to and indeed an important part of the longer Vercelli text, a similar emphasis on Christ-as-hero in the limited space available to the Ruthwell rune master would distract the reader unnecessarily from the Cross and its role in the Crucifixion. In consequence, in carving the equivalent lines of the Ruthwell Inscription the rune master eliminates these references to the ‘heroic’ Christ in favour of a more straightforward description of him as ‘almighty god’:

**R**

1.1 [+ Ond]geredae hinae god almehttig  
                   þa he walde on galgu gistiga  
 [m]odig f[ore *allæ*] men  
                                   [B]ūg[a ic ni dorstæ...]

God almighty stripped himself, courageous before all men, when he wanted to climb upon the gallows; [I dared not] bow...

**V**

Ongyrede hine **þa geong hæleð**  
                   **þæt wæs** god| ælmihtig  
 40 **strang ʒstið mod.**  
                   **ge stah** he ongealgan **heanne|**  
 modig **onmanigra ge syhðe.**  
                   **þa he wolde man cyn lysan.**  
**bifode icþa me se beorn ymb clypte.**  
                   ne dorste ichwæðre| bugan to eorðan  
 feallan tofoldan sceatū.  
                   Ac ic sceolde fæste| standan.

**The young man, who was** almighty god, stripped himself, **strong and unflinching.** **He climbed** upon **the despised** gallows, courageous **under the scrutiny of many, since he wanted to redeem mankind.** **I quaked then, when the man embraced me;** nonetheless I did not dare to collapse to the ground and fall to the surfaces of the earth, but I had to stand fast

While Pope argues that the Ruthwell version of these lines is “inferior” to the equivalent section of the Vercelli poem, this is only true in the context of the dream-vision as a whole.<sup>518</sup>

Given the limited space and different context of a standing stone cross, the differences

<sup>517</sup>Pope, *Seven Old English Poems*, p. 66.

<sup>518</sup>Pope, *Seven Old English Poems*, p. 66.

between the Ruthwell and Vercelli versions of the poem are sooner evidence of a different than of an inferior vision.

Not all the significant variants which separate the witnesses to the Anthologised and Excerpted poems can be linked so directly to the contextual differences between them. As various critics have pointed out, many of the variants these poems exhibit seem aimless – or worse, sensically, syntactically, or metrically suspect.<sup>519</sup> Thus while the omission of an equivalent to *Daniel* lines 343-345 from *Azarias* (or the addition of lines 343-345 to *Daniel*) in the following passage has an important effect on our interpretation of the local syntax of the sentence(s) in which they are found, the effect of the variant on our understanding of the poem as a whole seems negligible: *ne scod* ‘not harmed’ (E 60b) means approximately the same thing as *ne... owiht egled* ‘not a whit harmed’ (J 342b-343a), and, apart from the information that the Angel threw the fire back at the Children’s captors, the remaining material does not significantly alter our perception of what happened when the Angel arrived:

#### E(Az)

Tosweop 7||| toswen<sub>g</sub>de þurh swiðes meaht  
 60 liges leoman swa hyra lice nescod.|  
acwæs inþam hofne þase engel cwom  
 windig 7wynsum wede|re onlicust  
 þōn onsumeres tid sended weorþeð  
 dropena| dreorung mid dægес hwile.

#### J(Dan)

tosweop hine 7toswende. þurh þa swið|an miht.  
 ligges leoma. þhyre líce newæs.  
owiht| ge egled. ácheon andan sloh.  
fyron feondas| for fyren dædum.  
 345 þawæs onþam ofne. þær| se engel becwóm.  
 windig 7wynsum. wedere gelicost.  
 þōn hit onsumeres tíð. sended weor|ðeð.  
 dropena drearung. ondægес hwile.  
 wearm|lic wolcna scúr.

<sup>519</sup>This is the principal thrust of Moffat and Sisam’s argument against the ‘authority’ of Anglo-Saxon poetical manuscripts. For a discussion, see Chapter 1.

He swept back and brushed aside the light of the flame through the might of the Great One. Thus it did not harm the body of them, but it was breezy and pleasant in the furnace when the angel came, most like the weather in the summertime when a sprinkling of raindrops is sent during the day.

Brightness of the Flame, [he] swept it back and brushed [it]<sup>520</sup> aside by his great might so that not a whit was harmed on their body – but he flung the fire in anger upon their adversaries, for their wicked actions. Then when the angel had come it was breezy and pleasant in the furnace, most like the weather in summertime when a sprinkling of raindrops is sent during the day, a warm shower from the clouds.

But this is irrelevant. The quality of the changes found between the witnesses to the Anthologised and Excerpted poems is far less important than the fact that such interpretively important variants occur at all. As we have seen in Chapters Two and Three, the majority of the scribes responsible for copying the surviving witnesses to most multiply attested Old English poems were fundamentally conservative in their approach to the substantive details of their texts. While some scribes working in specific types of contexts might venture occasionally to substitute individual words or case endings, there are no surviving examples outside of the six poems discussed in this chapter of scribes attempting to recast, rearrange, edit or otherwise substantially recompose any portion of a metrically regular poem. While the scribes of the Anthologised and Excerpted texts are not always successful in the variation they introduce, it is the fact that they are willing to alter their texts in any coordinated fashion at all that sets them apart. Shakespeare and Chaucer have both been “improved” by subsequent editors, many of whom were themselves respected poets in their own day. And few who remember that William McGonagall considered himself to be as good an interpreter of Shakespeare’s plays as a poet in his own right will complain of the quality of the innovation introduced by even the worst transmitters of the Anthologised and Excerpted poems.

### **Exeter Riddle 30a/b**

Exeter Riddle 30a/b is unique among the multiply attested poems in that it is the only text to have been copied twice by the same scribe. Its two witnesses are found in the same

---

<sup>520</sup>Or, emending *ligges leoma* to *ligges leoman*: ‘[he] swept it back and brished [it], the brightness of the

manuscript, Exeter, Cathedral 3501, ff. 8-130 (**E**), a mid tenth-century collection of Old English vernacular poetry.<sup>521</sup> In its first appearance, the poem is found as the thirtieth (in Krapp and Dobbie's numbering) of the fifty-nine vernacular riddles on ff. 101r-115r. In its second appearance, it is found as part of a collection of miscellaneous shorter texts including Exeter Riddle 60, the "Husband's Message," and the "Ruin" on f. 122v.

As has been frequently noted, the **E** scribe is a remarkably consistent speller.<sup>522</sup> In the case of the two versions of Riddle 30, this consistency results in one of the lowest levels of accidental variation in the corpus of multiply attested poetry. In nine lines, the Riddle's two witnesses exhibit only two non-substantive orthographic differences: **E(Rid30a)** *leg bysig* **E(Rid30b)** *lig bysig*, line 1a; and **E(Rid30a)** *on hin gap* **E(Rid30b)** *on hnigað*, line 7b.<sup>523</sup> As Liuzza has noted, moreover, the two copies also share one unusual form, *onhæbbe* for expected West-Saxon *onhebbe* – an agreement which he suggests indicates that the two copies are descended from a common written source.<sup>524</sup>

Despite their low levels of accidental variation, the two witnesses to Exeter Riddle 30 are among the most substantively variable texts in the corpus. With eleven potentially significant substantive variants in eighteen copied lines, the witnesses to this poem show a frequency of substantive textual variation second only to that found in the common text of

---

flame, aside'. For a discussion, see below, p. 371.

<sup>521</sup> Descriptions of the manuscript and its history can be found in Bernard J. Muir, ed. *The Exeter Anthology of Old English Poetry: An Edition of Exeter Dean and Chapter MS 3501* (Exeter: U Exeter P, 1995), pp. 1-17; Patrick W. Conner, *Anglo-Saxon Exeter: A Tenth Century Cultural History*, Studies in Anglo-Saxon History 4 (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1993), esp. pp. 48-94, 95-147; Ker, *Catalogue*, art. 116; Krapp and Dobbie, *ASPR* 3, pp. ix-xvi; R. W. Chambers, Max Förster, and Robin Flower, eds., *The Exeter Book of Old English Poetry* (London: Percy Lund for the Dean and Chapter of Exeter Cathedral, 1933).

<sup>522</sup> In addition to Muir, see also David Megginson, "The Written Language of Old English Poetry," diss., Centre For Medieval Studies, U of Toronto, 1993, pp. 171-203, and Sisam, "The Exeter Book," *Studies*, pp. 97-108.

<sup>523</sup> The variation in the root syllable of *on hin gap* / *on hnigað* is discussed below, p. 252. Cf. Liuzza, who gives the **E(Rid30a)** reading in line 7b incorrectly as *on hin gað* ("Riddle 30," p. 3).

<sup>524</sup> Liuzza, "Riddle 30," p. 3. See also above, p. 232.

*Daniel* and *Azarias*, and nearly twice as high as that exhibited by the witnesses to the most variable of the “minor” poems, the *eorðan*-recension of “Cædmon’s Hymn.” As is true of the other poems to be discussed in this chapter, the witnesses to Exeter Riddle 30 show many of the same types of variants as are found among the witnesses to the “minor” poems, as well as a number of variants more characteristic of the “Anthologised and Excerpted texts”: two examples of the substitution of stressed non-homographic words and elements, one example of variation between a bare case ending and a prepositional phrase, and one example of the rearrangement of elements within the line. Like the *Dream of the Rood*/Ruthwell Cross Inscription, Exeter Riddle 30 shows no linked variants. Unique among the Anthologised and Excerpted poems, Exeter Riddle 30 also shows no examples of the addition, omission, substitution, or rearrangement of complete metrical units.

Although both copies of the poem are found in the same manuscript, the witnesses to Exeter Riddle 30 are found in contexts which imply that they were selected for different reasons by the person or persons responsible for first collecting them. In the case of **E(Rid30a)**, the connection between poem and context is purely generic. Apart from the fact that it is a riddle, the poem (usually solved as *beam* – a word meaning ‘tree’, ‘beam’, ‘piece of wood’, ‘gallows’, and ‘cross’) has no obvious affinity with its immediate neighbours Riddle 29 (‘Moon and Sun’ or ‘Bird and Wind’) and Riddle 31 (‘Bagpipe’). In the case of **E(Rid30b)**, in contrast, the connection is less generic than thematic. The solution *beam* makes it a suitable companion to both the religious poems immediately preceding, and the ostensibly secular poems which follow: Riddle 60 (‘Rune Staff’ or ‘Reed Pen’) and the “Husband’s Message” (in which a *beam* is used to transmit the message itself).<sup>525</sup> Indeed, the manuscript’s layout at this

---

<sup>525</sup>For the connection of Riddle 30 to the preceding religious texts, see Liuzza, “Riddle 30,” pp. 12-13. The suggestion that the Riddle might be connected to the following texts was first made by F. A. Blackburn, “Husband’s Message and the Accompanying Riddles of the Exeter Book,” *JEGP* 3 (1901): 1-11.



point suggests that the Exeter Scribe himself saw the Riddle as part of a longer poem or series of closely related poems extending at the least from Riddle 30 to the end of the “Ruin.” As numerous scholars have pointed out, the scribe uses similar-sized capitals to begin Riddle 30, Riddle 60, the three internal sections of the “Husband’s Message,” and the “Ruin.”<sup>526</sup>

It is unclear if the contextual differences between the two witnesses are directly responsible for any of the substantive variation they exhibit. If *beam* is assumed to be the correct solution and the thematic link which ties the second version to the surrounding texts, then the use of *gemylded* in **E(Rid30b)** for **E(Rid30a)** *gebysgad* in line 3b might be seen as the result of a desire on the part of the scribe to make the solution more obvious in its second copy. That their variation is coherent, however, has been demonstrated by Liuzza, who argues that **E(Rid30b)** is “rhetorically a decidedly more forceful poem”<sup>527</sup> – particularly in the second half of the riddle, where the b-text consistently shows the more compact reading: it eliminates the conjunction *7* in line 7a; substitutes *miltsum* for the prepositional phrase *mid miltse*, in line 8a; and uses the sentence adverb *swa* in place of the subordinating conjunction *þær* in line 8b (see below, pp. 251 and 253).

---

<sup>526</sup>Liuzza, “Riddle 30,” pp. 12-13; John C. Pope, “Paleography and Poetry: Some Solved and Unsolved Problems of the Exeter Book,” *Medieval Scribes, Manuscripts and Libraries, Essays Presented to N.R. Ker*, ed. M.B. Parkes, and Andrew G. Watson (London: Scolar, 1978): 25-65, at pp. 42-63; F. A. Blackburn, “Husband’s Message,” 1-11.

<sup>527</sup>Liuzza, “Riddle 30,” p. 10.

## Textual Variants

### Inflectional Difference (1 example)

#### *Rid30, 8a*

##### **E(*Rid30a*)**

7 þōn ic| mec onhæbbe ȝhi on hin gaþ. tome  
monige mid miltse| þæricmonnum sceal  
ycan up cyme eadig nesse :7

##### **E(*Rid30b*)**

7 þōn| icmec onhæbbe hion hnigað tome  
modge miltsum| swaic mongum sceal  
ycan up cyme eadignesse :7

**E(*Rid30a*)** *miltse* is a dative singular/instrumental prepositional object: ‘with kindness’ or ‘with joy’; **E(*Rid30b*)** *miltsum* is dative plural ‘with kindnesses’ or ‘with joys’. The variation has no significant effect on sense or metre. Mitchell reports the use of singular and (less frequently) plural datives in adverbial contexts with or without prepositions.<sup>528</sup> The addition or omission of the preposition *mid* is discussed below, p. 254.

### Substitution Of Unstressed Words and Elements (2 examples)

#### *Rid30, 6a*

##### **E(*Rid30a*)**

5 ful oft mec ge siþas sendað| æfter hondum  
þ mec weras ȝwif wlonce cyssað  
þōn ic| mec onhæbbe ȝhi on hin gaþ. tome  
monige mid miltse| þæricmonnum sceal  
ycan up cyme eadig nesse :7

##### **E(*Rid30b*)**

5 ful oft mec gesiþas sendað| æfter hondū  
þær mec weras ȝwif wlonce gecyssað  
þōn| icmec onhæbbe hion hnigað tome  
modge miltsum| swaic mongum sceal  
ycan up cyme eadignesse :7

The substitution **E(*Rid30a*)** *þ* **E(*Rid30b*)** *þær* affects sense and syntax. In **E(*Rid30a*)**, *þ* introduces a result clause modifying *sendað*, line 5a: ‘Very often comrades lay me across their hands so that men and women kiss me proudly’. In **E(*Rid30b*)**, *þær* introduces a local or temporal clause defining where (or when) the action of the main clause takes place: ‘Very often comrades lay me across their hands where men and women kiss me proudly’. Liuzza suggests that the **E(*Rid30b*)** text is “somewhat looser” than **E(*Rid30a*)**,<sup>529</sup> although it might as easily be argued that the temporal or local clause in **E(*Rid30b*)** is more appropriate than the

<sup>528</sup>Mitchell, *OES*, § 76; parallels cited by Mitchell include *Beowulf* 296 *arum* and *Beowulf* 2378 *mid are*.

<sup>529</sup>Liuzza, “Riddle 30,” p. 7.

result clause of **E(Rid30a)**.<sup>530</sup> A similar substitution is found in the **ChronA**<sup>5</sup> version of the “Death of Edgar” line 8b (see p. 183 and footnote 410, above).

### **Rid30, 8b**

#### **E(Rid30a)**

7 þōn ic| mec onhæbbe ȝhi on hin ȝap. tome  
monige mid miltse| þæricmonnum sceal  
ycan up cyme eadig nesse :7

#### **E(Rid30b)**

7 þōn| icmec onhæbbe hion hnigað tome  
modge miltsum| swaic mongum sceal  
ycan up cyme eadignesse :7

The substitution **E(Rid30a) þær E(Rid30b) swa** affects sense and syntax, but not metre. In **E(Rid30a) þær** introduces a temporal or local clause, ‘Then I shall raise myself up; and they will bow to me, multitudes with kindness, when [or where] I shall increase the fount of blessedness among men’.<sup>531</sup> In **E(Rid30b)**, *swa* is either a sentence adverb introducing lines 8b-9 as an independent clause (‘Thus shall I increase the fount of blessedness among men’),<sup>532</sup> or, less likely, a conjunction introducing a comparative clause: ‘Then I shall raise myself up; they will bow to me, the proud, kindly, as I shall increase the fount of blessedness among men.’<sup>533</sup>

### **Substitution Of Stressed Words and Elements (4 examples)**

#### **Rid30, 3b**

#### **E(Rid30a)**

1 I C eom leg bysig lace mid winde□  
bewunden mid wuldre| wedre gesomnad  
fus forð weges fyre gebysgad  
bearu| blowende byrnende gled

#### **E(Rid30b)**

1 I ceom lig bysig lace mid winde  
w[.....]dre gesomnad  
fus forð weges fyre gemylted  
bear[.]| blowende byrnende gled

The substitution **E(Rid30a) gebysgad E(Rid30b) gemylted** affects sense, but has no effect on syntax or metre. In **E(Rid30a)**, the speaker is ‘troubled’ by fire, in **E(Rid30b)**, ‘melted’. As Liuzza notes, the “repetition of the word *gebysgad* in lines 1a and 3b” could be

<sup>530</sup>See also Jabbour, diss., p. 176, who suggests that “either reading is acceptable.”

<sup>531</sup>Cf. Liuzza, “Riddle 30,” p. 10, where *þær* is described as “an adverb with the generalized meaning ‘then’.”

<sup>532</sup>For this punctuation, see Liuzza, “Riddle 30,” p. 10.

<sup>533</sup>Jabbour and Liuzza both prefer to read lines 8b-9 as an independent clause. See Liuzza, “Riddle 30,” p. 10; Jabbour, diss., pp. 176-177. Krapp and Dobbie punctuate lines 7-9 of **E(Rid30a)** as a single sentence.

evidence of either a “sophisticated stylistic parallel” or dittography.<sup>534</sup> Of the two verbs, *gebysgad* is the more common in the Exeter Book with eight occurrences against two for *gemylted*.<sup>535</sup> In as much as it indicates that the object can be destroyed by fire, the **E(Rid30b)** reading may also reflect a desire for less ambiguity on the part of the person first responsible for the variant.

### **Rid30, 7b**

#### **E(Rid30a)**

7 þōn ic| mec onhæbbe ȝhi on hin gaþ. tome  
monige mid miltse| þæricmonnum sceal  
ycan up cyme eadig nesse :7

#### **E(Rid30b)**

7 þōn| icmec onhæbbe hion hnigað tome  
modge miltsum| swaic mongum sceal  
ycan up cyme eadignesse :7

**E(Rid30a)** on *hin gaþ* is almost certainly a minim error for *onhnigaþ* (as in **E(Rid30b)**).<sup>536</sup> The **E(Rid30a)** form (from *hingan* ‘to go hence’?) makes no sense in context as written.

### **Rid30, 8a**

#### **E(Rid30a)**

7 þōn ic| mec onhæbbe ȝhi on hin gaþ. tome  
monige mid miltse| þæricmonnum sceal  
ycan up cyme eadig nesse :7

#### **E(Rid30b)**

7 þōn| icmec onhæbbe hion hnigað tome  
modge miltsum| swaic mongum sceal  
ycan up cyme eadignesse :7

Both **E(Rid30a)** *monige* ‘multitudes’ and **E(Rid30b)** *modge* ‘proud (ones)’ make good sense, metre, and syntax. In **E(Rid30b)**, the use of *modge* emphasises the nobility of the speaker by drawing out the contrast between the pride of his worshipers and the humility they display in bowing: ‘they bow to me, the proud, with kindness’.<sup>537</sup> In **E(Rid30a)**, *monige* accomplishes the same thing by emphasising the breadth of the adoration: ‘they bow to me, multitudes with kindnesses’. Metrically, **E(Rid30a)** is a Type A-1 line with a resolved first lift; in **E(Rid30b)**, the first lift is long by nature.

<sup>534</sup>Liuzza, “Riddle 30,” p. 6.

<sup>535</sup>Liuzza, “Riddle 30,” p. 10.

<sup>536</sup>Liuzza, “Riddle 30,” p. 8; Jabbour, diss., p. 176.

<sup>537</sup>Liuzza, “Riddle 30,” p. 9.

**Rid30, 8b****E(Rid30a)**

7 þōn ic| mec onhæbbe 7hi on hin gaþ. tome  
 monige mid miltse| þæricmonnum sceal  
 ycan up cyme eadig nesse :7

**E(Rid30b)**

7 þōn| icmec onhæbbe hion hnigað tome  
 modge miltsum| swaic mongum sceal  
 ycan up cyme eadignesse :7

The substitution **E(Rid30a)** *monnum* **E(Rid30b)** *mongum* makes good sense, metre and syntax in both manuscripts. Liuzza suggests that the **E(Rid30a)** reading may be the result of the Exeter scribe's "trouble with the letter <g>," which he reports is crowded in, omitted, miswritten, or otherwise altered on twenty-six occasions in the manuscript.<sup>538</sup> As *monige* is already the reading of the on-verse in this witness, however, the substitution may also be connected to the substitution **E(Rid30a)** *monige* **E(Rid30b)**, *mongum* discussed above.<sup>539</sup>

**Addition/Omission Of Unstressed Words and Elements (2 examples)****Rid30, 7b****E(Rid30a)**

7 þōn ic| mec onhæbbe 7hi on hin gaþ. tome  
 monige mid miltse| þæricmonnum sceal  
 ycan up cyme eadig nesse :7

**E(Rid30b)**

7 þōn| icmec onhæbbe hion hnigað tome  
 modge miltsum| swaic mongum sceal  
 ycan up cyme eadignesse :7

The addition or omission of *7* in line 7b has an important effect on the syntax of lines 7-8a. In **E(Rid30b)**, line 7b is a principal clause modified by the adverbial clause *þōn| icmec onhæbbe* in line 7a: 'When I raise myself up, they bow to me, the proud, kindly.' In **E(Rid30a)**, line 7a and 7b are parallel adverbial clauses modifying *sceal ycan* in lines 8b-9a: 'When I raise myself up, and they bow to me, multitudes with kindness, then I shall increase the fount of blessedness among men'.

The addition or omission of *7* occurs in the preliminary drop of a Type B-2 line and is metrically insignificant.

<sup>538</sup>Liuzza, "Riddle 30," p. 10.

<sup>539</sup>See also Jabbour, diss., p. 177.

**Rid30, 8a****E(Rid30a)**

7 þōn ic| mec onhæbbe ȝhi on hin ȝaþ. tome  
 monige **mid** miltse| þæricmonnum sceal  
 ycan up cyme eadig nesse :7

**E(Rid30b)**

7 þōn| icmec onhæbbe hion hnigað tome  
 modge miltsum| swaic mongum sceal  
 ycan up cyme eadignesse :7

The addition or omission of *mid* has no significant effect on sense or syntax (for the change in case ending, see above, p. 250). The addition or omission falls in the medial drop of a Type A-1 line and is metrically insignificant. Such variation between bare case endings and prepositional phrases is a characteristic of the Anthologised and Excerpted poems (see above, p. 227, footnote 479).

**Addition/Omission of Prefixes (1 example)****Rid30, 6b****E(Rid30a)**

5 ful oft mec ge siþas sendað| æfter hondum  
 þ mec weras ȝwif wlonce **cyssað**

**E(Rid30b)**

5 ful oft mec gesiþas sendað| æfter hondū  
 þærmec weras ȝwif wlonce **gecyssað**

The addition or omission of the prefix *ge-* has no significant effect on sense or syntax. As Liuzza notes, “it is... difficult to determine any significant *lexical* distinction between *cyssan* and *gecyssan*. There is not much kissing in Old English poetry...”<sup>540</sup> As it falls in the medial dip of a Type A-1 line, the variant is also metrically insignificant.

**Rearrangement within the Line (1 example)****Rid30, 2a****E(Rid30a)**

1 I C eom leg bysig lace mid winde□  
**bewunden** mid wuldre| wedre gesomnad  
 fus forð weges fyre gebysgad  
 bearu| blowende byrnende gled

**E(Rid30b)**

1 I ceom lig bysig lace mid winde  
 w[.....]|dre gesomnad  
 fus forð weges fyre gemylted  
 bear[.]| blowende byrnende gled

Line 2 of **E(Rid30b)** is usually reconstructed *wuldre bewunden wedre gesomnad* on the basis of traces of the letters *uldr* after the surviving initial *w*.<sup>541</sup> Such rearrangement within the line is characteristic of the Anthologised and Excerpted texts (see above, p. 227).

<sup>540</sup>Liuzza, “Riddle 30,” p. 8.

Regardless of the original reading, the variant almost certainly has an effect on metre: in **E**(*Rid30a*), the first syllable of the on-verse is clearly anacrustic; in **E**(*Rid30b*), it is almost certainly not.

### **Exeter Riddle 35/The Leiden Riddle**

The common text of Exeter Riddle 35/The Leiden Riddle is preserved in two manuscripts, the Exeter Book (**E**) and Leiden, Rijksbibliotheek, Vossianus Latin Quarto 106 (**Leid**).<sup>542</sup> In **E**, the riddle is found on ff. 109r-109v as the thirty-fifth in Krapp and Dobbie's numbering of the manuscript's first series of vernacular riddles. It is in the manuscript's main hand and is uniformly West-Saxon in dialect.<sup>543</sup> The preceding and following texts, Riddle 34 ('Rake') and Riddle 36 (probably 'Ship') are related to the poem only through their common genre.

In **Leid**, the poem is found on the verso of the last leaf of the manuscript (f. 25v), a collection of Latin Riddles by Symphosius and Aldhelm.<sup>544</sup> Apart from Riddle 35, this page contains the conclusion of the manuscript's main Latin text, a number of Latin tags, pen-trials, names, and neums.<sup>545</sup> The poem is Northumbrian in dialect and has been copied by a hand which has been identified variously as that of the second scribe of the main Latin text<sup>546</sup> or of a

---

<sup>541</sup>Liuzza, "Riddle 30," p. 5; Chambers *et al.*, *The Exeter Book*, p. 75.

<sup>542</sup>Ker, *Catalogue*, Appendix, art. 19.

<sup>543</sup>On the "remarkably consistent" orthography of the Exeter Scribe, see Megginson, *diss.*, pp. 201-203.

<sup>544</sup>The **M** version of the Northumbrian *aeldu*-recension of "Cædmon's Hymn" is found in a comparable place. See above, Chapter 2, pp. 49-52.

<sup>545</sup>The Riddle and its position on f. 25v have been described several times. See in particular, Johan Gerritsen, "Leiden Revisited: Further Thoughts on the Leiden Riddle," *Medieval Studies Conference, Aachen, 1983*, ed. W.-D. Bald and H. Weinstock, *Bamberger Beiträge zur englischen Sprachwissenschaft*, bd.15 (New York: Lang, 1984): 51-59, and "The Text of the Leiden Riddle," *ESs* 6 (1969): 529-544; M. B. Parkes, "The Manuscript of the Leiden Riddle," *ASE* 1 (1972): 207-17; and 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).

<sup>546</sup>Gerritsen, "Leiden Revisited"; "Text of the Leiden Riddle"; and Dobbie, *ASPR* 6, p. cviii.

third scribe working in the tenth century.<sup>547</sup> The script is Carolingian in form but shows the influence of – and misunderstandings caused by – an insular exemplar.<sup>548</sup> The text of the riddle is in particularly poor shape and is frequently unreadable due to both wear and the application of an ammonium sulfide reagent in the mid nineteenth century. The text used for this discussion is based on my own transcriptions of the manuscript, supplemented by readings from Parkes, Gerritsen, and Smith.<sup>549</sup>

In addition to their dialectal differences, the two witnesses to Riddle 35 show seventeen potentially significant substantive variants, many of which are characteristic of the “anthologised” texts. These include: one example of variation between a prepositional phrase and bare case ending; one example of the substitution of stressed, non-homographic, and non-synonymous words; one example of the rearrangement of elements within the line; and three linked variants connected to a verbal substitution in line 7b (**Leid** *hrutendo* **E** *hrutende*, **Leid** *me* **E** *æt me*, and the number of **Leid** *scelfath* **E** *scriþeð*, lines 7a-b; see below, pp. 258, 261, and 263). The two witnesses also show one example of the substitution of metrical units, involving the final two lines of the poem: **E** *saga soð cwidum searo þoncum gleaw / wordum wis//fæst hwæt þis ge wædu sy* ‘say in true words, clever in cunning, wise in words, what this garment may be’, **Leid** *Nian oegun icme aerig faerae egsanbrogū / ðehði ni/[...n siæ n]iudlicae obcocrum* ‘I do not dread the flight of arrows, in the terror of peril, though it be [taken] eagerly from the quiver’. As mentioned above (p. 241), this last example in particular is related to the two texts’ contextual differences. As a vernacular translation of a Latin riddle, preserved in a manuscript whose main text includes its Latin original, the **Leid** version of

<sup>547</sup>Parkes, “Manuscript of the Leiden Riddle”, pp. 215-217.

<sup>548</sup>See particularly Gerritsen “Text of the Leiden Riddle,” pp. 534-540. Gerritsen’s approach to the script and some of his conclusions have been criticised by Parkes “Manuscript of the Leiden Riddle.” For a reply, see Gerritsen, “Further Thoughts.”



Riddle 35 ends with a close translation of Aldhelm’s final verse. The final couplet in **E**, on the other hand, replaces the Latin conclusion with a vernacular tag, parallels to which are found throughout the surrounding collection of vernacular riddles.<sup>550</sup>

There are no common errors or unusual forms in the two witnesses. In his discussion of the variation between these two poems, Jabbour suggests that the substitution of *scelfath* and *scriþeð* in line 7b, the rearrangement of *sceal amas* and *aam sceal* in line 8b, and the substitution of lines 13-14 in the two witnesses “might argue persuasively for memorial transmission of the Exeter version of the riddle” were they combined with “other typically memorial traits.”<sup>551</sup> At the same time, the relatively large number of sensical, syntactical and metrical errors in both manuscripts (including the **E** reading *sceal amas*) suggest scribal rather than memorial corruption.<sup>552</sup>

## Textual Variants

### Inflectional Difference (8 examples)

#### *LeidR/Rid35, 3a*

##### **Leid**

3 Uuat icmecbiuorthæ uullanfliusū  
herū.ðerh hehcraeft hygiðon `c[...]/

##### **E(Rid35)**

3 ne wat ic mec be worhtne wulle flysum  
hæ|rum þurh heah cræft hyge þoncum min.

**Leid** *biuorthæ* (for *biuorhtæ*) is an archaic form of the feminine accusative singular strong adjective; **E35** *be worhtne* is masculine accusative singular strong. The two most

<sup>549</sup>See the references given above, fn. 545.

<sup>550</sup>Examples include Riddles 1, 2, 3, 8, 10, 12, 19 and 23.

<sup>551</sup>Jabbour, diss., p. 180.

<sup>552</sup>Variants making poor metre or sense in **E** include: the inflectional forms **E** *be worhtne* (**Leid** *biuorthæ*), l. 3a (see p. 257), and **E** *amas* for **Leid** *aam*, l. 8b (see p. 259). All of the nonsensical readings in **Leid** are scribal and are to be attributed to the ignorance of the continental scribe responsible for its surviving witness. See pp. 258, 262 and 263, below.

commonly proposed solutions to the riddle, *lorica* and *byrne*, are both feminine. Smith reports, however, that “the gender of the answers to the riddles often fluctuates.”<sup>553</sup>

### *LeidR/Rid35, 3a*

#### **Leid**

3 Uuat icmecbiuorthæ uullanfliusū  
herū.ðerh hehcraeft hygiðon`c[...]/

#### **E(Rid35)**

3 ne wat ic mec be worhtne wulle flysum  
hæ|rum þurh heah craeft hyge þoncum min.

*Wull(e)* varies between the feminine *-n* (weak) and *-ō* (strong) declensions. The difference in ending has no effect on sense, metre, or syntax.<sup>554</sup>

### *LeidR/Rid35, 6a*

#### **Leid**

5 Uundnae. menibiaðueflæ niic uar phafae\_\_\_  
\_niðerih ðrea[.]lungiðrae[.] ðr&me hlimmith.  
Nemehrutendo\_\_\_hrisil scelfath\_\_\_  
\_ne mec ouana| aam sceal cnyssa

#### **E(Rid35)**

5 wundene me| ne beoð wefle neic wearp hafu  
neþurh þreata geþræ|cu þræd mene hlimmeð  
ne æt me hrutende hrisil| scribeð  
nemec o hwonan sceal amas cnyssan

As Dobbie notes, the **Leid** reading is hard to explain.<sup>555</sup> In **E35**, *þreata* is the genitive plural of *þreat*, a masculine *a*-declension noun. The **Leid** reading is either a misinterpretation of *ðreat* as a weak noun, or the result of a graphic error, perhaps through a confusion of insular round *a* as *u* “with a nasal mark over it.”<sup>556</sup>

### *LeidR/Rid35, 6a*

#### **Leid**

5 Uundnae. menibiaðueflæ niic uar phafae\_\_\_  
\_niðerih ðrea[.]lungiðrae[.] ðr&me hlimmith.  
Nemehrutendo\_\_\_hrisil scelfath\_\_\_  
\_ne mec ouana| aam sceal cnyssa

#### **E(Rid35)**

5 wundene me| ne beoð wefle neic wearp hafu  
neþurh þreata geþræ|cu þræd mene hlimmeð  
ne æt me hrutende hrisil| scribeð  
nemec o hwonan sceal amas cnyssan

The **Leid** reading is usually reconstructed *giðraec* or *giðræc* although as Gerritsen notes, it might be “as easily [*geð*]racu or just [*geð*]rac.”<sup>557</sup> If either of the usual

<sup>553</sup>Smith, *Three Northumbrian Poems*, p. 44.

<sup>554</sup>B.-T. *wull*.

<sup>555</sup>*ASPR* 6, p. 200.

<sup>556</sup>Smith, *Three Northumbrian Poems*, p. 36.

<sup>557</sup>Gerritsen, “Text of the Leiden Riddle,” p. 543. In “Further Thoughts,” Gerritsen comes down more firmly for *giðraec*: “my ultraviolet photographs show a clearly separate *a* and *e*, as well as most of the *c*.” Parkes, however, reports the form to be *gið<ræ.>*, noting: “two traces which are recognizable as the stem and

reconstructions is correct, then the difference between the two witnesses is one of number. In **E**, *geþræ|cu* is best interpreted as an accusative plural neuter; the reconstructed **Leid** form *giðraec* (or *giðræc*) would be accusative singular neuter. The presumed inflectional difference has no significant effect on metre: with *-u*, **E** is Type B-2 with resolution of the second stress; without *-u*, the final stress is long by position.

### **LeidR/Rid35, 7a**

#### **Leid**

5 Uundnae. menibiaðueflæ niic uar phafae\_\_\_  
 \_niðerih ðrea[.Jungiðrae./ ðr&me hlimmith.  
 Nemehrutendo\_\_\_hrisil scelfath\_\_\_  
 \_ne mec ouana| aam sceal cnyssa

#### **E(Rid35)**

5 wundene me| ne beoð wefle neic wearp hafu  
 neþurh þreata geþræ|cu þræd mene hlimmeð  
 ne æt me hrutende hrisil| scribeð  
 nemec o hwonan sceal amas cnyssan

**Leid** *hrutendo* is a strong nominative plural neuter form of the present participle. **E** *hrutende* is a strong nominative singular neuter. As Smith notes, this variation is linked to a corresponding variation in the number of the verb in the following half-line, suggesting in turn that *hrisil* is to be understood as nominative singular in **E35**, and nominative plural in **Leid**.<sup>558</sup> For further discussion of the linked variants in this line, see pp. 261 and 263, below.

### **LeidR/Rid35, 8b**

#### **Leid**

5 Uundnae. menibiaðueflæ niic uar phafae\_\_\_  
 \_niðerih ðrea[.Jungiðrae./ ðr&me hlimmith.  
 Nemehrutendo\_\_\_hrisil scelfath\_\_\_  
 \_ne mec ouana| aam sceal cnyssa

#### **E(Rid35)**

5 wundene me| ne beoð wefle neic wearp hafu  
 neþurh þreata geþræ|cu þræd mene hlimmeð  
 ne æt me hrutende hrisil| scribeð  
 nemec o hwonan sceal amas cnyssan

As written, **E** *amas* is non-sensical and unmetrical. The verb *sceal* requires a singular subject; *amas* is nominative or accusative plural. It also adds an unstressed medial dip to what would otherwise be a Type C-1 line. With a different arrangement of words in the line and a nominative singular *aam*, the **Leid** text is Type A-2a. There is no obvious graphic or

---

approach stroke to the shoulder of the letter **r** are clearly visible. **æ** is certain. Identification of the letter following **æ** is not possible because the traces are too indistinct" (Parkes, "Manuscript of the Leiden Riddle," p. 210). I read *ae* with Gerritsen.

<sup>558</sup>Smith, *Three Northumbrian Poems*, p. 46.

memorial explanation for this variant. For a discussion of the rearrangement within the line, see below, p. 264.

**LeidR/Rid35, 9a**

**Leid**

Uyrmas mec niauefun uyrdicraeftum|  
10 ðaði goelu godueb \_\_\_geatūfraetuath.|

**E(Rid35)**

wyr|mas mecne á wæfan. wyrda cræftum  
10 þape geolo god|webb geatwum frætwað

A further example of alternation between the singular and plural in these two witnesses (see also pp. 258 and 261). The two readings make good sense and are metrically and syntactically identical. **E**: ‘worms did not spin me with the skills of the Fates’; **Leid**: ‘worms did not spin me with the skills of Fate’.

**LeidR/Rid35, 11a**

**Leid**

11 Uilmechuc<sup>h</sup>trae suaedeh \_\_\_uidæ ofaer eorðu\_  
\_hatan mith| \hęliðum hyhtlicgiuæ/|

**E(Rid35)**

11 wile mec mon hwæpre seþeah| wide ofer eorþan  
hatan forhælepū hyht lic gewæde.|

The variation is dialectic. **Leid** *Uil* shows Northumbrian loss of final *-e* in the third-person singular indicative present.<sup>559</sup> **E** *wile* is the expected form in all other dialects.

Assuming that *huc<sup>h</sup>trae* is for *huethrae* (with *c* for *e* and <sup>h</sup>*t* for *t<sup>h</sup>*), and that \**huethrae/hwæpre* alliterates with *uidæ/wide*,<sup>560</sup> the variation falls in the preliminary dip of a Type B-2 verse and has no significant metrical effect.

**Substitution Of Unstressed Words and Elements (2 examples)**

**LeidR/Rid35, 11a**

**Leid**

11 Uilmechuc<sup>h</sup>trae suaedeh \_\_\_uidæ ofaer eorðu\_  
\_hatan mith| \hęliðum hyhtlicgiuæ/|

**E(Rid35)**

11 wile mec mon hwæpre seþeah| wide ofer eorþan  
hatan forhælepū hyht lic gewæde.|

**E** *seþeah* and **Leid** *suaeðeh*, ‘yet, still’, appear to be synonyms. The form *seþeah* is characteristic of **E**, where it occurs where it occurs twelve times (including once more for *swa*

<sup>559</sup>For examples, see Campbell, *OEG*, § 768; also Sievers-Brunner, § 428 Anm. 4.

<sup>560</sup>For parallels see Craig Williamson, ed., *The Old English Riddles of the Exeter Book* (Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1977), p. 248, and Krapp-Dobbie, *ASPR* 3, p. 341.

*peah* in *Soul and Body* V66a/E 61a).<sup>561</sup> The variants fall on the internal dip of a Type B-2 line and are metrically insignificant.<sup>562</sup>

### *Leid*/Rid35, 12a

#### **Leid**

11 Uilmecuc<sup>h</sup>trae suaedeh \_\_\_uidæ ofaer eorðu\_ \_hatan **mith** | \heliðum hyhtlicgiuæ/

#### **E(Rid35)**

11 wile mec mon hwæpre sepeah| wide ofer eorþan hatan **for**hælepū hyht lic gewæde. |

The substitution of prepositions, **Leid** *mith* ‘among’ **E** *for* ‘before, in the presence of’, has no significant effect on sense, metre, or syntax.

### Substitution Of Stressed Words and Elements (1 example)

### *Leid*/Rid35, 7b

#### **Leid**

5 Uundnae. menibiaðueflæ niic uar phafae. \_\_\_niðerih ðrea[.Jungiðrae./ ðr&me hlimmith. Nemehrutendo \_\_\_hrisil **scelfath** \_\_\_ne mec ouana| aam sceal cnyssa

#### **E(Rid35)**

5 wundene me| ne beoð wefle neic wearp hafu neþurh þreata geþræ|cu þræd mene hlimmeð ne æt me hrutende hrisil| **scribeð** nemec o hwonan sceal amas cnyssan

**Leid** *scelfath* ‘shakes, reverberates’ and **E** *scribeð* ‘move, go, glide’ both make good sense, metre, and syntax. While they involve quite different actions, both are appropriate to a shuttle. Of the two, **Leid** is lexically closer to Aldhelm’s Latin, the passive *pulsor* ‘I am beaten’.<sup>563</sup>

The variants are linked to two other changes in the line: the inflectional difference **Leid** *hrutendo* **E** *hrutende* and the variation between bare case ending and prepositional phrase **Leid** *me* **E** *æt me* (both line 7a; pp. 258 and 263). **Leid** *scelfath* is transitive and plural. As a result it takes an accusative direct object (*me*) and a plural subject (*hrutendohrisil*). **E** *scribeð* on the other hand is intransitive and singular. It is preceded by a prepositional phrase (*æt me*)

<sup>561</sup> See p. 318, below. *Swa peah* in contrast occurs 7 times in the Exeter Book: *Christ*, lines 543, 1185, 1308; *Guðlac*, lines 493, 940; Riddle 58, line 11; Descent into Hell, line 129 (emended from *swa pean*). The spelling *sepeah* is not recorded in verse outside of the Exeter Book.

<sup>562</sup> See p. 260 and the references given in fn. 560 for a discussion of the alliteration in this line.

<sup>563</sup> James Hall Pitman, trans., *The Riddles of Aldhelm* (1925; New Haven, CT: Archon Books, 1970), p. 18, line 5.

and a singular subject (*hrutende hrisil*). The variation has no significant effect on metre, which is Type A-1 in both manuscripts.

### Substitution Corresponding To A Metrical Unit (1 example)

#### *LeidR/Rid35, 13a-14b*

##### **Leid**

13 Nian oegun icme aerig faerae egsanbrogū  
ðehōi ni||...n siae nliudlicae obcoerum||

##### **E(Rid35)**

13 saga soð cwidum searo þoncum gleaw  
wordum wis||fæst hwæt þis ge wædu sy :7

Both lines make good sense and metre. The **Leid** text is closer to that of Aldhelm's Latin *Et tamen en vestis vulgi sermone vocabor. / Spicula non vereor longis exempta faretris*, lines 6-7 – as is appropriate to its position in a manuscript containing the Latin original. The last lines of **E** are of a type frequently found closing the vernacular riddles of the Exeter Book.<sup>564</sup>

### Addition/Omission Of Unstressed Words and Elements (4 examples)

#### *LeidR/Rid35, 3a*

##### **Leid**

3 Uuat icmecbiuorthæ uullanfliusū  
 herū.ðerh hehcraeft hygiðon`c[...]'

##### **E(Rid35)**

3 ne wat ic mec be worhtne wulle flysum  
 hæ|rum þurh heah cræft hyge þoncum min.

The addition or omission of *ne* has a fundamental effect on the sense of the riddle as a whole. With *ne*, **E35** preserves the paradox of Aldhelm's Latin original: *non sum setigero lanarum vellere facta*, 'I am not made of the bristling wool of fleeces'. As written, **Leid** implies that the speaker *is* made of wool ('I know myself to be made with the fleeces of wool'), destroying the enigma.

Johan Gerritsen has argued that *Uuat* – or *Uaat* as read by most modern editors since Smith – may be for an original *Ni uat*, however. Noting that the *N* at the beginning of line 8 in the same text looks like a capital *U* and that the second letter of *Uuat* in line 3 (assuming it is an *u*) would be the only example of an insular square *a* in the riddle, Gerritsen suggests that

<sup>564</sup>See above, p. 257 and fn. 550.

the **Leid** scribe or the scribe of an earlier exemplar misinterpreted an insular *Niuat* as a Carolingian *Uuat*.<sup>565</sup>

The missing negative is metrically insignificant. It falls on the preliminary dip of Type A-3 line.

### **LeidR/Rid35, 6b**

#### **Leid**

5 Uundnae. menibiaðueflæ niic uar phafae\_\_\_  
 \_niðerih ðrea[.Jungiðrae./ ðr&me hlimmith.  
 Nemehrutendo\_\_\_hrisil scelfath\_\_\_  
 \_ne mec ouana| aam sceal cnyssa

#### **E(Rid35)**

5 wundene me| ne beoð wefle neic wearp hafu  
 neþurh þreata geþræ|cu þræd mene hlimmeð  
 ne æt me hrutende hrisil| scriþeð  
 nemec o hwonan sceal amas cnyssan

The addition or omission of *ne* from line 6b has no significant effect on sense, syntax or metre. As the clause in which **E** *hlimmeð* is found begins with a negative particle, the negation before the verb in **E35** is permissible but not necessary. The variant falls on the medial drop of a Type A-1 line and is metrically insignificant.

### **LeidR/Rid35, 7a**

#### **Leid**

5 Uundnae. menibiaðueflæ niic uar phafae\_\_\_  
 \_niðerih ðrea[.Jungiðrae./ ðr&me hlimmith.  
 Nemehrutendo\_\_\_hrisil scelfath\_\_\_  
 \_ne mec ouana| aam sceal cnyssa

#### **E(Rid35)**

5 wundene me| ne beoð wefle neic wearp hafu  
 neþurh þreata geþræ|cu þræd mene hlimmeð  
 ne ~~æt~~ me hrutende hrisil| scriþeð  
 nemec o hwonan sceal amas cnyssan

The addition or omission of the preposition **E** *æt* in line 7a is linked to the subsequent substitution between the transitive **Leid** *scelfath* and intransitive **E** *scriþeð*, line 7b. In **Leid**, *me* is accusative singular and the direct object of *scelfath*; in **E**, *me* is the object of the preposition, *æt*. For related variants in this line, see above, pp. 258 and 261.

As *æt* falls on the preliminary dip of a Type C-1 verse, its presence or absence is metrically insignificant.

<sup>565</sup>Gerritsen, "Text of the Leiden Riddle," pp. 540-542; also "Leiden Revisited," pp. 56-7. For the reading *Uaat* see Smith, *Three Northumbrian Poems*, p. 44 ("Uaat clear with u.v. but under ordinary vision it appears as *Uuat*,") and Parkes, "Manuscript of the Leiden Riddle," p. 216. I have examined the manuscript under various natural and ultra-violet lighting conditions and am inclined to agree with Gerritsen. While a stroke does connect the two ascenders, it does not look deliberate. Given the state of the manuscript, the question is probably irresolvable.

**LeidR/Rid35, 11a****Leid**

11 Uilmec<sup>h</sup>uc<sup>h</sup>trae suaedeh\_\_\_\_\_uidæ ofaer eorðu\_  
\_hatan mith| \heliðum hyhtlicgiuæ/

**E(Rid35)**

11 wile mec **mon** hwæþre seþeah| wide ofer eorþan  
hatan forhælepū hyht lic gewæde.|

**E mon** falls on the preliminary dip of a Type B-2 line.<sup>566</sup> Its presence or absence is metrically insignificant. Whether or not the variation has a syntactical effect is hard to say. Mitchell notes that there are no unambiguous examples of indefinite *hatan* without *man* as subject, but suggests that there enough examples of *magan* in similar contexts to “leave a nagging doubt in one’s mind that *LRid* 11 may be another example of a dying idiom which was not recognized by whoever inserted *mon* in the West-Saxon version.”<sup>567</sup>

**Rearrangement Within Line (1 example)****LeidR/Rid35, 8b****Leid**

5 Uundnae. menibiaðueflæ niic uar phafae\_\_\_\_  
\_niðerih ðrea[.]ungiðrae./ ðr&me hlimmith.  
Nemehrutendo\_\_\_\_hrisil scelfath\_\_\_\_  
\_ne mec ouana| **aam sceal** cnyssa

**E(Rid35)**

5 wundene me| ne beoð wefle neic wearp hafu  
neþurh þreata geþræ|cu þræd mene hlimmeð  
ne æt me hrutende hrisil| scriþeð  
nemec o hwonan **sceal amas** cnyssan

The inversion of *am(as)* and *sceal* has no effect on sense or syntax (although the use of the plural *amas* in **E** is non-sensical; see above, p. 259). Metrically, **Leid** is Type A-2a. **E35** is unmetrical.

**Solomon and Saturn I**

*Solomon and Saturn I* is preserved in two manuscripts, Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 422 (**CC**<sub>422</sub>), and, in fragmentary form, among the marginal texts of Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 41 (**B**<sub>1</sub>). The main text of **B**<sub>1</sub>, which also contains a copy of the *eorðan*-recension of “Cædmon’s Hymn” (discussed above, pp. 116 ff.), is an early tenth-century copy of the Old English translation of Bede’s *Historia ecclesiastica*. In the late

<sup>566</sup>The alliteration in this line is discussed above, p. 260 and fn. 560.

<sup>567</sup>Mitchell, *OES*, § 375.



eleventh or early twelfth century, the manuscript's margins were filled with a collection of charms, blessings, and religious prose texts – the first 93 lines of *Solomon and Saturn I* among them. These texts are copied on specially ruled lines in a single unusual hand.<sup>568</sup> The text of *Solomon and Saturn* is found in the margins of pp. 196-198, where it ends defectively with the first letter of metrical line 94a. As this break does not occur at the edge of the page, it is presumably to be attributed to either a scribal decision to stop copying or a defective exemplar.

In CC<sub>422</sub>, *Solomon and Saturn I* supplies the first part of a lengthy composite prose and verse dialogue between its two main characters. The texts are copied in a single tenth-century hand as part of the manuscript's main text, and are apparently intended to be read as a single dialogue: *Solomon and Saturn I* ends on p. 6 with a point in middle of manuscript line 12; the prose dialogue which follows begins in the same manuscript line with a small capital S.<sup>569</sup> The first page of this version of *Solomon and Saturn I* has been badly damaged, partially through the use of a reagent. Its first 30 lines are largely illegible, and are ignored as a result for the purposes of the following discussion and catalogue.

With forty-three potentially significant substantive variants in 127 legible copied lines, *Solomon and Saturn I* has the lowest ratio of substantive variants to lines copied among the Anthologised and Excerpted texts. Nevertheless, its two witnesses exhibit many variant types most characteristic of this group of poems: one example of a linked inflectional variant; two examples of alternation between case forms and prepositional phrases; one example of the addition or omission of a metrical unit; one example of rearrangement across metrical line boundaries; and numerous examples of the substitution of stressed, non-homographic and

---

<sup>568</sup>The best discussion of the marginal texts in B<sub>1</sub> is in Raymond J.S. Grant, *Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 41: The Loricis and the Missal*, Costerus: Essays in English and American Language and Literature, n.s. 17 (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1978), pp. 1-26, esp. p. 26.

<sup>569</sup>The end of the prose dialogue fell on a now missing page. After the missing page(s), the text resumes with a poetic dialogue. A third verse dialogue (beginning in capital letters) follows this.

frequently non-synonymous elements. Of these, perhaps the most interesting is the substitution **B**<sub>1</sub> *læteð* ‘sets free’ (corrected to *filgið*) for **CC**<sub>422</sub> *fylgeð* ‘follow, pursue, persecute’ in line 92b. As mentioned below (p. 280), the **B**<sub>1</sub> reading is lexically, metrically and syntactically appropriate to the context in which it occurs – but semantically exactly the opposite of what the correction tells us was the reading of the scribe’s exemplar. Apparently the **B**<sub>1</sub> scribe was able to follow his text well enough to revise it unconsciously, despite its many metrical and syntactical problems.

The witnesses to *Solomon and Saturn* I are unusual among the Anthologised and Excerpted texts in that they exhibit two examples of the omission of a sensically, syntactically, or metrically necessary stressed word from the final lift of a Type B or Type E line. This type of variant – which is almost certainly to be assigned to scribal haste – appears three times more in the corpus of multiply attested poems, all in marginal or occasional texts: “Durham,” line 6a, p. 80; Psalm 93:18.2a, p. 46; and “Gloria I,” line 48a, p. 70. Two potentially analogous examples from the Anthologised and Excerpted texts, in contrast, show the scribe compensating for the ‘lost’ element. In *Soul and Body* I and II lines **V** 33b/**E** 30b, the ‘omission’ of *cuman* from a similar metrical position in the Exeter version of *Soul and Body* is linked to the rearrangement of the remaining elements in the line: **V** *eardode icþe oninnan nemeahte icðe ||| of cuman E ic þe Ininnan noicþe of meahte* (see p. 348, below); in lines **V** 126b/**E** 121b, the omission of *gehwam* in **E** is compensated for by the intrusion of an unstressed syllable: *mód snot/terra* (see below, p. 350)

## Textual Variants

## Inflectional Difference (9 examples)

*MSol*, **B<sub>1</sub>** 38b/*CC*<sub>422</sub> 38b

<b>B<sub>1</sub></b>	<b>CC<sub>422</sub></b>
Saturnus cwæð	Saturnus cwæð
36 Achwamæg  eaðusð eallra ge sceafta	36 achwa mæg eaðost ealra gesc[.]fta
ðā haligan duru___heofna rices	ðā  halgan duru heofona rices
torhte ontynan on <u>ge tales rime</u> .	torhte ontynan on <u>getæ rime</u>

In **B<sub>1</sub>**, *ge|tales* is a genitive singular noun used to qualify the dative prepositional object *rime*: ‘in the count of numbers’. In **CC<sub>422</sub>**, *getæ|rime* is a nonce compound ‘number-count’ (i.e. order, succession).<sup>570</sup> The variation has no significant effect on sense, syntax, or metre. The line is Type C-1 in both witness. In **B<sub>1</sub>**, the first stress is resolved; in **CC<sub>422</sub>** it is long by position.

*MSol*, **B<sub>1</sub>** 45b/*CC*<sub>422</sub> 45b

<b>B<sub>1</sub></b>	<b>CC<sub>422</sub></b>
Swilceðumiht mid beorhtan gebede	swylce ðu miht mid ðy be[.]rtan gebede
blod onhætān	blod ón hætān
þæs deofles  dry þ him dropan  stigað	ðæs deofles dream [..]t him dropan stigað
45 swatege swiðed sefan  <u>intingan</u>	45 swate  <i>geswiðed seofan</i> <u>intingum</u>
eges fullicra___þane seo  ærene gripo	eges fulllicran ðōn seo ærene  <i>gripu</i>
þōn  for twelf fýra ty dernessum	ðōn heo for xii [..]yra tydernessū
ofer glédagripe  gifrost weallað	ofer gleda  gripe gifrust wealleð.

The variation **B<sub>1</sub>** *intingan* **CC<sub>422</sub>** *intingum* either is dialectal or reflects a difference in number. **CC<sub>422</sub>** *intingum* is the expected dative plural form of the weak masculine noun *intinga* ‘cause; occasion; sake.’ **B<sub>1</sub>** *intingan* can be interpreted either as the expected form of the dative singular, or a late West-Saxon spelling of the dative plural, perhaps under the influence of the ending of the preceding word, **B<sub>1</sub>** *sefan*.

<sup>570</sup>Bessinger Smith.



in **B**<sub>1</sub> is metrically deficient. As O’Keeffe notes, **B**<sub>1</sub> *heofon* “is written at the end of the column, and it is entirely possible that the variant before us is a simple product of an eyeskip rather than a grammatical substitution.”<sup>574</sup> As the **B**<sub>1</sub> scribe invariably uses *heofn-* for oblique cases of *heofon* elsewhere in the poem, however, it is equally possible that the scribe intended to write the compound.<sup>575</sup>

**MSol, B<sub>1</sub> 75b/CC<sub>422</sub> 74b**

<b>B</b> <sub>1</sub>	<b>CC</b> <sub>422</sub>
75 he is mo digra <u>middan geardes</u> . staðole  he is strengra  þone ealle stána  gripe.	74 He [.] s modigra <u>middangear de</u> staðole strengra ðøn ealra stana gripe

Both readings make good sense, syntax, and metre.<sup>576</sup> In **CC**<sub>422</sub> *middangear|de* is dative singular expressing place where: ‘he is more powerful on earth’<sup>577</sup>; in **B**<sub>1</sub> *middan|geardes* is genitive singular, again expressing place where.<sup>578</sup> The two forms are metrically identical.

**MSol, B<sub>1</sub> 76b/CC<sub>422</sub> 75b**

<b>B</b> <sub>1</sub>	<b>CC</b> <sub>422</sub>
75 he is mo digra <u>middan geardes</u> . staðole  he is strengra  þone <u>ealle</u> stána  gripe.	74 He [.] s modigra <u>middangear de</u> staðole strengra ðøn <u>ealra</u> stana gripe

In **CC**<sub>422</sub>, *ealra* is a genitive plural strong adjective agreeing with *stana*: ‘than the grip of all stones’. In **B**<sub>1</sub>, *ealle* is presumably to be understood as an adverb qualifying *strengra*:

<sup>574</sup>O’Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 62.

<sup>575</sup>Cf. **B**<sub>1</sub> *heofna* (**CC**<sub>422</sub> *heofona*), l. 37, **B**<sub>1</sub> *heofnas* (**CC**<sub>422</sub> *heofonas*), l. 40; **B**<sub>1</sub> *heofnum* (**CC**<sub>422</sub> *hefenum*), l. 60.

<sup>576</sup>See also, O’Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 62.

<sup>577</sup>See Mitchell, *OES*, § 1416, who cites Boethius 68.21 as providing “two examples of the dative alone apparently expressing place where alongside three with the preposition *on*”: *forðæm hi hine ne magon tobrædan geond ealle eorðan, þeah hi on sumum lande mægen; forðæm þeah he sie anum gehered, þonne bið he oðrum unhered; þeah he on þam lande sie mære, þonne bið he on oðrum unmaere*. Mitchell notes that the dative alone for place where is rare, adding that “a preposition + the dative is usual even in the early texts.”

<sup>578</sup>See Mitchell, *OES*, § 1395-1399, who cites a number of parallel passages, including the *Wife’s Lament* 45b-47a: *sy ful wide fah / feorres folclondes* ‘let him be an outcast far afield in a distant land’.

‘he is stronger entirely in [his] foundation than the grip of stones’.<sup>579</sup> Metrically, the two forms are identical.

**MSol, B<sub>1</sub> 81b/CC<sub>422</sub> 80b**

**B<sub>1</sub>**

Lamana| he is læce leoht| winci,<sup>e</sup>ndra  
 swil|ce he hisdeafra| duru deadra| tunge.  
 scild ig|ra<sup>580</sup> scild scip|pendes seld  
 80 flodes| ferierend folces ne|riend \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_ypayrfe| weard earma fixa|  
 wyrma wlenco wil|deora holt  
 westenes| weard weorð myn|ta gearð

**CC<sub>422</sub>**

*lame*/na he islæce leoht wince[...]*ra*  
 swilce he isdeafra| duru dumbra tunge  
 scyldigra scyld scyppendes| seld  
 flodes ferigend folces nerigend  
 80 yða yrfe|weard earmra fisca  
 ȝwyrma [.]*elm* wildeora holt|  
 ón westenne weard weorð myn[.]a gearð

CC<sub>422</sub> *earmra* is a strong genitive plural adjective modifying *fisca* ‘of wretched fish’.

B<sub>1</sub> *earma*, if not a mistake for *earmra* (perhaps due to the influence of the following form *fixa*), is nominative or accusative plural feminine or a weak nominative singular masculine, none of which fit the context. The two forms are metrically identical.

**MSol, B<sub>1</sub> 83a/CC<sub>422</sub> 82b**

**B<sub>1</sub>**

Lamana| he is læce leoht| winci,<sup>e</sup>ndra  
 swil|ce he hisdeafra| duru deadra| tunge.  
 scild ig|ra scild scip|pendes seld  
 80 flodes| ferierend folces ne|riend \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_ypayrfe| weard earma fixa|  
 wyrma wlenco wil|deora holt  
westenes| weard weorð myn|ta gearð

**CC<sub>422</sub>**

*lame*/na he islæce leoht wince[...]*ra*  
 swilce he isdeafra| duru dumbra tunge  
 scyldigra scyld scyppendes| seld  
 flodes ferigend folces nerigend  
 80 yða yrfe|weard earmra fisca  
 ȝwyrma [.]*elm* wildeora holt|  
 ón westenne weard weorð myn[.]a gearð

The inflectional variation B<sub>1</sub> *westenes* CC<sub>422</sub> *westenne* is linked to addition or omission of the preceding preposition *on* (see below, p. 283). In B<sub>1</sub>, *westenes* is a genitive of specification qualifying *weard*, syntactically parallel to the genitives in lines 77a-82b and 83b: ‘guardian of the wasteland’. In CC<sub>422</sub>, *westenne* is dative singular, object of the preposition *ón*: ‘guardian in the wasteland’. This destroys the parallelism of the passage as a whole, but makes perfectly good sense.

<sup>579</sup>Menner construes the B<sub>1</sub> form as “a[ccusative] p[lural] m[asculine]” (*Solomon and Saturn*, Glossary, p. 150). There are no other accusative plural masculine nouns in the sentence, however.

<sup>580</sup>B<sub>1</sub> *scild ig|ra* with *scild ig* corrected from *swilce*.

The inflectional difference has no direct effect on metre, although the two lines are not metrically congruent due to the addition or omission of the preposition. CC<sub>422</sub> line 83a is Type B-2; in B<sub>1</sub>, the equivalent verse is a Type E with a short syllable in the half-lift.<sup>581</sup>

**MSol, B<sub>1</sub> 88b/CC<sub>422</sub> 87b**

<b>B<sub>1</sub></b>	<b>CC<sub>422</sub></b>
<p>7seðe  wile geornlice þono godes cwide         85 singan smealice  7hine symle lui an        wile butan  leahtrū hemæg  þone laþan gesið         feohterne feond  fleonde gebringan         Gyf þu him ærest  ufan yorn <u>gebri ngeð</u>.        ploγο prim.  þam is .p. nama. </p>	<p>7seðe <i>wile</i>  geornlice ðone godes cwide        singan soðlice 7hine  siemle wile        85 lufian butan leahtrum he mæg ðone  laðan gæst        feohtende feond fleonde gebrengan         gif ðu hi ærest ón ufan ierne <u>gebrengest</u>        pro loga prima ðamis P P. nama</p>

B<sub>1</sub> *gebri|ngeð* is either a mistaken use of the third person singular for an expected second person singular form, or an example of the occasional use of -ð for the second person singular (a Northumbrian feature).<sup>582</sup> CC<sub>422</sub> *gebrengest* is second person singular present indicative, as expected. The two endings are metrically identical.

**Substitution Of Unstressed Words and Elements<sup>583</sup> (1 example)**

**MSol, B<sub>1</sub> 78a/CC<sub>422</sub> 77b**

<b>B<sub>1</sub></b>	<b>CC<sub>422</sub></b>
<p>Lamana  he is læce leoht  winci,<sup>e</sup>ndra        swil ce he <u>his</u>deafra  duru deadra  tunge.        scild ig ra scild scip pendes seld        80 flodes  ferierend folces ne riend____        _yþayrfe  weard earma fixa         wyrma wlenco wil deora holt        westenes  weard weorð myn ta geard</p>	<p><i>lame</i>/na he islæce leoht wince[...]<i>ra</i>        swilce he <u>is</u>deafra  duru dumbra tunge        scyldigra scyld scyppendes  seld        flodes ferigend folces nerigend        80 yða yrfe weard earmra fisca        7wyrma [.]<i>elm</i> wildeora holt         ón westenne weard weorð myn[.]<i>a</i> geard</p>

The B<sub>1</sub> form *his* is presumably to be explained as an example of the sporadic insertion of unetymological *h* before vowels.<sup>584</sup> The pronoun *his* makes no sense in context.

<sup>581</sup>For parallel examples, see Pope, *Seven Old English Poems*, p. 116; and O’Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 62, fn. 48.

<sup>582</sup>Sievers-Brunner, § 356 Anm. 2.

<sup>583</sup>*þane/þone* occurs twice in B<sub>1</sub> for CC<sub>422</sub> *þonne* (lines 46 and 76).

<sup>584</sup>Sievers-Brunner, § 217 Anm. 1.

### Substitution Of Prefixes (2 examples)

#### *MSol*, **B<sub>1</sub>** 59a/*CC*<sub>422</sub> 59a

<b>B<sub>1</sub></b>		<b>CC<sub>422</sub></b>	
57b	mec þæs  on worulde  full oft	57b	[.]ec ðæs on worolde full oft
	fyrwet frineð fús gewiteð		fyrwit frineð fus gewiteð
	mod <u>geond</u> menceð		mod <u>ge</u> menceð.

The substitution **B<sub>1</sub>** *geond*- *CC*<sub>422</sub> *ge*- in line 59a has no effect on syntax or metre,<sup>585</sup> and probably little effect on sense. As a nonce word, the sense of **B<sub>1</sub>** *geond menceð* can only be derived from its component parts. It is usually translated as ‘confuses’, though ‘mixes up’ is an equally appropriate calque.<sup>586</sup> *CC*<sub>422</sub> *ge menceð* ‘mix, combine’ is also used in a literal and figurative sense, though Bosworth-Toller gives no examples of the verb in the sense ‘confuse’.

Metrically, the two prefixes are identical.

#### *MSol*, **B<sub>1</sub>** 73a/*CC*<sub>422</sub> 72a

<b>B<sub>1</sub></b>		<b>CC<sub>422</sub></b>	
73	Hu <sup>n</sup> gor <u>hege hege</u> <sup>587</sup> hideð helle gestrudeð	72	hungor hé <u>ahieðeð</u> helle gestrudeð
	wylm to worpeð  wuldor getym breð.		wylm toweor peð wuldor getimbred

**B<sub>1</sub>** *ge hideð* and *CC*<sub>422</sub> *ahieðeð* are metrically and syntactically identical. Assuming **B<sub>1</sub>** *-hideð* ‘hides’ is a graphic mistake for *-hieðeð* ‘plunders’ (see below, p. 277), the substitution has no significant effect on sense. The corrected dittography in **B<sub>1</sub>** (see footnote 587) suggests that the exemplar to this witness may have read *he gehideð*.

<sup>585</sup>For the stress of *geond*- see Campbell, *OEG*, § 74.

<sup>586</sup>See B.-T. *geond-mengan*, ‘to mingle, confuse’; Clark-Hall, *geondmengan*, ‘to confuse, bewilder’.

<sup>587</sup>**B<sub>1</sub>** hege *hege* with first *hege* underlined for deletion.



### Substitution Of Stressed Words and Elements (18 examples)

#### *MSol*, B<sub>1</sub> 32a/CC<sub>422</sub> 32a

B <sub>1</sub>	CC <sub>422</sub>
30 Þōn him bið leafre ðōn eall þeos leohte gesceaft  gegoten fram ðamgrunde goldesȝsilofres <u>feðer s cette</u> full fyrn gestreo na gif he æfre þæs organes ówiht cuðe.	30 [...]   leofre ðōn eall ðeos leohte gesceaft geg[.]ten frā ðam  grunde goldes ȝseolfres <u>feðer sceatū</u> full feoh gestreona  gif he æfre ðæs órganes ówiht cuðe.

B<sub>1</sub> *feðer s cette* is a nominative singular feminine adjective agreeing with *gesceaft*, line 30b: ‘all this bright creation, four cornered, full of ancient treasures.’<sup>588</sup> CC<sub>422</sub> *feðer sceatū* is a masculine dative plural noun ‘four quarters’: ‘all this bright creation in its four quarters full of treasures.’<sup>589</sup>

#### *MSol*, B<sub>1</sub> 32b/CC<sub>422</sub> 32b

B <sub>1</sub>	CC <sub>422</sub>
30 Þōn him bið leafre ðōn eall þeos leohte gesceaft  gegoten fram ðamgrunde goldesȝsilofres feðer s cette full <u>fyrn gestreo na</u> gif he æfre þæs organes ówiht cuðe.	30 [...]   leofre ðōn eall ðeos leohte gesceaft geg[.]ten frā ðam  grunde goldes ȝseolfres feðer sceatū full <u>feoh gestreona </u> gif he æfre ðæs órganes ówiht cuðe.

The variants B<sub>1</sub> *fyrn gestreo|na* ‘ancient treasure’ CC<sub>422</sub> *feoh gestreona* ‘wealth-treasure’ are metrically and syntactically identical. Both make good sense in context, without being exact synonyms. As O’Keeffe points out, the first element of the B<sub>1</sub> reading, *fyrn-*, occurs as the first element in eighteen Old English compounds, eleven of which are nonce words: “if the occurrence of these compounds may be considered representative of their use in Old English verse then *fyrn-* was clearly a popular morpheme with which to build nonce-words.”<sup>590</sup>

<sup>588</sup>See B.-T. *feðer-scette*.

<sup>589</sup>See B.-T. *feðer-sceátas*.

<sup>590</sup>O’Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 65.

*MSol*, **B<sub>1</sub>** 35a/*CC*<sub>422</sub> 35a

<b>B<sub>1</sub></b>	<b>CC<sub>422</sub></b>
Fracoð he bið þanne ȝfremde   frean ælmihtigum	fracoð he biððōn ȝ  fremede frean ælmihtigū
35 englū <b>unge sibb</b> ána hwarfað.	35 englum <b>ungelic</b> ána hwearfað

As O’Keeffe notes, **B<sub>1</sub>** *unge sibb* ‘not related’ and **CC<sub>422</sub>** *ungelic* ‘unlike, different’ are “semantically, metrically and syntactically acceptable” and attested elsewhere in Old English.<sup>591</sup>

*MSol*, **B<sub>1</sub>** 41b/*CC*<sub>422</sub> 41b

<b>B<sub>1</sub></b>	<b>CC<sub>422</sub></b>
SALON cwæð	Salomon cwæð
þ ge pa, m twigude pater n̄r.	ðæt ge palm twigede <i>paī noster</i>
40 heofnas ontyneð hal ie geblissað	40 heofonas ontyneð halige geblissað
metod gemiltsað morðor <b>gefilleð</b>	metod gemiltsað  morðor <b>gesylleð</b>
adwæsceð deofles fyr___dryh nes onæleð.	adwæsceð deofles fyr dryhtnes ón æleð

**B<sub>1</sub>** *gefilleð* ‘strikes’ **CC<sub>422</sub>** *gesylleð* ‘gives, sells, betrays’ are metrically, semantically, and syntactically appropriate without being synonyms. In **B<sub>1</sub>**, the *Pater noster* is said to ‘strike down’ murder; in **CC<sub>422</sub>**, it ‘betrays’ it.<sup>592</sup> Given the graphic similarity of *f* (i.e. *f*) and *s* (i.e. *s*) in insular script, it is likely that the substitution has its origins in a visual error.<sup>593</sup>

<sup>591</sup>O’Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 64.

<sup>592</sup>B.-T(S). *sellan* V (c).

<sup>593</sup>O’Keeffe lists this among her examples of the visual errors separating the two texts, *Visible Song*, p. 61, fn. 45.



**MSol, B<sub>1</sub> 56a/CC<sub>422</sub> 56a**

**B<sub>1</sub>**  
 Saturnus cwæð|  
 ac hūlic is se|organan inge|myndum  
 tobe|gangen ne þā| þe his gæst| wile  
 55 miltan| wið morðre| merian of sor|ge  
 Asceaden of| scyldū

**CC<sub>422</sub>**  
 Saturnus cwæð  
 ac hūlic ísse|organ *ingemyndū*  
 tobe gonganne ðam ðe his gast| *wile*  
 55 meltan wið morðre mergan of*sorge*  
*asceadan*| of scyldigū

**B<sub>1</sub>** *scyldū* is the dative plural of the feminine or masculine noun *scyld* ‘offence’; **CC<sub>422</sub>** *scyldigū*, the strong dative plural form of the adjective *scyldig*, ‘guilty’. Both readings make good sense, metre, and syntax, although as Menner points out, the noun in **B<sub>1</sub>** corresponds “to the other abstract nouns *morðre*, *sorge* (55)” in the surrounding lines,<sup>596</sup> while the adjective in **CC<sub>422</sub>** breaks the parallelism. Metrically, line 56a is Type A-1 with anacrusis in **B<sub>1</sub>**; Type D\*2 (or A-1)<sup>597</sup> with anacrusis in **CC<sub>422</sub>**.

Suggesting that the **CC<sub>422</sub>** reading “can be argued to be a mechanical error,” O’Keeffe excludes this variant from her count of “‘formulaic’ lexical variants”.<sup>598</sup>

**MSol, B<sub>1</sub> 57a/CC<sub>422</sub> 57a**

**B<sub>1</sub>**  
 56b huru hī| scep pend geaf|  
wundor licne| wlite

**CC<sub>422</sub>**  
 56b huru him scippend geaf  
wuldorlicne wlite

Variation between *wuldor(-)* and *wundor(-)* is frequent in Old English. The two readings are metrically, semantically, and syntactically indistinguishable.

<sup>596</sup>Menner, *Solomon and Saturn*, p. 110.

<sup>597</sup>Campbell reports the syncopation of *-ig-* after long syllables to be “the rule in Old English metre (often against the manuscript spelling),” *OEG*, § 358.

<sup>598</sup>O’Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 63.

**MSol, B<sub>1</sub> 60b/CC<sub>422</sub> 60b**

<b>B<sub>1</sub></b>	nænig monna  wat 60 hæleðaunder heofnum huminhige <b>dreogeð</b> bisiafter bocum hwylū  me bryne stigeð hige heortan hearde wealleð.	<b>CC<sub>422</sub></b>	næ[...] manna wat 60 hæleðaunder hefenum hu min hige <b>dreoseð</b> bysig æfter bocū  hwilum me bryne stigeð hige heortan neah hædre wealleð.
----------------------	---	-------------------------	--

**B<sub>1</sub>** *dreogeð* **CC<sub>422</sub>** *dreoseð* are metrically and syntactically identical third-person preterite indicative singular inflected verbs. While both words are appropriate to the context in which they appear, they are not synonyms. In **CC<sub>422</sub>**, Saturn reports that his spirit ‘became weak’ (*drēosan*, ‘become weak, fail’) in his studies; in **B<sub>1</sub>**, he notes that nobody knows how hard it has ‘worked’ (*drēogan* ‘do, work, perform’) at them. As the two words differ in a single letter, graphic error in one or another text is a possible cause of the variant.

**MSol, B<sub>1</sub> 62b/CC<sub>422</sub> 62b**

<b>B<sub>1</sub></b>	nænig monna  wat 60 hæleðaunder heofnum huminhige dreogeð bisiafter bocum hwylū  me bryne stigeð hige heortan <b>hearde</b> wealleð.	<b>CC<sub>422</sub></b>	næ[...] manna wat 60 hæleðaunder hefenum hu min hige dreoseð bysig æfter bocū  hwilum me bryne stigeð hige heortan neah <b>hædre</b> wealleð.
----------------------	---	-------------------------	--

**B<sub>1</sub>** *hearde* **CC<sub>422</sub>** *hædre* are metrically and syntactically identical. Both readings make good, but different, sense in context: **B<sub>1</sub>** ‘welled furiously’; **CC<sub>422</sub>** ‘welled brightly’.<sup>599</sup>

**MSol, B<sub>1</sub> 73a/CC<sub>422</sub> 72b**

<b>B<sub>1</sub></b>	73 Hu <sup>n</sup> gor hege hege <b>hided</b> helle gestrudeð  wylm to worpeð  wuldor getym breð.	<b>CC<sub>422</sub></b>	72 hungor hé <b>ahieðeð</b> helle gestrudeð wylm toweor peð wuldor getimbred
----------------------	--	-------------------------	---

As written, **B<sub>1</sub>** *ge hided* ‘hides’ seems semantically inappropriate, though metrically and syntactically acceptable. As O’Keeffe, suggests, however, the form is most likely for *gehided* (cf. **CC<sub>422</sub>** *ahieðeð*), ‘plunders, ravages’.<sup>600</sup> See also above, p. 272.

<sup>599</sup>The adverb in **CC<sub>422</sub>** is usually taken (with a changing selection of examples from other poems) as evidence for the existence of a poetic adverb *hædre* ‘oppressively’ (cf. B.-T., CH, *hædre*; Menner, *Solomon and Saturn*, Glossary, p. 154). *Hædre*, an adverbial form of *hādor*, ‘bright’ is metrically indistinguishable, however, and makes equally good sense in all examples cited by B.-T. I am preparing a study of the form.

<sup>600</sup>O’Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 64.

**MSol, B<sub>1</sub> 78b/CC<sub>422</sub> 77b****B<sub>1</sub>**

Lamana| he is læce leoht| winci,<sup>e</sup>ndra  
 swil|ce he hisdeafra| duru **deadra**| tunge.  
 scild ig|ra scild scip|pendes seld  
 80 flodes| ferierend folces ne|riend\_\_\_\_\_  
 \_ypayrfe| weard earma fixa|  
 wyrma wlenco wil|deora holt  
 westenes| weard weorð myn|ta geard

**CC<sub>422</sub>**

*lame*/na he islæce leoht wince[...]|ra  
 swilce he isdeafra| duru **dumbra** tunge  
 scyldigra scyld scyppendes| seld  
 flodes ferigend folces nerigend  
 80 yða yrfe|weard earmra fisca  
 ȝwyrma [.]*elm* wildeora holt|  
 ón westenne weard weorð myn[.]a geard

Both readings make good sense and metre, although **CC<sub>422</sub>** *dumbra tunge* seems to offer a closer parallel to the other qualities of the *Pater noster* discussed in lines 77-78. As Sisam suggests, however, “even... *deadra tunge* [‘tongue of the dead’] might be defended if there were no second manuscript to support *dumbra*.”<sup>601</sup>

**MSol, B<sub>1</sub> 82a/CC<sub>422</sub> 81a****B<sub>1</sub>**

Lamana| he is læce leoht| winci,<sup>e</sup>ndra  
 swil|ce he hisdeafra| duru deadra| tunge.  
 scild ig|ra scild scip|pendes seld  
 80 flodes| ferierend folces ne|riend\_\_\_\_\_  
 \_ypayrfe| weard earma fixa|  
 wyrma **wlenco** wil|deora holt  
 westenes| weard weorð myn|ta geard

**CC<sub>422</sub>**

*lame*/na he islæce leoht wince[...]|ra  
 swilce he isdeafra| duru dumbra tunge  
 scyldigra scyld scyppendes| seld  
 flodes ferigend folces nerigend  
 80 yða yrfe|weard earmra fisca  
 ȝwyrma [.]*elm* wildeora holt|  
 ón westenne weard weorð myn[.]a geard

Both **B<sub>1</sub>** *wlenco* ‘pride, glory’ and **CC<sub>422</sub>** [.]*elm* (presumably for *welm* ‘surging flame’) make good sense, metre, and syntax. As O’Keeffe notes, “among the fantastic terms of this litany, neither *welm* nor *wlenco* can claim pride of place.”<sup>602</sup> The substitution is linked metrically to the addition or omission of *ȝ* at the beginning of the line. In **B<sub>1</sub>** (without *ȝ*), the verse is Type A-1; in **CC<sub>422</sub>** (with *ȝ*), it is Type B-1. See also below, p. 282.

<sup>601</sup>Sisam, “Authority,” p. 34.

<sup>602</sup>O’Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 64.

**MSol, B<sub>1</sub> 85a/CC<sub>422</sub> 84a****B<sub>1</sub>**

85 7seðe| wile geornlice þono godes cwide|  
 singan **smealice**| 7hine symle lui|an  
 wile butan| leahrū hemæg| þone laþan gesið|  
 feohterne feond| fleonde gebringan|  
 Gyf þu him ærest| ufan yorn gebri|ngeð.  
 plogo prim.| þam is .p. nama.|

**CC<sub>422</sub>**

85 7seðe *wile*| geornlice ðone godes cwide  
 singan **soðlice** 7hine| siemle wile  
 lufian butan leahtrum he mæg ðone| laðan gæst  
 feohtende feond fleonde gebrengan|  
 gif ðu hī ærest ón ufan ierne gebrengest  
 pro|loga prima ðamis P P. nama

The two adverbs are metrically and syntactically identical. O’Keeffe notes that **B<sub>1</sub>** *smealice* ‘closely, thoroughly, accurately’ is perhaps to be preferred to **CC<sub>422</sub>** *soðlice* ‘truly’ as a description of the preferred manner of singing the *Pater noster*, “but... is otherwise unattested in verse.”<sup>603</sup>

**MSol, B<sub>1</sub> 86b/CC<sub>422</sub> 85b****B<sub>1</sub>**

85 7seðe| wile geornlice þono godes cwide|  
 singan smealice| 7hine symle lui|an  
 wile butan| leahrū hemæg| þone laþan **gesið**|  
 feohterne feond| fleonde gebringan|  
 Gyf þu him ærest| ufan yorn gebri|ngeð.  
 plogo prim.| þam is .p. nama.|

**CC<sub>422</sub>**

85 7seðe *wile*| geornlice ðone godes cwide  
 singan soðlice 7hine| siemle wile  
 lufian butan leahtrum he mæg ðone| laðan **gæst**  
 feohtende feond fleonde gebrengan|  
 gif ðu hī ærest ón ufan ierne gebrengest  
 pro|loga prima ðamis P P. nama

Both readings make good sense and are syntactically identical. In **B<sub>1</sub>**, the *feond* is described as a hateful *gesið* ‘companion’, in **CC<sub>422</sub>**, as a hateful *gæst* ‘spirit’. Metrically, the half-line is Type B-2 in **B<sub>1</sub>** and B-1 in **CC<sub>422</sub>**. O’Keeffe cites parallels to the **CC<sub>422</sub>** reading in *Soul and Body* II 110b and *Guðlac* 361b; she finds parallels to the **B<sub>1</sub>** reading in *Daniel* 661b and *Juliana* 242.<sup>604</sup>

<sup>603</sup>O’Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 64.

<sup>604</sup>O’Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 64.

*MSol*, B<sub>1</sub> 88b/CC<sub>422</sub> 87bB<sub>1</sub>

85 ȝseðe| wile geornlice þono godes cwide|  
 singan smealice| ȝhine symle lui|an  
 wile butan| leahrū hemæg| þone laþan gesið|  
 feohterne feond| fleonde gebringan|  
 Gyf þu him ærest| ufan **vorn** gebri|ngeð.  
 plogo prim.| þam is .p. nama.|

CC<sub>422</sub>

85 ȝseðe *wile*| geornlice ðone godes cwide  
 singan soðlice ȝhine| siemle wile  
 lufian butan leahrūm he mæg ðone| laðan gæst  
 feohtende feond fleonde gebrengan|  
 gif ðu hī ærest ón ufan **ierne** gebrengest  
 pro|loga prima ðamis P P. nama

The B<sub>1</sub> reading is in error. For the confusion of *e* and *o* in the B<sub>1</sub> scribe's work, cf. B<sub>1</sub>

*þono* CC<sub>422</sub> *ðone*, line 84b/83b.

*MSol*, B<sub>1</sub> 90a/CC<sub>422</sub> 89aB<sub>1</sub>

90 hafað guð **maga** gyrde lange  
 gyldene gade ȝþone grymman feond  
 swið|mod swapeð ȝon swaðe læteð \filgið/  
 A. ofer mægene ȝhine eac ofslehð. T.|||

CC<sub>422</sub>

90 hafað guð|**mæcga** gierde lange  
 gyldene gade ȝa ðone g[...]|man|| feond  
 swið mod sweopað ȝhim on swaðe fylgeð  
 .A. á ofer|mægene ȝhine eac óf slihð. T t .

Both readings make good sense, metre and syntax. Confusion of *maga* and *mæcga* is also found among the witnesses to the *Capture of the Five Boroughs* (see p. 176, above).

*MSol*, B<sub>1</sub> 92b/CC<sub>422</sub> 91bB<sub>1</sub>

90 hafað guð maga gyrde lange  
 gyldene gade ȝþone grymman feond  
 swið|mod swapeð ȝon swaðe **læteð** \filgið/  
 A. ofer mægene ȝhine eac ofslehð. T.|||

CC<sub>422</sub>

90 hafað guð|mæcga gierde lange  
 gyldene gade ȝa ðone g[...]|man|| feond  
 swið mod sweopað ȝhim on swaðe **fylgeð**  
 .A. á ofer|mægene ȝhine eac óf slihð. T t .

As mentioned above (p. 266), the uncorrected B<sub>1</sub> reading *læteð* 'set free' means exactly the opposite of CC<sub>422</sub> *fylgeð* 'follow, pursue, persecute', but makes equally good syntax, sense, and metre. As there is nothing in the immediate context to suggest that the variation is the result of a visual error, it seems more likely that the variant is a result of the B<sub>1</sub> scribe's anticipation of his exemplar (as he immediately corrects his substitution, we know that his exemplar, like CC<sub>422</sub>, read *filgið*). This is at the same time evidence for how variants such as those found throughout the Anthologised and Excerpted texts may have arisen, and, since the scribe did not allow his variant to stand, evidence that the B<sub>1</sub> scribe was interested in the accurate reproduction of his text. The fact two examples of the omission of metrically,





(‘kettle, cauldron’) in line 46b. In **B**<sub>1</sub>, the equivalent lines show the non-expression of a subject which has to be supplied from a noun in a neighbouring principal clause (in this case *griþo*, line 46b). Both are acceptable Old English.<sup>606</sup>

**MSol, B<sub>1</sub> 76a/CC<sub>422</sub> 75a**

<b>B<sub>1</sub></b>	<b>CC<sub>422</sub></b>
75 he is mo digra middan geardes. staðole  <b>he is</b> strengra  þone ealle stána  gripe.	74 He [.]s modigra middangear de staðole strengra ðon ealra stana gripe

The addition or omission of *he is* has no significant effect on sense, metre, or syntax.

In both witnesses, the subject and verb of the clause in line 76 are the same as that of line 75.

In **B**<sub>1</sub>, this subject and verb are repeated before the predicate adjective *strengra*; in **CC**<sub>422</sub>, they are not. Both readings are acceptable Old English syntax.<sup>607</sup> O’Keeffe’s suggestion that the **B**<sub>1</sub> reading “does not conform to the classical shape of the half-line, since the beginning of the independent clause is not coincident with the beginning of the metrical unit”<sup>608</sup> rests on the assumption that *staðole* belongs to the same clause as **B**<sub>1</sub> 75a-b. I see no reason why the noun cannot be construed as a dative of place in the clause of line 76: ‘at [his] foundation, he is stronger entirely than [*þone* for *þonne*] the grip of stones.’

**MSol, B<sub>1</sub> 82a/CC<sub>422</sub> 81a**

<b>B<sub>1</sub></b>	<b>CC<sub>422</sub></b>
Lamana  he is læce leoht  winci, <sup>e</sup> ndra swilce he hisdeafra  duru deadra  tunge. scild ig ra scild scip pendes seld 80 flodes  ferierend folces ne riend_____	<i>lame</i> /na he islæce leoht wince[...] ra swilce he isdeafra  duru dumbra tunge scyldigra scyld scyppendes  seld flodes ferigend folces nerigend
_ypayrfe  weard earma fixa  wyrma wlenco wil deora holt westenes  weard weorð myn ta geard	80 yða yrfe weard earmra fisca ƿwyrma [.] <i>elm</i> wildeora holt  on westenne weard weorð myn[.]a geard

The addition or omission of *7* in **B**<sub>1</sub> 82a/CC<sub>422</sub> 81a has an important effect on metre, but little significant effect on sense or syntax. In both manuscripts, the line forms part of a

<sup>606</sup>See Mitchell, *OES*, §§ 1512-1516.

<sup>607</sup>Mitchell, *OES*, §§ 1512-1516.

long list of epithets for the *Pater noster*. In **B**<sub>1</sub>, the epithet is joined asyndetically to the preceding text; in **CC**<sub>422</sub>, it is linked syndetically. Both versions are acceptable Old English syntax.

Metrically, the addition or omission of *ȝ* is linked to the substitution of stressed words **B**<sub>1</sub> *wlenco* **CC**<sub>422</sub> [*.]elm* later in the same half-line (see above, p. 278). In **B**<sub>1</sub> (with *wlenco* and without *ȝ*), line 82a is Type A-1; in **CC**<sub>422</sub> (with [*.]elm* and *ȝ*), the same line is Type B-1.

*MSol*, **B**<sub>1</sub> 83a/**CC**<sub>422</sub> 82a

<b>B</b> <sub>1</sub>	<b>CC</b> <sub>422</sub>
Lamana  he is læce leoht  winci, <sup>e</sup> ndra	<i>lame</i> /na he islæce leoht wince[...] <i>ra</i>
swil ce he hisdeafra  duru deadra  tunge.	swilce he isdeafra  duru dumbra tunge
scild ig ra scild scip pendes seld	scyldigra scyld scyppendes  seld
80 flodes  ferierend folces ne riend _____	flodes ferigend folces nerigend
<u>y</u> payrfe  weard earma fixa	80 yða yrfe weard earmra fisca
wyrma wlenco wil deora holt	ȝwyrma [ <i>.]elm</i> wildeora holt
westenes  weard weorð myn ta geard	<u>ón</u> westenne weard weorð myn[.]a geard

The addition or omission of *on* in **B**<sub>1</sub> 83a/**CC**<sub>422</sub> 82a has an important effect on the local syntax of the clause, but is of little metrical or semantic significance. In **CC**<sub>422</sub>, *ón* introduces a prepositional adverbial phrase: '[he is] guardian in the wasteland'; in **B**<sub>1</sub>, the same syntactic task is performed by an adverbial genitive case ending. The addition or omission of *on* is linked to the case ending of *weste(n)e(s)*. See above, p. 270.

In **CC**<sub>422</sub> the line is Type B-2; in **B**<sub>1</sub> is it Type E.

<sup>608</sup>O'Keefe, *Visible Song*, p. 62. *Staðole* is included in the clause of line 76a in the punctuation of Dobbie's and Menner's editions.

**MSol, B<sub>1</sub> 88a/CC<sub>422</sub> 87a****B<sub>1</sub>**

85 7seðe| wile geornlice þono godes cwide|  
 singan smealice| 7hine symle lui|an  
 wile butan| leahrū hemæg| þone laþan gesið|  
 feohterne feond| fleonde gebringan|  
 Gyf þu him ærest| ufan yorn gebri|ngeð.  
 plogo prim.| þam is .p. nama.|

**CC<sub>422</sub>**

85 7seðe *wile*| geornlice ðone godes cwide  
 singan soðlice 7hine| siemle wile  
 lufian butan leahrūm he mæg ðone| laðan gæst  
 feohtende feond fleonde gebrengan|  
 gif ðu hī ærest **on** ufan ierne gebrengest  
 pro|loga prima ðamis P P. nama

The addition of *on* has no significant effect on syntax, sense, or metre. *Ufan* is found both with and without *on*, and the addition or omission falls in the medial drop of a Type B line. Such variation in the use of prepositions is a feature of the Anthologised and Excerpted texts. See also the addition or omission of *on* in **B<sub>1</sub> 83a/CC<sub>422</sub> 82a**, p. 283.

**MSol, B<sub>1</sub> 91b/CC<sub>422</sub> 90b****B<sub>1</sub>**

90 hafað guð maga gyrde lange  
 gyldene gade 7þone grymman feond  
 swið|mod swapeð 7on swaðe læteð |filgið/  
 A. ofer mægene 7hine eac ofslehð. T.||

**CC<sub>422</sub>**

90 hafað guð|mæcga gierde lange  
 90 gyldene gade 7a ðone g[...]|man|| feond  
 swið mod sweopað 7him on swaðe fylgeð  
 .A. á ofer|mægene 7hine eac óf slihð. T t .

The addition or omission of *a* ‘ever’ to **B<sub>1</sub> 91b/CC<sub>422</sub> 90b** has no significant effect on sense, metre, or syntax. The variant falls on the preliminary dip of a Type B-1 line.

**MSol, B<sub>1</sub> 92b/CC<sub>422</sub> 91b****B<sub>1</sub>**

90 hafað guð maga gyrde lange  
 gyldene gade 7þone grymman feond  
 swið|mod swapeð 7on swaðe læteð |filgið/  
 A. ofer mægene 7hine eac ofslehð. T.||

**CC<sub>422</sub>**

90 hafað guð|mæcga gierde lange  
 90 gyldene gade 7a ðone g[...]|man|| feond  
 swið mod sweopað 7**him** on swaðe fylgeð  
 .A. á ofer|mægene 7hine eac óf slihð. T t .

The addition or omission of *him* in line 92b has no significant effect on sense, metre, or syntax. In both witnesses, the object of the verb in line **B<sub>1</sub> 92b/CC<sub>422</sub> 91b** (**CC<sub>422</sub>** *fylgeð*, **B<sub>1</sub>** *læteð* corrected to *filgið*) is the same as that of the preceding clause (i.e. *þone grymman feond*, **B<sub>1</sub> 91b/CC<sub>422</sub> 90b**). In **B<sub>1</sub>**, the object of the first clause is not repeated in the second (the

normal pattern in Old English); in **CC**<sub>422</sub>, it is replaced by the dative third person singular pronoun. Both are acceptable syntax.<sup>609</sup>

### Addition/Omission Of Stressed Words and Elements (2 examples)

#### **MSol, B<sub>1</sub> 62a/CC<sub>422</sub> 62a**

<b>B<sub>1</sub></b>	<b>CC<sub>422</sub></b>
nænig monna  wat	næ[...] manna wat
60 hæleðaunder heofnum huminhige dreogeð	60 hæleða   under hefenum hu min hige dreoseð
bisiafter bocum hwylū  me bryne stigeð	bysig æfter bocū  hwilum me bryne stigeð
hige heortan hearde wealleð.	hige heortan <b>neah</b> hædre wealleð.

The addition or omission of *neah* has an important effect on sense, metre, and syntax.

In **CC**<sub>422</sub>, *neah* governs *hige* (to be construed as a dative singular noun), and *bryne* is the subject of both *stigeð* and *wealleð*: ‘at times the fire ascends me, wells brightly near the thoughts of my heart.’ Metrically, the line is Type E-1.

In **B<sub>1</sub>**, *hige* is itself the subject of *wealleð* and parallel to *bryne*: ‘at times fire ascends me; thought of the heart wells vigorously.’ With the omission of *neah*, **B<sub>1</sub>** line 62a is unmetrical. Similar omissions of metrically (and often syntactically and semantically) necessary words from the final stress of Type B and Type E lines are found among the marginal and glossing poems discussed in Chapter Two. See also **B<sub>1</sub>** Ø **CC**<sub>422</sub> *leaf*, line 64a (p. 286), the discussion of **B<sub>1</sub>** *læteð* **CC**<sub>422</sub> *fylgeð*, p. 280, and pp. 46, 70, 80 and 266.

<sup>609</sup>On the “pattern... in which the direct object is expressed with the first verb only,” see Mitchell, *OES*, § 1575. Sequences following the pattern “noun object...pronoun object” are discussed by Mitchell in § 1570. O’Keeffe describes the omission of *him* from **B<sub>1</sub>** as “probably the result of eyeskip,” *Visible Song*, p. 64. *Fylgan* is found with dative as well as accusative objects. See Mitchell, *OES*, § 1092.

**MSol, B<sub>1</sub> 64a/CC<sub>422</sub> 64a**

<b>B<sub>1</sub></b>	<b>CC<sub>422</sub></b>
SALON. ē.	Salomon cwæð
63 gylden isse  godes cwide gym mum astæned. hafað seolfren	63 gylden isse godes cwide gimmū [...]æned  hafað sylfren <u>leaf</u>

**CC<sub>422</sub>** *leaf* seems necessary for sense, metre and syntax. In **CC<sub>422</sub>**, line 64a is Type B-1; **B<sub>1</sub>** is unmetrical. See also **B<sub>1</sub>**  $\emptyset$  **CC<sub>422</sub>** *neah*, line 62a (p. 285), the discussion of **B<sub>1</sub>** *læteð* **CC<sub>422</sub>** *fylgeð*, p. 280.

**Addition/Omission Of Metrical Units (1 example)****MSol, B<sub>1</sub> 67**

<b>B<sub>1</sub></b>	<b>CC<sub>422</sub></b>
66 hebið sefan snytero ȝsawle hunig <u>ȝmodes meolc</u> <u>mærþa gesællgost.</u>	66 he bið seofan snytro ȝsaule hunig

Lines 66 and (in **B<sub>1</sub>**) 67 introduce a series of clauses detailing the qualities of the *Pater noster*. While line 67 introduces some further epithets for the prayer, line 66 is syntactically complete without it.

**Rearrangement across Line Boundaries (1 example)****MSol, B<sub>1</sub> 85b-86a/CC<sub>422</sub> 84b-85a**

<b>B<sub>1</sub></b>	<b>CC<sub>422</sub></b>
ȝseðe  wile geornlice þono godes cwide  85 singan smealice  ȝhine symle <u>lui an</u> <u>wile</u> butan  leahrū hemæg  þone laþan gesið  feohterne feond  fleonde gebringan  Gyf þu him ærest  ufan yorn gebri ngeð. plogo prim.  þam is .p. nama	ȝseðe <u>wile</u>   geornlice ðone godes cwide singan soðlice ȝhine  siemle <u>wile</u> 85 <u>lufian</u> butan leahtrum he mæg ðone  laðan gæst feohtende feond fleonde gebrengan  gif ðu hi ærest ón ufan ierne gebrengest pro loga prima ðamis P P. nama

The rearrangement affects the metre of the two lines. In **CC<sub>422</sub>**, line 84b is Type B-1 with resolution of the second lift; line 85a is Type A-1. In **B<sub>1</sub>**, *lui|an* (for *lufian*) adds a third (unmetrical) dip at the end of line 85b; line 86a is Type A-3.<sup>610</sup> In addition to the metrical problems in **B<sub>1</sub>**, the double alliteration in **CC<sub>422</sub>** line 85a suggests that it preserves the original reading.

<sup>610</sup>See also O’Keeffe, *Visible Song*, pp. 62-63. Menner’s arrangement of **B<sub>1</sub>** lines 85b-86a with the line division between *symle* and *lui|an* does not solve the problem: *ȝhine siemle* has only one lift.

**Reinterpretation (1 example)****MSol, B<sub>1</sub> 65b/CC<sub>422</sub> 65b**

<b>B<sub>1</sub></b>	<b>CC<sub>422</sub></b>
SALON. ē.	Salomon cwæð
gylden isse  godes cwide gym mum astæned.	gylden isse godes cwide gimmū [...]æned
hafað seolofren sundor mæg æg hwylc	hafað sylfren leaf sundor mæg æghwylc
65 þurh gæstæs  gife <b>god spellian</b>	65 ðurh gastes  gife <b>god spel secgan</b>

**B<sub>1</sub>** *god spellian* is a compound verb ‘evangelise’. **CC<sub>422</sub>** *god spel secgan* consists of an accusative object and infinitive ‘preach the gospel’. While O’Keeffe describes the **B<sub>1</sub>** reading as being “the weaker version and only marginally acceptable,”<sup>611</sup> both readings appear to make good sense and metre. Metrically, **B<sub>1</sub>** is Type D-2 and **CC<sub>422</sub>** Type A-2a.

***Dream of the Rood/Ruthwell Cross Inscription***

The poem known in its Vercelli Book form as the *Dream of the Rood*, survives in two different recensions: a longer version preserved among the verse and prose religious texts of the late tenth-century Vercelli, Biblioteca Capitolare CXVII (**V**); and a much shorter runic version carved around the edges of a mid eighth-century stone cross in Ruthwell Parish, Dumfriesshire (**R**).

In neither case can the poem be said with certainty to have been part of the original design of the environment in which it now appears. In **R**, the difficulty lies in the arrangement of the runic inscription as a series of short horizontal rows running down the monument’s vertical borders. While the poem is usually assumed on linguistic and iconographic grounds to have been carved at the same time as the monument’s sculptured panels,<sup>612</sup> R.I. Page and Paul

<sup>611</sup>O’Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 62.

<sup>612</sup>É. Ó Carragáin, “Liturgical Innovations Associated with Pope Sergius and the Iconography of the Ruthwell and Bewcastle Crosses,” *Bede and Anglo-Saxon England: Papers in Honour of the 1300th Anniversary of the Birth of Bede, Given at Cornell University in 1973 and 1974*, ed. Robert T. Farrell, British Archaeological Reports 46 (n.p.l.: n.p., 1978) 131-47, especially pp. 140-141. Rosemary Cramp, “The Anglican Sculptured Crosses of Dumfriesshire,” *Transactions of the Dumfriesshire and Galloway Natural History and Antiquarian Society*, 3rd ser. 38 (1959-60): 9-20, esp. p. 12.

Meyvaert have argued that this awkward and unusual layout is instead evidence that the poem was added to the cross after it was erected.<sup>613</sup>

In V, the difficulty involves the relationship of the *Dream of the Rood* to the surrounding texts. As it is now, the *Dream of the Rood* begins on the verso of the last folio of quire 14 (f. 104v) and ends with the second recto of quire 15 (f. 106r). It is preceded in quire 14 by the end of *Soul and Body II* and “Homiletic Fragment I” (also known as “Deceit”). In quire 15, the *Dream of the Rood* is followed by homily XIX and the beginning of homily XX, the second part of which continues into quire 16.

The trouble, however, is that quires 14 and 16 appear to have belonged originally to two different collections.<sup>614</sup> Quire 14, like the majority of leaves in the preceding ten quires, is ruled for 24 lines to the page. Quire 16, on the other hand, like quire 17, has been ruled for 31 lines. Quire 15, which is irregular in both lineation and makeup, appears to have been copied specially to link quires 14 and 16 when the scribe decided to join the two separate collections together. It is made up of three sheets with an extra singleton, and is ruled for 32 lines on ff. 105r-109v and 33 lines on ff. 110r-111v. Its last page is laid out so as to ensure that the end of the first part of Homily XX coincides with the end of the folio.

The relationship of the *Dream of the Rood* to the originally separate collections in quires 4-14 and 16-17 has been a matter of great dispute. Not only are parts of the poem found in both quire 14 and the “bridging” quire 15, but the quire-boundary also coincides with a marked difference in the poem’s layout and punctuation. In quire 14, the *Dream of the Rood* is copied with little regard for space. Its first twelve metrical lines are marked off as a distinct

---

<sup>613</sup>R. I. Page, *An Introduction to English Runes* (London: Methuen, 1973), p. 150. Paul Meyvaert, “An Apocalypse Panel on the Ruthwell Cross,” *Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 9 (1982): 3-32, at pp. 23-26.

<sup>614</sup>See Celia Sisam, ed., *The Vercelli Book: A Late Tenth Century Manuscript Containing Prose and Verse*. *Vercelli Biblioteca Capitolare CXVII*, EEMF 19 (Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1976), pp. 37-44.



verse paragraph by the use of a *positura* (:7) and blank space extending to the end of the manuscript line; a second *positura* follows *treow* at the end of metrical line 17. With the beginning of quire 15, however, the poem is both more compactly arranged on the page and punctuated according to a different system. As mentioned above, the first pages of the bridging quire are ruled for 32 lines instead of the 24 lines of quire 14. With f. 105r, moreover, the scribe abandons the use of the *positurae* and begins to mark his poem with metrical points. Where f. 104v contains only seven points, f. 105r has thirty-four. Where the scribe included two *positurae* in the first 21 metrical lines of f. the poem on 104v in quire 14, the text's remaining 135 metrical lines (most of which are in quire 15) contain only one variant form (:~) after the last line of the poem as a whole on f. 106r.<sup>615</sup>

For her part, Celia Sisam has argued that these differences in layout indicate that the *Dream of the Rood* was added to the Vercelli book to fill out the beginning of the “bridging” quire 15:

It is probable that, before quire 16 became part of the Vercelli Book, it was preceded by a quire \*15, which, like quires 16 and 17, had 31 lines to a page. It would have contained homily XIX and the first part of homily XX; these would have occupied most of the last six leaves of the quire, and homily XIX would have begun part-way down the recto of the third leaf. Before it must have come matter not wanted for the Vercelli Book; matter which could not be excised because it occupied part of the recto of the leaf on which homily XIX began. In its place the Vercelli compiler inserted the shorter *Dream of the Rood*. With characteristic economy, he began it in the blank space after ‘Deceit’ [i.e. “Homiletic Fragment I”] on the last page of quire 14; then made a new quire 15, exactly tailored to contain the rest of *The Dream of the Rood*, and the homilies (XIX and part of XX) which had to be recopied from his original quire \*15.<sup>616</sup>

---

<sup>615</sup>See Ó Carragáin, “How Did the Vercelli Collector Interpret the *Dream of the Rood*?,” *Studies in English Language and Early Literature in Honour of Paul Christopherson*, ed. P. M. Tilling, Occasional Papers in Linguistics and Language Learning 8 (Belfast: 1981) 62-104, at pp. 81-82.

<sup>616</sup>Celia Sisam, *The Vercelli Book*, p. 39.

E. Ó Carragáin, on the other hand, has suggested that the leisurely layout of the *Dream* in quire 14 indicates that it followed the religious poems *Soul and Body* and “Homiletic Fragment I” in the booklet (quires 4-14) to which the Vercelli scribe added the homilies of quires 16 and 17:

The evidence of the punctuation indicates that *The Dream of the Rood* was already part of Booklet B [i.e. the material in quires 4-14] before the Vercelli collector thought of the splicing procedure which gave us quires 15-17 as we have them; when he made a decision to splice Homilies XIX-XXII on to Booklet B, he recopied lines 22-156 of *The Dream of the Rood* in Quire 15, and fitted after it Homily XIX and the beginning of Homily XX. This makes it much more likely that the collector originally found *The Dream of the Rood* already circulating with the preceding verse texts, *Soul and Body I* and *Homiletic Fragment I*, and copied them as a group into his collection.<sup>617</sup>

Despite these difficulties in determining the original relationship of the poem to the contexts in which it is found in its two surviving witnesses, the substantive variation these witnesses exhibit is among the most coherent, interpretative, and contextually determined in the corpus of the multiply attested poems. As discussed above, pp. 241-244, this is partially a result in the case of **R** of the physical and thematic constraints imposed on the Ruthwell rune master by the nature of the environment in which he was working. In carving his text on the cross, the rune master both selected the most appropriate passages from the longer poem and adapted his text to eliminate distracting references to the framing dream-narrative and the Vercelli-poet’s conceit of Christ-as-Germanic-hero.<sup>618</sup> That these differences go beyond mere convenience, however, is illustrated by the equally coherent but less obviously contextually determined patterns of variation which affect such literary aspects of the text as historical point of view (see below, pp. 292 and 294).

---

<sup>617</sup> Ó Carragáin, “Vercelli Collector,” p. 82.

<sup>618</sup> As mentioned above (fn. 515), it seems more likely that the Ruthwell rune master was adapting a poem similar to the Vercelli Book text than that the poet of the Vercelli version was expanding a text like the Ruthwell Inscription – the argument remains the same, however, no matter which version represents the innovation.

The witnesses to the *Dream of the Rood* exhibit thirteen potentially significant substantive variants in their 30 copied lines. While these include no syntactically or metrically linked variants and no examples of variation between prepositional phrases and bare case endings, they do include most of the other variant types most characteristic of the Anthologised and Excerpted texts: one example of the substitution of stressed, non-homographic forms, two examples of the addition or omission of lines and half-lines, and three examples of recomposition (involving among other changes the substitution of metrical units and rearrangement of material within the line).

### Textual Variants

#### Inflectional Difference (2 examples)

##### *Dream/RuthCr*, V 48a/R 2.2a

**R**<sup>619</sup>

2.1 [āhōf] ic riicnae kyniNc  
 heafunæs hlafard hælde ic ni dorstæ.  
 Bismærædu uNket men bā ætgad[re] |  
 ic [wæs] miþ blōdæ [b]istēmi[d]  
 bi[goten of]

**V**(*Dream*)

Rod wæs icaræred. ahof icricne cyning  
 45 heofona hlaford. hyldan me nedorste.  
 þurh drifan hime mid| deorcan næglū.  
 on me syndon þa dolg ge siene  
 opene inwid|hlemmas.  
 ne dorste ic hira nænigū sceððan  
 bysmeredon hie| unc butu ætgædere.  
 eall ic wæs mid blode bestemed.  
 begoten of] þæs guman sidan.  
 siððan he hæfde his gast onsended.

**R** *heafunæs* is the genitive singular of *heofon* ‘heaven’; **V** *heofona* is the genitive plural. The variation has no significant effect on sense, metre, or syntax. *Heofon* in the sense ‘(Christian) heaven’ is found elsewhere in Old English in both the singular and plural, and the two forms are metrically identical.

<sup>619</sup>For ease of reference, the text of the Ruthwell Cross Inscription is based on the transliteration by Michael Swanton. For reference, see fn. 516.

*Dream/RuthCr*, V 48b/R 2.2b

**R**  
 2.1 [āhōf] ic riicnae kyniNc  
 heafunæs h/afard hælde **ic** ni dorstæ.  
*Bismærædu* uNket men bā ætgad[re] |  
 ic [wæs] miþ blōdæ [b]listēmi[d]  
 bi[goten of]

**V(Dream)**  
 Rod wæs icaræred. ahof ic ricne cyning  
 45 heofona| hlaford. hylðan **me** nedorste.  
 þurh drifan hime mid| deorcan næglū.  
 on me syndon þa dolg ge siene  
 opene inwid|hlemmas.  
 ne dorste ic hira nænigū sceððan  
 bysmeredon hie| unc butu ætgædere.  
 eall ic wæs mid blode bestemed.  
 begoten of| þæs guman sidan.  
 siððan he hæfde his gast onsended.

**R** *ic* is a first person nominative singular pronoun; **V** *me* is first person singular accusative or dative. While the two forms are metrically identical, the substitution does have an effect on the construction of the passage. In **R**, *ic* is the subject of *dorstæ* and *hælde* is an intransitive infinitive: ‘I dared not bend’. In **V**, the subject of *dorste* is the same as that of the preceding clause (*ic*, line 44b) but not repeated; in this version, *hylðan* is transitive, and takes *me* as its reflexive object: ‘I dared not bend myself’. Both versions make good sense and syntax. The variation falls in the medial dip of a Type A-1 line and is of no metrical significance.

**Substitution Of Unstressed Words and Elements (3 examples)***Dream/RuthCr*, V 48a/R 2.2a

**R**  
 2.1 [āhōf] ic riicnae kyniNc  
 heafunæs h/afard hælde ic ni dorstæ.  
*Bismærædu* uNket **men** bā ætgad[re] |  
 ic [wæs] miþ blōdæ [b]listēmi[d]  
 bi[goten of]

**V(Dream)**  
 Rod wæs icaræred. ahof ic ricne cyning  
 45 heofona| hlaford. hylðan me nedorste.  
 þurh drifan hime mid| deorcan næglū.  
 on me syndon þa dolg ge siene  
 opene inwid|hlemmas.  
 ne dorste ic hira nænigū sceððan  
 bysmeredon **hie**| unc butu ætgædere.  
 eall ic wæs mid blode bestemed.  
 begoten of| þæs guman sidan.  
 siððan he hæfde his gast onsended.

**V** *hie* ‘they’ and **R** *men* ‘men’ are syntactically and metrically identical, but have an important effect on the poem’s historical point of view. In **V**, Christ’s tormentors are identified as ‘they’. This establishes a sense of historical distance between the reader and the



*Dream/RuthCr*, V 63a/R 4.2a

**R**  
 4.1                    *mip strēlum giwundad*  
                          *ālegdun hiæ **hinæ** limwērignæ*  
                                  *gistōddun him [.....] licæs [hea]f[du]m*  
                          *[bi]hea[l]du[n] hi[æ] þē[r.....]*

**V(Dream)**  
 62b                    *eall ic wæs mid strælum for wundod.*  
                          *Aledon hie| **ðær** lim werigne*  
                                  *ge stodon him æt his lices heafdū*  
                          *be heoldon hie| ðær heofenes dryhten*  
                                  *ḡhe hine ðær hwile reste*

The substitution of **V** *ðær* **R** *hinæ* has a significant effect on sense and syntax. In **R**, the accusative pronoun *hinæ* anticipates the immediately following noun *limwērignæ*: ‘they laid him down, limb-weary...’ In **V**, *lim werigne* is the sole object of *Aledon*, while *ðær* serves as an adverb of place: ‘they laid down the limb-weary [one] there...’ As with the substitution **V** *hie* **R** *men* in line 48a (discussed above, p. 292), the use of *ðær* helps establish a sense of historical distance from the events of the Crucifixion in **V**.

As it falls on the preliminary drop of a hypermetrical Type D1-line, the substitution has have no metrical significance.

**Substitution Of Prefixes (1 example)***Dream/RuthCr*, V 62b/R 4.1a

**R**  
 4.1                    *mip strēlum **gi**wundad*  
                          *ālegdun hiæ hinæ limwērignæ*  
                                  *gistōddun him [.....] licæs [hea]f[du]m*  
                          *[bi]hea[l]du[n] hi[æ] þē[r.....]*

**V(Dream)**  
 62b                    *eall ic wæs mid strælum **for** wundod.*  
                          *Aledon hie| ðær lim werigne*  
                                  *ge stodon him æt his lices heafdū*  
                          *be heoldon hie| ðær heofenes dryhten*  
                                  *ḡhe hine ðær hwile reste*

**R** *giwundad* and **V** *for wundod* are close synonyms. They are metrically and syntactically identical.

### Substitution Of Stressed Words and Elements (1 example)

#### *Dream/RuthCr*, V 48a/R 2.2a

**R**  
 2.1 [āhōf] ic riicnae kyniNc  
 heafunæs h/afard hælde ic ni dorstæ.  
*Bismærædu* uNket men **bā** ætgad[re] |  
 ic [wæs] miþ blōdæ [b]istēmi[d]  
 bi[goten of]

**V(Dream)**  
 Rod wæs icaræred. ahof ic ricne cyning  
 45 heofona| hlaford. hyldan me nedorste.  
 þurh drifan hime mid| deorcan næglū.  
 on me syndon þa dolg ge siene  
 opene inwid|hlemmas.  
 ne dorste ic hira nænigū sceððan  
 bysmeredon hie| unc **butu** ætgædere.  
 eall ic wæs mid blode bestemed.  
 begoten of| þæs guman sidan.  
 siððan he hæfde his gast onsended.

The variants **V butu** **R bā** affect metre, but have no effect on sense or syntax. The second element of **V butu** adds an unstressed dip between the first and second lifts of a hypermetric Type D\*1 line. In **R**, the line is hypermetric Type D-1.

### Addition/Omission Of Unstressed Words and Elements (1 example)

#### *Dream/RuthCr*, V 48b/R 2.2b

**R**  
 2.1 [āhōf] ic riicnae kyniNc  
 heafunæs h/afard hælde ic ni dorstæ.  
*Bismærædu* uNket men bā ætgad[re] |  
 ic [wæs] miþ blōdæ [b]istēmi[d]  
 bi[goten of]

**V(Dream)**  
 Rod wæs icaræred. ahof ic ricne cyning  
 45 heofona| hlaford. hyldan me nedorste.  
 þurh drifan hime mid| deorcan næglū.  
 on me syndon þa dolg ge siene  
 opene inwid|hlemmas.  
 ne dorste ic hira nænigū sceððan  
 bysmeredon hie| unc butu ætgædere.  
**eall** ic wæs mid blode bestemed.  
 begoten of| þæs guman sidan.  
 siððan he hæfde his gast onsended.

The addition or omission of the intensifying adverb *eall* falls on the preliminary drop of a hypermetric Type A-1 line. It has no significant effect on sense, metre, or syntax.

### Addition/Omission of Metrical Units (2 examples)

#### *Dream/RuthCr*, V 46-47

**R**  
 2.1 [āhōf] ic riicnae kyniNc  
 heafunæs h/afard hælde ic ni dorstæ.  
*Bismærædu* uNket men bā ætgad[re] |  
 ic [wæs] miþ blōdæ [b]istēmi[d]  
 bi[goten of]

**V(Dream)**  
 Rod wæs icaræred. ahof ic ricne cyning  
 45 heofona| hlaford. hylðan me nedorste.  
burh drifan hime mid| deorcan næglū.  
on me syndon þa dolg ge siene  
opene inwid|hlemmas.  
ne dorste ic hira nænigū sceððan  
 bysmeredon hie| unc butu ætgædere.  
 eall ic wæs mid blode bestemed.  
 begoten of| þæs guman sidan.  
 siððan he hæfde his gast onsended.

V lines 46-47 contain information about the role of the cross in Christ's Crucifixion which is not found in R. While they contribute greatly to the characterisation of the cross as a Christ-figure in its own right – like Christ the Cross has still-visible wounds and dared not (but perhaps could) harm its persecutors – the lines are not necessary for sense or syntax.

The absence of V 46-47 from R might be construed as evidence that they are a later addition to the poem. As argued above, pp. 241-244, however, their omission is also in keeping with the Ruthwell rune master's demonstrable interest in keeping his text focused on the Crucifixion – rather than the character of the Cross or the dreamer.



*Dream/RuthCr, V 50-56***R**

2.1 [āhōf] ic riicnae kyniNc  
 heafunæs hlafard hælde ic ni dorstæ.  
 Bismærædu uNket men bā ætgad[re] |  
 ic [wæs] miþ blōdæ [b]listēmi[d]  
 bi[goten of]

....

3.1 [+] krist wæs on rōdi  
 Hweþræ þēr fūsæ fearran kwōmu  
 æþpilæ til ānum ic þæt al bih[eald]  
 Sār[æ] ic wæs mi[b] sorgum gidræ[fi]d  
 h[n]ag [ic....]

**V(Dream)**

Rod wæs icaræred. ahof ic ricne cyning  
 45 heofona| hlaford. hylðan me nedorste.  
þurh drifan hime mid| deorcan næglū.  
on me syndon þa dolg ge siene  
opene inwid|hlemmas.  
ne dorste ic hira nænigū sceððan  
 bysmeredon hie| unc butu ætgædere.  
 eall ic wæs mid blode bestemed.  
 begoten of| þæs guman sidan.  
 siððan he hæfde his gast onsended.  
 50 **Feala| ic onþam beorge gebiden hæbbe**  
**wraðra wvrda. ge seah ic weruda| god**  
**þearle þenian þvstro hæfdon**  
**be wrigen mid wolcnum wealdendes hræw.**  
**scirne sciman sceadu forð eode.**  
 55 **wann| under wolcnum weop ealge sceaft**  
**cwiðdon cyninges fyll** crist was onrode  
 hwæðere þær fuse feorran cwoman  
 to| þam æðelinge icþæt eall be heold.  
 Sare ic wæs mid gedrefed|  
 hnag ic hwæðre þam secgū to handa  
 60 eað mod elne mycle|

V 50-56a contain a description of the moment of Christ's death. As argued above, pp. 241-244, the elimination<sup>622</sup> of these lines from **R** is in keeping with rune master's emphasis on simplicity of narrative – Christ ascends the cross in Section 1, is Crucified in Sections 2 and 3, and is buried in Section 4 – and on the Crucifixion as an object of adoration.

<sup>622</sup>That these lines are eliminated from the Ruthwell Cross rather than added to the Vercelli Book is suggested by the fact that Section 3.1 begins with the off-verse, but appears to have been marked by a cross. If the Ruthwell text was original, we would expect the fragment to begin with an on-verse. See also above, p. 241, fn. 515.

**Recomposition (3 examples)*****Dream/RuthCr*, V 39-40/R 1.1****R**

- 1.1 [+ **Ond**]geredae hinae **god** almehttig  
þa he walde on galgu gistiqa  
 [m]odig f[ore *allæ*] men  
 [B]ūg[a ic ni dorstæ...]

**V(*Dream*)**

- Ongyrede hine þa geong hæleð**  
**þæt wæs god| ælmihtig**  
 40 **strang ʒstið mod.**  
**ge stah he ongealgan heanne|**  
 modig onmanigra ge syððe.  
 þa he wolde man cyn lysan.|  
 bifode icþa me se beorn ymb clypte.  
 ne dorste ichwæðre| bugan to eorðan  
 feallan tofoldan sceatū.  
 Ac ic sceolde fæste| standan.

**R** 1.1 and **V** 39-40 both express closely similar ideas. Of the material in **V**, **R** omits the reference to Christ as a *geong hæleð* and his qualities *strang ʒstið mod*, and combines the remaining text from the lines into a single hypermetric long line alliterating on *g*.<sup>623</sup>

As is argued above (pp. 241-244), the differences between the two texts in these lines are in keeping with the more general differences in theme and emphasis throughout their common text. In **V**, lines 39-43 serve to bring out the heroic nature of Christ, an aspect, which as Pope suggests, “the poet [of the Vercelli version] is all along at pains to emphasise as proper to Christ in his divine nature.”<sup>624</sup> In **R**, on the other hand, the rune master characteristically eliminates these references to Christ’s heroic quality in order to concentrate on the bare facts of the Crucifixion itself.

<sup>623</sup>Swanton prints **R** 1.1a and b as separate half-lines, and suggests that the equivalent of **V** line 40 (*þa he walde on galgu gistiqa*) is “metrically incomplete without alliterative continuation” (*Dream of the Rood*, p. 41). Pope, on the other hand, suggests that “at 39-40 [of **V**] the corresponding passage on the cross consists of a single pair of hypermetric verses” (*Seven Old English Poems*, p. 66).

<sup>624</sup>Pope, *Seven Old English Poems*, p. 66.

*Dream/RuthCr, V 41-42/R 1.2***R**

- 1.1 [+ Ond]geredae hinae god almehttig  
 bā hē walde on galgu gistiġa  
[m]odig f[ore allæ] men  
[B]ūg[a ic ni dorstæ...]

**V(Dream)**

- Ongyrede hine þa geong hæleð  
 þæt wæs god| ælmihtig  
 40 strang ȝstið mod. ge stah he ongealgan heanne|  
modig onmanigra ge svhðe.  
þa he wolde man cvn lysan.  
bifode icþa me se beorn vmb clypte.  
ne dorste ichwæðre| bugan to eorðan  
 feallan tofoldan sceatū.  
 Ac ic sceolde fæste| standan.

As is also true of **V 39-40/R 1.1**, the recomposition in **V 41-2/R 1.2** involves either an abridgement of **V** by **R** or an expansion of **R** by **V**. As *ūg* are the only letters to survive at this point in **R**, however, it is impossible to tell how close the two versions might originally have been. The usual reconstruction of **R**, *[m]odig f[ore allæ] men [B]ūg[a ic ni dorstæ...]*, does not alliterate, and, if correct, may represent an “unmetrical abridgement” as Pope suggests.<sup>625</sup>

*Dream/RuthCr, V 58a/R 3.3a***R**

- 3.1 [+] krist wæs on rōdi  
 Hweþræ þer fūsæ fearran kwōmu  
æþbilæ til ānum ic þæt al bih[eald]  
 Sār[æ] ic wæs mi[b] sorgum gedræ[fi]d  
 h[n]aġ [ic....]

**V(Dream)**

- cris̄t was onrode  
 hwæðere þær fuse feorran cwoman  
to| þam æðelinge icþæt eall be heold.  
 Sare ic wæs mid gedrefed|  
 hnag ic hwæðre þam secgū to handa  
 60 eað mod elne mycle|

As Swanton notes, the principal difference between these two half-lines is a “displacement of the attribute” *æpelu/æpeling*.<sup>626</sup> In **R**, *æþbilæ* (nominative plural of *æpele*, ‘noble’) is the subject of *kwōmu*, line 3.2b and refers to the people who hastened to see Christ on the cross: ‘the noble ones, eager, came together (*til ānum*)<sup>627</sup> there from afar...’; in **V**, *æðelinge* (dative singular of *æðeling*, ‘nobleman, prince’) is the object of *to* and refers to Christ himself: ‘eager ones came there from afar to that Prince...’

<sup>625</sup>Pope, *Seven Old English Poems*, p. 66.

<sup>626</sup>Swanton, *Dream of the Rood*, p. 40.

The two lines have a very different metre. In **R**, line 3.3a is Type A-1; in **V**, the equivalent line is Type C-1.

### ***Soul and Body I and II***

*Soul and Body I and II* are the names given to two versions of a poetic dialogue preserved in the Vercelli (**V**) and Exeter (**E**) Books. In **E**, the poem is found on ff. 98r-100r, where it is preceded by the “Partridge” and followed by “Deor.” Its first line is in capital letters and begins with a large illuminated *H*. Its last line is followed by a *positura* and a space extending to the end of the manuscript line. In **V**, the poem is found on ff. 101v-103v (quires 13-14) where it begins the manuscript’s second section of poetry. In this witness, the poem falls into two parts. The first, corresponding to the text in **E**, runs from f. 101v-103r. It is followed by a second dialogue in the same style, which ends defectively at the bottom of 103v. Although it seems unlikely that this continuation is by the same poet, the two ‘halves’ are connected by a number of verbal echoes and seem to have been copied as companion pieces.<sup>628</sup> F. 104r begins with the end of a short verse text known variously as “Homiletic Fragment I” and “Deceit.” This in turn is followed on the verso by the opening lines of the *Dream of the Rood*.<sup>629</sup>

The common text of *Soul and Body* is second only to that of *Daniel* and *Azarias* in the significance of its substantive textual variation. Its two witnesses exhibit all types of variants most closely associated with the Anthologised and Excerpted poems: twenty-one examples of the substitution of stressed words (of which fourteen involve neither homographs nor

---

<sup>627</sup> See Mitchell, “Linguistic Fact and the Interpretation of Old English Poetry,” *ASE* 4 (1975): 11-28, at pp. 24-5. Also Matti Rissanen, “Two Notes on Old English Poetic Texts: ‘Beowulf’ 2461; ‘Ruthwell Cross’ III 3,” *NM* 68 (1967): 276-88, at pp. 283-8

<sup>628</sup> Moffat, *Soul and Body*, pp. 41-44. See also Orton, “Disunity,” *passim*.

<sup>629</sup> Celia Sisam, ed., *The Vercelli Book*, pp. 37-44 and the associated table, “The Original Quiring and the Arrangement of Texts,” opposite p. 11.

declensional/conjugational variants); two examples of alternation between case forms and prepositional phrases; one substitution of a line or half-line; seven examples of the addition or omission of metrical units; three examples of rearrangement within the line; two examples of rearrangement across line boundaries; two examples of the rearrangement of entire lines and half-lines; and fourteen variants involving linked changes to two or more elements in the text. The majority of these occur in two passages, **V** 42-48/**E** 39-45 and **V** 113-115/**E** 103-110, in which the two witnesses offer greatly divergent interpretations of their common text.

In addition to these often highly significant variants, the two versions of *Soul and Body* also show a number of relatively minor but consistent differences in word-choice and syntax. The third person present indicative of *bēon*, for example, is consistently *synt* in **V** and *sindon* or *sindan* in **E** (pp. 318, 319, below). Similarly, **V** prefers *awiht-* to **E** *wiht-* (pp. 347, 347) and **E** prefers *wearg-* to **V** *weri(g)-* (pp. 325, 334) – even in cases where these preferred spellings create problems of metre and/or sense. Syntactically, as Moffat points out, **V** shows no examples of *for* with the accusative – the case preferred by **E** (pp. 309, 310, below).<sup>630</sup>

Despite the often great differences between them, the two witnesses to *Soul and Body* also exhibit a number of common errors and unusual forms. When taken together, these suggest that both witnesses are descended from a common written exemplar.<sup>631</sup> These include: the non-alliterating form *acen(ne)da* in line **V** 51a/**E** 48a (p. 321, below)<sup>632</sup>; difficulties with the formula *hwæt druge þu* in **V** 17a/**E** 17a (p. 303); and an unusual ‘unstressed’ *eft* before the alliterating *lift* in **V** 67b/**E** 62b.<sup>633</sup> As Orton suggests of the corrupt formula in **V** 17a/**E** 17a,

---

<sup>630</sup>Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 78.

<sup>631</sup>The most complete discussion of common errors and unusual forms in the two witnesses is Orton, “A Further Examination.” Moffat, “MS Transmission,” *passim*, and *Soul and Body*, pp. 8-9, offers some supplemental evidence.

<sup>632</sup>The **E** form is subsequently corrected to *a<sup>n</sup>cenda*.

<sup>633</sup>See Orton, “A Further Examination,” pp. 177-178.

it is scarcely conceivable that an error of this type should have been transmitted by reciters and also preserved in both written texts of the poem: some alteration to achieve good sense is to be expected in such circumstances. It is much more likely that the archetype version took the form of a written text which contained at this point some obscurity which later scribes were unable or unconcerned to correct.<sup>634</sup>

## Textual Variants

### Inflectional Difference (24 examples)

#### *Soul I/II, V 5a/E 5a*

##### V(*Soul I*)

H uru ðæs be hofað hæleða æghwylc  
 þæt he his| sawle sið sið sylfa ge þence.  
 hu þæt bið deoplic þōn| se deað cymeð  
 asyndreð þa sybbe þe ær samod wæron|  
 5 lic ʒsawle

##### E(*Soul II*)

HURU ÐÆS BE HOFAB| hæleþa æghwylc  
 þæthehis sawle sið sylfa be|witige  
 huþæt bið deoplic þōnse deað cymeð  
 asun|drað þasibbe þaþe ær somud wæron  
 5 lic ʒsawl

V *sawle* is accusative singular, parallel to *lic*, apposite (with *lic*) to *sybbe* ‘kinsmen’ (line 4b), and direct object of *asyndreð*: ‘...when the Death comes, separates the kinsmen, who were earlier together, body and soul.’ In E, *sawl* may be a mistake for *sawle* (as in V), a nominative singular, or perhaps an example of the Anglian endingless accusative singular.<sup>635</sup> As *lic* and *sibbe* have the same form in the nominative and accusative, either reading is grammatically possible. If *sawl* is nominative, *lic ʒsawl* are singular and the subjects (with *sibbe*) of *asun|drað*, which in turn must be understood as intransitive and plural (with *a* for *e* through the confusion of vowels in unaccented syllables): ‘...when the Death comes. The kinsmen who were together, body and soul, will separate.’ If *sawl* is accusative, the passage is to be construed as in V.

In V, line 5a is Type A-1; in E, the equivalent line is unmetrical as written, although restoring the unsyncopated form of the nominative/endingless accusative singular (*sāwol*) gives satisfactory metre (Type A-1).

<sup>634</sup>Orton, “A Further Examination,” p. 178.

<sup>635</sup>For the endingless accusative singular, see Sievers-Brunner, § 252 Anm. 2 and § 254.2. See also “Gloria I,” line 55b, where the same variation occurs.

**Soul I/II, V 17a/E 17a****V(Soul I)**

17 hwæt druhðu dreorega tohwan drehtest ðu me  
 eorðan|fulnes ealfor wisnad  
 lames ge lices

**E(Soul II)**

17 hwæt druguþu dreorga to hwon dreahtest| þu me  
 eorþan fylnes ealfor weornast  
 lames gelices|

**V** *druhðu* **E** *druguþu* are most likely both intended for *druge þu*, the second person singular preterite indicative of *drēogan* ‘do, work, perform’ and the nominative singular of the second person pronoun.<sup>636</sup> As Moffat notes, the lack of ending on **V** *druh* is to be explained as an example of the sporadic loss of *-e* from the second-person singular preterite of strong verbs when followed by the personal pronoun<sup>637</sup>; the *-u* of **E** *drugu* is most likely a result of the influence of the vowels of the preceding and following syllables. Following Bosworth-Toller, Krapp and Dobbie explain **V** *druh* as “an otherwise unrecorded” noun meaning “dust”: ‘Lo! thou gory dust’.<sup>638</sup> This is less likely in the face of parallel constructions from *Genesis* (*Hwæt druge þu dohtor*, line 888a) and, in the present tense, *Judgement Day II* (*Hwæt dreogest þu nu?*, lines 176b) in which *druhe* (or *druge*) is a verb.

The addition or omission of the ending falls in the preliminary drop of a Type A-3 verse and is metrically insignificant.

**Soul I/II, V 36a/E 36a****V(Soul I)**

35                                    þæt me þuhte ful oft  
 þæt hit wær.xxx.| þusend wintra  
 to þinū deað dæge

**E(Soul II)**

32                                    þme þuhte ful oft|  
 þæt wære þritig þusend wintra  
 toþinum deað dæge|

**E** *wære* is the third person singular preterite indicative of *wesan*. **V** *wær* is ostensibly an adjective ‘wary’ (*wǣr*) or ‘true’ (*wǣr*), or a noun ‘faith’. A verb is required by context. In

<sup>636</sup>The opinion of Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 67; Orton, “A Further Examination,” p. 178, and Sisam, “Authority,” p. 34.

<sup>637</sup>Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 67. For the loss of the second person ending of strong verbs before *þu*, see Sievers-Brunner § 364 Anm. 2.

<sup>638</sup>ASPR 2, p. 126. B.-T.(S) *druh*.

**E**, *wære* occupies the preliminary dip of a Type A-3 line. In the unlikely event that **V** *wær* is not an error for *wære*, the equivalent line in **V** is Type C-1.

**Soul I/II, V 42a/E 39a**

**V(Soul I)**

Forðan þu ne hogodest her on life  
 syððan icðe on| worulde wunian sceolde  
 þæt ðu wære þurh flæsc| ȝþurh fyren lustas  
 45 strange ge stryned. ȝgestaðolod| þurh me.  
 ȝlc wæs gast onðe fram gode sended  
 næfre| ðu me mid swa heardū helle witung  
 nege neredest| þurh þinra meda lust.

**E(Soul II)**

þærþu þōn hogode her onlife  
 40 þenden icþe inworul|de wunian sceolde  
 þæt þuwære þurh flæsc ȝþurh fi|ren lustas  
 strong gestyred ȝgestaþelad þurh mec.|  
 ȝicwæs gæst onþe from gode sended  
 næfre þumec| swa heardra helle wita  
 45 ne gearwode þurh þinra neo|da lust

**V** *hogodest* is the second person singular preterite indicative of *hogian* ‘care for, think about, reflect’. **E** *hogode* is the singular preterite subjunctive of the same verb. The variation is linked to the substitution of unstressed words **V** *Forðan* **E** *þær* earlier in the same line (for a discussion, see below, p. 316), and to the corresponding difference in mood of the verbs in line **E** 48a/**V** 45a (see below, p. 326). The two endings are metrically identical.

**Soul I/II, V 45a/E 42a**

**V(Soul I)**

Forðan þu ne hogodest her on life  
 syððan icðe on| worulde wunian sceolde  
 þæt ðu wære þurh flæsc| ȝþurh fyren lustas  
 45 strange ge stryned. ȝgestaðolod| þurh me.  
 ȝlc wæs gast onðe fram gode sended  
 næfre| ðu me mid swa heardū helle witung  
 nege neredest| þurh þinra meda lust.

**E(Soul II)**

þærþu þōn hogode her onlife  
 40 þenden icþe inworul|de wunian sceolde  
 þæt þuwære þurh flæsc ȝþurh fi|ren lustas  
strong gestyred ȝgestaþelad þurh mec.|  
 ȝicwæs gæst onþe from gode sended  
 næfre þumec| swa heardra helle wita  
 45 ne gearwode þurh þinra neo|da lust

**V** *strange* is an adverb meaning ‘strongly’; **E** *strong* can only be a mistake for *stronge* (as in **V**) or a strong nominative adjective apposite to *þu* (**E** 41a). In **V**, *strange* qualifies *ge stryned* ‘born’ in line 45: *þu ne hogodest... þæt ðu wære þurh flæsc... ge stryned*, ‘you did not consider... that you were strongly born [*ge stryned*, see below, p. 325] through flesh and through sin’; in **E** *strong* presumably modifies the subject of the sentence *þu*, perhaps with an eye towards establishing a contrast between the physical strength of the body and the incorporeal support offered by the soul: ‘you had not considered... that you, strong, were



directed [*gestyred*, see below, p. 325] through flesh and through sin...<sup>639</sup> Both versions are grammatical, though **E** makes better sense than **V**. As the inflectional ending adds or subtracts an additional unstressed syllable in the medial dip of a Type A-1 line, the variation is metrically insignificant.

**Soul I/II, V 47a-b/E 44a-b**

**V(Soul I)**

Forðan þu ne hogodest her on life  
 syððan icðe on| worulde wunian sceolde  
 þæt ðu wære þurh flæsc| ȝþurh fyren lustas  
 45 strange ge stryred. ȝgestaðolod| þurh me.  
 ȝIc wæs gast onðe fram gode sended  
 næfre| ðu me mid swa heardū helle witum  
 nege neredest| þurh þinra meda lust.

**E(Soul II)**

þærþu þōn hogode her onlife  
 40 þenden icþe inworulde wunian sceolde  
 þæt þuwære þurh flæsc ȝþurh fi|ren lustas  
 strong gestyred ȝgestabelad þurh mec.|  
 ȝicwæs gæst onþe from gode sended  
 næfre þumec| swa heardra helle wita  
 45 ne gearwode þurh þinra neo|da lust

**V** *heardū helle witum* is the dative plural object of *mid*: ‘with hard hell-torments’. **E** *heardra helle wita* is genitive plural, ‘of hard hell-torments’. Both readings are problematic. As Orton and Moffat have pointed out, the **E** reading is grammatically unattached to the rest of the sentence, and cannot be construed without emendation.<sup>640</sup> In **V**, the problem lies in the use of the preposition *mid* ‘with’ with *ge neredest* ‘rescued, saved, liberated’. See below, p. 340. Because the variant involves changes to both the adjective and noun, it is linked.

<sup>639</sup>Orton, “A Further Examination,” p. 189; Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 72.

<sup>640</sup>Orton, “A Further Examination,” p. 189. See also Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 71.

*Soul I/II, V 54a/E 52a***V(Soul I)**

ne eart| ðu þon leofra nænigū lifigendra  
 men to ge mæccan.| ne meder ne fæder.  
 ne nænigum ge sybban. þonn,°se| swearta hrefen  
 55 syððan ic ana ofðe utsiðode  
 þurh| þæs sylfes hand þe ic ær onsended wæs.

**E(Soul II)**

ne eart þu nuþon leofre nængū| lifigendra  
 50 menn toge mæccan nemedder nefæder  
 nenæn|gum gesibbra þōn se swearta hrefn  
 siþþan icana of| þe utsiþade.  
 þurh þæs sylfes hond þeic ær onsended wæs.|

**V** *ge sybban* is a weak dative singular adjective apposite to *nænigum*: ‘to no kinsman’<sup>641</sup> **E** *gesibbra* is a strong genitive plural adjective modifying *næn/gum*: ‘to none of [your] kinsmen.’ The two forms are metrically identical.

*Soul I/II, V 57a/E 54a***V(Soul I)**

ne mæg þe nu| heonon adon hyrsta þy readan.  
 ne gold ne seolfor| ne þinra goda nān  
 ne þinre bryde beag. ne þin| gold wela.  
 60 ne nanþara goda þeðu iu ahtest.  
 Ac her| sceolon on bidan ban be reafod  
 be sliten synum. ȝþe| þin sawl sceal  
 ȝ minum unwillu oft gesecan  
 wemman| þe mid wordū swa ðu worhtest to me.

**E(Soul II)**

Nemagon þe nu heonan adon hyrste þa readan  
 55 negold|ne sylfor neþinra goda nān  
 ac her sculon abidan ban| bireafod  
 besliten seonwum ȝþe þin sawl sceal  
 minū ún|willan oft gesecan  
 wemman mid wordum swaþu worhtest| tome.

**E** *magon* is the plural present indicative of *magan* ‘be able’; **V** *mæg* is the singular present indicative. The **V** version of the text is apparently corrupt. In **E**, the subject of *magon* is the nominative plural *hyrste* [for *hyrsta*]<sup>642</sup> *þa readan* ‘treasures the red’. **V**, however, lacks an obvious singular subject for *mæg* (*hyrsta* is nominative plural, *þy readan* ostensibly instrumental singular). Mitchell, who quotes **V** incorrectly as *hyrsta þa readan*, notes that “(ge)hyrst is not used in the singular as far as I have observed,” and suggest that the **V** form may have been understood by the scribe as a “collective” meaning ‘jewellery’.<sup>643</sup> The use of the instrumental *þy* for expected *þa*, however, suggests instead that the **V** scribe could not

<sup>641</sup>On the substantive use of the weak adjective declension, see Mitchell, *OES*, §§ 133-4.

<sup>642</sup>-e for -a is common in unstressed syllables, see Campbell, *OEG*, § 379.

<sup>643</sup>Mitchell, *OES*, § 1524.

follow his exemplar at this point (see the following variant).<sup>644</sup> The variants fall on the preliminary dip of a Type B-2 line and have no significant metrical effect.

**Soul I/II, V 57b/E 54b**

**V(Soul I)**

ne mæg þe nu| heonon adon hyrsta **þy** readan.  
 ne gold ne seolfor| ne þinra goda nán  
 ne þinre bryde beag. ne þin| gold wela.  
 60 ne nanþara goda þeðu iu ahtest.  
 Ac her| sceolon on bidan ban be reafod  
 be sliten synum. 7þe| þin sawl sceal  
 7 minum unwillu oft geseccan  
 wemman| þe mid wordū swa ðu worhtest to me.

**E(Soul II)**

Nemagon þe nu heonon adon hyrste **þa** readan  
 55 negold|ne sylfor neþinra goda nán  
 ac her sculon abidan ban| bireafod  
 besliten seonwum 7þe þin sawl sceal  
 minū ún|willan oft geseccan  
 wemman mid wordum swaþu worhtest| tome.

**E þa** is the nominative plural demonstrative pronoun. **V þy** is ostensibly the instrumental singular masculine form. The required case is nominative singular (or perhaps nominative plural, if we accept Mitchell's suggestion that *hyrsta* is being used as a "collective").<sup>645</sup> For a discussion of the relationship between this variant and the number of the verb in line 57a, see above, p. 306.

**Soul I/II, V 63a/E 58a**

**V(Soul I)**

ne mæg þe nu| heonon adon hyrsta þy readan.  
 ne gold ne seolfor| ne þinra goda nán  
 ne þinre bryde beag. ne þin| gold wela.  
 60 ne nanþara goda þeðu iu ahtest.  
 Ac her| sceolon on bidan ban be reafod  
 be sliten synum. 7þe| þin sawl sceal  
 7 minum unwillu oft geseccan  
 wemman| þe mid wordū swa ðu worhtest to me.

**E(Soul II)**

Nemagon þe nu heonon adon hyrste þa readan  
 55 negold|ne sylfor neþinra goda nán  
 ac her sculon abidan ban| bireafod  
 besliten seonwum 7þe þin sawl sceal  
 minū ún|willan oft geseccan  
 wemman mid wordum swaþu worhtest| tome.

**V unwillu** (for *unwillū* with omission of a tilde above *u*) is presumably dative plural; **E ún|willan** is dative singular or (with *-an* as a reduction of *-um*) dative plural. Both forms make good sense and syntax, and are metrically identical.

<sup>644</sup>Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 74.

<sup>645</sup>See Mitchell, *OES*, § 1524 and p. 306, above.

**Soul I/II, V 74b/E 69b****V(Soul I)**

ne synt þine æhta awihhte.|  
75 þe ðu her on moldan mannū eowdest.

**E(Soul II)**

nesindon þine geah|þe wiht  
70 þaþu her onmoldan monnum eawdest.

**V** *awihhte* is a nominative plural feminine strong adjective agreeing with *æhta* ‘possessions’: ‘nor are your possessions [*æhta*] of value, which you showed off to men here on earth.’ **E** *wiht* is a nominative singular neuter noun ‘anything’: ‘nor are your extravagances [*geah|þe*] anything, which you showed off to men here on earth.’ Both readings are semantically and syntactically appropriate.

With *awihhte*, **V** 74b is hypermetric Type D\*1<sup>646</sup>; the equivalent line in **E** is Type B-1. As the result of other changes in the line, the **V** version of the poem does not alliterate. For further discussion of the variants in this line, see pp. 319 and 329, below.

**Soul I/II, V 82a/E 77a****V(Soul I)**

Forðan þewære| selre swiðe mycle  
þōn þe wæron ealle eorðan speda.|  
butan þu hie gedælde dryhtne sylfum  
þær ðu wurde æt fryðe| fugel oððe fisc onsæ  
80 oððe on eorðan neat ætes tilode|  
feld gangende feoh butan snyttro  
oððe onwestenne| wild deora  
þæt wyrreste þær swa god wolde.  
ge þeah| ðu wære wyrn cynna  
85 þ grimmeste þær swa god wolde :7|  
þonne ðu æfre onmoldan mange wurde.  
oððe æfre| fulwihte onfon sceolde.

**E(Soul II)**

forþon| þewære selle swiþe micle  
þōn þewæran ealle eorþan spe|de  
butan þu hyge dælde dryhtne sylfū  
þær þu wurde| ætfrum sceaftē fugel oþþe fisc onsæ.  
75 oððe eorþan neat ætes tiolode  
feld gongende feoh butan snyttro  
ge on| westenne wildra deora  
þ grimmeste þær swa god wolde|  
ge þeah þu wære wyrn cynna þæt wyrreste  
80 þōn þu æfre|| onmoldan monge wurde  
oþþe æfre fulwihte onfon sceolde

**V** *wild deora* is a genitive plural compound noun: ‘of wild animals’. It makes good sense and syntax, but, with only three syllables, is unmetrical. In **E** *wildra deora* is a genitive plural adjective-noun pair and Type A-1 line.

<sup>646</sup>Moffat cites *ungedēfenlice* (*Beowulf*, l. 2345b) as a possible parallel to *ne synt þine æhta āwihhte* (*Soul and Body*, § 3.8 [d], p. 22). Given the differences in stress pattern between the two lines, the parallel is at best slight. On the stress of *āwihhte* see Campbell, *OEG*, § 393.

**Soul I/II, V 88a/E 82a****V(Soul I)**

þonne ðu for unc **bæm**| and wyrðan scealt  
 onðam miclan dæge þonne mannū| beoð  
 90 wunda on wrigene þaðe onworulde ær  
 fyren fullle men fyrnge worhton.  
 Ðōn wyle dryhten sylf dæda|ge hyran  
 hæleða gehwylces heofena scippend  
 æt ealra| manna gehwæs muðes reorde  
 95 wunde wiðer lean.

**E(Soul II)**

þōn þu for unc **bú** ondwyrdan scealt  
 onþam miclan| dæge þōn eallum monnū beoð  
 wunde onwrigene þaþe in| worulde ær.  
 85 firen fulle menn fyrn geworhton.  
 ðōn wile| dryhten sylf dæda gehyran  
 æt ealra monna gehwam| muþes reorde  
 wunde wiþer lean

**V** *bæm* is the dative of *begen*; **E** *bú* is indeclinable. The variation is of no metrical, syntactic, or lexical significance. Moffat, however, cites this and **V** 98/E 91 as evidence that *for* is unable to govern the accusative in the **V** tradition.<sup>647</sup> See also below, p. 310.

**Soul I/II, V 94a/E 87a****V(Soul I)**

þonne ðu for unc bæm| and wyrðan scealt  
 onðam miclan dæge þonne mannū| beoð  
 90 wunda on wrigene þaðe onworulde ær  
 fyren fullle men fyrnge worhton.  
 Ðōn wyle dryhten sylf dæda|ge hyran  
 hæleða gehwylces heofena scippend  
 æt ealra| manna gehwæs muðes reorde  
 95 wunde wiðer lean.

**E(Soul II)**

þōn þu for unc bú ondwyrdan scealt  
 onþam miclan| dæge þōn eallum monnū beoð  
 wunde onwrigene þaþe in| worulde ær.  
 85 firen fulle menn fyrn geworhton.  
 ðōn wile| dryhten sylf dæda gehyran  
 æt ealra monna gehwam| muþes reorde  
 wunde wiþer lean

**V** *gehwæs* is a genitive pronoun. It is modified by *muðes* ‘of the mouth’, which is in turn modified by the prepositional object *reorde* ‘voice’: ‘then the lord will hear himself of the deeds of each of men... from the voice of the mouth of each man.’ In **E**, *gehwam* is dative and itself object of *æt*. In this version *reorde* is a dative of means: ‘then the lord will hear himself of deeds from each of all men by the voice of the mouth.’ Both readings make good sense and are syntactically acceptable. The variation has no effect on the metre of the line, a Type B-2 in both manuscripts.

<sup>647</sup>Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 78.

**Soul I/II, V 98b/E 91a****V(Soul I)**

þonne| nebið nan natopæs lytel lið  
 onlime aweaxen.  
 þðu ne| scyle for anra ge hwylcum on sundrū  
 rihtagildan. ||| þōn reðe bið  
 100 dryhten æt þam dome

**E(Soul II)**

90 þōn nebið nænig topæs lytel lið|  
 onlime geweaxen  
 þæt þune scyle for æghwylc anra on|sundran  
 ryht agieldan. ðonne reþebið  
 dryhten æt do|me

V *ge hwylcum* is the dative singular or plural object of *for*: ‘for each of those ones separately’. E *æghwylc* is accusative singular and object of *for*: ‘for each of those ones’. The variation has no significant effect on sense or syntax, and is pointed to by Moffat as evidence of an “inability of *for* to govern the accusative case” in V (see also, p. 309, above).<sup>648</sup>

The inflectional difference is only one of a number of metrically significant variants in line V 98a-b/E 91a-b. In V, the ending of *ge hwylcum* falls in the preliminary dip of what is best analysed as a Type C-1 verse. In E, *æghwylc* provides both stresses to a Type C-1 verse. See also pp. 322 and 355, below.

**Soul I/II, V 98b/E 91b****V(Soul I)**

þonne| nebið nan natopæs lytel lið  
 onlime aweaxen.  
 þðu ne| scyle for anra ge hwylcum on sundrū  
 rihtagildan. ||| þōn reðe bið  
 100 dryhten æt þam dome

**E(Soul II)**

90 þōn nebið nænig topæs lytel lið|  
 onlime geweaxen  
 þæt þune scyle for æghwylc anra on|sundran  
 ryht agieldan. ðonne reþebið  
 dryhten æt do|me

E *on/sundran* is an adverb meaning ‘singly, separate’; V *on sundrū* is a dative plural or singular adjective, which, as Moffat suggests, “must be taken adverbially for the line to make sense.”<sup>649</sup> The two endings are metrically identical.

<sup>648</sup>Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 78.

<sup>649</sup>Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 78.

**Soul I/II, V 113a/E 108a****V(Soul I)**

bið þæt heafod tohliden handa to| liðode  
 geaglas toginene góman toslitene  
 110 sina beoð| ásocene swyra be cowen  
 fingras tohrorene  
 rib reaf|iað reðe wyrmas  
beoð hira tungan totogenne ontyn| healfa  
 hungregū tofrofne  
 forþan hie ne magon| huxlicum  
 115 wordum wrixlian wið þone werian gast.|

**E(Soul II)**

biþ þæt hea|fod tohliden honda tohleopode  
 geaflas toginene goman| toslitene  
 105 seonwe beoð asogene sweora bicowen  
 rib reafi|að reþe wyrmas  
 drincað hloþum hrá heolfres þurst|ge.  
bið seo tunge totogen on tyn healfe  
 hungnum to| hroþor  
 forþon heone mæg horsclice  
 110 wordū wrixlan| wið þone wergan gæst.

**V** *beoð* is the plural present indicative of *bēon*; **E** *bið* is the third singular. The variants are the first in a series of linked changes in number throughout **V** 113-115/ **E** 108-110.

See the discussion of **V** *tungan* **E** *tunge*, below.

**Soul I/II, V 113a/E 108a****V(Soul I)**

bið þæt heafod tohliden handa to| liðode  
 geaglas toginene góman toslitene  
 110 sina beoð| ásocene swyra be cowen  
 fingras tohrorene  
 rib reaf|iað reðe wyrmas  
 beoð hira tungan totogenne ontyn| healfa  
 hungregū tofrofne  
 forþan hie ne magon| huxlicum  
 115 wordum wrixlian wið þone werian gast.|

**E(Soul II)**

biþ þæt hea|fod tohliden honda tohleopode  
 geaflas toginene goman| toslitene  
 105 seonwe beoð asogene sweora bicowen  
 rib reafi|að reþe wyrmas  
 drincað hloþum hrá heolfres þurst|ge.  
 bið seo tunge totogen on tyn healfe  
 hungnum to| hroþor  
 forþon heone mæg horsclice  
 110 wordū wrixlan| wið þone wergan gæst.

**V** *tungan* is nominative plural, ‘tongues’; **E** *tunge* is nominative singular, ‘tongue’.

The variation is one of a number of linked differences in number in **V** 113-115/**E** 108-110.

In **E**, the tongue being spoken of is that of the body. Line 108 is syntactically parallel to lines 103-4 and 105, and belongs to the litany of punishments which the soul predicts the body will suffer after death:

The head is cracked apart, the hands are disjointed, the jaws dropped open, the palate ripped apart, the sinews have been sucked away, the neck gnawed through. Rampant worms rob the ribs and drink the corpse in swarms, thirsty for gore. The tongue is torn into ten pieces as a solace for hungers; therefore it cannot briskly trade words with the damned spirit.

In **V**, on the other hand, the *tungan* are almost certainly those of the *reðe wyrmas* mentioned in line 112b. In this version of the text, the direct catalogue of punishments stops with *fingras*

*tohrorene*, line 111. With line 112, the poet turns his attention to describing the horrific nature of the worms, with their lash-like tongues and terrible silence:

The head is cracked apart, the hands are disjointed, the jaws dropped open, the palate ripped apart, the sinews have been sucked away, the neck gnawed through, the fingers decay. Rampant worms rob the ribs. Their tongues are torn in ten pieces as a pleasure to the hungry ones: therefore, they cannot shamefully trade words with the weary spirit.

The two forms are metrically identical, although the lines as a whole are not equivalent. In **V**, line 13a is Type A-1 with a three syllable anacrusis. In **E**, line 108a is Type B-2.

**Soul I/II, V 113a/E 108a**

**V(Soul I)**

bið þæt heafod tohliden handa to| liðode  
 geaglas toginene góman toslitene  
 110 sina beoð| ásocene swyra be cowen  
 fingras tohrorene  
 rib reaf|iað reðe wyrmas  
 beoð hira tungan totogenne ontyn| healfa  
 hungregū tofrofne  
 forþan hie ne magon| huxlicum  
 115 wordum wrixlian wið þone werian gast.|

**E(Soul II)**

biþ þæt heafod tohliden honda tohleopode  
 geaflas toginene goman| toslitene  
 105 seonwe beoð asogene sweora bicowen  
 rib reafi|að reþe wyrmas  
 drincað hloþum hrá heolfres þurst|ge.  
 bið seo tunge totogen on tyn healfe  
 hungnum to| hroþor  
 forþon heone mæg horslice  
 110 wordū wrixlan| wið þone wergan gæst.

**V** *totogenne* is an inflected nominative plural feminine form of the preterite participial; **E** *totogen* is nominative singular. The variation is a further example of the linked variation in number in lines **V** 113-115/**E** 108-110.

In addition to their effect on sense and syntax, the variants also affect metre: in **E**, line 108a is Type B-2; in **V**, the equivalent line is a metrically poor Type A-1 with three anacrustic syllables.



**Soul I/II, V 114b/E 109b****V(Soul I)**

bið þæt heafod tohliden handa to| liðode  
 geaglas toginene góman toslitene  
 110 sina beoð| ásocene swyra be cowen  
 fingras tohrorene  
 rib reaf|iað reðe wyrmas  
 beoð hira tungan totogenne ontyn| healfa  
 hungregū tofrofne  
 forþan hie ne magon| huxlicum  
 115 wordum wrixlian wið þone werian gast.|

**E(Soul II)**

biþ þæt hea|fod tohliden honda tohleopode  
 geaflas toginene goman| toslitene  
 105 seonwe beoð asogene sweora bicowen  
 rib reafi|að reþe wyrmas  
 drincað hloþum hrá heolfres þurst|ge.  
 bið seo tunge totogen on tyn healfe  
 hungrum to| hroþor  
 forþon heone mæg horsclice  
 110 wordū wrixlan| wið þone wergan gæst.

**V** *hie* is the third person nominative plural personal pronoun. Its antecedent is presumably *wyrmas* (**V** 112b). **E** *heo* is the third person nominative singular feminine pronoun, and refers to the sinner's body or tongue. The choice of pronoun is linked to corresponding differences in number throughout the lines **V** 113-115/**E** 108-110.

**Soul I/II, V 114b/E 109b****V(Soul I)**

bið þæt heafod tohliden handa to| liðode  
 geaglas toginene góman toslitene  
 110 sina beoð| ásocene swyra be cowen  
 fingras tohrorene  
 rib reaf|iað reðe wyrmas  
 beoð hira tungan totogenne ontyn| healfa  
 hungregū tofrofne  
 forþan hie ne magon| huxlicum  
 115 wordum wrixlian wið þone werian gast.|

**E(Soul II)**

biþ þæt hea|fod tohliden honda tohleopode  
 geaflas toginene goman| toslitene  
 105 seonwe beoð asogene sweora bicowen  
 rib reafi|að reþe wyrmas  
 drincað hloþum hrá heolfres þurst|ge.  
 bið seo tunge totogen on tyn healfe  
 hungrum to| hroþor  
 forþon heone mæg horsclice  
 110 wordū wrixlan| wið þone wergan gæst.

**V** *magon* is third person plural present indicative; **E** *mæg* is third person singular, present indicative. The variation is linked to a corresponding difference in the number of the pronoun subject in each version and to a number of other differences in number throughout **V** 113-115/**E** 108-110. The variation affects the preliminary dip of a Type C-2 verse and is metrically insignificant.

**Soul I/II, V 119b/E 114b****V(Soul I)**

Sege nydde to me  
 ærest eallra onþam eorðscræfe|  
 þæthe þa tungan to tyhð ǵþa **teð** þurh smyhð.  
 120 ǵþa eagan| þurh eteð ufan onþ heafod.  
 ǵto ætwelan oðrum gerymeð.|  
 wyrnum towiste þonne þæt werie  
 lic acolod bið. þæt| lange ær  
 werede mid wædum

**E(Soul II)**

sege neþeð to  
 ærest ealra onþa eorð| scræfe  
 heþa tungan to tyhð. ǵþa **tobas** þurh smyhð  
 115 ǵto| ætwelan oþrum gerymeð  
 ǵþa eaxan þurh| iteð ufon onþ heafod  
 wyrnum towiste þōn biþ þæt werge.  
 lic acolad þæt| he longe ær  
 werede mid wædum

The two words are declensional variants of the athematic noun *tōþ*. **V** has the expected form with i-mutation. **E** *tobas* is by analogy with the masculine *a*-declension.<sup>650</sup> The variation has a minor effect on metre. In **V**, line 119 is Type B-1; in **E** it is B-2.

**Soul I/II, V 124b/E 119b****V(Soul I)**

bið þōn **wyrma** gifel  
 125 on| eorþan þæt mæg æghwylcum  
 mento ge mynde modsnotra| gehwam :7|

**E(Soul II)**

bið þōn **wyrmes** giefl  
 120 æt| oneorþan þæt mæg æghwylcum  
 men toge myndū mōd snot|terra :7|

**E** *wyrmes* is genitive singular ‘of/for a worm’; **V** *wyrma* is genitive plural, ‘of/for worms’. Most critics prefer **V** on the assumption that the worms being discussed are the same as those in line **V** 112b (**E** 106b): *rib reaf|iað reðe wyrmas*.<sup>651</sup> **E** is just as appropriate, however, since the poet also speaks of a single, personified worm, *Gifer* in **V** 116a/**E** 111a.

**Soul I/II, V 126a/E 121a****V(Soul I)**

bið þōn **wyrma** gifel  
 125 on| eorþan þæt mæg æghwylcum  
 mento **ge mynde** modsnotra| gehwam :7|

**E(Soul II)**

bið þōn **wyrmes** giefl  
 120 æt| oneorþan þæt mæg æghwylcum  
 men toge **myndū** mōd snot|terra :7|

**V** *ge mynde* is dative singular ‘a reminder’; **E** *ge myndū* is dative plural ‘reminders’. As the poem is concerned with a single body, the singular seems preferable to the reading in **E**. The two words are otherwise metrically, semantically, and syntactically identical.

<sup>650</sup>Campbell, *OEG*, § 623.

<sup>651</sup>See Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 81.

### Substitution Of Unstressed Words and Elements (14 examples)

#### *Soul I/II, V 10a/E 10a*

##### **V(Soul I)**

Sceal se gast cuman| geohðum hremig  
 10 symble **ymbe** seofon niht sawle findan|  
 þone lichoman þe hie ær lange wæg  
 þreo hund wintra| butan ær þeod cyning  
 ælmihtig god ende worulde  
 wyr|can wille weoruda dryhten :7

##### **E(Soul II)**

Scealse gæst cuman gehþum hremig  
 10 sý|le **ymb** seofon niht sawle findan  
 þone lic homan þe| heo ær longe wæg  
 þreo hund wintra  
 butan ær wyrce ece| dryhten  
 ælmihtig god ende worlde.

The substitution **V ymbe** **E ymb** adds or removes an unstressed syllable from the medial dip of a Type A-2b line. They are otherwise identical.

#### *Soul I/II, V 33b/E 30b*

##### **V(Soul I)**

eardode icþe oninnan  
**ne**meahte icðe|| of cuman  
 flæsce befangen 7mefyren lustas  
 35 þine ge|þrungon

##### **E(Soul II)**

30 ic þe Ininnan **no**icþe of meahte  
 flæsce bifongen| 7mefyren lustas  
 þinegeþrungon

**V ne** and **E no** are both negative adverbs. The substitution has no significant effect on sense, metre, or syntax.<sup>652</sup>

#### *Soul I/II, V 37b/E 34b*

##### **V(Soul I)**

37 **á** ic unces ge|dales onbád  
 earfoðlice nis nu huru se ende to góð|

##### **E(Soul II)**

35 **hwæt** ic unces gedales bád.  
 earfoðlice nisnu se ende| togod.

**V á** 'ever' is a sentence adverb describing how the soul awaited separation from the body. **E hwæt** 'lo' is an interjection. The two words make good sense and syntax, and are metrically identical.

<sup>652</sup>See Mitchell, *OES*, § 1128.

**Soul I/II, V 42a/E 39a****V(Soul I)**

**Forðan** þu ne hogodest her on life  
 syððan icðe on| worulde wunian sceolde  
 þæt ðu wære þurh flæsc| ȝþurh fyren lustas  
 45 strange ge stryued. ȝgestaðolod| þurh me.  
 ȝIc wæs gast onðe fram gode sended  
 næfre| ðu me mid swa heardū helle witung  
 nege neredest| þurh þinra meda lust.

**E(Soul II)**

**þær**þu þōn hogode her onlife  
 40 þenden icþe inworulde wunian sceolde  
 þæt þuwære þurh flæsc ȝþurh filren lustas  
 strong gestyred ȝgestabelad þurh mec.|  
 ȝicwæs gæst onþe from gode sended  
 næfre þumec| swa heardra helle wita  
 45 ne gearwode þurh þinra neo|da lust

The substitution **V Forðan E þær** is linked to the tense and mood of **V hogodest/E hogode** in line 42a/39a and the substitution of verbs **V ge neredest E gearwode** in line 48a/45a. The variant has an important effect on the syntax of **V 42-48/E 39-45**. In **E**, lines 39-43 are a conditional clause dependent on E 44-45:

If you had thought then, while alive here, while I had to dwell in the world with you, that you, the strong one, were directed through flesh and through criminal desires, and strengthened by me, and [that] I was a soul sent by God in you, you should never have prepared me †of hard hell-torments [*heardra helle wita*, see above, p. 305]† through pleasure of your desires.

The equivalent lines of **V**, on the other hand, can be interpreted in three different ways: as a clause subordinate to **V 40b-41** (*ȝoffyrsted wæs / godes lichoman gastes drynces*)<sup>653</sup>:

...and [I] was thirsted of the body of God and of spiritual drink because you did not think while alive here, after I had to dwell in the world with you, that you were strongly begotten through flesh and through criminal desires, and strengthened by me, and [that] I was a soul sent by God in you. You never protected me with [*mid for wið* ‘against?’] such hard hell-torments through pleasure of your desires.

as an independent clause, with *forðan* being used as an adverb<sup>654</sup>:

Consequently, you did not think while alive here, after I had to dwell in the world with you, that you were strongly begotten through flesh and through criminal desires, and strengthened by me, and [that] I was a soul sent by God in you. You never protected me with [*mid for wið* ‘against?’] such hard hell-torments through pleasure of your desires.

or as contrary-to-fact condition subordinate to **V47-48**<sup>655</sup>:

<sup>653</sup>See Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 70 (who does not accept this interpretation). That this was not the interpretation of the **V** scribe himself is indicated by the heavy punctuation he places at the end of metrical line 41b (:7).

Because you did not think while alive here, after I had to dwell in the world with you, that you were strongly begotten through flesh and through criminal desires, and strengthened by me, and [that] I was a soul sent by God in you, you never protected me with [*mid* for *wið* ‘against?’] such hard hell-torments through pleasure of your desires.

As the variants fall in the preliminary dip of a Type A-3 line in both manuscripts, the substitution has no metrical effect.

### *Soul I/II, V 43a/E 40a*

#### **V(*Soul I*)**

Forðan þu ne hogodest her on life  
syððan icðe on| worulde wunian sceolde  
 þæt ðu wære þurh flæsc| ȝþurh fyren lustas  
 45 strange ge stryred. ȝgestaðolod| þurh me.  
 ȝIc wæs gast onðe fram gode sended  
 næfre| ðu me mid swa heardū helle witung  
 nege neredest| þurh þinra meda lust.

#### **E(*Soul II*)**

þærþu þōn hogode her onlife  
 40 **benden** icþe inworulde wunian sceolde  
 þæt þuwære þurh flæsc ȝþurh filren lustas  
 strong gestyred ȝgestapelad þurh mec.|  
 ȝicwæs gæst onþe from gode sended  
 næfre þumec| swa heardra helle wita  
 45 ne gearwode þurh þinra neo|da lust

**E** *þenden* is a conjunction indicating coincidental time: ‘If you had thought then, while alive here, while I had to dwell in the world with you...’ **V** *syððan* is a conjunction indicating either time from which or time after which. The two words make good sense and syntax, and are metrically identical.

### *Soul I/II, V 45b/E 42b*

#### **V(*Soul I*)**

Forðan þu ne hogodest her on life  
 syððan icðe on| worulde wunian sceolde  
 þæt ðu wære þurh flæsc| ȝþurh fyren lustas  
 45 strange ge stryred. ȝgestaðolod| þurh **me**.  
 ȝIc wæs gast onðe fram gode sended  
 næfre| ðu me mid swa heardū helle witung  
 nege neredest| þurh þinra meda lust.

#### **E(*Soul II*)**

þærþu þōn hogode her onlife  
 40 **þenden** icþe inworulde wunian sceolde  
 þæt þuwære þurh flæsc ȝþurh filren lustas  
 strong gestyred ȝgestapelad þurh **mec**.|  
 ȝicwæs gæst onþe from gode sended  
 næfre þumec| swa heardra helle wita  
 45 ne gearwode þurh þinra neo|da lust

**E** *mec* and **V** *me* are variant forms of the accusative of the first person plural personal pronoun.<sup>656</sup> The scribe of **E** frequently prefers accusative pronouns in *-ec*, although these

<sup>654</sup>See Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 70 (who does not accept this interpretation) and *ASPR* 3, pp. 55-6.

<sup>655</sup>This interpretation is preferred by Moffat, *Soul and Body*, pp. 70-71.

<sup>656</sup>See Campbell, *OEG*, §702.

forms are often later corrected to *-e*. See also V 47a/E 44b, p. 318, below. **E** corrects *þec* to *þe* three times: V 57a/E 54a, V 62b/E 57b, V 73a/E 67a.

**Soul I/II, V 47a/E 44a**

**V(Soul I)**

Forðan þu ne hogodest her on life  
 syððan icðe on| worulde wunian sceolde  
 þæt ðu wære þurh flæsc| 7þurh fyren lustas  
 45 strange ge stryned. 7gestaðolod| þurh me.  
 7Ic wæs gast onðe fram gode sended  
 næfre| ðu me mid swa heardū helle witung  
 nege neredest| þurh þinra meda lust.

**E(Soul II)**

þærþu þōn hogode her onlife  
 40 þenden icþe inworul|de wunian sceolde  
 þæt þuwære þurh flæsc 7þurh fi|ren lustas  
 strong gestyred 7gestaþelad þurh mec.|  
 7icwæs gæst onþe from gode sended  
 næfre þmec| swa heardra helle wita  
 45 ne gearwode þurh þinra neo|da lust

*Mec* and *me* are variant forms of the first person accusative plural personal pronoun.

See the preceding variant.

**Soul I/II, V 65b/E 60b**

**V(Soul I)**

65 eart ðu nu dumb|| 7deaf  
 nesynt þine dreamas awiht

**E(Soul II)**

60 eart þu dumb 7deaf  
 nesindan þine dreamas| wiht.

**V** *synt* and **E** *indan* are variant forms of the third person plural present indicative of *bēon*. The lines are not metrically similar due to the variation **V** *awiht* **E** *wiht* (see below, p. 347). In **E**, *indan* falls in the preliminary drop of a Type B-1 line; in **V**, *synt* is one of a metrically suspicious four anacrusic syllables in what is best scanned as a Type A-2b verse.

An identical substitution occurs in V 74b/E 69b. See below, p. 319.

**Soul I/II, V 66a/E 61a**

**V(Soul I)**

sceal icðe nihtes| swa þeah nede gesecan  
 synnum ge sargod 7eft sona| fram þe  
 hweorfan onhancrod þonne halige men  
 lifi|endum gode lof sang doð  
 70 secan þahamas þe ðu me| her scrife.  
 7þa arleasan eardung stowe.  
 7þe sculon| her mold wyrmas manige ceowan  
 slitan sarlice swear|te wihta  
 gifre 7grædige

**E(Soul II)**

sceal icþe nihtes seþeah nyde gesecan  
 synnum ge|sargad 7eft sona fromðe  
 hweorfan onhoncred. þōnn| halege menn  
 gode lifgendum lof song doð  
 65 secan þa ha|mas þeþume ærscrife  
 7þa arleasan eardung stowe  
 7þe sculon mold wyrmas monige ceowan.  
 seonowum besli|tan swearte wihte  
 gifre 7grædige

The forms *swa þeah* and *seþeah* appear to be synonyms. As noted above (p. 260), *seþeah* is a characteristic spelling in **E**. It occurs twelve times (vs. seven for *swa þeah*)

including once more for *swa þeah* (**Leid** *suaeðeh*) in Riddle 35, line 11. The form is not found in verse outside the Exeter Book.

**Soul I/II, V 74b/E 69b**

**V(Soul I)**

ne **synt** þine æhta awihte.|  
75 þe ðu her on moldan mannū eowdest.

**E(Soul II)**

ne**sindon** þine geah|þe wiht  
70 þaþu her onmoldan monnum eawdest.

**V** *synt* and **E** *sindon* are variant forms of the third person plural present indicative of *bēon*. The variation affects the preliminary dip of the line in each manuscript, and is metrically insignificant. The forms are otherwise syntactically and semantically identical. For a similar variation see p. 318, above. The metre is discussed below, pp. 329 and 347.

**Soul I/II, V 82a/E 77a**

**V(Soul I)**

Forðan þewære| selre swiðe mycle  
þōn þe wæron ealle eorðan speda.|  
butan þu hie gedælde dryhtne sylfum  
þær ðu wurde æt fryðe| fugel oððe fisc onsæ  
80 oððe on eorðan neat ætes tilode|  
feld gangende feoh butan snyttro  
**oððe** onwestenne| wild deora  
þæt wyrreste þær swa god wolde.  
ge þeah| ðu wære wyrm cynna  
85 þ grimmeste þær swa god wolde :7|  
þonne ðu æfre onmoldan mange wurde.  
oððe æfre| fulwihte onfon sceolde.

**E(Soul II)**

forþon| þewære selle swiþe micle  
þōn þewæran ealle eorþan spe|de  
butan þu hyge dælde dryhtne sylfū  
þær þu wurde| ætfrum sceaftē fugel oþþe fisc onsæ.  
75 oððe eorþan neat ætes tiolode  
feld gongende feoh butan snyttro  
**ge** on| westenne wildra deora  
þ grimmeste þærswa god wolde|  
ge þeah þu wære wyrm cynna þæt wyrreste  
80 þōn þu æfre|| onmoldan monge wurde  
oþþe æfre fulwihte onfon sceo|lde

**V** *oððe* and **E** *ge* are both conjunctions meaning ‘or’. The substitution falls on the preliminary drop of a Type C-1 line and has no metrical, syntactic, or lexical significance.

**Soul I/II, V 97a/E 90a**

**V(Soul I)**

þonne| nebið **nan** natoþæs lytel lið  
onlime aweaxen.  
þðu ne| scyle for anra ge hwylcum on sundrū  
rihtagildan. ||| þōn reðe bið  
100 dryhten æt þam dome

**E(Soul II)**

90 þōn nebið **nænig** topæs lytel lið|  
onlime geweaxen  
þæt þune scyle for æghwylc anra on|sundran  
ryht agieldan. ðonne reþebið  
dryhten æt do|me

**V** *nan* and **E** *nænig* are approximate synonyms. The substitution falls on the preliminary dip of a Type B-1 line and has no significant metrical effect.

**Soul I/II, V 113a/E 108a****V(Soul I)**

bið þæt heafod tohliden handa to| liðode  
 geaglas toginene góman toslitene  
 110 sina beoð| ásocene swyra be cowen  
 fingras tohrorene  
 rib reaf|iað reðe wyrmas  
 beoð **hira** tungan totogenne ontyn| healfa  
 hungregū tofrofre  
 forþan hie ne magon| huxlicum  
 115 wordum wrixlian wið þone werian gast.|

**E(Soul II)**

biþ þæt heafod tohliden honda tohleopode  
 geafas toginene goman| toslitene  
 105 seonwe beoð asogene sweora bicowen  
 rib reaf|iað reþe wyrmas  
 drincað hloþum hrá heolfres þurst|ge.  
 bið **seo** tunge totogen on tyn healf  
 hungum to| hroþor  
 forþon heone mæg horsclice  
 110 wordū wrixlan| wið þone wergan gæst.

**V** *hira* is the third-person plural possessive adjective. It agrees with *tungan* ‘their tongues’ and refers to the *wyrmas* of **V** 112b. **E** *seo* is the nominative singular feminine form of the demonstrative article. It agrees with *tunge* ‘the tongue’. The variants are part of a number of linked differences in number throughout **V** 113-115/**E** 108-110. See above, p. 311. In **V**, the adjective adds two syllables to the unusually long anacrustic drop of a Type A-1 line. In **E**, *seo* falls in the preliminary drop of a B-2 line.

**Soul I/II, V 116b/E 111b****V(Soul I)**

116 gifer hatte se wurm **þe** þa eaglas beoð  
 nædle sceaþ|ran.

**E(Soul II)**

111 Gifer hatte sewurm **þam**þa geaf|las|| beoð  
 nædle sceaþran

The variation between **V** *þe* (the relative particle) and **E** *þam* (a demonstrative pronoun used to introduce an adjective clause) is metrically, syntactically, and semantically insignificant. Both forms are used frequently in Old English to introduce adjective clauses.



### Substitution Of Prefixes (4 examples)

#### *Soul I/II, V 51a/E 48a*

##### V(*Soul I*)

scealt ðu minra gesynta| sceame þrowian  
50 onðam myclan dæge þonne eall| manna cynn  
se acenneda ealle gesamnað.

##### E(*Soul II*)

46 scealt þunu hwæþre minra gescenta sco|me þrowian  
onþam miclan dæge þon monna cynn  
se|| a.<sup>n</sup>cenda ealle gegædrað.

The substitution V *acenneda* and E<sup>corr</sup> *a.<sup>n</sup>cenda*<sup>657</sup> affects sense and metre. As Moffat and Orton point out, the common reading of V and E<sup>uncorr</sup> is unmetrical and semantically less appropriate than that of E<sup>corr</sup>: the prefix *a-* never takes metrical stress (in contrast to *an-*), and *acen(ne)da* ‘begotten one’ is less appropriate as an epithet for Christ than *ancenda* ‘only begotten one’.<sup>658</sup>

#### *Soul I/II, V 61a/E 56a*

##### V(*Soul I*)

ne mæg þe nu| heonan adon hyrsta þy readan.  
ne gold ne seolfor| ne þinra goda nán  
ne þinre bryde beag. ne þin| gold wela.  
60 ne nanþara goda þeðu iu ahtest.  
Ac her| sceolon on bidan ban be reafod  
be sliten synum. 7þe| þin sawl sceal  
7 minum unwillu oft gesecan  
wemman| þe mid wordū swa ðu worhtest to me.

##### E(*Soul II*)

Nemagon þe nu heonan adon hyrste þa readan  
55 negold|ne sylfor neþinra goda nán  
ac her sculon abidan ban| bireafod  
besliten seonwum 7þe þin sawl sceal  
minū ún|willan oft gesecan  
wemman mid wordum swaþu worhtest| tome.

V *on bidan* and E *abidan* are both infinitives, approximate synonyms and metrically identical. The substitution has no significant effect on sense, metre, or syntax.

<sup>657</sup> E<sup>corr</sup> means “the E reading after correction”; E<sup>uncorr</sup> means “the E reading before correction.” For a discussion of the sigla used in this dissertation, see Appendix 2.

<sup>658</sup> Orton, “A Further Examination,” p. 188. Moffat regards the common use of *acen(ne)da* in V and E<sup>uncorr</sup> as ‘decisive’ proof of the common scribal origins of the two versions of the poem, “MS Transmission,” 300-302.

**Soul I/II, V 97b/E 90b****V(Soul I)**

þonne| nebið nan natopæs lytel lið  
 onlime aweaxen.  
 þðu ne| scyle for anra ge hwylcum on sundrū  
 rihtagildan. ||| þōn reðe bið  
 100 dryhten æt þam dome

**E(Soul II)**

90 þōn nebið nænig topæs lytel lið|  
 onlime geweaxen  
 þæt þune scyle for æghwylc anra on|sundran  
 ryht agieldan. ðonne reþebið  
 dryhten æt do|me

V *aweaxen* and E *geweaxen* are approximate synonyms, and metrically and syntactically identical. The substitution has no significant effect on sense, metre, or syntax.

**Soul I/II, V 98b/E 91a****V(Soul I)**

þonne| nebið nan natopæs lytel lið  
 onlime aweaxen.  
 þðu ne| scyle for anra ge hwylcum on sundrū  
 rihtagildan. ||| þōn reðe bið  
 100 dryhten æt þam dome

**E(Soul II)**

90 þōn nebið nænig topæs lytel lið|  
 onlime geweaxen  
 þæt þune scyle for æghwylc anra on|sundran  
 ryht agieldan. ðonne reþebið  
 dryhten æt do|me

The substitution of prefixes, E *æg-* V *ge-* has no apparent lexical effect. The two are not metrically identical however. In E 91a, *æghwylc* alliterates with *anra* and contributes both stresses to a Type C-1 line. In V 98b, *ge hwylcum* falls in the preliminary dip of a Type C-1 line.<sup>659</sup> For further discussion of the metrical variation in this line, see pp. 310, and 355.

**Substitution Of Stressed Words and Elements (21 examples)****Soul I/II, V 2b/E 2b****V(Soul I)**

H uru ðæs be hofað hæleða æghwylc  
 þæt he his| sawle sið sið sylfa ge þence.  
 hu þæt bið deoplic þōn| se deað cymeð  
 asyndreð þa sybbe þe ær samod wæron|  
 5 lic ʒsawle

**E(Soul II)**

HURU ÐÆS BE HOFAP| hæleþa æghwylc  
 þæthehis sawle sið sylfa be|witige  
 huþæt bið deoplic þōnse deað cymeð  
 asun|drað þasibbe þaþe ær somud wæron  
 5 lic ʒsawl

While V *ge þence* (from *geþencan*, ‘to employ the mind on something, consider’) and E *be/witige* (*bewitian*, ‘to have charge or direction of’) are not synonyms, the variation has little effect on the immediate sense of the passage as a whole and no significant effect on

<sup>659</sup>For the suggestion that *on sundrū* has a full stress on *on* and *sundrū*, see Orton, “A Further Examination,” p. 189 and Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 78. Moffat reports that *onsundran* “bears alliteration on its prefix in extant OE verse only in *Instructions to Christians*, l. 114” (*Soul and Body*, p. 78).

syntax or metre. In **V**, line 2 is Type A-1 with both stresses long by position; in **E**, the equivalent line is Type A-1 with a resolved second stress.

**Soul I/II, V 18b/E 18b**

**V(Soul I)**

17 hwæt druhðu dreorega tohwan drehtest ðu me  
eorðan|fulnes ealfor wisnad  
lames ge licnes

**E(Soul II)**

17 hwæt druguþu dreorga to hwon dreahtest| þu me  
eorþan fylnes ealfor weornast  
lames gelicnes|

**V** *for wisnad* is the past participle of *forwisnian* ‘to wither away’; **E** *for weornast* is the second person singular present indicative of *forweornian*, ‘dry up, wither away.’ The two forms are metrically identical and approximate synonyms.

The substitution does have an important syntactical effect, however. In **V**, *for wisnad* is nominative singular, and, as the subject of *drehtest*, syntactically parallel to *ðu*, *eorðan|fulnes*, and *lames ge licnes*: ‘What have you done, blood-stained one? Why did you afflict me, foulness of the earth, entirely withered away, figure of clay?’ In **E**, *for weornast* is the main verb of a new clause *eorþan fylnes ealfor weornast lames gelicnes*: ‘foulness of the earth, (you) wither away, figure of clay.’<sup>660</sup>

**Soul I/II, V 19b/E 19b**

**V(Soul I)**

lyt ðu ge mundest  
20 tohwan þinre sawle þing siþþan wurde  
syððan oflic| homan læded wære :

**E(Soul II)**

lyt þu ge þohtes  
20 towon þinre sawle sið siþþan wurde|  
siþþan heo of lic homan læded wære.

The two words are roughly synonymous in context, and metrically and syntactically identical.

<sup>660</sup>See Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 67.

**Soul I/II, V 20a/E 20a****V(Soul I)**

- lyt ðu ge mundest|  
 20 tohwan þinre sawle **þing** siðþan wurde  
 syððan oflic| homan læded wære :  
 hwæt wite ðuðu me weriga  
 hwæt| ðu huru wyrma gyfl  
 lyt ge þohtest þa ðu lust gryrum| eallū  
 ful geodest huðu on eorðan scealt  
 25 wyrnum to| wiste. hwæt ðu onworulde ær  
 lyt ge þohtest hu þis is| þus lang hider  
 hwæt þe la engel ufan of roderum  
 sawle| onsende þurh his sylfes hand  
 meotod ælmihtig of| his mægen þrymme.  
 30 ȝbege bohte blode þy halgan.  
 ȝ| þu me mid þy heardan hungre gebunde  
 ȝge hæft nedest| helle witum.

**E(Soul II)**

- lyt þuge þohtes  
 20 towon þinre sawle **sið** siþþan wurde|  
 siþþan heo of lic homan læded wære.  
 hwæt wite þume| werga.  
 hwæt þu huru wyrma gifl.  
 lyt geþohtes hu þis| is long hider  
 ȝbeþurh engel ufan ofroderum  
 25 sawle on|sende þurh his sylfes hond  
 meotud ælmihtig of his| mægen þrymme  
 ȝbeþa gebohte blode þyhalgan  
 ȝþume| þy heardan hungre gebunde  
 ȝge hæftna dest helle| witū

The substitution **V** *þing* ‘affair’ **E** *sið* ‘journey’ has an important effect on the imagery of lines **V** 19-32/**E** 19-29. In **E**, the experiences of the soul after the death of the body are presented using the consistent metaphor of a journey (cf. *of... læded* ‘unloaded’, **E** 21b; *hu þis/ is long hider* ‘how long it is to here’, **E** 23b; and *on/sende* ‘sent forth’, **E** 25a). In **V**, the soul’s experiences are not presented in any consistent fashion.

The use of the masculine *sið* in **E** for the neuter *þing* in **V** also clears up an agreement problem in **V**. As Moffat notes, “there is no clear antecedent for *þis*” in **V** 26b, which he suggests “must refer in a general way to *wyrnum to wiste*, i.e. to the situation of the body in the grave.”<sup>661</sup> With the omission of **V** 23b-25a and the substitution *sið* for **V** *þing* in **E**, however, *þis* refers to the nature of the journey the Soul must undergo, taking *sið* as its masculine singular antecedent. For a discussion of further changes in the line, see below, p. 351.

In **E**, line 20 is Type B-1 with double alliteration. In **V**, the line is Type B-1 with single alliteration on the first lift.

<sup>661</sup>Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 68.

**Soul I/II, V 22a/E 22a****V(Soul I)**

hwæt wite ðuðu me **weriga**  
 hwæt| ðu huru wyrma gyfl  
 lyt ge þohtest þa ðu lust gryrum| eallū  
 ful geodest huðu on eorðan scealt  
 25 wyrnum to| wiste.

**E(Soul II)**

22 hwæt wite þume| **werga**.  
 hwæt þu huru wyrma gifl.

Here and in V 122b/E 117b, **E** has *werg-* for **V** *weri(g)-*. As Moffat suggests, the **E** form could be either for *wearg* ‘accursed one’ or *wērig* ‘weary, miserable’ (as in **V**).<sup>662</sup> In this instance both possibilities make good sense, metre, and syntax. In line 112b/117b, a form of *werig* is to be preferred on metrical grounds. See p. 334, below.

In **V**, line 22a is Type C-2 line (Type A-3 if *-ig-* is assumed to be syncopated). In **E**, the equivalent line is Type A-3 as written.

**Soul I/II, V 45a/E 42a****V(Soul I)**

Forðan þu ne hogodest her on life  
 syððan icðe on| worulde wunian sceolde  
 þæt ðu wære þurh flæsc| ȝþurh fyren lustas  
 45 strange **ge stryned**. ȝgestaðolod| þurh me.  
 ȝlc wæs gast onðe fram gode sended  
 næfre| ðu me mid swa heardū helle witung  
 nege neredest| þurh þinra meda lust.

**E(Soul II)**

þærþu þōn hogode her onlife  
 40 þenden icþe inworulde wunian sceolde  
 þæt þuwære þurh flæsc ȝþurh fi|ren lustas  
 strong **gestyred** ȝgestaþelad þurh mec.|  
 ȝicwæs gæst onþe from gode sended  
 næfre þumec| swa heardra helle wita  
 45 ne gearwode þurh þinra neo|da lust

**V** *ge stryned* is the past participle of *striēnan* ‘beget’; **E** *gestyred* is the past participle of *gestīerian* ‘guide, direct’. The substitution affects sense and syntax. In **E**, *gestyred* emphasises how the body is driven by conflicting impulses: on the one hand, it is ‘directed’ (*gestyred*) ‘through flesh and sinful lusts,’ on the other ‘strengthened’ (*gestaþelad*) by the soul. In **V**, the contrast appears to be between the physical nature of the body’s birth (‘you were strongly begotten through flesh and criminal desires’) and the ethereal nature of the soul’s support (*ȝgestaðolod| þurh me*, ‘and [you were] strengthened through me’).<sup>663</sup>

<sup>662</sup>Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 80.

<sup>663</sup>Cf. Moffat, “Scribal Revision,” p. 4; *Soul and Body*, p. 72.

The two forms are metrically identical.

**Soul I/II, V 48a/E 45a**

**V(Soul I)**

Forðan þu ne hogodest her on life  
 syððan icðe on| worulde wunian sceolde  
 þæt ðu wære þurh flæsc| ȝþurh fyren lustas  
 45 strange ge stryned. ȝgestaðolod| þurh me.  
 ȝIc wæs gast onðe fram gode sended  
 næfre| ðu me mid swa heardū helle witung  
 ne ge neredest| þurh þinra meda lust.

**E(Soul II)**

þærþu þōn hogode her onlife  
 40 þenden icþe inworulde wunian sceolde  
 þæt þuwære þurh flæsc ȝþurh fi|ren lustas  
 strong gestyred ȝgestaþelad þurh mec.|  
 ȝicwæs gæst onþe from gode sended  
 næfre þumec| swa heardra helle wita  
 45 ne gearwode| þurh þinra neo|da lust

**V** *ge neredest* is the second person singular preterite indicative of *generian* ‘saved, rescued; preserved, defended’. **E** *gearwode* is the singular preterite subjunctive of *gearwian* ‘equip, prepare, make ready’. The difference in mood is linked to the substitution **V** *Forðan* **E** *þær* and the corresponding difference in the mood of *hogian* in **V** 42a/**E** 39a. See above, pp. 304 and 316.

Both verbs are semantically and syntactically appropriate to the contexts in which they appear but fail to alliterate. In **V**, this seems most likely the result of a scribal misinterpretation of minims in *meda* ‘pleasure’ (see below, p. 327). In **E**, the origins of the failure of alliteration are less obvious. Krapp and Dobbie, following Holthausen, emend *ne* to *ned* (*nīed*) ‘distress, privation’ or *nēaru* ‘danger, distress’, thus providing a noun to govern the genitives of line 39 and an alliterating syllable to line 40.<sup>664</sup> More recently, Orton and Moffat have suggested emending *gearwode* to *genearwode* (from *genearwian* ‘to force in, cramp, confine’).<sup>665</sup> As *genearwode* does not govern the genitive, this second option requires a further emendation in the preceding line. See also above, p. 305.

<sup>664</sup>For *nēd*, see *ASPR* 3, pp. 317-8; for *nearu*, see Holthausen, *Review of the Exeter Book: Part II*, ed. W.S. Mackie, *Bleiblatt zur Anglia* 46 (1935): 5-10, at p. 8.

<sup>665</sup>Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 71.

In addition to these metrical difficulties, both versions of the text suffer from lexical or syntactical difficulties in their predicates. These are discussed above, p. 305, and below, p. 340.

**Soul I/II, V 48b/E 45b**

**V(Soul I)**

Forðan þu ne hogodest her on life  
 syððan icðe on| worulde wunian sceolde  
 þæt ðu wære þurh flæsc| 7þurh fyren lustas  
 45 strange ge stryred. 7gestaðolod| þurh me.  
 7Ic wæs gast onðe fram gode sended  
 næfre| ðu me mid swa heardū helle witum  
 nege neredest| þurh þinra meda lust.

**E(Soul II)**

þærþu þōn hogode her onlife  
 40 þenden icþe inworulde wunian sceolde  
 þæt þuwære þurh flæsc 7þurh fi|ren lustas  
 strong gestyred 7gestapelad þurh mec.|  
 7icwæs gæst onþe from gode sended  
 næfre þumec| swa heardra helle wita  
 45 ne gearwode þurh þinra neolda lust

Although it is possible to make some sense from **V** *meda lust* ‘pleasure of rewards’, the sense is strained and the line fails to alliterate. The most likely cause of the ‘substitution’ is a minim mistake: *meda* for *nieda*. See also above, p. 326.

**Soul I/II, V 49a/E 46a**

**V(Soul I)**

scealt ðu minra gesynta| sceame þrowian  
 50 onðam myclan dæge þonne eall| manna cynn  
 se acenneda ealle gesamnað.

**E(Soul II)**

46 scealt þunu hwæpre minra gescenta  
 sco|me þrowian  
 onþam miclan dæge þōn monna cynn  
 se|| a,<sup>n</sup>cenda ealle gegædrað.

The substitution **V** *gesynta* **E** *gescenta* affects both sense and metre. As Moffat and others have noted, the **V** reading *gesynta* ‘prosperity, health’ ‘gives an unusual twist to the address of a damned soul – the introduction at this juncture of the soul’s ‘health’.’<sup>666</sup> It also destroys the alliteration.<sup>667</sup>

**E** *gescenta* is presumably from \**gescentu*, a word otherwise known only from a gloss in the Junius Psalter, *Sien gegerede þa þe tæleð me mid scome & scien oferwrigene swa swa*

<sup>666</sup>Moffat, *Soul and Body*, pp. 72-3.

<sup>667</sup>Moffat, *Soul and Body*, pp. 72-3.

*twitelgode gescentðe his* “where it glosses the Latin *Confusio*.”<sup>668</sup> This makes better sense, and alliterates with *sco/me*, **E** 46b.

**Soul I/II, V 51b/E 48b**

**V(Soul I)**

scealt ðu minra gesynta| sceame þrowian  
50 onðam myclan dæge þonne eall| manna cynn  
se acenneda ealle gesamnað.

**E(Soul II)**

46 scealt þunu hwæpre minra gescenta  
sco|me þrowian  
onþam miclan dæge þōn monna cynn  
se|| a,<sup>n</sup>cenda ealle gegædrað.

The two verbs are essentially synonymous and metrically and syntactically identical.

The variation has no significant effect on sense, syntax, or metre.

**Soul I/II, V 70b/E 65b**

**V(Soul I)**

sceal icðe nihtes| swa þeah nede gesecan  
synnum ge sargod 7eft sona| fram þe  
hweorfan onhanced þonne halige men  
lifi|endum gode lof sang doð  
70 secan þahasas þe ðu me| her scrife.  
7þa arleasan eardung stowe.  
7þe sculon| her mold wyrmas manige ceowan  
slitan sarlice swear|te wihta  
gifre 7grædige

**E(Soul II)**

sceal icþe nihtes seþeah nyde gesecan  
synnum ge|sargad 7eft sona fromðe  
hweorfan onhoncred. þōnn| halege menn  
gode lifgendum lof song doð  
65 secan þa ha|mas þeþume ærscrife  
7þa arleasan eardung stowe  
7þe sculon mold wyrmas monige ceowan.  
seonowum besli|tan swearte wihte  
gifre 7grædige

**V** *her* is an adverb of place modifying *scrife* (from *scrifan* ‘prescribe, impose on’). **E**

*ær* is an adverb of time: *ærscrife* ‘had prescribed.’ While both readings make good (though different) sense and syntax, **E** *ær* destroys the alliteration. In **V**, *her* alliterates with *hamas*.

Scragg, however, has suggested that the **E** scribe had difficulties with initial and medial *h* and may have substituted *ær* for *her* unconsciously.<sup>669</sup>

<sup>668</sup>Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 72 (Old English cited from Moffat).

<sup>669</sup>Scragg, “Initial *h* in OE,” *Anglia* 88 (1970): 165-96, at p. 173; see also Moffat, *Soul and Body*, pp. 75 and 13 (§ 2.1.1 [n]).



**Soul I/II, V 74b/E 69b****V(Soul I)**

ne synt þine **æhta** awihte.|  
75 þe ðu her on moldan mannū eowdest.

**E(Soul II)**

nesindon þine **geahþe** wiht  
70 þaþu her onmoldan monnum eawdest.

The substitution **V** *æhta* ‘possessions’ **E** *geahþe* ‘care, anxiety’<sup>670</sup> affects sense and metre. **E** line 69 is Type B-1, alliterating on **g**. In **V**, the equivalent line is a hypermetric Type D\*1, but fails to alliterate with the on-verse, *gifre ʒgrædige*. See also pp. 308, 319 and 347.

**Soul I/II, V 79a/E 74a****V(Soul I)**

Forðan þewære| selre swiðe mycle  
þōn þe wæron ealle eorðan speda.|  
butan þu hie gedælde dryhtne sylfum  
þær ðu wurde æt **frȳðe**| fugel oððe fisc onsá  
80 oððe on eorðan neat ætes tilode|  
feld gangende feoh butan snyttro  
oððe onwestenne| wild deora  
þæt wyrreste þær swa god wolde.  
ge þeah| ðu wære wyrm cynna  
85 þ grimmeste þær swa god wolde :7|  
Ponne ðu æfre onmoldan mange wurde.  
oððe æfre| fulwihte onfon sceolde.

**E(Soul II)**

forþon| þewære selle swiþe micle  
þōn þewæran ealle eorþan spe|de  
butan þu hyge dælde dryhtne sylfū  
þær þu wurde| æt**frum sceafte** fugel oþþe fisc onsá.  
75 oððe eorþan neat ætes tiolode  
feld gongende feoh butan snyttro  
ge on| westenne wildra deora  
þgrimmeste þærswa god wolde|  
ge þeah þu wære wyrm cynna þæt wyrreste  
80 þōn þu æfre|| onmoldan monge wurde  
oþþe æfre fulwihte onfon sceo|lde

**V** *frȳðe*, dative singular of *frymð* ‘origin, beginning’, and **E** *frum sceafte*, dative singular of *frumsceaft* ‘first creation, origin’, are approximate synonyms and syntactically identical.<sup>671</sup> Their substitution affects metre, however. In **V**, line 79a is Type B-1. In **E**, the equivalent line is Type B-2 with *-sceafte* providing a half-lift in the medial dip.<sup>672</sup>

<sup>670</sup>Moffat’s suggestion that “*geahþ* [sic] in E... is more likely to be the nominative plural of *geað*,” than from *geahþu* ‘care, anxiety’ is unnecessary. It requires both the assumption of an orthographic error (the medial *h*) and the reinterpretation of *geað* as having a “less pejorative meaning than ‘foolishness’, something nearer to *dream* ‘joy’” (*Soul and Body*, p. 75). Since *geahþe* (the MS reading in **E**) is a perfectly acceptable form of the nominative plural, and is lexically appropriate in context, I see no reason for the emendation.

<sup>671</sup>On the convoluted syntax of this passage, see Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 75 and Mitchell, *OES*, § 3415.

<sup>672</sup>Moffat describes the **E** as having an “improbable length” (*Soul and Body*, pp. 75, 20 [§ 3.2], and 22 [§ 3.7 (b)]). For a parallel, see *Dream of the Rood*, line 86b: *þæra þe him biþ egesa to me*.

**Soul I/II, V 109a/E 104a****V(Soul I)**

bið þæt heafod tohliden handa to| liðode  
geaglas toginene góman toslitene  
 110 sina beoð| ásocene swyra be cowen  
 fingras tohrorene  
 rib reaf|iað reðe wyrmas  
 beoð hira tungan totogetenne ontyn| healfa  
 hungregū tofrofne  
 forþan hie ne magon| huxlicum  
 115 wordum wrixlian wið þone werian gast.|

**E(Soul II)**

biþ þæt heafod tohliden honda tohleopode  
geaflas toginene goman| toslitene  
 105 seonwe beoð asogene sweora bicowen  
 rib reaf|iað reþe wyrmas  
 drincað hloþum hrá heolfres þurst|ge.  
 bið seo tunge totogeten on tyn healf  
 hungrum to| hroþor  
 forþon heone mæg horsclice  
 110 wordū wrixlan| wið þone wergan gæst.

The two words are synonymous and metrically identical. Moffat notes that *geagl* appears else where only in prose.<sup>673</sup> A similar substitution occurs in V 116b/E 111b (see below, p.333).

**Soul I/II, V 114a/E 109a****V(Soul I)**

bið þæt heafod tohliden handa to| liðode  
 geaglas toginene góman toslitene  
 110 sina beoð| ásocene swyra be cowen  
 fingras tohrorene  
 rib reaf|iað reðe wyrmas  
 beoð hira tungan totogetenne ontyn| healfa  
hungregū tofrofne  
 forþan hie ne magon| huxlicum  
 115 wordum wrixlian wið þone werian gast.|

**E(Soul II)**

biþ þæt heafod tohliden honda tohleopode  
 geaflas toginene goman| toslitene  
 105 seonwe beoð asogene sweora bicowen  
 rib reaf|iað reþe wyrmas  
 drincað hloþum hrá heolfres þurst|ge.  
 bið seo tunge totogeten on tyn healf  
hungrum to| hroþor  
 forþon heone mæg horsclice  
 110 wordū wrixlan| wið þone wergan gæst.

V *hungregū* is the dative plural of the adjective *hungrig* ‘hungry’, here used substantively to refer to the worms. E *hungrum* is the dative plural of the noun *hungor* ‘hunger’. As Moffat suggests, “it is unclear why ‘hunger’, if that is what was intended, would appear in the plural.”<sup>674</sup> Eyeskip from an exemplar in *\*hungrigum* cannot be ruled out. With a half-stressed medial syllable, V is a Type A\* line, A-1 if the medial syllable of *hungregū* is omitted from scansion; E is Type A-1.

<sup>673</sup>Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 17.

<sup>674</sup>Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 79.

**Soul I/II, V 114a/E 109a****V(Soul I)**

bið þæt heafod tohliden handa to| liðode  
 geaglas toginene góman toslitene  
 110 sina beoð| ásocene swyra be cowen  
 fingras tohrorene  
 rib reaf|iað reðe wyrmas  
 beoð hira tungan totogenne ontyn| healfa  
 hungregū tofrofre  
 forþan hie ne magon| huxlicum  
 115 wordum wrixlian wið þone werian gast.|

**E(Soul II)**

biþ þæt heafod tohliden honda tohleopode  
 geaflas toginene goman| toslitene  
 105 seonwe beoð asogene sweora bicowen  
 rib reaf|iað reþe wyrmas  
 drincað hloþum hrá heolfres þurst|ge.  
 bið seo tunge totogen on tyn healfe  
 hungnum to| hroþor  
 forþon heone mæg horsclice  
 110 wordū wrixlan| wið þone wergan gæst.

**V** *frofre* and **E** *hroþor* are syntactically identical and synonymous, although *hroþor* “is almost wholly confined to verse usage in extant OE.”<sup>675</sup> Metrically, **E** line 109a is Type A-1 with double alliteration; in **V**, the equivalent line is Type A\* (Type A-1 if the middle syllable of *hungregū* is assumed to be syncopated) with single alliteration.

**Soul I/II, V 114b/E 109b****V(Soul I)**

bið þæt heafod tohliden handa to| liðode  
 geaglas toginene góman toslitene  
 110 sina beoð| ásocene swyra be cowen  
 fingras tohrorene  
 rib reaf|iað reðe wyrmas  
 beoð hira tungan totogenne ontyn| healfa  
 hungregū tofrofre  
 forþan hie ne magon| huxlicum  
 115 wordum wrixlian wið þone werian gast.|

**E(Soul II)**

biþ þæt heafod tohliden honda tohleopode  
 geaflas toginene goman| toslitene  
 105 seonwe beoð asogene sweora bicowen  
 rib reaf|iað reþe wyrmas  
 drincað hloþum hrá heolfres þurst|ge.  
 bið seo tunge totogen on tyn healfe  
 hungnum to| hroþor  
 forþon heone mæg horsclice  
 110 wordū wrixlan| wið þone wergan gæst.

The substitution **V** *huxlicum* (dative plural of *huxlice* ‘shameful, ignominious’) **E** *horsclice* (dative singular of *horsclice*, ‘briskly, readily’) affects sense and syntax. The difference in number between the two forms is linked to similar differences in number throughout lines **V** 113-115/**E** 108-110. The forms are metrically identical.

Moffat suggests that the substitution may be the result of an originally graphic mistake:

The dative plural adjective *huxlicum* appears for E's adverb *horsclice*, a word that occurs elsewhere only in glosses. *Horsclice* means ‘briskly, readily’ while *huxlice* should mean ‘shameful, ignominious’. Perhaps *horsclice* was confused with *horsclice*

<sup>675</sup>Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 79.



**Soul I/II, V 115a/E 110a****V(Soul I)**

bið þæt heafod tohliden handa to| liðode  
 geaglas toginene góman toslitene  
 110 sina beoð| ásocene swyra be cowen  
 fingras tohrorene  
 rib reaf|iað reðe wyrmas  
 beoð hira tungan totogetne ontyn| healfa  
 hungregū tofrofre  
 forþan hie ne magon| huxlicum  
 115 wordum wrixlian wið þone werian gast.|

**E(Soul II)**

biþ þæt heafod tohliden honda tohleopode  
 geaf|las toginene goman| toslitene  
 105 seonwe beoð asogene sweora bicowen  
 rib reaf|iað reþe wyrmas  
 drincað hloþum hrá heolfres þurst|ge.  
 bið seo tunge totogeten on tyn healfe  
 hungnum to| hroþor  
 forþon heone mæg horsclice  
 110 wordū wrixlan wið þone wergan gast.

The two verbs are conjugational variants. **V** *wrixlian* is weak II; **E** *wrixlan* is weak I.

Moffat notes that **V** “is the only verse occurrence of *wrixlian*” and suggests that it is unmetrical.<sup>678</sup> Parallel stress patterns are found elsewhere with the preterite of weak II verbs,<sup>679</sup> however, and Sievers gives six examples from *Beowulf* of Type D-2 lines in which the *-i-* of a weak II infinitive ending is scanned as a short half-stressed syllable, all from the on-verse: *wong wisian*, 2409a; *feorh ealgian*, 2668a; *hord sceawian*, 2744a; *gold glitnian*, 2758a; *heah hlifian*, 2805a; *flod fæðmian*, 3133a.<sup>680</sup> Assuming *wordum wrixlian* is an acceptable verse, **V** line 115 is Type D\*2; the equivalent line in **E** is Type A-1.

**Soul I/II, V 116b/E 111b****V(Soul I)**

116 gifer hatte se wyrm þe þa eaglas beoð  
 nædle scearp|ran.

**E(Soul II)**

111 Gifer hatte sewyrm þamþa geaf|las|| beoð  
 nædle scearpran

**V** *eaglas* is presumably for *gēaglas* with Kentish loss of *g* due to transference of stress.<sup>681</sup> Moffat notes that **E** *geaf|las* “preserves a poetic usage while **V** introduces a more

<sup>678</sup>Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 23.

<sup>679</sup>For example, in the *Battle of Maldon: Byrhtnop mædelode* (Type D\*2), lines 42a and 309a. See Pope, *Seven Old English Poems*, p. 114.

<sup>680</sup>See “Zur Rhythmik des germanischen Alliterationsverses I”, *PBB* 10 (1885): 209-314, at p. 301. Text and line numbers as in Fr. Klaeber, *Beowulf and the Fight at Finnsburg*, third edition with first and second supplements (Lexington MA: Heath, 1950). On the possibility of a short half-stress in a similar position in D\*2 lines, see “Zur Rhythmik,” pp. 302-3. Sievers gives no examples of Weak II infinitives in this position, however.

<sup>681</sup>Sievers-Brunner § 212 Anm. 2.

common form, one that... does not occur elsewhere in the extant verse<sup>682</sup> (except in **V** 109a/**E** 104a: **V** *geaglas* **E** *geaflas*, see above, p. 330). The words are synonyms and (assuming that *eaglas* is for *geaglas*) metrically identical.

### **Soul I/II, V 117b/E 112b**

#### **V(Soul I)**

Sege nydde to me  
 ærest eallra onþam eorðscræfe|  
 þæthe þa tungan to tyhð ǵþa teð þurh smyhð.  
 120 ǵþa eagan| þurh eteð ufan onþ heafod.  
 ǵto ætwelan oðrum gerymeð.|  
 wýrmum towiste þonne þæt werie  
 lic acolod bið. þæt| lange ær  
 werede mid wædum

#### **E(Soul II)**

sege neþeð to  
 ærest ealra onþā eorð| scræfe  
 heþa tungan to tyhð. ǵþa toþas þurh smyhð  
 115 ǵto| ætwelan oþrum gerymeð  
 ǵþa eaxan þurh| iteð ufon onþ| heafod  
 wýrmum towiste þōn biþ þæt werge.  
 lic acolad þæt| he longe ær  
 werede mid wædum

**E** *ge neþeð* (from *genēðan* ‘venture forth’) seems more appropriate in context than **V** *ge nydde* (from *genēdan* ‘compel, force, urge’), a fact which may also have prompted **V** to add *me* at the end of the line (see below, p. 349). The two verbs are syntactically and metrically identical, although the addition or omission of *me* affects the metre of the line as a whole.

### **Soul I/II, V 122b/E 117b**

#### **V(Soul I)**

Sege nydde to me  
 ærest eallra onþam eorðscræfe|  
 þæthe þa tungan to tyhð ǵþa teð þurh smyhð.  
 120 ǵþa eagan| þurh eteð ufan onþ heafod.  
 ǵto ætwelan oðrum gerymeð.|  
 wýrmum towiste þonne þæt werie  
 lic acolod bið. þæt| lange ær  
 werede mid wædum

#### **E(Soul II)**

sege neþeð to  
 ærest ealra onþā eorð| scræfe  
 heþa tungan to tyhð. ǵþa toþas þurh smyhð  
 115 ǵto| ætwelan oþrum gerymeð  
 ǵþa eaxan þurh| iteð ufon onþ| heafod  
 wýrmum towiste þōn biþ þæt werge.  
 lic acolad þæt| he longe ær  
 werede mid wædum

As in **V** 22a/**E** 22a, **E** *werg-* could be for *wearg-* ‘accursed’ or *wēr(i)g-* ‘weary, miserable’ (as in **V**). Here, the **V** reading *werie* (for *wērige*) is to be preferred on metrical grounds. With *werie*, **V** 122b is Type C-2 ; if *werge* is for *wearge* in **E**, the equivalent line is

<sup>682</sup>Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 80.

Type A-3. This is a type more properly restricted to the on-verse. In V 22a/E 22a, both forms are metrically acceptable. See p. 325, above.

### Substitution of Metrical Units (1 example)

#### *Soul I/II, V 27a/E 24a*

##### V(*Soul I*)

25 hwæt ðu onworulde ær  
lyt ge þohtest hu þis is| þus lang hider  
**hwæt þe la engel** ufan of roderum  
sawle| onsende þurh his sylfes hand  
meotod ælmihtig of| his mægen þrymme.  
30 ȝbege bohte blode þy halgan.  
ȝ| þu me mid þy heardan hungre gebunde  
ȝge hæft nedest| helle witum.

##### E(*Soul II*)

lyt geþohtes hu þis| is long hider  
**ȝbeburh engel** ufan ofroderum  
25 sawle on|sende þurh his sylfes hond  
meotud ælmihtig of his| mægen þrymme  
ȝbeþa gebohte blode þyhalgan  
ȝbume| þy heardan hungre gebunde  
ȝge hæftna dest helle| witū

Moffat gives a good summary of the differences between the two versions:

The two versions differ here in syntax and in meaning. In E, *engel* is accusative following *þurh* and apparently parallel to *þurh his sylfes hond*, 28b [i.e. E 25b<sup>683</sup>]; the subject of the sentence is *meotud*, 29a [E 26a]. In V, *engel* is nominative, appositive to *meotod*.... *La* as an interjection frequently intensifies the meaning of the preceding word, in this instance the pronoun *þe*.

There are a handful of passages in OE verse where Christ is called an angel, and V27a seems to be one of these. The clearest references are *engla beorhtest* in *Christ I*, 104... and *halig encgel* in *Christ and Satan*, 585.... [S]uch references, while most often associated with early Christianity, are not inappropriate in OE.... However,... it is not so easy to find the orthodoxy in the E passage. The *engel* in E seems unambiguously to be an agent of *meotud ælmihtig*. Grein, Wülker, and Orton all prefer the E text, and exchange *þurh* for *la*. My own view is that a deliberate scribal change from the unusual reading of V to the surprising and perhaps doctrinally questionable reading of E would be unlikely. Therefore I suspect E is original.<sup>684</sup>

<sup>683</sup>Moffat uses a non-standard line-numbering in his edition.

<sup>684</sup>Moffat, *Soul and Body*, pp. 68-69. See also "Anglo-Saxon Scribes," pp. 815-816.

### Addition/Omission Of Unstressed Words and Elements (27 examples)

#### *Soul I/II, V 4b/E 4b*

##### V(*Soul I*)

H uru ðæs be hofað hæleða æghwylc  
 þæt he his| sawle sið sið sylfa ge þence.  
 hu þæt bið deoplic þōn| se deað cymeð  
 asyndreð þa sybbe **þe** ær samod wæron|  
 5 lic ʒsawle

##### E(*Soul II*)

HURU ÐÆS BE HOFAP| hæleþa æghwylc  
 þæthehis sawle sið sylfa be|witige  
 huþæt bið deoplic þōnse deað cymeð  
 asun|drað þasibbe **þabe** ær somud wæron  
 5 lic ʒsawl

The addition or omission of *þa* has a minor effect on metre and sense, but none on syntax. In **E**, *þa* serves to identify the case and number of the antecedent to the relative clause introduced by *þe*. In **V**, *þe* is an indeclinable relative particle. Both are acceptable Old English syntax. The variation falls on the preliminary drop of a Type C-1 line and is metrically insignificant.

#### *Soul I/II, V 16b/E 16b*

##### V(*Soul I*)

15 Cleopað þōn swa cearful| cealdan reorde  
 spreceð grimlice **se** gast toþamduste.|

##### E(*Soul II*)

15 Cleopað þonne| swa cearful caldan reorde  
 spriced grimlice gæst to|| þam duste

The addition or omission of the demonstrative pronoun *se* adds or subtracts an anacrustic syllable at the beginning of an A-1 line. It has no obvious effect on sense or syntax.

#### *Soul I/II, V 21a/E 21a*

##### V(*Soul I*)

lyt ðu ge mundest|  
 20 tohwan þinre sawle þing siðþan wurde  
 syððan oflic| homan læded wære :

##### E(*Soul II*)

lyt þuge þohtes  
 20 towon þinre sawle sið siþþan wurde|  
 siþþan **heo** of lic homan læded wære.

The addition or omission of the nominative singular feminine pronoun *heo* has no significant effect on the metre, sense, or syntax of the passage. Metrically, the variant adds or removes an unstressed syllable in the preliminary drop of a Type C-2 line; in terms of sense and syntax, it reiterates the subject of the clause, tying it firmly *sawle*, l.20a. Mitchell notes that the “non-expression of a pronoun subject which can be supplied from a preceding clause



must be accepted as idiomatic OE” and gives many examples in which the subject of a subordinate clause has to be supplied from a preceding main clause.<sup>685</sup>

**Soul I/II, V 26b/E 23b**

**V(Soul I)**

25                    hwæt ðu onworulde ær  
 lyt ge þohtest   hu þis is| **þus** lang hider  
 hwæt þe la engel   ufan of roderum  
 sawle| onsende   þurh his sylfes hand  
 meotod ælmihtig   of| his mægen þrymme.  
 30   ʒþege bohte   blode þy halgan.  
 ʒ| þu me mid þy heardan   hungre gebunde  
 ʒge hæft nedest|   helle witum.

**E(Soul II)**

lyt geþohtes   hu þis| is long hider  
 ʒþeþurh engel   ufan ofroderum  
 25   sawle on|sende   þurh his sylfes hond  
 meotud ælmihtig   of his| mægen þrymme  
 ʒþeþa gebohte   blode þyhalgan  
 ʒþume| þy heardan   hungre gebunde  
 ʒge hæftna dest   helle| witū

The addition or omission of *þus* has little effect on sense, syntax, or metre. Metrically, the adverb falls on the preliminary drop of a Type C-2 verse.

**Soul I/II, V 30a/E 27a**

**V(Soul I)**

25                    hwæt ðu onworulde ær  
 lyt ge þohtest   hu þis is| þus lang hider  
 hwæt þe la engel   ufan of roderum  
 sawle| onsende   þurh his sylfes hand  
 meotod ælmihtig   of| his mægen þrymme.  
 30   ʒþege bohte   blode þy halgan.  
 ʒ| þu me mid þy heardan   hungre gebunde  
 ʒge hæft nedest|   helle witum.

**E(Soul II)**

lyt geþohtes   hu þis| is long hider  
 ʒþeþurh engel   ufan ofroderum  
 25   sawle on|sende   þurh his sylfes hond  
 meotud ælmihtig   of his| mægen þrymme  
 ʒþe**þa** gebohte   blode þyhalgan  
 ʒþume| þy heardan   hungre gebunde  
 ʒge hæftna dest   helle| witū

The addition or omission of the sentence adverb *þa* in V 30a/E 27a has no significant effect on sense, metre, or syntax. In E, *þa* specifies the logical/temporal relationship between the clause *þe... gebohte blode þyhalgan* (E 27) and the preceding clause; in V, no temporal relationship is expressed. The addition or omission adds or removes an unstressed syllable from the preliminary dip of a Type A-3 line and is metrically insignificant.

<sup>685</sup>Mitchell, *OES*, §§ 1512 and 1513.

**Soul I/II, V 31a/E 28a****V(Soul I)**

25 hwæt ðu onworulde ær  
 lyt ge þohtest hu þis is| þus lang hider  
 hwæt þe la engel ufan of roderum  
 sawle| onsende þurh his sylfes hand  
 meotod ælmihtig of| his mægen þrymme.  
 30 ȝbege bohte blode þy halgan.  
 ȝ| þu me **mid** þy heardan hungre gebunde  
 ȝge hæft nedest| helle witum.

**E(Soul II)**

lyt geþohtes hu þis| is long hider  
 ȝbeþurh engel ufan ofroderum  
 25 sawle on|sende þurh his sylfes hond  
 meotud ælmihtig of his| mægen þrymme  
 ȝbeþa gebohte blode þyhalgan  
 ȝþume| þy heardan hungre gebunde  
 ȝge hæftna dest helle| witū

In **V**, *mid þy heardan hungre* is a prepositional phrase expressing means: ‘with hard hunger’; **E** *þy heardan hungre* is an example of the instrumental/dative case being used alone to express means: ‘with hard hunger’. Both are acceptable Old English. The addition or omission affects the preliminary drop of a Type A-3 line and is metrically insignificant.

**Soul I/II, V 33a/E 30a****V(Soul I)**

**eadode** icþe oninnan  
 nemeahte icðe ||| of cuman  
 flæsce befangen ȝmefyren lustas  
 35 þine ge|þrungon

**E(Soul II)**

30 ic þe Ininnan noicþe of meahte  
 flæsce bifongen| ȝmefiren lustas  
 þinegeþrungon

**V** *eadode* ‘dwell’ is essential to sense and syntax, although its addition or omission has no significant metrical effect. **V** 33a/**E** 30a are both Type A-3. For the addition or omission of *cuman* (and related changes) in the off-verse, see below, pp. 127 and 354.

**Soul I/II, V 36a/E 32a****V(Soul I)**

35 þæt me þuhte ful oft  
 þæt **hit** wær.xxx.| þusend wintra  
 to þinū deað dæge

**E(Soul II)**

32 þme þuhte ful oft|  
 þæt wære þritig þusend wintra  
 toþinum deað dæge|

Both forms are idiomatic.<sup>686</sup> The addition or omission of *hit* has no significant effect on sense, metre, or syntax.

<sup>686</sup>Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 69. See also Mitchell, *OES*, §§ 1487, 1507.

**Soul I/II, V 38b/E 35b****V(Soul I)**

37 á ic unces ge|dales onbád  
earfoðlice nis nu huru se ende to góð.|

**E(Soul II)**

35 hwæt ic unces gedales bád.  
earfoðlice nisnu se ende| togod.

The addition or omission of the interjection *huru* adds or removes two unstressed syllables in the preliminary drop of a Type B-2 line. The variation has no significant effect on sense or syntax.

**Soul I/II, V 40b/E 37b****V(Soul I)**

Wære þu þe wiste wlanc. 7wines sæd.  
40 þrym ful þune|dest 7ofþyrsted wæs  
godes lichoman gastes drynces :7|

**E(Soul II)**

36 wære þuþe wiste wlanc 7wines sæd  
þrymful þu| nedest. 7*ic* of þyrsted wæs.  
godes lichoman gæstes drin|ces

**E** *ic* provides an expressed subject for *wæs* and marks a change in person from the second (*nedest*, E 37a) to the first. **V** is potentially confusing since *ofþyrsted wæs* could be either first or third person and *godes lichoman* (V 41a) provides a grammatically suitable third person subject for the verb. This suggests that the pronoun *ic* was mistakenly omitted from **V**. The addition or omission of the pronoun falls in the preliminary drop of a Type B-1 line in both manuscripts: it is metrically insignificant.

**Soul I/II, V 42a/E 39a****V(Soul I)**

Forðan þu ne hogodest her on life  
syððan icðe on| worulde wunian sceolde  
þæt ðu wære þurh flæsc| 7þurh fyren lustas  
45 strange ge stryned. 7gestaðolod| þurh me.  
7Ic wæs gast onðe fram gode sended  
næfre| ðu me mid swa heardū helle witung  
nege neredest| þurh þinra meda lust.

**E(Soul II)**

þærþu þōn hogode her onlife  
40 þenden icþe inworul|de wunian sceolde  
þæt þuwære þurh flæsc 7þurh fi|ren lustas  
strong gestyred 7gestaþelad þurh mec.|  
7icwæs gæst onþe from gode sended  
næfre þumec| swa heardra helle wita  
45 ne gearwode þurh þinra neo|da lust

The addition or omission of *ne* in V 42a E 39a is linked to the substitution of unstressed words **V** *Forðan* **E** *þær* at the beginning of the line. In **E**, lines 39-43 are a contrary-to-fact condition introduced by *þær*, ‘if’. As a result, the main verb of the clause (*hogode*) is subjunctive and positive: ‘If you thought then, while alive here...’ The most likely interpretation of the equivalent lines in **V** is as a causal or result clause introduced by *Forðan*

‘because, therefore’ (for a discussion of other possible translations of **V** see above, p. 316). Consequently, *hogodest* is indicative and negative: ‘Because you did not think while alive here....’ The change affects the preliminary drop of a Type A-3 line and is metrically insignificant.

**Soul I/II, V 42a/E 39a**

**V(Soul I)**

Forðan þu ne hogodest her on life  
 syððan icðe on| worulde wunian sceolde  
 þæt ðu wære þurh flæsc| ȝþurh fyren lustas  
 45 strange ge stryred. ȝgestaðolod| þurh me.  
 ȝIc wæs gast onðe fram gode sended  
 næfre| ðu me mid swa heardū helle witum  
 nege neredest| þurh þinra meda lust.

**E(Soul II)**

þærþu þōn hogode her onlife  
 40 þenden icþe inworulde wunian sceolde  
 þæt þuwære þurh flæsc ȝþurh fi|ren lustas  
 strong gestyred ȝgestaþelad þurh mec.|  
 ȝicwæs gæst onþe from gode sended  
 næfre þumec| swa heardra helle wita  
 45 ne gearwode þurh þinra neo|da lust

The addition or omission of *þōn* (i.e. *þonne* ‘then, when’) has no significant effect on sense, syntax, or metre. In **E**, *þōn* is an adverb of time correlative with *þenden*: ‘If you thought then, while alive here...’ Together with *nu*, **E** 46a, *þōn* also helps emphasise the relationship between the body’s earlier actions and its subsequent punishments. See below, pp. 341 and 342. Its presence is not syntactically necessary, however, and its absence in **V** is without syntactic significance. The adverb falls on the preliminary dip of a Type A-3 line and is metrically insignificant.

**Soul I/II, V 47a/E 44a**

**V(Soul I)**

Forðan þu ne hogodest her on life  
 syððan icðe on| worulde wunian sceolde  
 þæt ðu wære þurh flæsc| ȝþurh fyren lustas  
 45 strange ge stryred. ȝgestaðolod| þurh me.  
 ȝIc wæs gast onðe fram gode sended  
 næfre| ðu me mid swa heardū helle witum  
 nege neredest| þurh þinra meda lust.

**E(Soul II)**

þærþu þōn hogode her onlife  
 40 þenden icþe inworulde wunian sceolde  
 þæt þuwære þurh flæsc ȝþurh fi|ren lustas  
 strong gestyred ȝgestaþelad þurh mec.|  
 ȝicwæs gæst onþe from gode sended  
 næfre þumec| swa heardra helle wita  
 45 ne gearwode þurh þinra neo|da lust

The addition or omission of *mid* in **V** 47a/E 44a is one of a number of highly significant changes in **V** 46-48/E 43-45. Both versions of the text are problematic. In **V**, *mid* introduces a prepositional phrase *mid swa heardū helle witum*: ‘with such hard hell-torments’.

As the main verb of the clause in **V** is *ge neredest* ‘protect’, *mid* ‘with’ is lexically suspect and most editors emend to *wið* ‘against’.<sup>687</sup> In **E**, *swa heardra helle wita* is a genitive plural phrase without any obvious grammatical relationship to the rest of the clause. It cannot be construed without emendation. The omission has no significant effect on metre, removing or adding a single unstressed syllable in the preliminary drop of a Type A-3 line.

For further discussion of the variation in these lines, see pp. 305, 318, 326 and 327, above.

### **Soul I/II, V 49a/E 46a**

#### **V(Soul I)**

scealt ðu minra gesynta| sceame þrowian  
50 onðam myclan dæge þonne eall| manna cynn  
se acenneda ealle gesamnað.

#### **E(Soul II)**

46 scealt þunu hwæpre minra gescenta  
sco|me þrowian  
onþam miclan dæge þōn monna cynn  
se|| a,<sup>n</sup>cenda ealle gegædrað.

The addition or omission of the adverb *nu* in **V** 49a/**E** 46a has no significant effect on syntax or metre. Together with *þōn* in **E** 39a (see above, p. 340), *nu* emphasises the connection between the body’s current and future punishment and its previous behaviour. Neither adverb is syntactically, metrically or syntactically necessary, however. As it falls on the preliminary dip of a Type A-3 verse, the addition or omission of *nu* has no significant metrical effect. See also pp. 340 and 342.

### **Soul I/II, V 49a/E 46a**

#### **V(Soul I)**

scealt ðu minra gesynta| sceame þrowian  
50 onðam myclan dæge þonne eall| manna cynn  
se acenneda ealle gesamnað.

#### **E(Soul II)**

46 scealt þunu **hwæpre** minra gescenta  
sco|me þrowian  
onþam miclan dæge þōn monna cynn  
se|| a,<sup>n</sup>cenda ealle gegædrað.

Like **E** *nu*, lines 46a and 51a, and **E** *þōn*, line 39a, **E** *hwæpre* emphasises the contrast between the body’s previous behaviour and its current and future punishment. It is not

<sup>687</sup>Moffat, *Soul and Body*, pp. 70-71.

syntactically necessary, however, and, as it falls on the preliminary drop of a Type A-3 line, is metrically insignificant. See also pp. 340, 341 and 342.

**Soul I/II, V 52a/E 51a**

**V(Soul I)**

ne eart| ðu þon leofra nænigū lifigendra  
men to ge mæccan.| ne meder ne fæder.  
ne nænigum ge sybban.  
þonn,<sup>e</sup> se| swearta hrefen  
55 syððan ic ana ofðe utsiðode  
þurh| þæs sylfes hand þe ic ær onsended wæs.

**E(Soul II)**

ne eart þu **nu**þon leofre nængū| lifigendra  
50 menn toge mæccan nemedder nefæder  
nenæn|gum gesibbra þōn se swearta hrefn  
siþþan icana of| þe utsiþade.  
þurh þæs sylfes hond þe ic ær onsended wæs.|

The addition of *nu* to **E** continues the contrast between past actions and present/future judgement found throughout **E** 39-60. It falls on the preliminary drop of a Type A-3 line. For further examples, see pp. 340, 341 and 342.

**Soul I/II, V 63a/E 58a**

**V(Soul I)**

ne mæg þe nu| heonon adon hyrsta þy readan.  
ne gold ne seolfor| ne þinra goda nán  
ne þinre bryde beag. ne þin| gold wela.  
60 ne nanþara goda þeðu iu ahtest.  
Ac her| sceolon on bidan ban be reafod  
be sliten synum. 7þe| þin sawl sceal  
7 minum unwillu oft gesecan  
wemman| þe mid wordū swa ðu worhtest to me.

**E(Soul II)**

Nemagon þe nu heonan adon hyrste þa readan  
55 negold|ne sylfor neþinra goda nán  
ac her sculon abidan ban| bireafod  
besliten seonwum 7þe þin sawl sceal  
minū ún|willan oft gesecan  
wemman mid wordum swaþu worhtest| tome.

The addition or omission of *7* in **V** 63a/**E** 58a affects sense, syntax, and metre. In both manuscripts, **V** *minum unwillu* **E** *minū ún/willan* is best construed as a dative of manner or accompaniment: ‘with my lack of will(s) (i.e. unwillingly)’. Of the two versions, **E** seems the less strained: in **V**, *7* comes between the verb and its predicate. Metrically, the addition or omission adds or subtracts an unstressed syllable from the preliminary dip of a Type C-1 line. The character has been partially erased in **V**.

**Soul I/II, V 64a/E 59a****V(Soul I)**

ne mæg þe nu| heonon adon hyrsta þy readan.  
 ne gold ne seolfor| ne þinra goda nán  
 ne þinre bryde beag. ne þin| gold wela.  
 60 ne nanþara goda þeðu iu ahtest.  
 Ac her| sceolon on bidan ban be reafod  
 be sliten synum. 7þe| þin sawl sceal  
 7 minum unwillu oft gesecean  
 wemman| **þe** mid wordū swa ðu worhtest to me.

**E(Soul II)**

Nemagon þe nu heonan adon hyrste þa readan  
 55 negold|ne sylfor neþinra goda nán  
 ac her sculon abidan ban| bireafod  
 besliten seonwum 7þe þin sawl sceal  
 minū ún|willan oft gesecean  
 wemman mid wordum swaþu worhtest| tome.

V *þe* is the accusative singular of the second person personal pronoun and object of *wemman* ‘defile, besmirch’. In E the object of *wemman* is to be inferred from *gesecean* and is not expressed. Both are acceptable syntax.<sup>688</sup> The addition or omission of *þe* occurs on the medial dip of a Type A-1 line and is metrically insignificant.

**Soul I/II, V 65a/E 60a****V(Soul I)**

65 eart ðu **nu** dumb| 7deaf  
 nesynt þine dreamas awiht

**E(Soul II)**

60 eart þu dumb 7deaf  
 nesindan þine dreamas| wiht.

The addition or omission of *nu* in V 65a/E 60a has no significant effect on sense, syntax, or metre. The line is Type B-1 in both manuscripts.

**Soul I/II, V 72a/E 67a****V(Soul I)**

sceal icðe nihtes| swa þeah nede gesecean  
 synnum ge sargod 7eft sona| fram þe  
 hweorfan onhanced þonne halige men  
 lifi|endum gode lof sang doð  
 70 secan þahamas þe ðu me| her scrife.  
 7þa arleasan eardung stowe.  
 7þe sculon| **her** mold wyrmas manige ceowan  
 slitan sarlice swear|te wihta  
 gifre 7grædige

**E(Soul II)**

sceal icþe nihtes seþeah nyde gesecean  
 synnum gesargad 7eft sona fromðe  
 hweorfan onhoncred. þōnn| halege menn  
 gode lifgendum lof song doð  
 65 secan þa ha|mas þeþume ærscife  
 7þa arleasan eardung stowe  
 7þe sculon mold wyrmas monige ceowan.  
 seonowum besli|tan swearte wihte  
 gifre 7grædige

The presence of *her* in V 72a emphasises the physical nature of the punishments which are to be suffered by the body here on earth. The adverb falls on the preliminary drop of a Type C-1 line and is not essential to sense, metre, or syntax. See also below, p. 345.

<sup>688</sup>See Mitchell, *OES*, §§ 1575-6.

**Soul I/II, V 96a/E 89a****V(Soul I)**

95 Ac| hwæt wylt ðu þær.  
on**þā** dō dæge dryhtne secgan.

**E(Soul II)**

88 ac hwæt wilt þuþær  
ondóm|dæge dryhtne secgan.

The addition or omission of the dative singular masculine demonstrative pronoun *þā* adds or removes an unstressed syllable from the preliminary drop of a Type C-2 verse. It has no significant effect on sense and syntax.

**Soul I/II, V 97a/E 90a****V(Soul I)**

þonne| nebið nan **na**topæs lytel lið  
onlime aweaxen.  
þðu ne| scyle for anra ge hwylcum on sundrū  
rihtagildan. ||| þōn reðe bið  
100 dryhten æt þam dome

**E(Soul II)**

90 þōn nebið nænig topæs lytel lið|  
onlime geweaxen  
þæt þune scyle for æghwylc anra on|sundran  
ryht agieldan. ðonne reþebið  
dryhten æt do|me

**V na** is not syntactically, semantically, or metrically necessary. Both *ne* and *nænig* negate the verb in **E**. The adverb falls on the preliminary dip of a Type B-1 line and has no significant effect on metre.

**Soul I/II, V 100a/E 93a****V(Soul I)**

þonne| nebið nan natopæs lytel lið  
onlime aweaxen.  
þðu ne| scyle for anra ge hwylcum on sundrū  
rihtagildan. ||| þōn reðe bið  
100 dryhten æt **þam** dome

**E(Soul II)**

90 þōn nebið nænig topæs lytel lið|  
onlime geweaxen  
þæt þune scyle for æghwylc anra on|sundran  
ryht agieldan. ðonne reþebið  
dryhten æt do|me

The addition or omission of the dative singular demonstrative pronoun *þam* falls in the medial dip of a Type A-1 line. It is metrically, semantically, and syntactically insignificant.

**Soul I/II, V 101a/E 95a****V(Soul I)**

100 ac hwæt do wyt unc.|  
sculon wit þōn **eft** æt somne siððan brucan  
swylcra yrm|ða swaðu unc her ær scrife.

**E(Soul II)**

achwæt dowit unc  
þōn he unc hafað geedbyrded| oþre siþe  
95 sculon wit þonne ætsomne siþþan brucan  
swylcra yrmþa swaþu unc ær scrife

**V eft** emphasises the extent to which the miseries suffered by the soul and body are the result of the body's earlier actions: 'But what will we two do for ourselves? We shall then



again experience such miseries afterwards together as you imposed on us both here earlier’.

The adverb falls on the preliminary dip of a Type A-3 verse and is not necessary for sense, syntax, or metre.

**Soul I/II, V 102b/E 96b**

**V(Soul I)**

100 ac hwæt do wyt unc.  
 sculon wit þōn eft æt somne siððan brucan  
 swylcra yrmða swaðu unc **her** ær scrife.

**E(Soul II)**

achwæt dowit unc  
 þōn he unc hafað geedbyrded| oþre siþe  
 95 sculon wit þonne ætsomne siþþan brucan  
 swylcra yrmþa swaþu unc ær scrife

As in V 72a, V *her* 102b emphasises the extent to which it is the body’s actions on earth which lead to its subsequent punishment (see also above, p. 343). As *her* is presumably equal in stress to the alliterating adverb *ær*, its addition adds a non-alliterating and unmetrical stress before the first lift of what would otherwise be a Type C-1 line.

**Soul I/II, V 119a/E 114a**

**V(Soul I)**

Sege nydde to me  
 ærest eallra onþam eorðscræfe|  
**þæ**the þa tungan to tyhð ǵþa teð þurh smyhð.  
 120 ǵþa eagan| þurh eteð ufan onþ heafod.  
 ǵto ætwelan oðrum gerymeð.  
 wrymum towiste

**E(Soul II)**

sege nepeð to  
 ærest ealra onþa eorð| scræfe  
 heþa tungan to tyhð. ǵþa toþas þurh smyhð  
 115 ǵto| ætwelan oþrum gerymeð  
 ǵþa eaxan þurh| iteð ufon onþ heafod  
 wrymum towiste

The addition of *þæt* to V suggests that lines V119-121a were understood in this version to be an adverbial clause of purpose or result: ‘He, first of all in that earthly grave, compelled †to me† [see below, p. 349], so that he then pulls apart the tongue, and pierces through the teeth.’ The omission of the conjunction in E indicates that the equivalent lines were understood as an independent clause: ‘He, first of all in that earthly grave, ventures forth. He then pulls apart the tongue and pierces through the teeth’. The addition or omission falls in the preliminary dip of a Type B-1 line and is metrically insignificant.

*Soul I/II, V 123b/E 118b***V(Soul I)**

Sege nydde to me  
 ærest eallra onþam eorðscræfe|  
 þæthe þa tungan to tyhð ȝþa teð þurh smyhð.  
 120 ȝþa eagan| þurh eteð ufan onþ heafod.  
 ȝto ætwelan oðrum gerymeð.|  
 wýrmum towiste þonne þæt werie  
 lic acolod bið. þæt| lange ær  
 werede mid wædum

**E(Soul II)**

sege neþeð to  
 ærest ealra onþa eorð| scræfe  
 heþa tungan to tyhð. ȝþa toþas þurh smyhð  
 115 ȝto| ætwelan oþrum gerymeð  
 ȝþa eaxan þurh| iteð ufon onþ| heafod  
 wýrmum towiste þōn biþ þæt werge.  
 lic acolad þæt| **he** longe ær  
 werede mid wædum

The addition or omission of *he* in V123b/E118b affects syntax. In **E**, *he* is the subject of *werede*, ‘dressed’, the object of which is the accusative singular neuter demonstrative/relative *þæt* (for which *lic*, **E** 118a, is the antecedent): ‘then that wretched body has cooled, which he long ago dressed with clothes’. The pronoun seems to be syntactically necessary. *Þæt* cannot be the subject of *werian*, as Bosworth and Toller give no examples of *werian* without a direct object (for which *þæt* is the only candidate).<sup>689</sup> Nor is there any obvious candidate in **V** (or **E**) for an unexpressed subject to be understood from the preceding clause.

At the same time *he* is also without an obvious expressed antecedent.<sup>690</sup> While *gæst* (**V** 115b/**E** 110b) provides a grammatically acceptable candidate, it seems unlikely that the poet means that the soul dressed the body with clothes. Wülker’s suggestion that *he* refers generally to ‘der Mensch’ whose body and soul are the focus the poem seems the most likely explanation.<sup>691</sup> The addition or omission is metrically insignificant and falls on the preliminary drop of a Type B-1 line.

<sup>689</sup>B.-T. s.v. *werian*.

<sup>690</sup>See Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 81.

<sup>691</sup>Wülker, *Die Verceller Handschrift: die Handschrift des Cambridger Corpus Christi Collegs CCI, die Gedichte der sogen. Cædmonhandschrift, Juduth, der Hymnus Cædmons, Heiligenkalendar nebst kleineren geistlichen Dichtungen*, Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Poesie v. 2.1 (Kassel: Georg H. Wigand, 1888), p. 104.

**Addition/Omission Of Prefixes (3 examples)****Soul I/II, V 37b/E 34b****V(Soul I)**

37                    á ic unces ge|dales onbád  
 earfoðlice    nis nu huru se ende to góð.|

**E(Soul II)**

35                    hwæt ic unces gedales bád.  
 earfoðlice    nisnu se ende| togod.

The addition or omission of the prefix adds or removes an unstressed syllable in the medial drop of a Type B line. It has no significant effect on sense or syntax.

**Soul I/II, V 65b/E 60b****V(Soul I)**

65    eart ðu nu dumb|| ȝdeaf  
       nesynt þine dreamas awiht

**E(Soul II)**

60    eart þu dumb ȝdeaf  
       nesindan þine dreamas| wiht.

The (normally stressed)<sup>692</sup> prefix of **V** *awiht* creates metrical problems. In **E**, line 60b is Type B-1; in **V**, the equivalent line is closest to a Type A-2b with four anacrustic syllables. The addition or omission does not have a significant effect on sense or syntax. The same substitution is repeated in **V** 74b/E 69b.

**Soul I/II, V 74b/E 69b****V(Soul I)**

75                    ne synt þine æhta awihte.|  
 þe ðu her on moldan    mannū eowdest.

**E(Soul II)**

70                    nesindon þine geah|þe wiht  
 þaþu her onmoldan    monnum eawdest.

Together with the difference in case, the addition of the prefix *a-* creates metrical problems in **V**.<sup>693</sup> In **E**, line 70b is Type B-1, alliterating on *geah/þe*. In **V**, the equivalent half line is closest to a D\*1, but with four anacrustic syllables. With the substitution **V** *æhta* **E** *geah/þe*, **V** also fails to alliterate. See also above, pp. 308, 329 and 347.

<sup>692</sup>See Campbell, *OEG*, § 393. **V** 64b and 74b are the only examples (in 36 occurrences) in which the prefix in *āwiht(e)/āuht(e)* is not certainly stressed. There are no examples in which the second syllable of *āwiht(e)/āuht(e)* is necessary for alliteration on *w*.

<sup>693</sup>See above, fn. 692

### Addition/Omission Of Stressed Words and Elements (6 examples)

#### *Soul I/II, V 33b/E 30b*

##### **V(*Soul I*)**

eardode icþe oninnan  
 nemeahte icðe ||| of **cuman**  
 flæsce befangen ȝmefyren lustas  
 35 þine ge|þrungon

##### **E(*Soul II*)**

30 ic þe Ininnan noicþe of meahte  
 flæsce bifongen| ȝmefiren lustas  
 þinegeþrungon

**V** *cuman* is the complement of *meahte* ‘could come’. In **E**, the equivalent line has *meahte* with the non-expression of a verb of motion. This is a common idiom in Old English.<sup>694</sup> In **V**, *cuman* provides the second lift in a Type C-2 line (the first and alliterating lift is provided by the post-positive preposition *of* in each witness). In **E**, the second lift is provided by the first syllable of *meahte*. In this case, the verse is Type C-1. The variant is metrically linked to the position of *meahte*, see below, p. 354.

#### *Soul I/II, V 50b/E 47b*

##### **V(*Soul I*)**

scealt ðu minra gesynta| sceame þrowian  
 50 onðam myclan dæge þonne **eall**| manna cynn  
 se acenneda ealle gesamnað.

##### **E(*Soul II*)**

46 scealt þunu hwæþre minra gescenta  
 sco|me þrowian  
 onþam miclan dæge þōn monna cynn  
 se|| a,<sup>n</sup>cenda ealle gegædrað.

**V** *eall* is a nominative singular neuter strong declension adjective modifying *manna cynn* ‘all the race of men’. This is a syntactically acceptable construction, and, as the adjective falls in the preliminary dip of a Type B-1 line early in the clause, is probably metrical. A similar variant occurs in **V** 89b/E 83b. See the following variant.

<sup>694</sup>Mitchell, *OES*, § 1007.

**Soul I/II, V 89b/E 83b****V(Soul I)**

þonne ðu for unc bæm| and wyrðan scealt  
 onðam miclan dæge þonne mannū| beoð  
 90 wunda on wrigene þaðe onworulde ær  
 fyren fulle men fyrnge worhton.  
 Ðōn wyle dryhten sylf dæda|ge hyran  
 hæleða gehwylces heofena scippend  
 æt ealra| manna gehwæs muðes reorde  
 95 wunde wiðer lean.

**E(Soul II)**

þōn þu for unc bú ondwyrdan scealt  
 onþam miclan| dæge þōn **eallum** monnū beoð  
 wunde onwrigene þaþe in| worulde ær.  
 85 firen fulle menn fyrn geworhton.  
 ðōn wile| dryhten sylf dæda gehyran  
 æt ealra monna gehwam| muþes reorde  
 wunde wiþer lean

**E** *eallum* is a dative plural adjective agreeing with *monnū* ‘to all men’. In **V** *mannū* is unqualified. Both versions are syntactically and lexically acceptable, although Moffat suggests that “*eallum*... has crept into the E version by analogy with the common collocation ‘all men’ used in this poem and elsewhere.”<sup>695</sup> As in the preceding variant, *eallum* falls in the preliminary dip of a Type B-1 line and is probably unstressed. See also **V** *eall| manna cynn*, **V** 50b/E 47b.

**Soul I/II, V 117b/E 112b****V(Soul I)**

Sege nydde to **me**  
 ærest eallra onþam eorðscræfe|  
 þæthe þa tungan to tyhð ȝþa teð þurh smyhð.  
 120 ȝþa eagan| þurh eteð ufan onþ heafod.  
 ȝto ætwelan oðrum gerymeð.|  
 wrymum towiste þonne þæt werie  
 lic acolod bið. þæt| lange ær  
 werede mid wædum

**E(Soul II)**

sege nepeð to  
 ærest ealra onþa eorð| scræfe  
 heþa tungan to tyhð. ȝþa toþas þurh smyhð  
 115 ȝto| ætwelan oþrum gerymeð  
 ȝþa eaxan þurh| iteð ufon onþ heafod  
 wrymum towiste þōn biþ þæt werge.  
 lic acolad þæt| he longe ær  
 werede mid wædum

As Krapp suggests, the addition of *me* in **V** is probably “an unreflecting impulse on the part of the scribe to provide *to* with an object.”<sup>696</sup> While the pronoun makes good sense and syntax at a local level within the clause itself, it is illogical in the larger context of the poem as a whole as the body is not speaking at this point. The scribe may have been confused by the poor sense of *nydde* (see above, p. 334). With *me*, **V** is Type B-2 with an odd distribution of sentence particles; without *me*, the equivalent line in **E** is Type B-1.

<sup>695</sup>Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 77.



### Addition/Omission of Metrical Units (7 examples)

#### *Soul I/II, V 19b-26*

##### V(*Soul I*)

hwæt wite ðuðu me weriga  
 hwæt| ðu huru wyrma gyfl  
 lyt ge þohtest **þa ðu lust gryrum| eallū**  
**ful geodest huðu on eorðan scealt**  
 25 **wyrmum to| wiste. hwæt ðu onworulde ær**  
**lyt ge þohtest** hu þis is| þus lang hider  
 hwæt þe la engel ufan of roderum  
 sawle| onsende þurh his sylfes hand  
 meotod ælmihtig of| his mægen þrymme.  
 30 ȝþe ge bohte blode þy halgan.  
 ȝ| þu me mid þy heardan hungre gebunde  
 ȝge hæft nedest| helle witum.

##### E(*Soul II*)

hwæt wite þume| werga.  
 hwæt þu huru wyrma gifl.  
 lyt geþohtes hu þis| is long hider  
 ȝþeþurh engel ufan ofroderum  
 25 sawle on|sende þurh his sylfes hond  
 meotud ælmihtig of his| mægen þrymme  
 ȝþeþa gebohte blode þyhalgan  
 ȝþume| þy heardan hungre gebunde  
 ȝge hæftna dest helle| witū

The simplest explanation for this variant is eyeskip *lyt ge þohtest* (V 23a/E 23a) to *lyt ge þohtest* (V 25a).<sup>697</sup> V contains little or no information missing from E, however, leaving editorial intervention a possibility. The resulting lines E 23a-b, E 26a-b, V 23a-b are all metrical.

#### *Soul I/II, V 59-60*

##### V(*Soul I*)

ne mæg þe nu| heonon adon hyrsta þy readan.  
 ne gold ne seolfor| ne þinra goda nán  
**ne þinre brvde beag. ne þin| gold wela.**  
 60 **ne nanþara goda þeðu iu ahtest.**  
 Ac her| sceolon on bidan ban be reafod  
 be sliten synum. ȝþe| þin sawl sceal  
 ȝ minum unwillu oft gesecan  
 wemman| þe mid wordū swa ðu worhtest to me.

##### E(*Soul II*)

Nemagon þe nu heonan adon hyrste þa readan  
 55 negold|ne sylfor neþinra goda nán  
 ac her sculon abidan ban| bireafod  
 besliten seonwum ȝþe þin sawl sceal  
 minū ún|willan oft gesecan  
 wemman mid wordum swaþu worhtest| tome.

A possible explanation for the absence of V 59-60 from E is eyeskip: *ne þinra goda nán* > *ne nan þara goda*. As Moffat notes, however, this does not directly explain the absence of the following half-line *þeðu iu ahtest* (V 60b).<sup>698</sup> Neither of the lines omitted from E alliterate in V, a fact which leads Jones-Gyger, Orton, and Moffat to suspect interpolation on

<sup>697</sup>Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 68; see also Orton, "A Further Examination," p. 181-2.

<sup>698</sup>Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 74.

the part of the **V** scribe (or predecessor).<sup>699</sup> This is perhaps supported by the nature of the verses themselves, which continue a list of the worldly things which cannot take the body away from its earthly prison. A similar metrically suspicious addition to a list occurs in **V** 111.

See below, p. 353.

### **Soul I/II, V 93**

#### **V(Soul I)**

þonne ðu for unc bæm| and wyrðan scealt  
 onðam miclan dæge þonne mannū| beoð  
 90 wunda on wrigene þaðe onworulde ær  
 fyren fullle men fyrnge worhton.  
 Ðōn wyle dryhten sylf dæda|ge hyran  
hæleða gehwylces heofena scippend  
 æt ealra| manna gehwæs muðes reorde  
 95 wunde wiðer lean.

#### **E(Soul II)**

þōn þu for unc bú ondwyrdan scealt  
 onþam miclan| dæge þōn eallum monnū beoð  
 wunde onwrigene þaþe in| worulde ær.  
 85 firen fullle menn fyrn geworhton.  
 ðōn wile| dryhten sylf dæda gehyran  
 æt ealra monna gehwam| muþes reorde  
 wunde wiþer lean

**V** 93 neither adds nor detracts from the sense of the surrounding text. There is no obvious explanation for either the omission of the line from **E** or its addition to **V**.

### **Soul I/II, E 94**

#### **V(Soul I)**

100 ac hwæt do wyt unc|  
 sculon wit þōn eft æt somne siððan brucan  
 swylcra yrm|ða swaðu unc her ær scrife.

#### **E(Soul II)**

achwæt dowit unc  
þōn he unc hafað geedbyrded| oþre siþe  
 95 sculon wit þonne ætsomne siþþan brucan  
 swylcra yrmþa swaþu unc ær scrife

The absence of **E** 94 from **V** leaves a terse but complete question: ‘and what are we two to do with ourselves?’ In **E**, the two lines are somewhat fuller: ‘and what are we two to do with ourselves / when he has regenerated us a second time?’ There is no obvious textual reason for the omission or addition of **E** 94 in either manuscript.

<sup>699</sup>Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 74; Orton, “A Further Examination,” p. 183; Alison [Jones-]Gyger, “The Old English *Soul and Body* as an Example of Oral Transmission,” *MÆ* 38 (1969) 239-244, at p. 245.



**Soul I/II, E 101****V(Soul I)**

105                                    liget dust þær hit| wæs.  
nemæg him ʒsware ænige ge hatan  
 geomrum gaste| geoce oððe frofre.

**E(Soul II)**

100                                    ligeð dust þærhit wæs|  
 100 nemæg him ʒsware ænige secgan  
nebær edringe ænge| ge hatan  
 gæste geomrum geoce oþþe frofre

The most likely explanation for the absence of **E 101** from **V** is eyeskip: *ænige secgan*

(**E 100b**) > *ænige ge/hatan* (**E 101b/V 106b**). Both versions make good sense, however.

**Soul I/II, V 111****V(Soul I)**

   bið þæt heafod tohliden handa to| liðode  
 geaglas toginene góman toslitene  
 110 sina beoð| ásocene swyra be cowed  
fingras tohrorene  
 rib reaf|iað reðe wyrmas  
 beoð hira tungan totogenne ontyn| healfa  
 hungregū tofrofre  
    forþan hie ne magon| huxlicum  
 115 wordum wrixlian wið þone werian gast.|

**E(Soul II)**

   biþ þæt heafod tohliden honda tohleopode  
 geaflas toginene goman| toslitene  
 105 seonwe beoð asogene sweora bicowen  
 rib reafi|að reþe wyrmas  
 drincað hloþum hrá heolfres þurst|ge.  
 bið seo tunge totogen on tyn healfe  
 hungrum to| hroþor  
    forþon heone mæg horsclice  
 110 wordū wrixlan| wið þone wergan gæst.

**V** is metrically incomplete, and, while it continues the list of the punishments which will overcome the body begun in **V 108/E 103**, is not syntactically necessary to the clause as a whole. A similar example – where **V** again has the longer list of parallel items – involves **V 59-60**. In both examples, the additional text shows metrical problems. See above, p. 351.

Moffat suggests the omission of the off-verse from **E** may be the result of eye-skip “given the similarity of the participial endings in this passage.”<sup>700</sup> Interpolation in **V** seems at least as likely given the line’s metrical difficulties.

<sup>700</sup>Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 79

**Soul I/II, E 107****V(Soul I)**

bið þæt heafod tohliden handa to| liðode  
 geaglas toginene góman toslitene  
 110 sina beoð| ásocene swyra be cowen  
 fingras tohrorene  
 rib reaf|iað reðe wyrmas  
 beoð hira tungan totogetenne ontyn| healfa  
 hungregū tofrofre  
 forþan hie ne magon| huxlicum  
 115 wordum wrixlian wið þone werian gast.|

**E(Soul II)**

biþ þæt healfod tohliden honda tohleopode  
 geaflas toginene goman| toslitene  
 105 seonwe beoð asogene sweora bicowen  
 rib reaf|iað reþe wyrmas  
drincað hloþum hrá heolfres þurst|ge.  
 bið seo tunge totogeten on tyn healfre  
 hungnum to| hroþor  
 forþon heone mæg horsclice  
 110 wordū wrixlan| wið þone wergan gæst.

This is the opposite of the variant in V 111. The passage absent in V but present in E is syntactically parallel to V 112/E 106, but not necessary for sense. Orton suggests that the poetic word *heolfor* may have led the V scribe to omit the line.<sup>701</sup> Interpolation in E seems at least as likely.

**Rearrangement Within The Line (3 examples)****Soul I/II, V 33b/E 30b****V(Soul I)**

eardode icþe oninnan  
nemeahte icðe|| of cuman  
 flæsce befangen ǵmefyren lustas  
 35 þine ge|þrungon

**E(Soul II)**

30 ic þe Ininnan noicþe of meahte  
 flæsce bifongen| ǵmefiren lustas  
 þinegeþrungon

The rearrangement within line V 33b/E30b is linked metrically to the addition or omission of *cuman* in the same line. In V, *of* and *cuman* carry stress; *meahte* comes earlier in the line and is unstressed. In E, *meahte* comes at the end of the line, occupying the (metrically necessary) second lift. See also above, p. 348.

<sup>701</sup>Orton, "A Further Examination," p. 185.

**Soul I/II, V 69a/E 64a****V(Soul I)**

sceal icðe nihtes| swa þeah nede gesecan  
 synnum ge sargod 7eft sona| fram þe  
 hweorfan onhancrod þonne halige men  
lifiendum gode lof sang doð  
 70 secan þahamas þe ðu me| her scrife.  
 7þa arleasan eardung stowe.  
 7þe sculon| her mold wyrmas manige ceowan  
 slitan sarlice swear|te wihta  
 gifre 7grædige

**E(Soul II)**

sceal icþe nihtes seþeah nyde gesecan  
 synnum ge|sargad 7eft sona fromðe  
 hweorfan onhoncred. þōnn| halege menn  
gode lifgendum lof song doð  
 65 secan þa ha|mas þepume ærscrife  
 7þa arleasan eardung stowe  
 7þe sculon mold wyrmas monige ceowan.  
 seonowum besli|tan swearte wihte  
 gifre 7grædige

The rearrangement has a significant effect on metre: in **E**, line 64a is Type D-1; in **V**, the equivalent verse is Type E. Krapp suggests that the **V** reading has “a more usual alliteration.”<sup>702</sup>

**Soul I/II, V 107a/E 102a****V(Soul I)**

105 liget dust þær hit| wæs.  
 nemæg him 7sware ænige ge hatan  
geomrum gaste| geoce oððe frofre.

**E(Soul II)**

ligeð dust þærhit wæs|  
 100 nemæg him 7sware ænige secgan  
 neþær edringe ænge| ge hatan  
gæste geomrum geoce oþþe frofre

The two versions are semantically, syntactically, and metrically identical.

**Rearrangement Across Metrical Boundaries (2 examples)****Soul I/II, V 98a-b/E 91a-b****V(Soul I)**

þonne| nebið nan natopæs lytel lið  
 onlime aweaxen.  
 þðu ne| scyle for anra ge hwylcum on sundrū  
 rihtagildan. ||| þōn reðe bið  
 100 dryhten æt þam dome

**E(Soul II)**

90 þōn nebið nænig topæs lytel lið|  
 onlime geweaxen  
 þæt þune scyle for æghwylc anra on|sundran  
 ryht agieldan. ðonne reþebið  
 dryhten æt do|me

The rearrangement (when taken with the inflectional difference and substitution **V** *ge hwylcum* **E** *æghwylc*) affects stress and the alliteration pattern in the line. In **E**, the on-verse is Type C-1, the off-verse Type A-1. In **V**, the equivalent verses are Type A-3 and C-1. See above, p. 322.

<sup>702</sup>ASPR 3, p. 318.

**Soul I/II, V 122b-123a/E 117b-118a****V(Soul I)**

Sege nydde to me  
 ærest eallra onþam eorðscræfe|  
 þæthe þa tungan to tyhð ǵþa teð þurh smyhð.  
 120 ǵþa eagan| þurh eteð ufan onþ heafod.  
 ǵto ætwelan oðrum gerymeð.|  
 wyrnum towiste þonne þæt werie  
lic acolod bið. þæt| lange ær  
 werede mid wædum

**E(Soul II)**

sege neþeð to  
 ærest ealra onþa eorð| scræfe  
 heþa tungan to tyhð. ǵþa toþas þurh smyhð  
 115 ǵto| ætwelan oþrum gerymeð  
 ǵþa eaxan þurh| iteð ufon onþ| heafod  
 wyrnum towiste þōn biþ þæt werge.  
lic acolad þæt| he longe ær  
 werede mid wædum

The rearrangement of V 122b-123a/E 117b-118a has a significant effect on metre, but none on sense or syntax. In E, *biþ* appears in the preliminary drop of a metrically inappropriate Type A-3 (if E *werge* is for *wēarge*) or (more appropriate) Type C-2 (if E *werge* is for *wērige*) line.<sup>703</sup> In V 123a, *bið* is fully stressed and adds a metrically illicit third full lift to what would otherwise be a Type A-1 line. Moffat cites the *Phoenix*, line 228b *hrā bið ācōlad* as an example of the metrical arrangement of a similar line.<sup>704</sup>

**Rearrangement Of Metrical Units (2 examples)****Soul I/II, V 83-85/E 78-79****V(Soul I)**

Forðan þewære| selre swiðe mycle  
 þōn þe wæron ealle eorðan speda.|  
 butan þu hie gedælde dryhtne sylfum  
 þær ðu wurde æt fryðe| fugel oððe fisc onsá  
 80 oððe on eorðan neat ætes tilode|  
 feld gangende feoh butan snyttro  
 oððe onwestenne| wild deora  
þæt wyrreste þær swa god wolde.  
ge þeahl ðu wære wyrm cynna  
 85 þ grimmeste þær swa god wolde :7|  
 Þonne ðu æfre onmoldan mange wurde.  
 oððe æfre| fulwihte onfon sceolde.

**E(Soul II)**

forþon| þewære selle swiþe micle  
 þōn þewæran ealle eorþan spe|de  
 butan þu hyge dælde dryhtne sylfū  
 þær þu wurde| ætfrum sceaft fugel oþþe fisc onsá.  
 75 oððe eorþan neat ætes tiolode  
 feld gongende feoh butan snyttro  
 ge on| westenne wildra deora  
þgrimmeste þærswa god wolde|  
ge þeah þu wære wyrm cynna þæt wyrreste  
 80 þōn þu æfre|| onmoldan monge wurde  
 oþþe æfre fulwihte onfon sceo|lde

The origins of this complex set of variants seem to lie in V: of the three lines in that manuscript, the first off-verse alliterates improperly, the second off-verse is a syllable short of a complete line, and the third off-verse repeats the first. In contrast, lines 78-9 in E show

<sup>703</sup>See above, p. 334.

<sup>704</sup>Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 81.

appropriate alliteration, metre, syntax and sense. Orton suggests that the **V** version may have its origins in an eyeskip (*þgrimmeste* > *þæt wyrreste*), which was subsequently caught and reworked to avoid correction.<sup>705</sup>

### **Soul I/II, V 120-1/E 115-116**

#### **V(Soul I)**

Sege nydde to me  
 ærest eallra onþam eorðscræfe|  
 þæthe þa tungan to tyhð ǵþa teð þurh smyhð.  
 120 ǵþa eagan| þurh eteð ufan onþ heafod.  
ǵto ætwelan oðrum gerymeð.  
 wýrmum towiste þonne þæt werie  
 lic acolod bið. þæt| lange ær  
 werede mid wædum

#### **E(Soul II)**

sege neþeð to  
 ærest ealra onþa eorð| scræfe  
 heþa tungan to tyhð. ǵþa toþas þurh smyhð  
 115 ǵto| ætwelan oþrum gerymeð  
ǵþa eaxan þurh| iteð ufon onþ| heafod  
 wýrmum towiste þōn biþ þæt werge.  
 lic acolad þæt| he longe ær  
 werede mid wædum

Both readings make sense, although the Gifer's progress seems more logically organised in **V**. The lines are otherwise metrically, syntactically and semantically identical.

### **Recomposition (2 examples)**

#### **Soul I/II, V 12-14/E 13-14**

#### **V(Soul I)**

Sceal se gast cuman| geohðum hremig  
 10 symble ymbe seofon niht sawle findan|  
 þone lichoman þe hie ær lange wæg  
 þreo hund wintra| butan ær þeod cyning  
ælmihlig god ende worulde  
wyr|can wille weoruda dryhten :7

#### **E(Soul II)**

Scealse gæst cuman gehþum hremig  
 10 sý|le ymb seofon niht sawle findan  
 þone lic homan þe| heo ær longe wæg  
 þreo hund wintra  
butan ær wyrce ece| dryhten  
ælmihlig god ende worlde.

Both versions of the passage make good sense and reasonable syntax. The principal syntactic and lexical differences are: variation in the main verb of the clause between the present subjective of *wyrcean* in **E** (*wyrce*, line 13a), and the present subjunctive of *willa* plus the infinitive *wyr/can* in **V** (line 14a); the addition or omission of **V** *þeod cyning* as an epithet for God (line 12a); and a variation between the genitive plural **V** *weoruda* and the adjective **E** *ece* in the epithet: **V** *weoruda dryhten* (line 14b); **E** *ece| dryhten* (line 13b).

<sup>705</sup>Orton, "A Further Examination," pp. 186-187; see also Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 76.

Of the various variants, the most problematic readings are in **E**: the substitution of *wyrce* (**E** 13a) for *þeod cyning* (**V** 12b) leaves the on-verse *þreo hund wintra* (**E** 12a) without an appropriately alliterating off-verse. While *wyrce* alliterates with *wintra*, the verse is either Type A-3 or Type C-1 with *wyrce* on the second lift. Neither is appropriate as an off-verse in a line with alliteration on *w*. In addition, Orton reports that the word order of the two lines (*butan...* Verb, Subject, Object) “is unparalleled in Old English verse.”<sup>706</sup>

This suggests in turn that **E** is responsible for the variation and reorganisation of these lines. Orton suggests that the variation may have its origins in the unusual use of **V** *þeod cyning* (line 12b) to refer to God, instead of ‘king (of a nation)’ as in all other recorded instances.<sup>707</sup> In this case, the subsequent recomposition and rearrangement of material is presumably to be seen as an attempt at salvaging metre: all the lines in **E** are rhythmically acceptable verses, and, with the exception of **E** 12, alliterate correctly.

### **Soul I/II, V 73a/E 68a**

#### **V(Soul I)**

sceal ic ðe nihtes| swa þeah nede gesecan  
synnum ge sargod 7eft sona| fram þe  
hweorfan onhancrod þonne halige men  
lifi|endum gode lof sang doð  
70 secan þahamas þe ðu me| her scrife.  
7þa arleasan eardung stowe.  
7þe sculon| her mold wyrmas manige ceowan  
slitan sarlice swear|te wihta  
gifre 7grædige

#### **E(Soul II)**

sceal ic þe nihtes seþeah nyde gesecan  
synnum ge|sargad 7eft sona fromðe  
hweorfan onhoncred. þōnn| halege menn  
gode lifgendum lof song doð  
65 secan þa ha|mas þepume ærscrife  
7þa arleasan eardung stowe  
7þe sculon mold wyrmas monige ceowan.  
seonowum beslihtan swearte wihte  
gifre 7grædige

There are three differences in this half-line: an addition or omission of the prefix *be-*; a substitution of stressed words (**V** *sarlice* **E** *seonowum*); and the rearrangement of elements within the line.

<sup>706</sup>Orton, “A Further Examination,” p. 186.

<sup>707</sup>Orton, “A Further Examination,” p. 186.

These variants affect sense, metre, and syntax. In **V**, *slitan sarlice* is a variation on the preceding half-line *manige ceowan*: ‘and here shall many earthworms chew you, tear sorely, dark creatures....’; **E** *seonowum besli/tan*, on the other hand, introduces a new punishment, ‘tear(ing) from sinews’,<sup>708</sup> to the litany: ‘and many earthworms shall chew you, tear [you] from your sinews, dark creatures...’.

Metrically, **V** 73a is Type D\*1; **E** is Type A-1. Moffat points out that “the on-verse in **E** is a repetition with reversed word order of 61a, although the verb form has changed from past participle to infin[i]tive.” He suggests that the variation was introduced in **V**.<sup>709</sup>

### **Daniel and Azarias**

*Daniel* and *Azarias* are the names given to two biblical poems preserved in the Junius Manuscript (Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 11 [**J**]) and Exeter Book (**E**) respectively. In **J**, *Daniel* is the last of three biblical poems copied in the manuscript’s first hand. It begins on page 173 (in quire 14) and extends to page 212, the first verso of the seventeenth quire. It is preceded in quires 1-14 by two other retellings of biblical stories, *Genesis* and *Exodus*. On page 213 it is followed by a fourth poem or group of poems known to modern editors as *Christ and Satan*. This final text or texts is in three hands of the early eleventh century and fills all but the first page and last verso of quire 17 (pages 213-229). As *Daniel* appears to end imperfectly, and as pages 213-229 are ruled differently from the rest of the manuscript, Ker has suggested that *Christ and Saturn* was inserted into **J** to replace leaves lost from the middle of the manuscript’s last quire.<sup>710</sup>

The Exeter Book *Azarias* begins, probably defectively, on f. 53r and ends on f. 55v. It is followed after two blank lines by an unrelated poem, the *Phoenix* and preceded, on f. 52 v,

<sup>708</sup>*Beslitan* is found only in *Soul and Body* (Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 75). See also **V** 62a/**E** 57a.

<sup>709</sup>Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 75.

by the apparently defective ending of *Guðlac*. A strip approximately seven centimetres wide has been cut from the top of f. 53, immediately above the “first” line of *Azarias*. As Pope and Ker have pointed out, there is considerable paleographic evidence to suggest that the text of this missing strip belonged to *Azarias*.<sup>711</sup> The first letter of the surviving poem is, as Pope notes, “of a size commonly used by the scribe for a new section within a long poem,”<sup>712</sup> and remains of two letters above the first line indicate that the “poem” was not preceded by a blank line – contrary to the scribe’s standard practice at the beginning of a new text in this part of the manuscript.<sup>713</sup> As f. 53r is the first page of its quire, and as *Guðlac* appears to end defectively at the foot of f. 52v, it seems likely that the missing text included one or more quires. On the assumption that a single quire is missing between the current quires 6 and 7, Pope has suggested that the missing text might have filled as many as “250 or 300 lines.”<sup>714</sup>

The two poems share a common section of approximately 75 lines (corresponding to **J** 279-364/**E** 1-75) and show occasional similarities of vocabulary and phrasing for most of the remainder of *Azarias* (**J** 365-464/**E** 76-191, especially **J** 365-415/**E** 76-175). These common sections correspond to the Vulgate *Daniel* 3:24-90 and include two long prayers, “The Prayer of Azarias” and the “Song of the Three Children.”<sup>715</sup>

---

<sup>710</sup>Ker, *Catalogue*, art. 334. For an opposing view, see Farrell, *Daniel and Azarias*, pp. 5-6.

<sup>711</sup>Pope, “Paleography and Poetry,” pp. 35-41. Ker, rev. of *The Exeter Book of Old English Poetry*, with Introductory Chapters by R.W. Chambers, Max Förster and Robin Flower, *MÆ* 2 (1933): 224-31. For an opposing view, see Farrell, *Daniel and Azarias*, pp. 39-40 and “Some Remarks on the Exeter Book *Azarias*,” *MÆ* 41 (1972): 1-8.

<sup>712</sup>Pope, “Paleography and Poetry,” pp. 35-36.

<sup>713</sup>Ker, rev. of *The Exeter Book*, p. 227.

<sup>714</sup>Pope, “Paleography and Poetry,” p. 41.

<sup>715</sup>See Krapp, *ASPR* 1, pp. xxxii-xxxiii. Jabour, diss., pp. 115-161 (esp. pp. 116-17 and 148-152). As the similarities between the two versions of the “Song of the Three Children” are too slight to lend themselves to the type of variant-by-variant analysis on which this study is based, the following discussion and catalogue is concerned almost entirely with the “Prayer of Azarias.” That the “common” text of “Song of the Three Children” shows even more evidence of recomposition and reworking than does the “Prayer of Azarias” strengthens rather than weakens the conclusions drawn here, however, as it demonstrates an even



The two poems use this material in different ways. In *Daniel*, the common text appears as part of a sequential retelling of the Vulgate *Daniel*. The two prayers are preceded by a section corresponding to Daniel 3:1-50 (in which Nebuchadnezzar orders the Children to be thrown into the furnace), and followed by an account of the rescue of the Children from the fire (corresponding to *Dan* 3:91-97), and Nebuchadnezzar's dream (corresponding to *Dan* 4-5). In *Azarias*, on the other hand, the common text appears at first glance to make up the entire poem. The first line of the surviving text corresponds to *Dan* 3:25, and the poem ends with a translation of *Dan* 3:90. This corresponds almost exactly with the deuterocanonical section of the Vulgate *Daniel* (3:24-3:90) added by Jerome to his translation of the Hebrew Bible,<sup>716</sup> parts of which were used as canticles in a number of contemporary liturgies.<sup>717</sup> Were it not for the evidence that *Azarias* begins defectively, this would suggest that the Exeter book poem was intended as a translation of the prayer alone.<sup>718</sup> What preceded the text as it now survives, however, is impossible to tell. As the remains of the letters from the last line on the strip cut from f. 53r – “g at the margin and, after the space of one letter, a letter with a long descender (f, p, r, s, þ, or þ)”<sup>719</sup> – do not match anything in the corresponding line of *Daniel* (*þe hie generede wið þam niðhete*, J 278), it seems fairly safe to assume that the missing text was not closely related to the Junius poem.

---

greater willingness to alter the received text. A brief discussion and catalogue of similarities in the two versions of the “Song of the Three Children” can be found in Jabbour, diss., pp. 148-152.

<sup>716</sup>Cf. the warnings before 3:24 and after 3:90 in the Vulgate *Daniel*: *Quae sequuntur in hebraeis voluminibus non reperi* and *Hucusque in hebraeo non habetur; et quae posuimus de Theodotionis editione translata sunt*. See also Farrell, *Daniel and Azarias*, pp. 24-25.

<sup>717</sup>Farrell, *Daniel and Azarias*, pp. 24-5; “The Unity of the Old English *Daniel*,” *RES* 18 (1967): 117-35, at p. 133.

<sup>718</sup>This is the basis of Farrell's suggestion that the Exeter Scribe saw *Azarias* as containing “appropriate songs of praise and celebration” with which to conclude a defective exemplar of *Guðlac* (“Some Remarks,” pp. 5-6). For objections to this reading, see Celia Sisam's review of the *Finnsburh Fragment and Episode* and *Daniel and Azarias*, *RES* n.s. 27 (1976): 324-26.

<sup>719</sup>Pope, “Paleography and Poetry,” p. 37, fn. 39.

With 120 potentially significant substantive variants in 160 copied lines, the common text of *Daniel* and *Azarias* is the most variable in the entire corpus of multiply attested Old English poetry. Like *Soul and Body* I and II, *Daniel* and *Azarias* show all variant types characteristic of the anthologised poems: twenty-four linked variants; twenty-two examples of the substitution of stressed words (the majority of which involve non-homographs); three examples of alternation between case forms and prepositional phrases; three examples of the substitution of lines and half-lines; five examples of the addition or omission of metrical units; five examples of rearrangement within the line; and one example of the rearrangement of entire lines and half-lines. As was the case in *Soul and Body*, many of these variants are clustered in passages showing important interpretative differences – although the common text of *Daniel* and *Azarias* shows a generally more even spread of its substantive variation.

## Textual Variants

### Inflectional Difference (18 examples)

#### *Az/Dan*, E 3a/J 281a

##### E(*Az*)

1 Himþa azarias ingeþoncum  
 hleoþrede halig þurh hatne lig  
 dreag dædum georn dryhten herede  
 wis| inweorcum ȝþas word acwæð

##### J(*Dan*)

ða| azarias inge þancum.  
 280 hleoðrade halig.| þurh hatne líg.  
dæda georn. drihten herede.|  
 wer womma leas. ȝþa word ácwæð.

**E** *dædum* is dative plural. **J** *dæda* is genitive plural. The variation has no significant effect on sense or metre. In both witnesses, *dæd-* modifies *georn* ‘eager, zealous’. Mitchell reports that *georn* is found with both cases, with no apparent difference in meaning.<sup>720</sup> The endings are metrically identical. For a discussion of the addition or omission of **E** *dreag* and the resulting metrical differences between the two witnesses, see below, p. 402.

<sup>720</sup>Mitchell, *OES*, § 219, p. 92.

**Az/Dan, E 12a/J 291a****E(Az)**

ro|dera waldend  
 geoca us georne gæsta scyppend  
 7| þurh hyldo help halig dryhten  
 nuwe þec forþear|fum 7for þrea nydum  
 15 7fore eað medum arena| biddaþ  
 lege bilegde

**J(Dan)**

290 rodora waldend.  
 geo causer georne.| nu gasta scyppend.  
 7þurh help halig drih|ten.  
 nu<sup>wc</sup>þec for þreaum. 7for ðeo nydum.|  
 7for eaðmedum. arna biddað.  
 295 líge beleg|de.

**E** *us* is the normal West-Saxon form of the accusative or dative of the second person plural pronoun. **J** *user* is the Northumbrian and poetic form of the genitive of the second person plural pronoun. The difference reflects a variation in the rection of *gēocian*, which can take a dative or genitive object.<sup>721</sup>

Although the two half-lines are metrically quite different, both *us* and *user* make good metre. In **E**, *us* falls in the medial drop of a Type A-1 line. In **J**, *user* is found in the preliminary drop of what is best analysed as a Type B-1.

**Az/Dan, E 19b/J 298b****E(Az)**

wepæs lifgende  
 worhton inwo|rulde eacþon wom dydon.  
 ylðran usse inofer hygdū|  
 þinbibodu bræcon burg sit tende  
 20 had ofer hogedon| halgan lifes

**J(Dan)**

295 weðæs lifgende.  
 worhton onworulde.| eac ðon wóm dyde.  
 user ylðran. for ofer|hygdum.  
 bræcon bebodo. burhsittendū|  
 had ofer hogedon. halgan lifes.

**E** *burg sit tende* is nominative plural, parallel to *ylðran*, line 18a, and subject of *bræcon*, line 19a: ‘Our forefathers, city-dwellers, also broke your commandments in pride’. In **J**, *burhsittendū* is a dative of possession or interest: ‘Our forefathers also broke the commandments for the city dwellers on account of pride’.<sup>722</sup> The two forms are metrically identical.

<sup>721</sup>Mitchell, *OES*, § 1092.

<sup>722</sup>Farrell, p. 65, note to *Daniel*, 298; also Jabbour, diss., p. 126, who points to *Daniel* 729 to þam beacne *burhsittendum* as a syntactic parallel.





**Az/Dan, E 26b/J 305b****E(Az)**

wurdon weto wrecene geond widne grund|  
 heapum to<sup>h</sup>worfne hylða lease  
 wæs ure lif geond lon|ða fela  
 fracuð ȝgefræge fold buendū  
 25 nuþu usic be|wræce inþas wyrrestan  
 eorð cyninges æht gewealda  
 in| hæft heoro grimmes  
 sceolon weþær hæþenra  
 þrea nyd || [strip of c. 4 ll. missing from MS]

**J(Dan)**

300 siendonwe|| towrecene. geond widne grund.  
 heapum tohwor|fene. hylde lease.  
 is user lif. geond landafela.|  
 fracod ȝgefræge. folca manegum.  
 þaus éc| bewræcon. toþæs wyrrestan.  
 305 eorð cyninga.| æhta gewealde.  
 onhæft heoru grimra ȝwe| nu hæðenra.  
 þeow ned þoliað.

**E** *æht gewealda* is a dative singular neuter compound noun (with *a* for expected *e*)

‘power’: ‘you have exiled us into the power of this most terrible earth-king’. In **J**, *æhta* is most likely an accusative plural feminine noun ‘chattels, slaves’<sup>723</sup> appositive to *us éc* (line 304a): ‘who have exiled us as chattels into the power of this most terrible of earth-kings’. The inflectional ending adds or subtracts an unstressed syllable from the medial dip of a Type A-1 line and is metrically insignificant.

**Az/Dan, E 27a/J 306a****E(Az)**

wurdon weto wrecene geond widne grund|  
 heapum to<sup>h</sup>worfne hylða lease  
 wæs ure lif geond lon|ða fela  
 fracuð ȝgefræge fold buendū  
 25 nuþu usic be|wræce inþas wyrrestan  
 eorð cyninges æht gewealda  
 in| hæft heoro grimmes  
 sceolon weþær hæþenra  
 þrea nyd || [strip of c. 4 ll. missing from MS]

**J(Dan)**

300 siendonwe|| towrecene. geond widne grund.  
 heapum tohwor|fene. hylde lease.  
 is user lif. geond landafela.|  
 fracod ȝgefræge. folca manegum.  
 þaus éc| bewræcon. toþæs wyrrestan.  
 305 eorð cyninga.| æhta gewealde.  
 onhæft heoru grimra ȝwe| nu hæðenra.  
 þeow ned þoliað.

**E** *heoro grimmes* is a genitive singular substantive adjective. It is appositive to *þas* [for *þæs*] *wyrrestan eorð cyninges* and refers to Nebuchadnezzar: ‘the bondage of the savage one’. In **J**, *heoru grimra* is genitive plural and refers either to Nebuchadnezzar’s henchmen or to the *folca manegum* responsible for oppression of Jews as a whole: ‘the bondage of savages’. In contrast to the difference in the number of *eorð cyninges* / *eorð cyninga* in line 25a/305a,

<sup>723</sup>B.-T. *æht*, I d. (cf. *Gif hwylc man his æht ofslyhð* ‘if any man strikes down his slave’)

the variation in number here is part of the linked changes in number and tense throughout **E** 21-28/J 300-307a (see pp. 228 ff. above). The two forms are metrically identical.

**Az/Dan, E 32b/J 315b**

**E(Az)**

þuhimge hete þurh hleoþor cwidas  
 þæt þu hyra from|cynn onfyrn dagum  
 ycan wolde þhit æfter him  
 35 oncne|ryce cenned wurde  
 yced oneorþan þæt swa untime  
 had to| hebban swa heofon steorran  
 bugað bradne hwearft oðbrim|flodas.  
 swa waroþa sond ymb sealt wæter  
 40 yþe geond ear|grund þæt swa untime  
 ymb wintra hwearft weorðan sceolde

**J(Dan)**

315 þu him þgehéte. þurh| hleoðor cwyde.  
 þ þu hyra frum cyn. infyrn| dagum.  
 ícan wolde. þte æfter him.  
 oncneo|rissum. cenned wurde.  
 7seo mænigeo mære| wære.  
 320 hat to hebbanne. swa heofon steor|ran.  
 bebugað bradne hwyrft. oð þ brim|faro. þæs  
 sæ faroða sand. geond sealtne| wæg.  
 me áre gryndeð. þ his únrima.  
 inwintra| worn. wurðan sceolde.

**E** *hleoþor cwidas* is accusative plural. **J** *hleoðor cwyde* is dative singular. In both versions the noun is the object of *þurh*. Both make good sense, syntax and metre, although the use of the plural in **E** adds an extra weight to Azarias's petition by emphasising the repeated nature of the prophesy.<sup>724</sup> The endings are metrically identical.

**Az/Dan, E 37a/J 320a**

**E(Az)**

þuhimge hete þurh hleoþor cwidas  
 þæt þu hyra from|cynn onfyrn dagum  
 ycan wolde þhit æfter him  
 35 oncne|ryce cenned wurde  
 yced oneorþan þæt swa untime  
 had to hebban swa heofon steorran  
 bugað bradne hwearft oðbrim|flodas.  
 swa waroþa sond ymb sealt wæter  
 40 yþe geond ear|grund þæt swa untime  
 ymb wintra hwearft weorðan sceolde

**J(Dan)**

315 þu him þgehéte. þurh| hleoðor cwyde.  
 þ þu hyra frum cyn. infyrn| dagum.  
 ícan wolde. þte æfter him.  
 oncneo|rissum. cenned wurde.  
 7seo mænigeo mære| wære.  
 320 hat to hebbanne. swa heofon steor|ran.  
 bebugað bradne hwyrft. oð þ brim|faro. þæs  
 sæ faroða sand. geond sealtne| wæg.  
 me áre gryndeð. þ his únrima.  
 inwintra| worn. wurðan sceolde.

**E** *hebban* is the infinitive, **J** *hebbanne* the inflected infinitive, of *hebban* 'to raise, lift, exalt'. While *to* + the inflected infinitive is the norm in Old English, Callaway reports that

<sup>724</sup>The equivalent verse in the Vulgate *Daniel* makes no mention of the number of times the promise was made: *Quibus* [sc. Abraham, Isaac, and the people of Israel] *locutus es quod multiplicares semen eorum...* (*Dan* 3:36).

“occasionally the *to* is followed by an infinitive in *-an*.”<sup>725</sup> In **E**, *had to| hebban* is Type A-1; **J** *hat to hebbanne* is D\*1.

**Az/Dan, E 39b/J 322b**

**E(Az)**

þuhinge hete þurh hleoþor cwidas  
 þæt þu hyra from|cynn onfyrn dagum  
 ycan wolde þhit æfter him  
 35 oncyne|ryce cenned wurde  
 yced oneorþan þæt swa unrime  
 had to| hebban swa heofon steorran  
 bugað bradne hwearft oðbrim|flodas.  
 swa waroþa sond ymb sealt wæter  
 40 yþe geond ear|grund þæt swa unrime  
 ymb wintra hwearft weorðan sceolde

**J(Dan)**

315 þu him þgehéte. þurh| hleoðor cwyde.  
 þ þu hyra frum cyn. infyrn| dagum.  
 ícan wolde. þte æfter him.  
 oncneo|rissum. cenned wurde.  
 7seo mænigeo mære| wære.  
 320 hat to hebbanne. swa heofon steor|ran.  
 bebugað bradne hwyrft . oð þ brim|faro. þæs  
 sæ faroða sand. geond sealtne| wæg.  
 me áre gryndeð. þ his únrima.  
 inwintra| worn. wurðan sceolde.

The inflectional variation between **E** *sealt* **J** *sealtne* is linked to the substitution of stressed words immediately following. In **E**, *sealt* is the accusative singular neuter strong form of the adjective, agreeing with *wæter*, an accusative singular neuter noun. In **J**, *sealtne* is accusative singular masculine strong, agreeing with the accusative singular masculine noun *wæg*. The two forms are not metrically equivalent, but each is appropriate to the metrical context in which it occurs. In **E**, *sealt* provides the first lift for a Type C-2 line. In **J**, the accusative ending *-ne* occupies the dip of a Type B-1 line.

<sup>725</sup>Morgan Callaway, Jr, *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon*, Publications of the Carnegie Institute 169 (Washington: Carnegie Institute, 1913), p. 2.



**Az/Dan, E 40b/J 323b****E(Az)**

þuhinge hete þurh hleoþor cwidas  
 þæt þu hyra from|cynn onfyrn dagum  
 ycan wolde þhit æfter him  
 35 oncne|ryce cenned wurde  
 yced oneorþan þæt swa unrim  
 had to| hebban swa heofon steorran  
 bugað bradne hwearft oðbrim|flodas.  
 swa waroþa sond ymb sealt wæter  
 40 yþe geond ear|grund þæt swa unrime  
 ymb wintra hwearft weorðan sceol|de

**J(Dan)**

315 þu him þgehéte. þurh| hleoðor cwyde.  
 þ þu hyra frum cyn. infyrn| dagum.  
 ícan wolde. þte æfter him.  
 oncneo|rissum. cenned wurde.  
 7seo mænigeo máre| wære.  
 320 hat to hebbanne. swa heofon steor|ran.  
 bebugað bradne hwyrft. oð þ brim|faro. þæs  
 sæ faroða sand. geond sealtne| wæg.  
 me áre gryndeð. þ his únrima.  
 inwintra| worn. wurðan sceolde.

**J** *únrim* is a nominative singular noun, subject of *sceolde* (that *únrima* is not a graphic variant for *únrim* is indicated by the preceding genitive pronoun *his*<sup>726</sup>; see below, p. 381). Its clause, **J** 323b-324, is either a noun clause governed by *gehéte* (line 315a), or a purpose/result clause qualifying to *hebbanne* (l. 320): ‘you promised them... that a countless number of it [*his*, referring to *hat*, line 320a] should always come into being in a span of years’ or ‘you promised them... to raise a race as the stars of heaven enclose the wide heaven... so that a countless number of it should always come into being in a span of years’.<sup>727</sup>

**E** *unrime* is a nominative singular masculine adjective, ‘innumerable’, and the predicate of *weorðan*. As in **J**, **E** 40b-41 can be construed as a purpose/result or noun clause: ‘you promised... that [it, i.e. *had*, ‘race’ line 37a] should become so innumerable in the span of years’, or ‘you promised them... to raise a race... so that [it, i.e. *had*, ‘race’ line 37a] should become so innumerable in the span of years’. This is only one of a number of highly significant syntactic and lexical variants in **E** 32-41/**J** 315-324. The passage is convoluted and possibly corrupt in both witnesses.<sup>728</sup>

<sup>726</sup>On the use of pronouns in a partitive sense, see Mitchell, *OES*, § 1268.

<sup>727</sup>Both translations of lines 323b-324 are based on Farrell, *Daniel and Azarias*, p. 67. Farrell understands the lines as a purpose clause, as do Bradley, *Anglo-Saxon Poetry*, p. 75, and Gordon, *Anglo-Saxon Poetry*, p. 123.

<sup>728</sup>See also Farrell, *Daniel and Azarias*, pp. 66-67, 91-92.

The variation has an effect on metre. In **E** (with the inflected form *unrime*), line 40b is Type C-1; in **J** (with *únrim* and the adverb *a*), the same line is Type B-1. The addition or omission of *a* is discussed below, p. 417. The substitution **E swa J his** on p. 381.

**Az/Dan, E 45b/J 328b**

**E(Az)**

gecyð cræft ȝmeaht nu| þec caldeas  
 45 ȝeac fela folca gefregen **habban**  
 þæt þu ana| eart ece dryhten  
 sige rof set tend ȝsoð meo tod  
 wuldres| waldend ȝworuld sceafta

**J(Dan)**

gecyð cræft ȝ| miht. þþcaldeas.  
 ȝfolca fela. gefrigen **hab|bað.**  
 ðaþe under heofenum. hæðene lifigeað.|  
 330 ȝþu ána eart. éce drihten.  
 weroda waldend.| woruld gesceafta.  
 sigora settend. soð fæst| metod.

**E** *habban* is plural present subjunctive; **J** *hab|bað* is plural present indicative. The indicative would be the expected form in both versions; indeed **E** is one of only two examples known to Mitchell of the subjunctive in a clause of “actual or accepted cause.”<sup>729</sup> If it is not a mistake, the use of the subjunctive in **E** may reflect an awareness that the cause being suggested by Azarias for the Chaldean’s actions is not strictly accurate: Nebuchadnezzar orders the children thrown into the fire not because he wants to test their God, but because they refuse to worship his idol (see *Daniel* 3:8-23). In **J**, 327b-329 is best construed as an adjective clause modifying *cræft ȝ| miht*. See below, p. 382.

**Az/Dan, E 52a/J 336a**

**E(Az)**

ða ofroderum wearð  
 engel **ælbeorhta** ufon onsended|  
 wlite scyne wer inhis wuldor homan.  
 Cwomhimþa toare| ȝto ealdor nere  
 55 þurh lufan ȝþurh lisse

**J(Dan)**

335b ðaof roderum wæs.  
 engel **ælbeorht.**| ufan onsended.  
 wlite scyne wer. onhiswul|dorhaman.  
 sehim cwóm tofrefre. ȝto| feorh nere.  
 mid lufan ȝmid lisse.

**E** *ælbeorhta* is a weak-declension nominative singular masculine adjective modifying *engel*. **J** *ælbeorht* is the strong-declension form of the adjective. The variation has no effect on sense or syntax. Metrically, **E** 52a is Type D\*1; in **J**, the equivalent verse is Type A-2b.

<sup>729</sup>Mitchell, *OES*, § 3105. He describes the second example, Blickling Homilies 163.3, as “probably corrupt”.

**Az/Dan, E 59b/J 341b****E(Az)**

Tosweop 7||| toswen<sub>g</sub>de þurh swiðes meah  
 60 liges leoman swa hyra lice nescod.|  
 acwæs inþam þofne þase engel cwom  
 windig 7wynsum wede|re onlicust  
 þōn onsumeres tid sended weorþeð  
 dropena dreorung mid dægēs hwile.

**J(Dan)**

tosweop hine 7toswende. þurh þa swið|an miht.  
 ligges leoma. þhyre líce newæs.  
 owiht| ge egled. ácheon andan sloh.  
 fyron feondas| for fyren dáðum.  
 345 þawæs onþam ofne. þær| se engel becwóm.  
 windig 7wynsum. wedere gelicost.  
 þōn hit onsumeres tíð. sended weor|ðeð.  
 dropena drearung. ondægēs hwile.  
 wearm|lic wolcna scúr.

**E** *swiðes* is a strong genitive singular masculine or neuter adjective, in this case used substantively for the angel or God: ‘might of the Great [One].’ In **J**, *swið|an* is a weak accusative singular feminine adjective. It agrees with *þa* and *miht*: ‘great might’. The two forms are metrically indistinguishable. For a further discussion of the line, see p. 412, below.

**Az/Dan, E 60a/J 342a****E(Az)**

55b seþone lig tosceaf|  
 halig 7heofonbeorht hatan fyres  
 þse bittra bryne beor|gan sceolde  
 forþæs engles ége æfæstum þrim.  
 Tosweop 7||| toswen<sub>g</sub>de þurh swiðes meah  
 60 liges leoman swa hyra lice nescod.|  
 acwæs inþam þofne þase engel cwom  
 windig 7wynsum wede|re onlicust  
 þōn onsumeres tid sended weorþeð  
 dropena dreorung mid dægēs hwile.

**J(Dan)**

seðone| lig tosceaf.  
 340 halig 7heofon beorht. hatan||| fyres.  
 tosweop hine 7toswende. þurh þa swið|an miht.  
 ligges leoma. þhyre líce newæs.  
 owiht| ge egled. ácheon andan sloh.  
 fyron feondas| for fyren dáðum.  
 345 þawæs onþam ofne. þær| se engel becwóm.  
 windig 7wynsum. wedere gelicost.  
 þōn hit onsumeres tíð. sended weor|ðeð.  
 dropena drearung. ondægēs hwile.  
 wearm|lic wolcna scúr.

**E** *leoman* is accusative singular, object of *Tosweop* and *toswen<sub>g</sub>de* in line 59a: ‘He swept back and brushed aside the light of the flame through the might of the Great One’. In **J**, *leoma* is ostensibly nominative singular, but is perhaps best understood as an example of the loss of final *n*. This usually described as a Northumbrian feature, but Farrell reports such loss to be “very frequent in the Hatton MS. of the *Pastoral Care*.<sup>730</sup>

<sup>730</sup>Farrell, *Daniel and Azarias*, pp. 17 and 68. Farrell cites *heredo* for expected *heredon* (3 plural preterite) as a further example. But cf. S-B §188.2: “In den übrigen Mundarten [i.e. excluding Northumbrian] fällt *n* im allgemeinen nur in der 1. 2. Pl. vor dem Pron. *wē, zē* ab.”

A second possibility, however, is that *leoma* was understood by a scribe in **J** tradition as the subject of the verbs in line 341a, referring either to the angel who comes to save the children, or the power by which the flames are “swept back” and “brushed aside”: the addition of *hine* to line 341a (with *lig*, line 339b, as antecedent) provides the main verbs of the sentence in **J** with an accusative object, while *ligges leoma* ‘brightness of flame’ recalls the description of the angel in **E** 56a/**J** 340a as *heofon beorht*: ‘That one, holy and bright from heaven, shoved the flame of the hot fire; Brightness of Flame, [he] swept it [*hine*, referring to *lig*, line 339b] back and brushed [it] aside by his great might...’. That this is not the original sense of the passage is suggested by the fact that “*leoma* never refers to a human (or divine) being” elsewhere in Old English literature.<sup>731</sup> See also below, p. 411.

#### **Az/Dan, E 70a/J 359a**

##### **E(Az)**

bædon bletsunge bearn Inworulde  
70 ealle gesceafte ecne dryhten  
þeoda waldend

##### **J(Dan)**

bædon bletsian. bearn| israela.  
eall lánd gesceaft. écne drihten.|  
360 ðeoda waldend.

**E** *ealle* is an instrumental singular adjective ‘agreeing’ with the neuter dative *gesceafte*: ‘for all creation’.<sup>732</sup> **J** *eall* is an accusative singular neuter adjective agreeing with *lánd gesceaft*, the direct object of *bædon*: ‘all terrestrial creation’. The difference in inflection is linked to that of the following noun and to the variation **E** *bletsunge* **J** *bletsian*, **E** 69/**J** 358. Its syntactic and metrical significance is discussed below, p. 398.

<sup>731</sup>Fred C. Robinson, personal communication.

<sup>732</sup>On the gender of *gesceaft* see B.-T. and B.-T.(S), *gesceaft*. While the expected form of the adjective would be *eallum* (neuter dative singular), Mitchell reports that the intrusion of instrumental forms “into the realm of the ‘dative proper’” is of “no syntactical importance” (Mitchell, *OES*, § 1345). A close parallel to **E** is found in Mark 16.15, where the Northumbrian text of the Rushworth Gospels (Ru<sup>2</sup>) reads *bodigaþ godspel elce gesceafte* for Lindisfarne (Li) *alle t eghuelcum sceafta*” (texts cited from Mitchell, *OES*, § 1345).

Together with the variation in the case of *gesceaft-* and the addition or omission of the stressed element *land-*, the difference in the inflection of *eall-* has a significant effect on metre.

In **E**, line 70 is Type A-1; the equivalent line in **J** is Type D-4.

#### **Az/Dan, E 70a/J 359a**

##### **E(Az)**

bædon bletsunge bearn Inworulde  
70 ealle gesceafte ecne dryhten  
peoda waldend

##### **J(Dan)**

bædon bletsian. bearn| israela.  
eall lánd gesceaft. écne drihten.|  
360 ðeoda waldend.

**E** *gesceafte* is dative singular, modified by the instrumental adjective *ealle*.<sup>733</sup> In **J** *lánd gesceaft* is accusative singular, agreeing with *eall*. In addition to being linked to the case of the preceding adjective, the variants are linked to the difference in the part of speech of **E** *bletsunge* **J** *bletsian* in 69a/358a. See below, p. 398.

Together with the variation in the case of *eall-* and the addition or omission of the stressed element *land-*, the difference in the inflection of *gesceaft-* has a significant effect on metre. In **E**, line 70 is Type A-1; the equivalent line in **J** is Type D-4.

#### **Substitution Of Unstressed Words and Elements (31 examples)**

##### **Az/Dan, E 4b/J 284b**

##### **E(Az)**

1 Himþa azarias ingeþoncum  
hleoþrede halig þurh| hatne lig  
dreag dædum georn dryhten herede  
wis| inweorcum þas word acwæð

##### **J(Dan)**

ða| azarias inge þancum.  
280 hleoðrade halig.| þurh hatne líg.  
dæda georn. drihten herede.|  
wer womma leas. þa word ácwæð.

**E** *þas* is the neuter accusative plural form of the demonstrative pronoun *þis*; **J** *þa* is the neuter accusative plural form of the demonstrative pronoun *þæt*. In both witnesses, the form agrees with *word*. Both are very common in formulae introducing speeches<sup>734</sup> and are metrically indistinguishable.

<sup>733</sup>See above, fn. 732.

<sup>734</sup>Jabbour, diss., p. 120.

**Az/Dan, E 8b/J 286b****E(Az)**

sindon þine domas| **on**dæda gehwam  
 soðe geswiðde 7gesige fæste.  
 10 eac| þinne willan inworuld spedum  
 ryhte mid ræde

**J(Dan)**

siendon þine dólmas. **in**daga gehwam.  
 soðe 7geswiðde. 7ge|sige fæste.  
 swa þu eac sylfa eart.  
 syndon| þine willan. onworuld spedum.  
 290 rihte 7ge|rume.

The substitution has no significant effect on sense, metre, or syntax.

**Az/Dan, E 10a/J 289a****E(Az)**

sindon þine domas| **on**dæda gehwam  
 soðe geswiðde 7gesige fæste.  
 10 **eac**| þinne willan inworuld spedum  
 ryhte mid ræde

**J(Dan)**

siendon þine dólmas. **in**daga gehwam.  
 soðe 7geswiðde. 7ge|sige fæste.  
 swa þu eac sylfa eart.  
**syndon**| þine willan. onworuld spedum.  
 290 rihte 7ge|rume.

In **J**, *syndon* is the main verb of the clause *syndon| þine willan...rihte 7ge|rume*: ‘your wishes are just and generous in the abundance of the world’. In **E**, *eac* is best interpreted as a conjunction, ‘and, also’.<sup>735</sup> In this case, the main verb of the resulting clause *eac| þinne willan... ryhte mid ræde* (lines 10b-11a) is same as that of the preceding clause (*sindon*, line 8a) and is not expressed<sup>736</sup>; *þinne willan* is to be understood as a nominative plural with graphic doubling of the medial *n* in *þinne*<sup>737</sup>: ‘your decrees are truly established... and secured of their triumph; also your wishes [are] just with wisdom.’

The substitution is metrically insignificant. The line is Type A-3 in both manuscripts.

<sup>735</sup>Mitchell, *OES*, § 1740

<sup>736</sup>On the non-expression of “a simple verb or periphrasis... in a clause or sentence which requires the same form as that which precedes,” see Mitchell, *OES*, § 1532. Farrell’s implicit interpretation of **E** *ryhte* as a form of the weak verb “ryhtan” is syntactically unlikely (glossary, p. 123). As a verb, *ryhte* could only be imperative or second person singular subjunctive, neither of which fits the immediate context.

<sup>737</sup>Campbell, *OEG*, § 65. Such doubling is primarily a Northumbrian feature, however. See also Farrell, p. 90, note to line 10, and *ASPR* 3, p. 269.

**Az/Dan, E 10b/J 289b****E(Az)**

siendon þine domas| ondæda gehwam  
 soðe geswiðde 7gesige fæste.  
 10 eac| þinne willan **in**woruld spedum  
 ryhte mid ræde

**J(Dan)**

siendon þine dó|mas. indaga gehwam.  
 soðe 7geswiðde. 7ge|sige fæste.  
 swa þu eac sylfa eart.  
 syndon| þine willan. **on**woruld spedum.  
 290 rihte 7ge|rume.

The substitution has no significant metrical, semantic, or syntactic effect.

**Az/Dan, E 11a/J 290a****E(Az)**

siendon þine domas| ondæda gehwam  
 soðe geswiðde 7gesige fæste.  
 10 eac| þinne willan inworuld spedum  
 ryhte **mid** ræde

**J(Dan)**

siendon þine dó|mas. indaga gehwam.  
 soðe 7geswiðde. 7ge|sige fæste.  
 swa þu eac sylfa eart.  
 syndon| þine willan. onworuld spedum.  
 290 rihte 7ge|rume.

**J** 7 joins the predicate adjectives, *rihte* and *ge/rume*: ‘your wishes are correct and generous’. In **E**, *mid* is a preposition governing the dative noun *ræde*, albeit with strained sense: ‘also your wishes [are] correct with counsel’. The two words are metrically identical.

For the substitution **E** *ræde* **J** *ge/rume*, see below, p. 389.

**Az/Dan, E 15a/J 294a****E(Az)**

ro|dera waldend  
 geoca us georne gæsta scyppend  
 7| þurh hyldo help halig dryhten  
 nuwe þec forþear|fum 7for þrea nydum  
 15 **7fore** eað medum arena| biddaþ  
 lege bilegde

**J(Dan)**

290 rodora waldend.  
 geo causer georne.| nu gasta scyppend.  
 7þurh help halig drih|ten.  
 nu<sup>wc</sup>þec for þreaum. 7for ðeo nydum.|  
**7for** eaðmedum. arna biddað.  
 295 líge beleg|de.

The variation is metrically, syntactically and semantically insignificant. Both prepositions can be used causatively to mean ‘because, for’ and both witnesses use *for* in the preceding, syntactically parallel, phrase, **E** *þec forþear|fum 7for þrea nydum* **J** *for þreaum 7for ðeo nydum* (**E** 14/**J** 293). As the extra syllable in **E** falls in the initial dip of a Type C-1 line, the variation has no significant effect on metre.

**Az/Dan, E 17a/J 296a****E(Az)**

weþæs lifgende  
 worhton **in**worlde eacþon wom dydon.  
 ylðran usse inofer hygdū|  
 þinbibodu bræcon burg sit tende  
 20 had ofer hogedon| halgan lifes

**J(Dan)**

295 weðæs lifgende.  
 worhton **on**worlde.| eac ðon wóm dyde.  
 user ylðran. for ofer|hygdum.  
 bræcon bebodo. burhsittendū|  
 had ofer hogedon. halgan lifes.

The variants are metrically, syntactically, and semantically indistinguishable.

**Az/Dan, E 18b/J 297b****E(Az)**

weþæs lifgende  
 worhton inwo|rulde eacþon wom dydon.  
 ylðran usse **in**ofer hygdū|  
 þinbibodu bræcon burg sit tende  
 20 had ofer hogedon| halgan lifes

**J(Dan)**

295 weðæs lifgende.  
 worhton onworulde.| eac ðon wóm dyde.  
 user ylðran. **for** ofer|hygdum.  
 bræcon bebodo. burhsittendū|  
 had ofer hogedon. halgan lifes.

The substitution has a minor effect on sense (**E** *in ofer hygdū* ‘in pride’, **J** *for ofer/hygdum* ‘on account of pride’) but none on syntax or metre. The two prepositions are appropriate to context, take the same case, and are metrically identical.

**Az/Dan, E 21a/J 300a****E(Az)**

**wurdon** weto wrecene geond widne grund|  
 heapum to<sup>h</sup>worfne hylða lease  
 wæs ure lif geond lon|ða fela  
 fracuð ȝgefræge fold buendū  
 25 nuþu usic be|wraece inþas wyrrestan  
 eorð cyninges æht gewealda  
 in| hæft heoro grimmes  
 sceolon weþær hæpenra  
 þrea nyd || [strip of c. 4 ll. missing from MS]

**J(Dan)**

300 **siendon**we|| towrecene. geond widne grund.  
 heapum tohwor|fene. hylde lease.  
 is user lif. geond landafela.|  
 fracuð ȝgefræge. folca manegum.  
 þaus éc| bewraecon. toþæs wyrrestan.  
 305 eorð cyninga.| æht gewealde.  
 onhæft heoru grimra ȝwe| nu hæðenra.  
 þeow ned þoliað.

**E** *wurdon* is the plural preterite indicative of *weorðan* ‘become’; **J** *siendon* is the plural present indicative of *bēon* ‘to be’. The variants are the first of a number of linked differences in tense and number in **E** 21-28/**J** 300-307a. Their effect on the passage as a whole is discussed above, pp. 228 ff. The two forms are metrically identical.



**Az/Dan, E 23a/J 302a****E(Az)**

wurdon weto wrecene geond widne grund|  
 heapum to<sup>h</sup>worfne hylða lease  
 wæs **ure** lif geond lon|ða fela  
 fracuð ȝgefræge fold buendū  
 25 nuþu usic be|wræce inþas wyrrestan  
 eorð cyninges æht gewealda  
 in| hæft heoro grimmes  
 sceolon weþær hæþenra  
 þrea nyd || [strip of c. 4 ll. missing from MS]

**J(Dan)**

300 siendonwe|| towrecene. geond widne grund.  
 heapum tohwor|fene. hylde lease.  
 is **user** lif. geond landafela.|  
 fracuð ȝgefræge. folca manegum.  
 þaus éc| bewræcon. toþæs wyrrestan.  
 305 eorð cyninga.| æhta gewealde.  
 onhæft heoru grimra ȝwe| nu hæðenra.  
 þeow ned þoliað.

**E ure** is the normal form of the possessive adjective; **J user** is the genitive form of the first person plural pronoun. The substitution has no effect on metre. A similar variant occurs in **E 18a/J 297a**, p. 391.

**Az/Dan, E 25a/J 304a****E(Az)**

wurdon weto wrecene geond widne grund|  
 heapum to<sup>h</sup>worfne hylða lease  
 wæs ure lif geond lon|ða fela  
 fracuð ȝgefræge fold buendū  
 25 **nu**þu usic be|wræce inþas wyrrestan  
 eorð cyninges æht gewealda  
 in| hæft heoro grimmes  
 sceolon weþær hæþenra  
 þrea nyd || [strip of c. 4 ll. missing from MS]

**J(Dan)**

300 siendonwe|| towrecene. geond widne grund.  
 heapum tohwor|fene. hylde lease.  
 is user lif. geond landafela.|  
 fracuð ȝgefræge. folca manegum.  
**þaus** éc| bewræcon. toþæs wyrrestan.  
 305 eorð cyninga.| æhta gewealde.  
 onhæft heoru grimra ȝwe| nu hæðenra.  
 þeow ned þoliað.

**E nu** is a temporal adverb; **J þa** a third-person plural demonstrative pronoun. The substitution has a significant effect on sense and syntax and is one of a number of linked variants in tense and number in **E 21-28/J 300-307**. In **E**, **nu** marks the point at which Azarias turns from his general discussion of the past suffering of the Jewish people to his current predicament inside Nebuchadnezzar's oven. In this version of the text, **E 25-27a** is an independent clause:

We were exiled throughout the wide earth, scattered in flocks, lacking protection. In many lands our way of life was held in contempt and notoriety by many peoples. Now you have exiled us into the power of this most terrible earth-king, into the bondage of the savage one.

In **J**, lines 304-306a are an adjective clause modifying *folca manegum*, the antecedent of *þa*. This is in keeping with the general focus of lines 304-306a in this version of the poem, in which Azarias's principal focus is on the sufferings of his people as a whole:

We are exiled throughout the wide earth, scattered in flocks, lacking protection. In many lands our way of life is held in contempt and notoriety by many peoples who have exiled us as chattels into the power of this most terrible of earth-kings, into the bondage of savages.

The substitution falls on the preliminary dip of a Type A-3 line in both witnesses and is metrically insignificant.

#### *Az/Dan*, E 25b/J 304b

##### **E(Az)**

wurdon weto wrecene geond widne grund|  
 heapum to<sup>h</sup>worfne hylða lease  
 wæs ure lif geond lon|ða fela  
 fracuð ȝgefræge fold buendū  
 25 nuþu usic be|wræce **in**þas wyrrestan  
 eorð cyninges æht gewealda  
 in| hæft heoro grimmes  
 sceolon weþær hæþenra  
 þrea nyd || [strip of c. 4 ll. missing from MS]

##### **J(Dan)**

300 siendonwe|| towrecene. geond widne grund.  
 heapum tohwor|fene. hylde lease.  
 is user lif . geond landafela.|  
 fracuð ȝgefræge. folca manegum.  
 þaus éc| bewræcon. **to**þæs wyrrestan.  
 305 eorð cyninga.| æhta gewealde.  
 onhæft heoru grimra ȝwe| nu hæðenra.  
 þeow ned þoliað.

**E** *in* and **J** *to* both make good sense, metre, and syntax. There is a subtle difference between the two witnesses, however. While both prepositions are appropriate, *in* reminds the reader that the *æht gewealda* 'power' being referred to in **E** includes Nebuchadnezzar's furnace. **J** *to* has no sense 'inside'.

#### *Az/Dan*, E 27a/J 306a

##### **E(Az)**

wurdon weto wrecene geond widne grund|  
 heapum to<sup>h</sup>worfne hylða lease  
 wæs ure lif geond lon|ða fela  
 fracuð ȝgefræge fold buendū  
 25 nuþu usic be|wræce inþas wyrrestan  
 eorð cyninges æht gewealda  
**in** hæft heoro grimmes  
 sceolon weþær hæþenra  
 þrea nyd || [strip of c. 4 ll. missing from MS]

##### **J(Dan)**

300 siendonwe|| towrecene. geond widne grund.  
 heapum tohwor|fene. hylde lease.  
 is user lif . geond landafela.|  
 fracuð ȝgefræge. folca manegum.  
 þaus éc| bewræcon. toþæs wyrrestan.  
 305 eorð cyninga.| æhta gewealde.  
**on**hæft heoru grimra ȝwe| nu hæðenra.  
 þeow ned þoliað.

The substitution has no effect on sense, syntax, or metre.



**Az/Dan, E 38b/J 321b****E(Az)**

þuhinge hete þurh hleoþor cwidas  
 þæt þu hyra from|cynn onfyrn dagum  
 ycan wolde þhit æfter him  
 35 oncne|ryce cenned wurde  
 yced oneorþan þæt swa unrime  
 had to| hebban swa heofon steorran  
 bugað bradne hwearft **oð**brim|flodas.  
 swa waroþa sond ymb sealt wæter  
 40 yþe geond ear|grund þæt swa unrime  
 ymb wintra hwearft weorðan sceol|de

**J(Dan)**

315 þu him þgehéte. þurh| hleoðor cwyde.  
 þ þu hyra frum cyn. infyrn| dagum.  
 ícan wolde. þte æfter him.  
 oncneo|rissum. cenned wurde.  
 7seo mænigeo máre| wære.  
 320 hat to hebbanne. swa heofon steor|ran.  
 bebugað bradne hwyrft. **oð þ** brim|faro. þæs  
 sæ faroða sand. geond sealtne| wæg.  
 me áre gryndeð. þ his únrima.  
 inwintra| worn. wurðan sceolde.

The substitution **E oð J oð þ** has a significant effect on sense and syntax of lines 32-41/315-324, although neither version is without difficulty. In **E**, *oð* is a preposition meaning ‘as far as, to’ and expresses the limits of the area surrounded or occupied by the *heofon steorran* (this reading assumes the loss [or non-expression] of a relative particle before **E bugað** in 38a): ‘...as uncountable as the stars of heaven [which] encompass the broad horizon as far as the seas...’<sup>739</sup> In **J**, *oð þ*, a temporal conjunction meaning ‘until’, is usually taken as an error for *oðþe* ‘or’<sup>740</sup> – a not unreasonable assumption given the evident difficulty the **J** scribe has with 315-324. *Op þ* is not impossible to construe, however. Assuming that **J brim|faro. þæs** is an error for *brimfaropes*, that *me áre* is an error for *in eare*, and that *gryndeð* is for *gryndað*, **J 320-323a** can be translated as an adverb clause modifying *to hebbanne* (line 320a): ‘you promised them... to raise a race as the stars of heaven enclose the wide heaven, until the sand of the seas, the seacoasts throughout the salt way, settle in the waves...’

The substitution falls on the preliminary dip of a Type C-1 line in both witnesses and is metrically insignificant. For further discussion of this passage, see pp. 392 and 425, below.

<sup>739</sup>See Farrell, *Daniel and Azarias*, p. 91. Also, Krapp and Dobbie, *ASPR* 3, p. 270.

<sup>740</sup>See Mitchell, *OES*, § 1930; Farrell, p. 67; Krapp, *ASPR* 3, p. xxii.

*Az/Dan, E 39b/J 322b***E(Az)**

þuhinge hete þurh hleoþor cwidas  
 þæt þu hyra from|cynn onfyrn dagum  
 ycan wolde þhit æfter him  
 35 oncne|ryce cenned wurde  
 yced oneorþan þæt swa unrime  
 had to| hebban swa heofon steorran  
 bugað bradne hwearft oðbrim|flodas.  
 swa waroþa sond **ymb** sealt wæter  
 40 yþe geond ear|grund þæt swa unrime  
 ymb wintra hwearft weorðan sceol|de

**J(Dan)**

315 þu him þgehéte. þurh| hleoðor cwyde.  
 þ þu hyra frum cyn. infyrn| dagum.  
 ícan wolde. þte æfter him.  
 oncneo|rissum. cenned wurde.  
 7seo mænigeo máre| wære.  
 320 hat to hebbanne. swa heofon steor|ran.  
 bebugað bradne hwyrft. oð þ brim|faro. þæs  
 sæ faroða sand. **geond** sealtne| wæg.  
 me áre gryndeð. þ **his** únrima.  
 inwintra| worn. wurðan sceolde.

The substitution has no effect on metre or syntax. Both prepositions are semantically appropriate to the context in which they appear.

*Az/Dan, E 40b/J 323b***E(Az)**

þuhinge hete þurh hleoþor cwidas  
 þæt þu hyra from|cynn onfyrn dagum  
 ycan wolde þhit æfter him  
 35 oncne|ryce cenned wurde  
 yced oneorþan þæt swa unrime  
 had to| hebban swa heofon steorran  
 bugað bradne hwearft oðbrim|flodas.  
 swa waroþa sond ymb sealt wæter  
 40 yþe geond ear|grund þæt **swa** unrime  
 ymb wintra hwearft weorðan sceol|de

**J(Dan)**

315 þu him þgehéte. þurh| hleoðor cwyde.  
 þ þu hyra frum cyn. infyrn| dagum.  
 ícan wolde. þte æfter him.  
 oncneo|rissum. cenned wurde.  
 7seo mænigeo máre| wære.  
 320 hat to hebbanne. swa heofon steor|ran.  
 bebugað bradne hwyrft. oð þ brim|faro. þæs  
 sæ faroða sand. geond sealtne| wæg.  
 me áre gryndeð. þ **his** únrima.  
 inwintra| worn. wurðan sceolde.

The substitution **E swa J his** is linked to the substitution of stressed words **E unrime J únrim** immediately following (see above, p. 369). In **E**, where *unrime* is an adjective, *swa* is an adverb modifying it: ‘as uncountable’; in **J**, where *únrim* is a neuter noun, *his* is a genitive of specification ‘an uncountable number of it’. Its antecedent is probably *hat*, line 320a. The substitution has no effect on metre.

**Az/Dan, E 41a/J 324a****E(Az)**

þuhinge hete þurh hleoþor cwidas  
 þæt þu hyra from|cynn onfyrn dagum  
 ycan wolde þhit æfter him  
 35 oncne|ryce cenned wurde  
 yced oneorþan þæt swa unrime  
 had to| hebban swa heofon steorran  
 bugað bradne hwearft oðbrim|flodas.  
 swa waroþa sond ymb sealt wæter  
 40 yþe geond ear|grund þæt swa unrime  
ymb wintra hwearft weorðan sceol|de

**J(Dan)**

315 þu him þgehéte. þurh| hleoðor cwyde.  
 þ þu hyra frum cyn. infyrn| dagum.  
 ícan wolde. þte æfter him.  
 oncneo|rissum. cenned wurde.  
 7seo mænigeo máre| wære.  
 320 hat to hebbanne. swa heofon steor|ran.  
 bebugað bradne hwyrft. oð þ brim|faro. þæs  
 sæ faroða sand. geond sealtne| wæg.  
 me áre gryndeð. þ his únrima.  
inwintra| worn. wurðan sceolde.

The two prepositions are syntactically and metrically equivalent. The substitution does not have a significant effect on sense. For the temporal sense of *ymb(e)* ‘after’ see Mitchell, *OES*, § 1219.

**Az/Dan, E 42b/J 325b****E(Az)**

42 fyl nuþa frum spræce þeahþe user fea lifgen  
 wlitega| þine word cwidas 7ðinwuldor us.

**J(Dan)**

325 fyl nu frum spræce. | ðeah heora féa lifigen.  
 wlitiga þinne word| cwyde. 7þín wuldor on us.

The substitution **E** *user* ‘of us’ **J** *heora* ‘of them’ affects point of view. In **E**, Azarias speaks as one who is sharing in the predicament of his people: ‘fulfill now your promise, although few of us survive...’ With *heora* in **J**, Azarias speaks of the Jews in the third person: ‘Fulfill now your promise, though few of them survive’... This is the opposite of the distinction in **E** 21-28/**J** 300-307a, in which Azarias speaks as a representative of the Jewish people in **J** and on his own behalf and that of the Children in **E**. See above, pp. 228 ff.. The two pronouns are metrically identical.

**Az/Dan, E 44b/J 327b****E(Az)**

gecyð cræft 7meaht **nu** þec caldeas  
 45 7eac fela folca gefregen habban  
 þæt þu ana| eart ece dryhten  
 sige rof set tend 7soð meo tod  
 wuldres| waldend 7woruld sceafta

**J(Dan)**

gecyð cræft 7| miht. **þþ**caldeas.  
 7folca fela. gefrigen hab|bað.  
 ðaþe under heofenum. hæðene lifigeað.|  
 330 7þþu ána eart. éce drihten.  
 weroda waldend.| woruld gesceafta.  
 sigora settend. soð fæst| metod.

In **E**, *nu* ‘now’ introduces a causal clause explaining why God is being asked to show his skill and might: ‘show your skill and might now the Chaldeans and also many peoples †should have asked†<sup>741</sup> you...’

**J þþ** is more problematic. The most likely explanation is that the first *þæt* is an example of the neuter demonstrative pronoun being used to introduce an adjective clause without regard to gender or number (*cræft* and *miht* are respectively masculine and feminine). The second *þæt* is almost certainly a scribal error. Suggested emendations have included *þa* and *þe*.<sup>742</sup>

The substitution falls on the preliminary dip of a Type C-2 line in both manuscripts and is metrically insignificant.

**Az/Dan, E 53b/J 337b****E(Az)**

ða ofroderum wearð  
 engel ælbeorhta ufon onsended|  
 wlite scyne wer **in**his wuldor homan.  
 Cwomhimþa toare| 7to ealdor nere  
 55 þurh lufan 7þurh lisse

**J(Dan)**

335b ðaof roderum wæs.  
 engel ælbeorht.| ufan onsended.  
 wlite scyne wer. **on**hiswul|dorhaman.  
 sehim cwóm tofrofe. 7to| feorh nere.  
 mid lufan 7mid lisse.

The substitution **E in J on** has no significant effect on sense, metre, or syntax.

<sup>741</sup>The use of the subjunctive *habban* (i.e. *habben*) is unusual in this context. For details, see above, p. 370.

<sup>742</sup>See Farrell, p. 67; Krapp, *ASPR* 3, p. xxii; and Mitchell, *OES*, § 1930.

**Az/Dan, E 55a/J 339a****E(Az)**

ðā ofroderum wearð  
engel ælbeorhta ufon onsended|  
wlite scyne wer inhis wuldor homan.  
Cwomhimþa toare| ȝto ealdor nere  
55 **þurh** lufan ȝþurh lisse

**J(Dan)**

335b ðaof roderum wæs.  
engel ælbeorht.| ufan onsended.  
wlite scyne wer. onhiswul|dorhaman.  
sehim cwóm tofrofre. ȝto| feorh nere.  
**mid** lufan ȝmid lisse.

In **E**, *þurh* is used to indicate the causes which led to the angel being dispatched to the Children: he comes *through* love (*þurh lufan*) and *through* grace (*þurh lisse*). In **J**, *mid* indicates accompaniment. In this case the angel brings love and grace *with* him. The variation is repeated once more in the same line (see the following variant)

The two prepositions are metrically identical.

**Az/Dan, E 55a/J 339a****E(Az)**

ðā ofroderum wearð  
engel ælbeorhta ufon onsended|  
wlite scyne wer inhis wuldor homan.  
Cwomhimþa toare| ȝto ealdor nere  
55 þurh lufan ȝ**þurh** lisse

**J(Dan)**

335b ðaof roderum wæs.  
engel ælbeorht.| ufan onsended.  
wlite scyne wer. onhiswul|dorhaman.  
sehim cwóm tofrofre. ȝto| feorh nere.  
mid lufan ȝ**mid** lisse.

See the preceding entry.

**Az/Dan, E 60b/J 342b****E(Az)**

Tosweop ȝ||| toswenȝde þurh swiðes meaht  
60 liges leoman **swa** hyra lice nescod.|  
acwæs inþam þofne þase engel cwom  
windig ȝwynsum wede|re onlicust  
þōn onsumeres tid sended weorþeð  
dropena| dreorung mid dæges hwile.

**J(Dan)**

tosweop hine ȝtoswende. þurh þa swið|an miht.  
ligges leoma. **þ**hyre líce newæs.  
owiht| ge egled. ácheon andan sloh.  
fyron feondas| for fyren dáðdum.  
345 þawæs onþam ofne. þær| se engel becwóm.  
windig ȝwynsum. wedere gelicost.  
þōn hit onsumeres tíð. sended weor|ðeð.  
dropena drearung. ondæges hwile.  
wearm|lic wolcna scúr.

**E** *swa* is a sentence adverb and refers back to the preceding clause: ‘He swept back and brushed aside the light of the flame through the might of the Great One. Thus it did not



harm their body'.<sup>743</sup> In **J**, *þ* introduces a result clause: '[he]<sup>744</sup> swept it back and brushed [it] aside by his great might so that not a whit was harmed on their body...'.<sup>744</sup>

Metrically, the two forms are identical.

### *Az/Dan*, E 61a/J 345a

#### **E(Az)**

Tosweop 7||| toswen<sub>g</sub>de þurh swiðes meah  
60 liges leoman swa hyra lice nescod.|  
**ac**wæs inþam þofne þase engel cwom  
windig 7wynsum wede|re onlicust  
þōn onsumeres tid sended weorþeð  
dropena| dreorung mid dæges hwile.

#### **J(Dan)**

tosweop hine 7toswende. þurh þa swið|an miht.  
ligges leoma. þhyre líce newæs.  
owiht| ge egled. ácheon andan sloh.  
fyron feondas| for fyren dáðum.  
345 **þa**wæs onþam ofne. þær| se engel becwóm.  
windig 7wynsum. wedere gelicost.  
þōn hit onsumeres tíð. sended weor|ðeð.  
dropena drearung. ondæges hwile.  
wearm|lic wolcna scúr.

**E ac** is a conjunction connecting lines 61-64 to the preceding half line, *swa hira lice nescod*: 'Thus it did not harm their body, but it was breezy and pleasant in the furnace when the angel came...' In **J**, lines 345-349a are a new sentence, and *þa* is a temporal adverb 'then': 'Then when the angel had come it was breezy and pleasant in the furnace...' The substitution follows the addition or omission of two lines (**J** 343-344). See below, p. 420.

The substitution has no effect on metre.

### *Az/Dan*, E 61a/J 345a

#### **E(Az)**

Tosweop 7||| toswen<sub>g</sub>de þurh swiðes meah  
60 liges leoman swa hyra lice nescod.|  
acwæs **in**þam þofne þase engel cwom  
windig 7wynsum wede|re onlicust  
þōn onsumeres tid sended weorþeð  
dropena| dreorung mid dæges hwile.

#### **J(Dan)**

tosweop hine 7toswende. þurh þa swið|an miht.  
ligges leoma. þhyre líce newæs.  
owiht| ge egled. ácheon andan sloh.  
fyron feondas| for fyren dáðum.  
345 þawæs **on**þam ofne. þær| se engel becwóm.  
windig 7wynsum. wedere gelicost.  
þōn hit onsumeres tíð. sended weor|ðeð.  
dropena drearung. ondæges hwile.  
wearm|lic wolcna scúr.

The substitution **E in J on** has no effect on sense, metre, or syntax.

<sup>743</sup>This use of *swa* is mentioned in Mitchell, *OES*, § 1862.

<sup>744</sup>This translation ignores the problem of **J** *ligges leoma*. For a discussion, see above, p. 371.

**Az/Dan, E 61b/J 345b****E(Az)**

Tosweop ȝ||| toswenȝde þurh swiðes meaht  
 60 liges leoman swa hyra lice nescod.|  
 acwæs inþam þofne þase engel cwom  
 windig ȝwynsum wede|re onlicust  
 þōn onsumeres tid sended weorþeð  
 dropena| dreorung mid dæges hwile.

**J(Dan)**

tosweop hine ȝtoswende. þurh þa swið|an miht.  
 ligges leoma. þhyre líce newæs.  
 owiht| ge egled. ácheon andan sloh.  
 fyron feondas| for fyren dáðdum.  
 345 þawæs onþam ofne. þær| se engel becwóm.  
 windig ȝwynsum. wedere gelicost.  
 þōn hit onsumeres tíð. sended weor|ðeð.  
 dropena drearung. ondæges hwile.  
 wearm|lic wolcna scúr.

In **E**, *þa* introduces an adverbial clause of time: ‘but it was breezy and pleasant in the furnace when the angel came...’ In **J**, *þær* can be interpreted temporally or locally<sup>745</sup>: ‘Then when [or where] the angel had come it was breezy and pleasant in the furnace ...’ The substitution has no metrical effect.

**Az/Dan, E 64b/J 348b****E(Az)**

Tosweop ȝ||| toswenȝde þurh swiðes meaht  
 60 liges leoman swa hyra lice nescod.|  
 acwæs inþam þofne þase engel cwom  
 windig ȝwynsum wede|re onlicust  
 þōn onsumeres tid sended weorþeð  
 dropena| dreorung **mid** dæges hwile.

**J(Dan)**

tosweop hine ȝtoswende. þurh þa swið|an miht.  
 ligges leoma. þhyre líce newæs.  
 owiht| ge egled. ácheon andan sloh.  
 fyron feondas| for fyren dáðdum.  
 345 þawæs onþam ofne. þær| se engel becwóm.  
 windig ȝwynsum. wedere gelicost.  
 þōn hit onsumeres tíð. sended weor|ðeð.  
 dropena drearung. **ond**æges hwile.  
 wearm|lic wolcna scúr.

The substitution **E mid J on** does not appear to affect sense, metre, or syntax. A similar substitution occurs in **E 68a/ J 357a**. See p. 387, below.

**Az/Dan, E 65a/J 350a****E(Az)**

65 **se**wæs inþam fire forfrea|n| meahtum  
 halgum| tohelpe

**J(Dan)**

swylc bið wedera cyst.  
 350 **swylc**| wæs on þam fyre. fréan mihtum.  
 halgum| to helpe.

**E se** is a demonstrative pronoun and the subject of *wæs*. Its antecedent is *engel* (**E 52a**). In this version of the text, lines 65-66a explain why the angel came to the furnace: ‘that

<sup>745</sup>See Mitchell, *OES*, § 2460-2462.



## Substitution Of Stressed Words and Elements (22 examples)

### *Az/Dan*, E 8b/J 286b

#### E(*Az*)

siendon þine domas| ondæda gehwam  
soðe geswiðde 7gesige fæste.  
10 eac| þinne willan inworuld spedum  
ryhte mid ræde

#### J(*Dan*)

siendon þine dó|mas. indaga gehwam.  
soðe 7geswiðde. 7ge|sige fæste.  
swa þu eac sylfa eart.  
syndon| þine willan. onworuld spedum.  
290 rihte 7ge|rume.

The substitution **E** *dæda* ‘of deeds’ **J** *daga* ‘of days’ has a significant effect on sense.

In **E**, Azarias praises the practical effect of God’s *domas*: ‘your decrees are truly established, and secured of their triumph in every action’. In **J**, he praises their eternal nature: ‘your decrees are true and established, and secured of their triumph every day.’

Farrell suggests that the **E** reading is farther from the Vulgate than **J**:

It appears that the *Azarias* poet (or reciter) had become fixed on certain words and repeated them, where the *Daniel* poet has used other wording. In addition, the *Daniel* poet’s wording is closer to the Latin in several of these instances. The first such case is *Azarias* 3a and 8b, *dreag dædum georn* and *on dæda gehwam*. *Daniel* in the parallel passages has respectively *dæda georn* (281a) and *in daga gehwam* (286b). The latter passage corresponds to *Dan* 3:26: ‘Benedicite opera omnia Domini Domino, laudate et superexaltate eum in sæcula,’ and the *Daniel* version is thus closer to the original.<sup>747</sup>

<sup>747</sup>Farrell, p. 43. It is important to note, however, that neither version of the text is so close to the Biblical Latin at this point as to allow a precise determination of the correspondences between the Old English translation and the Latin original. Indeed, the text of *Azarias* from line 5 could as easily be seen as a closer translation of the equivalent part of the biblical *Daniel*, given the emphasis in both texts on God’s acts:

3:27 Quia iustus es in omnibus quae fecisti nobis,  
Et universa opera tua vera, et via tuae rectae,  
Et omnia iudicia tua vera.  
3:28 Iudicia enim vera fecisti  
Uxta omnia quae induxisti super nos  
Et super civitatem sanctam patrum nostrorum, Ierusalem,  
Quia in veritate et in iudicio induxisti omnia haec,  
Propter peccata nostra.

Correspondences between *Azarias* and the Biblical *Daniel* are as follows: *super nos* (3:27): *ofer wer þeode* (**E** 7; the sentence in *Azarias* lines 5-7, combines the sections of the Biblical *Daniel* in praise of God’s name [3:28] and his works [3:27]); *iustus... quae fecisti... opera tua... iudicia tua vera* (3:27): *domas ondaeda gehwam... soðe...* (**E**, 8a-9).

See also Jabbour, diss., pp. 119-148, who argues that *Azarias* contains an inferior version of the text.

But it is also possible that the variation reflects a larger thematic difference between the two texts. As the substitution of half-lines **E** 4a *wis/ inweorcum* **J** 282a *wer womma leas* (see below, p. 400) in the opening description of Azarias suggests, the *Azarias*-poet places a particular emphasis on the practical nature of his characters' wisdom.

As genitive plurals modifying *gehwm*, the two words are syntactically equivalent.

Metrically, **E** 8b is Type B-2; in **J**, the equivalent line is Type B-1 with a resolved first lift.

### *Az/Dan*, **E** 11a/**J** 290a

#### **E**(*Az*)

    sindon þine domas| ondæda gehwam  
    soðe geswiðde ƒgesige fæste.  
10 eac| þinne willan inworuld spedum  
    ryhte mid ræde

#### **J**(*Dan*)

    siendon þine dólmas. indaga gehwam.  
    soðe ƒgeswiðde. ƒgelsige fæste.  
    swa þu eac sylfa eart.  
    syndon| þine willan. onworuld spedum.  
290 rihte ƒgelrume.

In **E** *ræde* is the object of *mid*. Together the two words form a prepositional phrase modifying *ryhte*: 'also your desires in worldly prosperity [are] correct with counsel'. In **J**, *ge/rume* is an adjective, syntactically parallel to *rihte*: 'your desires in worldly prosperity are correct and generous'. The substitution adds or subtracts a metrically insignificant unstressed syllable (the prefix *ge-*) from the medial dip of a Type A-1 line. For the substitution **E** *mid* **J** ƒ, see above, p. 375.

**Az/Dan, E 14a/J 293a****E(Az)**

ro|dera waldend  
 geoca us georne gæsta scyppend  
 7| þurh hyldo help halig dryhten  
 nuwe þec for **þearlfum** 7for þrea nydum  
 15 7fore eað medum arena| biddaþ  
 lege bilegde

**J(Dan)**

290 rodora waldend.  
 geo causer georne.| nu gasta scyppend.  
 7þurh help halig drih|ten.  
 nu<sup>wc</sup>þec for **þreaum**. 7for ðeo nydum.|  
 7for eaðmedum. arna biddað.  
 295 líge beleg|de.

The substitution **E** *þearlfum* **J** *þreaum* has no significant effect on sense, syntax, or metre. The two words are approximately synonymous (*þēarf*, ‘trouble, hardship, distress’; *þrēa*, ‘calamity’), and are syntactically and metrically equivalent.<sup>748</sup>

**Az/Dan, E 14b/J 293b****E(Az)**

ro|dera waldend  
 geoca us georne gæsta scyppend  
 7| þurh hyldo help halig dryhten  
 nuwe þec forþearlfum 7for **þrea nydum**  
 15 7fore eað medum arena| biddaþ  
 lege bilegde

**J(Dan)**

290 rodora waldend.  
 geo causer georne.| nu gasta scyppend.  
 7þurh help halig drih|ten.  
 nu<sup>wc</sup>þec for þreaum. 7for **ðeo nydum**.|  
 7for eaðmedum. arna biddað.  
 295 líge beleg|de.

The substitution **E** *þrea nydum* **J** *ðeo nydum* affects sense, but not syntax or metre. *þrēanīed* ‘affliction’ and *þēownīed*, ‘slavery’ are both contextually appropriate, as both ideas provide a sufficient motivation for Azarias’s petition to God. At the same time, the variants, which are repeated in **E** 28a/**J** 307a, may be linked to subsequent differences in the interpretation of lines **E** 21-28a **J** 300-307a. As mentioned above, in the **E** version of these lines, Azarias’s principal subject is the danger faced by himself, Annanias and Misael in Nebuchadnezzar’s furnace. In this context, *þrēanīed* is more appropriate than *þēownīed*. In **J**, the focus of the equivalent lines is the oppression suffered by the Jews in their Babylonian captivity and *þēownīed* is the more appropriate lexical choice. See also pp. 228 ff. above and 391, below.

The two words are metrically identical.

<sup>748</sup>Jabbour, diss., p. 125.

**Az/Dan, E 18a/J 297a****E(Az)**

weþæs lifgende  
 worhton inwo|rulde eacþon wom dydon.  
 ylðran **usse** inofer hygdū|  
 þinbibodu bræcon burg sit tende  
 20 had ofer hogedon| halgan lifes

**J(Dan)**

295 weðæs lifgende.  
 worhton onworulde.| eac ðon wóm dyde.  
**user** ylðran. for ofer|hygdum.  
 bræcon bebodo. burhsittendū|  
 had ofer hogedon. halgan lifes.

**E** *usse* is the nominative plural of the poetic possessive adjective \**user*<sup>749</sup>; **J** *user* is the genitive of second person plural personal pronoun.<sup>750</sup> The substitution has no significant effect on sense, and the two lines are metrically equivalent. The rearrangement of elements is discussed below, p. 423.

**Az/Dan, E 28a/J 307a****E(Az)**

wurdon weto wrecene geond widne grund|  
 heapum to<sup>h</sup>worfne hylða lease  
 wæs ure lif geond lon|ða fela  
 fracuð ȝgefræge fold buendū  
 25 nuþu usic be|wraece inþas wyrrestan  
 eorð cyninges æht gewealda  
 in| hæft heoro grimmes  
 sceolon weþær hæþenra  
**brean nyd** || [strip of c. 4 ll. missing from MS]

**J(Dan)**

300 siendonwe|| towrecene. geond widne grund.  
 heapum tohwor|fene. hylde lease.  
 is user lif. geond landafela.|  
 fracuð ȝgefræge. folca manegum.  
 þaus éc| bewraecon. toþas wyrrestan.  
 305 eorð cyninga.| æhta gewealde.  
 onhæft heoru grimra ȝwe| nu hæðenra.  
**beow ned** þoliað.

The same substitution occurs in line **E** 14b/**J** 293b. As in the previous example, the variation in **E** 28a/307a is in keeping with thoroughgoing differences in the focus of Azarias's petition in **E** 21-28a/**J** 300-307a. See above, p. 390.

The two words are metrically identical.

<sup>749</sup>Campbell, *OEG*, § 706; Sievers-Brunner § 335.

<sup>750</sup>Campbell, *OEG*, § 705.

**Az/Dan, E 35a/J 318a****E(Az)**

þuhimge hete þurh hleoþor cwidas  
 þæt þu hyra from|cynn onfyrn dagum  
 ycan wolde þhit æfter him  
 35 oncyne|ryce cenned wurde  
 yced oneorþan þæt swa unrime  
 had to| hebban swa heofon steorran  
 bugað bradne hwearft oðbrim|flodas.  
 swa waroþa sond ymb sealt wæter  
 40 yþe geond ear|grund þæt swa unrime  
 ymb wintra hwearft weorðan sceolde

**J(Dan)**

315 þu him þgehéte. þurh| hleoðor cwyde.  
 þ þu hyra frum cyn. infyrn| dagum.  
 ícan wolde. þte æfter him.  
 oncneo|rissum. cenned wurde.  
 ʒseo mænigeo máre| wære.  
 320 hat to hebbanne. swa heofon steor|ran.  
 bebugað bradne hwyrft. oð þ brim|faro. þæs  
 sæ faroða sand. geond sealtne| wæg.  
 me áre gryndeð. þ his únrima.  
 inwintra| worn. wurðan sceolde.

The substitution **E** *cyne|ryce* **J** *cneo|rissum* affects Azarias's interpretation of God's promise to Isaac and Abraham: in **E**, Azarias argues that God promised that the descendants of Abraham would be born in 'sovereignty'; in **J**, the promise is understood as being that there would be future 'generations'. Both make good sense in context, although the **E** reading is perhaps preferable in as much as it creates a rhetorically effective contrast to the Children's current lack of sovereignty as Jews in captivity and victims of Nebuchadnezzar's wrath.

The variation is of little metrical significance. Both versions are Type C-1. In **J**, both lifts are long by nature or position. In **E**, both lifts are resolved.

**Az/Dan, E 38b/J 321b****E(Az)**

þuhimge hete þurh hleoþor cwidas  
 þæt þu hyra from|cynn onfyrn dagum  
 ycan wolde þhit æfter him  
 35 oncyne|ryce cenned wurde  
 yced oneorþan þæt swa unrime  
 had to| hebban swa heofon steorran  
 bugað bradne hwearft oðbrim|flodas.  
 swa waroþa sond ymb sealt wæter  
 40 yþe geond ear|grund þæt swa unrime  
 ymb wintra hwearft weorðan sceolde

**J(Dan)**

315 þu him þgehéte. þurh| hleoðor cwyde.  
 þ þu hyra frum cyn. infyrn| dagum.  
 ícan wolde. þte æfter him.  
 oncneo|rissum. cenned wurde.  
 ʒseo mænigeo máre| wære.  
 320 hat to hebbanne. swa heofon steor|ran.  
 bebugað bradne hwyrft. oð þ brim|faro. þæs  
 sæ faroða sand. geond sealtne| wæg.  
 me áre gryndeð. þ his únrima.  
 inwintra| worn. wurðan sceolde.

The substitution **E** *brim|flodas* **J** *brim|faro. þæs* has a minor effect on sense and metre. Semantically, *brimflōd* and *brimfaroð* have comparable meanings, and both can be translated approximately as 'sea-water(s)'. Both lines are Type C-1, although the second lift is resolved in **J**.



Because of changes elsewhere in the line, the two forms are not syntactically equivalent. In **E**, *brim/flodas* is accusative plural, object of the preposition *oð* ‘as far as’. If *oþ* is not a mistake (see above, p. 380), then **J** *brim/faro. þæs* (for *brimfaropaþas*) is most likely to be construed as the nominative plural masculine subject of *gryndeð*.<sup>751</sup>

As Jabbour suggests, the **J** reading may be an anticipation of *sæ faroða* in the following line.<sup>752</sup>

### Az/Dan, E 39b/J 322b

#### E(Az)

þuhinge hete þurh hleoþor cwidas  
 þæt þu hyra from|cynn onfyrn dagum  
 ycan wolde þhit æfter him  
 35 oncyne|ryce cenned wurde  
 yced oneorþan þæt swa untime  
 had to| hebban swa heofon steorran  
 bugað bradne hwearft oðbrim|flodas.  
 swa waroþa sond ymb sealt **wæter**  
 40 yþe geond ear|grund þæt swa untime  
 ymb wintra hwearft weorðan sceolde

#### J(Dan)

315 þu him þgehéte. þurh| hleoðor cwyde.  
 þ þu hyra frum cyn. infyrn| dagum.  
 ícan wolde. þte æfter him.  
 oncneo|rissum. cenned wurde.  
 7seo mænigeo mære| wære.  
 320 hat to hebbanne. swa heofon steor|ran.  
 bebugað bradne hwyrft. oð þ brim|faro. þæs  
 sæ faroða sand. geond sealtne| **wæg**.  
 me áre gryndeð. þ his únrima.  
 inwintra| worn. wurðan sceolde.

**E** *wæter* ‘water’ and **J** *wæg* ‘path’ make good sense and metre and are syntactically identical. The collocations *sealt wæter* and *sealtne wæg* occur elsewhere in the sense ‘sea’ in Old English poetry.<sup>753</sup> As mentioned above, the substitution is linked to the inflectional difference in the preceding adjective. See above, p. 368.

In **E**, line 39b line is Type C-2; in **J**, Type B-1.

<sup>751</sup>As this is the only example of (-)faroð in a possibly nominative or accusative plural context, it is impossible to be absolutely certain of the word’s gender. B.-T(S). gives *brimfaroð* as m.; Campbell cites it as “? n.” (OEG, § 574.4); Farrell cites it as neuter, but describes *sæfaroð* as “mn?” Since the genitive singular (the only possible form if *brimfaroð* is neuter) is nonsensical here, it seems more likely that the form is to be interpreted as nominative or accusative plural masculine.

<sup>752</sup>Jabbour, diss., p. 132.

<sup>753</sup>See Bessinger-Smith, *sealt*-.

**Az/Dan, E 41a/J 324a****E(Az)**

þuhinge hete þurh hleoþor cwidas  
 þæt þu hyra from|cynn onfyrn dagum  
 ycan wolde þhit æfter him  
 35 oncne|ryce cenned wurde  
 yced oneorþan þæt swa untime  
 had to| hebban swa heofon steorran  
 bugað bradne hwearft oðbrim|flodas.  
 swa waroþa sond ymb sealt wæter  
 40 yþe geond ear|grund þæt swa untime  
 ymb wintra **hwearft** weorðan sceol|de

**J(Dan)**

315 þu him þgehéte. þurh| hleoðor cwyde.  
 þ þu hyra frum cyn. infyrn| dagum.  
 ícan wolde. þte æfter him.  
 oncneo|rissum. cenned wurde.  
 7seo mænigeo máre| wære.  
 320 hat to hebbanne. swa heofon steor|ran.  
 bebugað bradne hwyrft. oð þ brim|faro. þæs  
 sæ faroða sand. geond sealtne| wæg.  
 me áre gryndeð. þ his únrima.  
 inwintra| **worn**. wurðan sceolde.

**E** *wintra hwearft* ‘circuit of years’ and **J** *wintra/ worn* ‘number of years’ are lexically appropriate to the context in which they appear and syntactically identical. While the two texts have the same metrical type (B-1), **J** has double alliteration.

**Az/Dan, E 47a/J 332b****E(Az)**

gecyð cræft 7meaht nu| þec caldeas  
 45 7eac fela folca gefregen habban  
 þæt þu ana| eart ece dryhten  
**sigerof** set tend 7soð meo tod  
 wuldres| waldend 7woruld sceafta

**J(Dan)**

gecyð cræft 7| miht. þþcaldeas.  
 7folca fela. gefrigen hab|bað.  
 ðaþe under heofenum. hæðene lifigeað.|  
 330 7þþu ána eart. éce drihten.  
 weroda waldend.| woruld gesceafta.  
**sigora** settend. soð fæst| metod.

**E** *sigerof* is a nominative singular strong adjective modifying *set tend*: ‘victorious creator’; in **J**, *sigora* is a genitive plural noun modifying *settend*: ‘creator of victories’. Despite their syntactical differences, the two epithets mean essentially the same thing.<sup>754</sup> Metrically, **E** is Type A-2ab; in **J**, the line is a Type A-2b.

<sup>754</sup>Both epithets are nonce occurrences.

**Az/Dan, E 47b/J 332b****E(Az)**

gecyð cræft ȝmeaht nu| þec caldeas  
 45 ȝeac fela folca gefregen habban  
 þæt þu ana| eart ece dryhten  
 sige rof set tend ȝsoð meo tod  
 wuldres| waldend ȝworuld sceafta

**J(Dan)**

gecyð cræft ȝ| miht. þþcaldeas.  
 ȝfolca fela. gefrigen hab|bað.  
 ðaþe under heofenum. hæðene lifigeað.|  
 330 ȝþþu ána eart. éce drihten.  
 weroda waldend.| woruld gesceafta.  
 sigora settend. soð **fæst**| metod.

Both **E** *soð* and **J** *soð fæst* are adjectives meaning ‘true; just, righteous’, and both modify the following noun *me(o)tod*, ‘creator’. In **J**, the addition of *-fæst* supplies a metrically necessary half-stressed syllable in the medial dip of a Type A-4(2a) line. In **E** the equivalent line is Type C-2. As is the case with the prefix *ge-* in line 48b/331b, the absence of *-fæst* from **E** 47b requires and is linked to the presence of *ȝ* in the preliminary dip (see p. 414).<sup>755</sup>

**Az/Dan, E 48a/J 331a****E(Az)**

gecyð cræft ȝmeaht nu| þec caldeas  
 45 ȝeac fela folca gefregen habban  
 þæt þu ana| eart ece dryhten  
 sige rof set tend ȝsoð meo tod  
**wuldres**| waldend ȝworuld sceafta

**J(Dan)**

gecyð cræft ȝ| miht. þþcaldeas.  
 ȝfolca fela. gefrigen hab|bað.  
 ðaþe under heofenum. hæðene lifigeað.|  
 330 ȝþþu ána eart. éce drihten.  
**weroda** waldend.| woruld gesceafta.  
 sigora settend. soð fæst| metod.

**E** *wuldres* is genitive singular, ‘of wonder’; **J** *weroda* is genitive plural, ‘of companies’. In both versions, the noun qualifies the follow noun, *waldend*, and both epithets can be paralleled elsewhere in the corpus.<sup>756</sup> The substitution has no significant effect on metre. In **E**, line 48 is Type A-1 with the first stress falling on a closed syllable; in **J**, the line is Type A-1 with a resolved first stress.

<sup>755</sup>See also Jabbour, diss., p. 139.

<sup>756</sup>Jabbour, diss., pp. 138-9. Parallel to the **E** reading are: *Beowulf*, ll. 17a, 183a, 1752a; *Andreas*, 193a, 539a. Parallels to **J** are found in: *Andreas*, 388a, *Guðlac*, 594a; *Christ and Satan*, 563a.

**Az/Dan, E 50b/J 334b****E(Az)**

swase halga wer hergende wæs|  
 50 meotudes miltse ȝhis mod sefan  
 rehte þurh reorde|

**J(Dan)**

swa se halgawer. hergende wæs.  
 me|todes miltse. ȝhis mihta sped.  
 335 rehte þurh| reorde.

**E** *mod sefan* is an accusative masculine noun, ‘heart’, object of *rehte*, **E** 51a. In **J**, *mihta sped* is the accusative feminine noun *sped* ‘grace; abundance’ and either a qualifying adjective (for expected *mihte*, due to the falling together of unstressed *a* and *e*) or a dependent genitive plural feminine noun ‘of strengths, abilities’. Both the **E** and **J** readings can be paralleled elsewhere in the Old English poetic corpus.<sup>757</sup>

Metrically, **E** *ȝhis mod sefan* is Type C-2; **J** *ȝhis mihta sped* is Type B-1.

**Az/Dan, E 51b/J 335b****E(Az)**

ða ofroderum wearð  
 engel ælbeorhta ufon onsended|  
 wlite scyne wer inhis wuldor homan.  
 Cwomhimþa toare| ȝto ealdor nere  
 55 þurh lufan ȝþurh lisse

**J(Dan)**

335b ðaof roderum wæs.  
 engel ælbeorht.| ufan onsended.  
 wlite scyne wer. onhiswul|dorhaman.  
 sehim cwóm tofrofere. ȝto| feorh nere.  
 mid lufan ȝmid lisse.

The substitution **E** *wearð* **J** *wæs* has no significant effect on sense, metre, or syntax.

**Az/Dan, E 54a/J 338a****E(Az)**

ða ofroderum wearð  
 engel ælbeorhta ufon onsended|  
 wlite scyne wer inhis wuldor homan.  
 Cwomhimþa toare| ȝto ealdor nere  
 55 þurh lufan ȝþurh lisse

**J(Dan)**

335b ðaof roderum wæs.  
 engel ælbeorht.| ufan onsended.  
 wlite scyne wer. onhiswul|dorhaman.  
 sehim cwóm tofrofere. ȝto| feorh nere.  
 mid lufan ȝmid lisse.

**E** *are* is the dative singular of *ār*, ‘messenger’, and refers to the function of the angel: ‘[he] came to them then as a messenger’; in **J**, *frofere*, the dative singular of *frōfor*, ‘consolation’, supplies the reason why the angel came to the Children: ‘[he] came to them... as a comfort...’. In both witnesses, the noun is the dative object of the preposition *to*.

<sup>757</sup>Jabbour, diss., p. 140. Parallel to the **E** reading are found in: *Andreas*, line 1209a; *Beowulf*, lines 349a, and 1853b. The **J** reading can be paralleled by forms in: *Phoenix*, line 640b; *Genesis*, line 1696a.

The variants are metrically linked to the substitution **E** *ealdor nere* **J** *feorh nere* in the following half-line. In **E**, *are* provides a necessary vocalic alliteration; in **J**, *frofre* alliterates with *feorh nere*. The two words are otherwise metrically identical. The substitution in line 54b is discussed in the following entry.

**Az/Dan, E 54b/J 338b**

**E(Az)**

                    ða ofroderum wearð  
engel ælbeorhta ufon onsended|  
wlite scyne wer inhis wuldor homan.  
Cwomhimþa toare| ȝto ealdor nere  
55 þurh lufan ȝþurh lisse

**J(Dan)**

335b                    ðaof roderum wæs.  
engel ælbeorht.| ufan onsended.  
wlite scyne wer. onhiswul|dorhaman.  
sehim cwóm tofrofre. ȝto| feorh nere.  
mid lufan ȝmid lisse.

**E** *ealdor nere* and **J** *feorh nere* can both be translated as ‘life-preserver’, although Jabbour reports *feorhnere* to be the more common word in Old English poetry.<sup>758</sup> The principal effect of the substitution is metrical, however. In **E**, line 54b is Type B-1 with resolution of the second lift and vocalic alliteration. In **J**, the equivalent line is Type C-2 with alliteration on *f*. This is linked metrically to corresponding changes in the alliterating word of the on-verse, **E** *are* **J** *frofre*. See also the preceding entry.

**Az/Dan, E 60b/J 342b**

**E(Az)**

60 Tosweop ȝ||| toswenȝde þurh swiðes meaht  
liges leoman swa hyra lice nescod.|  
acwæs inþam þofne þase engel cwom  
windig ȝwynsum wede|re onlicust  
þōn onsumeres tid sended weorþeð  
dropena| dreorung mid dægæs hwile.

**J(Dan)**

345 tosweop hine ȝtoswende. þurh þa swið|an miht.  
ligges leoma. þhyre líce newwæs.  
owiht| ge egled. ácheon andan sloh.  
fyron feondas| for fyren dáðdum.  
þawæs onþam ofne. þær| se engel becwóm.  
windig ȝwynsum. wedere gelicost.  
þōn hit onsumeres tíð. sended weor|ðeð.  
dropena drearung. ondægæs hwile.  
wearm|lic wolcna scúr.

The substitution **E** *scod* **J** *wæs* affects sense and syntax, and is linked to other changes throughout **E** 59-64/**J** 341-344. In **E**, *scod* ‘harmed’ has an unexpressed subject which is to be inferred from *liges leoman*: ‘He swept back and brushed aside the light of the flame through

the might of the Great One. Thus it did not harm their body...’. In **J**, a similar idea is expressed more expansively through a combination of *wæs* and two lines unique to **J** (343-4): ‘[he]<sup>759</sup> swept it back and brushed [it] aside by his great might so that not a whit was harmed on their body – but he flung the fire in anger upon their adversaries, for their wicked actions’. Metrically, the two forms are identical. **J** lines 343-4 are discussed further below, p. 420.

### **Az/Dan, E 69a/J 358a**

#### **E(Az)**

bædon **bletsunge** bearn Inworulde  
70 ealle gesceafte ecne dryhten  
þeoda waldend

#### **J(Dan)**

bædon **bletsian**. bearn| israela.  
eall lánd gesceaft. écne drihten.|  
360 ðeoda waldend.

**E** *bletsunge* is an accusative (or genitive) form of the feminine noun ‘blessing’. It specifies the thing for which the subjects of *bædon* ‘asked’. As mentioned above, *ealle gesceafte* is a dative phrase<sup>760</sup> expressing the person for whom the blessing is requested: ‘the children in the world asked the eternal lord, ruler of peoples, for a blessing for all creation’.

**J** *bletsian* is an infinitive verb ‘to bless’. Its ‘subject’ in an accusative-infinitive construction is one or both of *bearn| israela* and *eall lánd gesceaft*: ‘...they asked the children of the Israelites, all earthly creatures to bless the everlasting Lord, ruler of peoples...’

The substitution has no effect on metre. Although, as Farrell notes, **J** is closer to the Latin canticle,<sup>761</sup> both versions of the text make good sense in context.

<sup>758</sup>Jabbour, diss., p. 141. Jabbour records six parallels to **J**: *Panther*, line 72a; *Christ*, lines 620a and 1596b; *Elene* 897a; and *Guðlac*, line 917b. The only other occurrence of *ealdornere* is in *Genesis*, line 2521b

<sup>759</sup>This translation ignores the problem of **J** *ligges leoma*. For a discussion, see above, p. 371.

<sup>760</sup>*Ealle* is instrumental, *gesceafte* dative. For a discussion of the forms, see above, p. 372, fn. 732.

<sup>761</sup>Farrell, p. 93, note to line 69a. See also Jabbour, diss., p. 146; and *ASPR* 3, p. 270.

**Az/Dan, E 69b/J 358b****E(Az)**

bædon bletsunge bearn **Inworulde**  
 70 ealle gesceafte ecne dryhten  
 þeoda waldend

**J(Dan)**

bædon bletsian. bearn| **israela**.  
 eall lánd gesceaft. écne drihten.|  
 360 ðeoda waldend.

**E** *Inworulde* is a prepositional phrase, ‘in the world’; **J** *israela* is a genitive plural noun modifying *bearn*: ‘children of the Israelites’. Both readings make good sense, although Jabbour, pointing to similar collocations in **E** 17a/**J** 296a (**E** *inwo/rulde* **J** *onworulde*) and **E** 36a (*oneorþan*),<sup>762</sup> suggests that *in worulde* may be an “all-purpose half-verse tag” used without thought by the **E** scribe.<sup>763</sup>

Metrically, **E**, line 69b, is Type A-1 with resolution of the second lift. In **J**, the equivalent half-line is Type D-1.

**Az/Dan, E 74a/J 363a****E(Az)**

B Letsige þec bilwit fæder  
 woruld **sceafta** wuldor| ȝweorca gehwylc  
 75 heofonas ȝenglas ȝhluttor| wæter

**J(Dan)**

362 ÐE Gebletsige. bylywit fæder.  
 woruld|**cræfta** wlite. ȝweorca gehwile.  
 heofon|nas ȝenglas. ȝhluttor wæter.

**E** *woruld sceafta* and **J** *woruld/cræfta* are metrically and syntactically identical. Although different in meaning – **E** *woruld sceafta*, ‘of earthly creatures’ **J** *woruld/cræfta* ‘of worldly arts’ – both words make good sense in context.

**Az/Dan, E 74a/J 363a****E(Az)**

B Letsige þec bilwit fæder  
 woruld sceafta **wuldor** | ȝweorca gehwylc  
 75 heofonas ȝenglas ȝhluttor| wæter

**J(Dan)**

362 ÐE Gebletsige. bylywit fæder.  
 woruld|cræfta **wlite**. ȝweorca gehwile.  
 heofon|nas ȝenglas. ȝhluttor wæter.

The substitution **E** *wuldor* **J** *wlite* affects sense and metre. Of the two readings, **E** *woruld sceafta wuldor* ‘wonder of earthly creatures’ perhaps makes slightly better sense than **J** *woruld/cræfta wlite* ‘splendor of worldly arts,’ but neither reading is obviously incorrect. As

<sup>762</sup>**J** has a different half-line here; see below, p. 401.

<sup>763</sup>Jabbour, diss., p. 146.

written, *wuldor* adds a lift and final drop to E 74a, a Type A-2a half-verse; it is likely, however, that the word was scanned as a monosyllable, in which case the line is Type E. In J *wlite* contributes the (resolved) final stress to a Type E verse.

### Substitution Of Metrical Units (3 examples)

#### Az/Dan, E 4a/J 282a

##### E(Az)

1 Himþa azarias ingeþoncum  
 hleoþrede halig þurh hatne lig  
 dreag dædum georn dryhten herede  
wis! inweorcum 7þa word acwæð

##### J(Dan)

ða| azarias inge þancum.  
 280 hleoðrade halig.| þurh hatne líg.  
 dæda georn. drihten herede.|  
wer womma leas. 7þa word ácwæð.

Both verses make good sense, metre, and syntax. While they differ significantly in sense (E *wis/ inweorcum*, ‘wise in works’; J *wer womma leas*, ‘a man devoid of faults’), both serve as positive epithets for Azarias.

Jabbour notes that “both [verses] have the appearance of being formulas,” although only the E reading can be paralleled from elsewhere in the poetic corpus (*Menologium*, line 209a).<sup>764</sup> While he adds that “it is hard to imagine one being substituted for the other by choice” and suggests that “a memorial slip best explains the variant,”<sup>765</sup> it seems equally possible that the variation was introduced for *literary* reasons by a transmitter who felt that one or the other reading was thematically more appropriate to the immediate context. In the case of *Azarias*, for example, the substitutions here and in line 8b appear to be part of a consistent emphasis on the value of wisdom demonstrated in one’s *works*. See also p. 388 above.

<sup>764</sup>Jabbour, diss., p. 120.

<sup>765</sup>Jabbour, diss., p. 120.



**Az/Dan, E 24b/J 303b****E(Az)**

wurdon weto wrecene geond widne grund|  
 heapum to<sup>h</sup>worfne hylða lease  
 wæs ure lif geond lon|ða fela  
 fracuð ȝgefræge **fold buendū**  
 25 nuþu usic be|wraece inþas wyrrestan  
 eorð cyninges æht gewealda  
 in| hæft heoro grimmes  
 sceolon weþær hæþenra  
 þrea nyd || [strip of c. 4 ll. missing from MS]

**J(Dan)**

300 siendonwe|| towrecene. geond widne grund.  
 heapum tohwor|fene. hylde lease.  
 is user lif . geond landafela.|  
 fracuð ȝgefræge. **folca manegum.**  
 þaus éc| bewraecon. toþæs wyrrestan.  
 305 eorð cyninga.| æhta gewealde.  
 onhæft heoru grimra ȝwe| nu hæðenra.  
 þeow ned þoliað.

Both **E** *fold buendū* ‘by the earth-dwellers’ and **J** *folca manegum* ‘by multitudes of peoples’ are metrically, sensically, and syntactically appropriate to the context in which they occur. In **E**, *fold buendū* further emphasises the contrast between the Jews – described as the *burg sit tende* ‘city-dwellers’ in **E** 19b/J 298b – and the surrounding peoples. Otherwise the variation has little effect on the over all sense of the passage as a whole.

Metrically, **J** line 303b is Type A-1; in **E**, the equivalent line is Type D-1.

**Az/Dan, E 36/J 319****E(Az)**

puhinge hete þurh hleoþor cwidas  
 þæt þu hyra from|cynn onfyrn dagum  
 ycan wolde þhit æfter him  
 35 oncnye|ryce cenned wurde  
**yced oneorþan þæt swa unrime**  
 had to| hebban swa heofon steorran  
 bugað bradne hwearft oðbrim|flodas.  
 swa waroþa sond ymb sealt wæter  
 40 yþe geond ear|grund þæt swa unrime  
 ymb wintra hwearft weorðan sceolde

**J(Dan)**

315 þu him þgehéte. þurh| hleoðor cwyde.  
 þ þu hyra frum cyn. infyrn| dagum.  
 ícan wolde. þte æfter him.  
 oncneo|rissum. cenned wurde.  
**ȝseo mænigeo mære| wære.**  
 320 hat to hebbanne. swa heofon steor|ran.  
 bebugað bradne hwyrft . oð þ brim|faro. þæs  
 sæ faroða sand. geond sealtne| wæg.  
 me áre gryndeð. þ his únrima.  
 inwintra| worn. wurðan sceolde.

**J** 319 is a noun clause parallel to **J** 317b-318, without repetition of the subordinating conjunction (*þæt*): ‘you promised them... that [it, i.e. *hyra frum cyn*, line 316a] would be born after them in generations and [that] the multitude would be famous’. In **E**, lines 36a and b each belong to a different clause. **E** 36a is a continuation of 34-35b (‘you promised them... that it [i.e. *hyra from/cynn*, line 33a] would be born to them in sovereignty, increased on earth’). **E** 36b is best understood with lines 37b-40a, *þæt* being used to anticipate line 40b and

*swa* as an adverb correlative with the conjunctions in lines 37b and 39a: ‘you promised them... [l. 37a:] to raise a race [l. 36b:] that, as uncountable [l. 37b:] as the stars of heaven [ll. 38-40a: which] inhabit the broad horizon as far as the seas, as the sands of the beaches about the sea-water, the waves of the bottom of the sea, [ll. 40b-41:] that it should be so uncountable in the course of winters’.

### Addition/Omission Of Unstressed Words and Elements (24 examples)

#### *Az/Dan, E 1a/J 279a*

##### **E(Az)**

1 **Him**þa azarias ingeþoncum  
hleoprede halig þurh hatne lig  
dreag dædum georn dryhten herede  
wis| inweorcum ȝþas word acwæð

##### **J(Dan)**

ða| azarias inge þancum.  
280 hleoðrade halig.| þurh hatne líg.  
dæda georn. drihten herede.|  
wer womma leas. ȝþa word ácwæð.

In **E**, *him* is a reflexive pronoun referring to Azarias: ‘then holy Azarias himself gave voice to his inner thoughts...’. In **J**, the verb is used without a reflexive pronoun. Both readings make good sense and syntax, and have approximate metrical parallels elsewhere in the two poems.<sup>766</sup>

#### *Az/Dan, E 3a/J 281a*

##### **E(Az)**

1 Himþa azarias ingeþoncum  
hleoprede halig þurh hatne lig  
**dreag** dædum georn dryhten herede  
wis| inweorcum ȝþas word acwæð

##### **J(Dan)**

ða| azarias inge þancum.  
280 hleoðrade halig.| þurh hatne líg.  
**dæda** georn. drihten herede.|  
wer womma leas. ȝþa word ácwæð.

In **J**, *dæda georn* is an epithet for Azarias, and, with *wer womma leas*, line 282a, is appositive to the subject of *herede*, line 281b: ‘A man zealous in good deeds and devoid of faults,<sup>767</sup> he praised the Lord.’ With the addition of *dreag*, the preterite singular of *drēogan*, ‘to labour, suffer’, the equivalent line in **E** becomes a complete clause in its own right, parallel to lines 3b-4a: ‘[he] suffered, zealous in deeds; wise in works, he praised the Lord’.

<sup>766</sup>For **E**, cf. **J** *oðer azarias*, line 91b; for **J**, cf. **J** *ȝazarías*, line 355b; **E** *ȝazarías*, line 153b.

<sup>767</sup>For a discussion of the substitution **E** *wis| in weorcum* **J** *wer womma leas*, see p. 400.

The addition of *dreag* has a significant effect on metre. In **E**, line 3a is Type D-4, with *dreag* occupying the first lift. The equivalent half line in **J** is unmetrical, although Jabbour argues on the basis of this and three examples from *Soul and Body*, that three syllable half-lines were acceptable in some cases in “post-classical Old English.”<sup>768</sup> It is also possible, however, that an exemplar to **J** had *georna*, the masculine singular weak form of the adjective.<sup>769</sup> This would provide good metre and – as weak forms are permissible in such contexts in verse – acceptable syntax.

**Az/Dan, E 5b/J 283b**

**E(Az)**

5 meotud allwihta þueart| meahtum swið  
niþas tonerganne

**J(Dan)**

283 metod al|wihta. **hwæt** þu eart mihtum swið.  
niðas to| nergenne.

The addition or omission of *hwæt* in 5b/283b has no significant metrical, semantic, or syntactic effect. As *hwæt* is frequently used to introduce long speeches and poems in Old English, its addition may give *Daniel* a more “poetic” feel.

The addition or omission falls in the preliminary drop of a Type B-1 line and is metrically insignificant.<sup>770</sup>

<sup>768</sup>Jabbour, diss., pp. 89-90, 119-120.

<sup>769</sup>I am grateful to Fred C. Robinson for this suggestion.

<sup>770</sup>In *ASPR* 3, Krapp punctuated and divides **J** line 283 as follows: “Metod alwihta, hwæt! Þu eart mihtum swið...” (p. 119). As Jabbour suggests, this division is contrary to usual Old English style, which places *Hwæt* as an unstressed syllable at the beginning of the half-line in which it appears (diss., p. 121; Jabbour’s suggestion that Krapp was “influenced by the punctuation of the Junius MS” is unlikely, however. In facsimile, a point clearly precedes *hwæt*).

**Az/Dan, E 9a/J 287a****E(Az)**

sindon þine domas| ondæda gehwam  
 soðe geswiðde 7gesige fæste.  
 10 eac| þinne willan inworuld spedum  
 ryhte mid ræde

**J(Dan)**

siendon þine dóm|mas. indaga gehwam.  
 soðe 7geswiðde. 7ge|sige fæste.  
 swa þu eac sylfa eart.  
 syndon| þine willan. onworuld spedum.  
 290 rihte 7ge|rume.

The addition or omission of *7* affects our interpretation of the precedig word in both witnesses, *soðe*. In **J**, *soðe* is a nominative plural adjective agreeing with *dóm|mas*, line 286a, and syntactically parallel to *geswiðde*, line 287a, and *ge|sige fæste*, line 287b: ‘your decrees are true and established, and secured of their triumph.’ Without *7*, **E** *soðe* would be more likely interpreted as an adverb qualifying *geswiðde*: ‘your decrees are truly established, and secured of their triumph.’

As *7* falls on the medial dip of a Type A-1 line, the addition or omission has no significant metrical effect.

**Az/Dan, E 19a/J 298a****E(Az)**

weþæs lifgende  
 worhton inwo|rulde eacþon wom dydon.  
 ylðran usse inofer hygdū|  
 þinbibodu bræcon burg sit tende  
 20 had ofer hogedon| halgan lifes

**J(Dan)**

295 weðæs lifgende.  
 worhton onworulde.| eac ðon wóm dyde.  
 user ylðran. for ofer|hygdum.  
 bræcon bebodo. burhsittendū|  
 had ofer hogedon. halgan lifes.

The addition or omission of *þin* has a minor effect on sense, syntax, and metre. Its inclusion in **E** is in keeping with the nature of Azarias’s prayer as a direct address to God, but is not necessary for sense: the context is presumably sufficient for a reader to recognise that it is God’s commandments that are being spoken of.

In **E**, *þin* supplies an anacrustic syllable for a Type A-1 line. With a different word order, the equivalent line in **J** is also Type A-1. See also p. 423, below.



**Az/Dan, E 31a/J 314a****E(Az)**

[text missing from E]

hæfdes.  
 30 to abra hame. 7to isace.  
 7jacobe. gæsta scyþpend.

**J(Dan)**

þæs þe þanc| sie  
 wereda wuldor cyning. þþuus þas wra|ce teodest: ||  
 Nefor let þu usic ana . éce drihten.  
 310 forðam| miltsum. ðe ðec men hligað.  
 7forðam treowū. þe þu tirum fæst.  
 niða nergend. genumen| hæfdest.  
 to abrahame. 7to isaace.  
 7toiacobe\_\_gasta scyppend.

**J** *toiacobe* is a prepositional phrase, syntactically parallel to *to abrahame* and *to isaace* in the preceding half-lines. In **E**, *iacobe* is an example of the dative singular being used alone to express interest. Because of the missing text in **E**, it is impossible to know whether *genumen* was the complement of **E** *hæfdes* as in **J**.<sup>771</sup> All examples of *geniman* in the senses ‘to make peace (a treaty) with’ or ‘to give one’s word to’ use a prepositional phrase (*wiþ* or *to*) for the recipient.<sup>772</sup>

**Az/Dan, E 32a/J 315a****E(Az)**

þuhinge hete þurh hleoþor cwidas  
 þæt þu hyra from|cynn onfyrn dagum  
 ycan wolde þhit æfter him  
 35 oncne|ryce cenned wurde  
 yced oneorþan þæt swa untime  
 had to| hebban swa heofon steorran  
 bugað bradne hwearft oðbrim|flodas.  
 swa waroþa sond ymb sealt wæter  
 40 yþe geond ear|grund þæt swa untime  
 ymb wintra hwearft weorðan sceolde

**J(Dan)**

315 þu him þgehéte. þurh| hleoðor cwyde.  
 þ þu hyra frum cyn. infyrn| dagum.  
 ícan wolde. þte æfter him.  
 oncneor|rissum. cenned wurde.  
 7seo mænigeo mære| wære.  
 320 hat to hebbanne. swa heofon steor|ran.  
 bebugað bradne hwyrft . oð þ brim|faro. þæs  
 sæ faroða sand. geond sealtne| wæg.  
 me áre gryndeð. þ his únrima.  
 inwintra| worn. wurðan sceolde.

**J** *þ* is a pronoun anticipating the subsequent noun clauses in lines 316-324. The presence of such a pronoun is common but not syntactically necessary in Old English. As it falls on the preliminary drop of a Type A-3 verse, the addition or omission has no significant effect on metre.

<sup>771</sup>The danger of assuming the missing text is the same can be illustrated by the text preceding the gap in **E**: **E** 27b-28a/**J** 306b-7a. See the preceding variant.

<sup>772</sup>B.T(S). *geniman*, senses XVII and XVIIa.

**Az/Dan, E 34b/J 317b****E(Az)**

þuhinge hete þurh hleoþor cwidas  
 þæt þu hyra from|cynn onfyrn dagum  
 ycan wolde **þhit** æfter him  
 35 oncne|ryce cenned wurde  
 yced oneorþan þæt swa unrime  
 had to| hebban swa heofon steorran  
 bugað bradne hwearft oðbrim|flodas.  
 swa waroþa sond ymb sealt wæter  
 40 yþe geond ear|grund þæt swa unrime  
 ymb wintra hwearft weorðan sceol|de

**J(Dan)**

315 þu him þgehéte. þurh| hleoðor cwyde.  
 þ þu hyra frum cyn. infyrn| dagum.  
 ícan wolde. þte æfter him.  
 oncneo|rissum. cenned wurde.  
 7seo mænigeo máre| wære.  
 320 hat to hebbanne. swa heofon steor|ran.  
 bebugað bradne hwyrft. oð þ brim|faro. þæs  
 sæ faroða sand. geond sealtne| wæg.  
 me áre gryndeð. þ his únrima.  
 inwintra| worn. wurðan sceolde.

**E hit** is the third person singular nominative form of the neuter personal pronoun. It is the subject of *cenned wurde* and has *from|cynn* as antecedent. In **J**, the subject of *cenned wurde* is not expressed, but is to be understood from *frum cyn*. Both usages can be paralleled in Old English. See also p. 379, above.

The addition or omission of *hit* falls on the preliminary drop of an extremely weak Type B-1 verse.<sup>773</sup> It has no significant effect on metre.

**Az/Dan, E 42a/J 325a****E(Az)**

42 fyl nu**þa** frum spræce þeahþe user fea lifgen  
 wlitega| þine word cwidas 7ðinwuldor us.

**J(Dan)**

325 fyl nu frum spræce.| ðeah heora féa lifigen.  
 wlitiga þinne word| cwyde. 7þín wuldor on us.

In **E**, *þa* is the accusative singular feminine form of the demonstrative pronoun, agreeing with *frum spræce*. It falls on the preliminary dip of a Type C-1 line and is necessary neither syntactically nor metrically.

**Az/Dan, E 42b/J 325b****E(Az)**

42 fyl nuþa frum spræce þeah**þe** user fea lifgen  
 wlitega| þine word cwidas 7ðinwuldor us.

**J(Dan)**

325 fyl nu frum spræce.| ðeah heora féa lifigen.  
 wlitiga þinne word| cwyde. 7þín wuldor on us.

**E þeahþe** and **J ðeah** are semantically and syntactically equivalent. As *þe* falls in the preliminary dip of Type C-1 line, its addition or omission is metrically insignificant.

<sup>773</sup>See Farrell, *Daniel and Azarias*, p. 22.

**Az/Dan, E 43b/J 326b****E(Az)**

42 fyl nuþa frum spræce þeahþe user fea lifgen  
wlitega| þine word cwidas 7ðinwuldor us.

**J(Dan)**

325 fyl nu frum spræce.| ðeah heora féa lifigen.  
wlitiga þinne word| cwyde. 7þín wuldor **on** us.

**E** *us* is a dative of advantage. In **J**, the prepositional phrase *on us* expresses location.

Metrically, the addition or omission of the preposition adds or subtracts an unstressed syllable from the medial drop of a Type B line. In **E**, line 42b is Type B-1; in **J** the equivalent verse is Type B-2.

**Az/Dan, E 44b/J 327b****E(Az)**

gecyð cræft 7meaht nu| **þec** caldeas  
45 7eac fela folca gefregen habban  
þæt þu ana| eart ece dryhten  
sige rof set tend 7soð meo tod  
wuldres| waldend 7woruld sceafta

**J(Dan)**

gecyð cræft 7| miht. þþcaldeas.  
7folca fela. gefrigen hab|bað.  
ðaþe under heofenum. hæðene lifigeað.|  
330 7þþu ána eart. éce drihten.  
weroda waldend.| woruld gesceafta.  
sigora settend. soð fæst| metod.

The addition or omission of *þec* in **E** 44b/ **J** 327b is linked to variation in the immediately preceding word(s). In **E**, *nu* introduces a causal clause, and *þec* is necessary as an object for *gefregen*. In **J**, the equivalent lines are most likely an adjective clause modifying *cræft* and *miht*; in this case the relative particle *þæt* provides an object for *gefrigen*. The addition or omission of *þec* adds or subtracts an unstressed syllable from the preliminary dip of a Type C-2 line. It is metrically insignificant. For further discussion of these variants, see above, pp. 370 and 382.

**Az/Dan, E 45a/J 328a****E(Az)**

gecyð cræft 7meaht nu| þec caldeas  
45 7**eac** fela folca gefregen habban  
þæt þu ana| eart ece dryhten  
sige rof set tend 7soð meo tod  
wuldres| waldend 7woruld sceafta

**J(Dan)**

gecyð cræft 7| miht. þþcaldeas.  
7folca fela. gefrigen hab|bað.  
ðaþe under heofenum. hæðene lifigeað.|  
330 7þþu ána eart. éce drihten.  
weroda waldend.| woruld gesceafta.  
sigora settend. soð fæst| metod.

The addition or omission of *eac* ‘also’ has no significant effect on sense or syntax. In **E**, *eac* falls on the preliminary dip of a Type C-1 line. In **J**, it would occupy the equivalent



position of a Type B-1 line (the difference in metre is caused by the rearrangement of elements: **E** *fela folca* **J** *folca fela*). See also below, p. 424.

**Az/Dan, E 46a/J 330a**

**E(Az)**

gecyð cræft 7meaht nu| þec caldeas  
45 7eac fela folca gefregen habban  
þæt þu ana| eart ece dryhten  
sige rof set tend 7soð meo tod  
wuldres| waldend 7woruld sceafta

**J(Dan)**

gecyð cræft 7| miht. þþcaldeas.  
7folca fela. gefrigen hab|bað.  
ðape under heofenum. hæðene lifigeað.|  
330 7þþu ána eart. éce drihten.  
weroda waldend.| woruld gesceafta.  
sigora settend. soð fæst| metod.

The addition or omission of 7 in **E** 46a/**J** 330a has a minor effect on syntax and metre. In both versions, **E** 46-48/**J** 330-2 is a noun clause, direct object of *gecyð*, and syntactically parallel to *cræft 7 meah*t in **E** 44a/**J** 327a. With 7 in **J**, the parallelism is explicit; without the conjunction in **E**, it is implicit. The addition of the conjunction is acceptable Old English, but not necessary. Metrically the addition or omission adds or subtracts an unstressed syllable from the beginning of a Type B-1 line.

**Az/Dan, E 47b/J 332b**

**E(Az)**

gecyð cræft 7meaht nu| þec caldeas  
45 7eac fela folca gefregen habban  
þæt þu ana| eart ece dryhten  
sige rof set tend 7soð meo tod  
wuldres| waldend 7woruld sceafta

**J(Dan)**

gecyð cræft 7| miht. þþcaldeas.  
7folca fela. gefrigen hab|bað.  
ðape under heofenum. hæðene lifigeað.|  
330 7þþu ána eart. éce drihten.  
weroda waldend.| woruld gesceafta.  
sigora settend. soð fæst| metod.

The addition or omission of 7 in 47b/332b has a minor effect on syntax and (together with changes elsewhere in the line) a significant effect on metre.

The line forms part of a series of epithets for God in lines **E** 46b-48b **J** 336b-332b. In **E**, 7 joins the epithet *soð meo tod* ‘true Creator’ syndetically to the preceding epithets. With the omission of 7 in **J**, the juxtaposition is asyndetic. A similar variant occurs at the beginning of **E** 48b/**J** 332b. See the following variant.

The addition or omission of *ȝ* is linked to the substitution **E** *soð* **J** *soð fæst* discussed above, p. 395. In **E** *ȝ* adds a metrically necessary syllable to the preliminary drop of a Type C-2 line. In **J**, the equivalent line in **J** is Type A-4(2a).

**Az/Dan, E 48b/J 331b**

**E(Az)**

gecyð cræft ȝmeaht nu| þec caldeas  
45 ȝeac fela folca gefregen habban  
þæt þu ana| eart ece dryhten  
sige rof set tend ȝsoð meo tod  
wuldres| waldend ȝworuld sceafta

**J(Dan)**

gecyð cræft ȝ| miht. þþcaldeas.  
ȝfolca fela. gefrigen hab|bað.  
ðaþe under heofenum. hæðene lifigeað.|  
330 ȝþu ána eart. éce drihten.  
weroda waldend.| woruld gesceafta.  
sigora settend. soð fæst| metod.

As in the preceding variant, the addition or omission of *ȝ* in **E** 48b/**J** 331b affects metre and syntax. In both manuscripts, *woruld (ge)sceafta* is an epithet for God, syntactically parallel to those in the half-lines **E** 46b/**J** 330b, **E** 47b/**J** 332a, **E** 47b/**J** 332b, and **E** 48a/**J** 331a. In **J**, the epithet is joined asyndetically to the preceding half-line; in **E**, the juxtaposition is syndetic.

Together with the addition or omission of the prefix *ge-*, the addition or omission of *ȝ* has an important effect on metre. In **E**, *ȝworuld sceafta* is Type C-1; in **J**, *woruld gesceafta* is Type A-1. The conjunction is metrically necessary in **E**, and is linked to the addition or omission of the prefix. See also below, p. 415.

**Az/Dan, E 54a/J 338a**

**E(Az)**

ða ofroderum wearð  
engel ælbeorhta ufon onsended|  
wlite scyne wer inhis wuldor homan.  
Cwomhimþa toare| ȝto ealdor nere  
55 þurh lufan ȝþurh lisse

**J(Dan)**

335b ðaof roderum wæs.  
engel ælbeorht.| ufan onsended.  
wlite scyne wer. onhiswul|dorhaman.  
sehim cwóm tofrofre. ȝto| feorh nere.  
mid lufan ȝmid lisse.

**J** *se* is a nominative singular neuter demonstrative pronoun, the subject of *cwóm*. Its antecedent is *engel ælbeorht*, line 336a. In **E**, the subject of *Cwom* is unexpressed, but the

same (*engel ælbeorhta*) as that of the preceding clause, 51b-53b.<sup>774</sup> Both versions are acceptable Old English syntax.

The addition or omission of *se* occurs on the preliminary dip of a Type A-3 line and is metrically insignificant.

### *Az/Dan, E 54a/J 338a*

#### **E(Az)**

                                  ða ofroderum wearð  
engel ælbeorhta  ufon onsended|  
wlite scyne wer  in his wuldor homan.  
Cwomhim **þa** toare|  ȝto ealdor nere  
55 þurh lufan ȝþurh lisse

#### **J(Dan)**

335b                          ðaof roderum wæs.  
engel ælbeorht.|  ufan onsended.  
wlite scyne wer.  on his wul|dorhaman.  
sehim cwóm tofrofre.  ȝto| feorh nere.  
mid lufan ȝmid lisse.

In **E**, *þa* is a sentence adverb used to establish the time at which the angel came to the fire: ‘he came then to them through love and grace as a messenger and life-preservation.’ Its absence from **J** has no significant effect on sense, syntax or metre.

### *Az/Dan, E 59a/J 341a*

#### **E(Az)**

Tosweop ȝ|| toswen<sub>g</sub>de  þurh swiðes meah  
60 liges leoman  swa hyra lice nescod.|  
acwæs in þam hofne  þase engel cwom  
windig ȝwynsum  wede|re onlicust  
þōn onsumeres tid  sended weorþeð  
dropena| dreorung  mid dæges hwile.

#### **J(Dan)**

tosweop **hine** ȝtoswende.  þurh þa swið|an miht.  
ligges leoma.  þhyre lice newæs.  
owiht| ge egled.  ácheon andan sloh.  
fyron feondas|  for fyren dǣdum.  
345 þawæs on þam ofne.  þær| se engel becwóm.  
windig ȝwynsum.  wedere gelicost.  
þōn hit onsumeres tíð.  sended weor|ðeð.  
dropena drearung.  ondæges hwile.  
wearm|lic wolcna scúr.

In **E**, the object of *Tosweop* and *toswen<sub>g</sub>de* is *leoman*, 60a, ‘light’: ‘[he] swept back and brushed aside the light of the flame through the might of the Great One...’ The addition of *hine* to **J** provides a pronominal object (agreeing in gender with *lig*, line 339b) for the two verbs: ‘[he]<sup>775</sup> swept it back and brushed [it] aside by his great might...’ As **J** *leoma*, line

<sup>774</sup>Krapp and Dobbie’s punctuation joins ll. 54a-55a to 51b-53b as part of the same sentence. In the manuscript, however, line 54a begins with a large *C*.

<sup>775</sup>This translation ignores the problem of **J** *ligges leoma*. For a discussion, see above, p. 371.

342a, is ostensibly nominative singular, *hine* is syntactically necessary and linked to the difference in case. For a further discussion, see p. 371.

The addition or omission of *hine* adds or removes two unstressed syllables to the preliminary dip of a Type A-1 line and is metrically insignificant. It has no significant metrical effect.

**Az/Dan, E 59b/J 341b**

**E(Az)**

Tosweop 7||| toswen<sub>g</sub>de þurh swiðes meah  
60 liges leoman swa hyra lice nescod.  
acwæs inþam þofne þase engel cwom  
windig 7wynsum wede|re onlicust  
þōn onsumeres tid sended weorþeð  
dropena| dreorung mid dægес hwile.

**J(Dan)**

tosweop hine 7toswende. þurh þa swið|an miht.  
ligges leoma. þhyre líce newæs.  
owiht| ge eged. ácheon andan sloh.  
fyron feondas| for fyren dæðum.  
345 þawæs onþam ofne. þær| se engel becwóm.  
windig 7wynsum. wedere gelicost.  
þōn hit onsumeres tíð. sended weorþeð.  
dropena drearung. ondægес hwile.  
wearm|lic wolcna scúr.

**J** *þa* is the accusative singular feminine form of the demonstrative pronoun. It agrees with *miht* and is followed by what is best construed as the weak accusative singular feminine form of the adjective *swið*: ‘through great might’. In **E**, *swiðes* is the strong genitive singular masculine form of the adjective, and is used substantively and without a demonstrative pronoun for God: ‘through the might of the Great One’.

The addition or omission adds or subtracts an unstressed syllable in the preliminary drop of a Type B-1 line. It has no significant metrical effect.

**Az/Dan, E 63a/J 347a****E(Az)**

Tosweop ȝ||| toswenȝde þurh swiðes meaht  
 60 liges leoman swa hyra lice nescod.|  
 acwæs inþam þofne þase engel cwom  
 windig ȝwynsum wede|re onlicust  
 þōn onsumeres tid sendeð weorþeð  
 dropena| dreorung mid dæges hwile.

**J(Dan)**

tosweop hine ȝtoswende. þurh þa swið|an miht.  
 ligges leoma. þhyre líce newæs.  
 owiht| ge eged. ácheon andan sloh.  
 fyron feondas| for fyren dáðum.  
 345 þawæs onþam ofne. þær| se engel becwóm.  
 windig ȝwynsum. wedere gelicost.  
 þōn **hit** onsumeres tíð. sendeð weor|ðeð.  
 dropena drearung. ondæges hwile.  
 wearm|lic wolcna scúr.

The addition or omission of *hit* in 63a/347a has a minor effect on syntax. In **E**, the subject of *sendeð weorþeð*, line 63b, is *dreorung*, line 64b: ‘...when a sprinkling of raindrops is sent during the day...’ In **J**, *hit* anticipates *drearung* as the subject of *weor|ðeð*: ‘...when it, a sprinkling of raindrops, is sent during the day...’ The addition or omission has no significant metrical effect. The line is Type B-1 in both witnesses.

**Az/Dan, E 65b/J 350b****E(Az)**

65 sewæs inþam fire forfrea|n|meahtum  
 halgum tohelpe

**J(Dan)**

swylc bið wedera cyst.  
 350 swylc| wæs on þam fyre. fréan|mihtum.  
 halgum| to helpe.

In **E**, *forfrea|n|meahtum* is a prepositional phrase expressing cause: ‘on account of the might of the Lord’; in **J**, the case ending alone is used. The variation has no significant effect on sense,<sup>776</sup> but does affect metre. In **J**, *fréan* must be scanned disyllabically and the line is Type A-1. In **E**, *frea*n is best scanned as a monosyllable, producing a Type C-1 verse. Farrell reports that *frēa* (i.e. the nominative singular) “is monosyllabic in *Dan.* 185 and 377, *Az.* 65, 92,” but *frēan* “disyllabic in *Dan.* 159 and 350, as is *freos* 66.”<sup>777</sup>

<sup>776</sup>See also, Jabbour, diss., p. 144.

<sup>777</sup>Farrell, *Daniel and Azarias*, p. 20.

### Addition/Omission Of Prefixes (4 examples)

#### Az/Dan, E 38a/J 321a

##### E(Az)

þuhinge hete þurh hleoþor cwidas  
 þæt þu hyra from|cynn onfyrn dagum  
 ycan wolde þhit æfter him  
 35 oncyne|ryce cenned wurde  
 yced oneorþan þæt swa untime  
 had to| hebban swa heofon steorran  
**bugað** bradne hwearft oðbrim|flodas.  
 swa waroþa sond ymb sealt wæter  
 40 yþe geond ear|grund þæt swa untime  
 ymb wintra hwearft weorðan sceolde

##### J(Dan)

315 þu him þgehéte. þurh| hleoðor cwyde.  
 þ þu hyra frum cyn. infyrn| dagum.  
 ícan wolde. þte æfter him.  
 oncneo|rissum. cenned wurde.  
 7seo mænigeo mære| wære.  
 320 hat to hebbanne. swa heofon steor|ran.  
**bebugað** bradne hwyrft . oð þ brim|faro. þæs  
 sæ faroða sand. geond sealtne| wæg.  
 me áre gryndeð. þ his únrima.  
 inwintra| worn. wurðan sceolde.

**J** *bebugað* is the present indicative third person plural of *bebūgan*, ‘flow round, surround, enclose’. It is the main verb of a clause of comparison beginning with *swa*, and has *heofon steor|ran* as its subject: ‘you promised them... to raise a race as the stars of heaven enclose the wide heaven, until the sands of the seas, the seacoasts throughout the salt way, settle in the waves...’

**E** *bugað* is third person plural present indicative of *būgan*, ‘bow, bow down, join’ or the uncontracted third person plural present indicative of *būan*, ‘to inhabit, dwell’.<sup>778</sup> Either understanding appears to require the insertion of a relative pronoun between *heofon steorran* and *bugað*, however: ‘you promised them... to raise a race that, as uncountable as the stars of heaven [which] inhabit the broad horizon as far as the seas, as the sands of the beaches about the sea-water, the waves of the bottom of the sea, that it should be so uncountable in the course of winters’.<sup>779</sup>

<sup>778</sup> *Būan* is the implicit reading in ASPR 3, pp. 269-70, where Krapp and Dobbie translate lines 36b-41: “that as innumerable, to exalt their race, as the stars of heaven occupy the broad circuit down to the water-floods, as the sand of the shores by the salt water, the waves across the ocean, that so innumerable after the course of years should be their race.”

In his note to *Azarias* 32a-41b, Farrell translates *bugað* as ‘encompass’, apparently by mistake (*Daniel and Azarias*, p. 91): in his glossary he translates it as “BOW, bow down, join.” ‘Encompass’ is the translation used by Bradley for **J** *bebugað* (*Anglo-Saxon Poetry*, p. 75) and appears as a gloss for *bebugan* (and not *bugan*) in Clark-Hall and B.-T.

<sup>779</sup> See Farrell, *Daniel and Azarias*, p. 91. Also, Krapp and Dobbie, *ASPR* 3, p. 270.

Without the prefix, **E** 38a is Type D\*4. The prefix adds an anacrustic syllable to **J**.

**Az/Dan, E 48b/J 331b**

**E(Az)**

gecyð cræft 7meaht nu| þec caldeas  
45 7eac fela folca gefregen habban  
þæt þu ana| eart ece dryhten  
sige rof set tend 7soð meo tod  
wuldres| waldend 7woruld sceafta

**J(Dan)**

gecyð cræft 7| miht. þþcaldeas.  
7folca fela. gefrigen hab|bað.  
ðaþe under heofenum. hæðene lifigeað.|  
330 7þþu ána eart. éce drihten.  
weroda waldend.| woruld gesceafta.  
sigora settend. soð fæst| metod.

The addition or omission of *ge-* to or from the second element of the compound *woruld (ge)sceafta* has no significant effect on sense or syntax. Of the two readings, the **J** form is the more common. As Jabbour notes, *woruld sceafta* occurs only once more in verse, in *Azarias* line 74a; *woruldgsceafta* and grammatical variants are found nine times more.<sup>780</sup> On the basis of the simplices, it seems likely that the two words are near or identical synonyms.

The addition or omission of *ge-* is metrically significant and linked to the addition or omission of *7* at the beginning of the off-verse. In **J**, the line is a Type A-1 with a resolved first stress. With the omission of *ge-* (and the metrically necessary addition of *7* to the preliminary drop), **E** is a Type C-1.

**Az/Dan, E 61b/J 345b**

**E(Az)**

Tosweop 7||| toswen<sub>g</sub>de þurh swiðes meaht  
60 liges leoman swa hyra lice nescod.|  
acwæs inþam þofne þase engel cwom  
windig 7wynsum wede|re onlicust  
þōn onsumeres tid sended weorþeð  
dropena| dreorung mid dægēs hwile.

**J(Dan)**

tosweop hine 7toswende. þurh þa swið|an miht.  
ligges leoma. þhyre líce newæs.  
owiht| ge egled. ácheon andan sloh.  
fyron feondas| for fyren dáðum.  
345 þawæs onþam ofne. þær| se engel becwóm.  
windig 7wynsum. wedere gelicost.  
þōn hit onsumeres tíð. sended weor|ðeð.  
dropena drearung. ondægēs hwile.  
wearm|lic wolcna scúr.

The addition or omission of *be-* in line 61b/345b has no obvious semantic effect. Both *cuman* and *becuman* are frequently found in the sense ‘come’. The prefix falls in the medial

dip of a Type B line and has a minor effect on metre. In **E**, *þase engel cwom* is Type B-1; in **J**, *þær| se engel becwóm* is Type B-2.

**Az/Dan, E 73a/J 362a**

**E(Az)**

B Letsige þec bilwit fæder  
 woruld sceafta wuldor| 7weorca gehwylc  
 75 heofonas 7englas 7hluttur| wæter

**J(Dan)**

362 DE Gebletsige. bylywit fæder.  
 woruld|cræfta wlite. 7weorca gehwilc.  
 heofon|nas 7englas. 7hluttur wæter.

The addition or omission of *ge-* has no effect on sense or syntax. In **J**, the prefix falls in the preliminary dip of a Type C-2 line, and is not metrically necessary. With a different word order, the equivalent line in **E** is Type E-1. It would be unmetrical with the prefix.

**Addition/Omission Of Stressed Words and Elements (4 examples)**

**Az/Dan, E 12a/J 291a**

**E(Az)**

ro|dera waldend  
 geoca us georne gæsta scyppend  
 7| þurh hyldo help halig dryhten  
 nuwe þec forþear|fum 7for þrea nydum  
 15 7fore eað medum arena| biddaþ  
 lege bilegde weþæs lifgende

**J(Dan)**

290 rodora waldend.  
 geo causer georne.| **nu** gasta scyppend.  
 7þurh help halig drih|ten.  
 nu<sup>w</sup>þec for þreaum. 7for ðeo nydum.|  
 7for eaðmedum. arna biddað.  
 295 líge beleg|de.

The addition or omission of *nu* in **E 12a/J 291a** has a significant effect on metre. In **E**, *geoca us georne* is Type A-1; with the addition of *nu* at the end of the half-line in **J**, the equivalent verse is Type B-1.<sup>781</sup> A sentence adverb, *nu* has little significant effect on sense or syntax.

<sup>780</sup>Jabbour, diss., p. 139. See Bessinger-Smith *woruldgesceaft, woruldgesceafta, woruldgesceafta*.

<sup>781</sup>As Krapp's punctuation suggests, *rodora waldend* is best taken with the preceding clause in **J**. See *ASPR* 1, p. 119, and cf. *ASPR* 3, pp. 88-89.



**Az/Dan, E 13a/J 292a****E(Az)**

ro|dera waldend  
 geoca us georne gæsta scyppend  
 7| þurh **hyldo** help halig dryhten  
 nuwe þec forþear|fum 7for þrea nydum  
 15 7fore eað medum arena| biddaþ  
 lege bilegde

**J(Dan)**

290 rodora waldend.  
 geo causer georne.| nu gasta scyppend.  
 7þurh help halig drih|ten.  
 nu<sup>we</sup>þec for þreaum. 7for ðeo nydum.|  
 7for eaðmedum. arna biddað.  
 295 líge beleg|de.

**E** *hyldo* is necessary to sense, metre, and syntax. Its omission from **J** is to be attributed to scribal oversight, perhaps aided by a misinterpretation of *help* as a noun instead of as the imperative of *helpan*.<sup>782</sup>

**Az/Dan, E 40b/J 323b****E(Az)**

þuhimge hete þurh hleoþor cwidas  
 þæt þu hyra from|cynn onfyrn dagum  
 ycan wolde þhit æfter him  
 35 oncne|ryce cenned wurde  
 yced oneorþan þæt swa unrim  
 had to| hebban swa heofon steorran  
 bugað bradne hwearft oðbrim|flodas.  
 swa waroþa sond ymb sealt wæter  
 40 yþe geond ear|grund þæt swa unrim  
 ymb wintra hwearft weorðan sceolde

**J(Dan)**

315 þu him þgehéte. þurh| hleoðor cwyde.  
 þ þu hyra frum cyn. infyrn| dagum.  
 ícan wolde. þte æfter him.  
 oncneo|rissum. cenned wurde.  
 7seo mænigeo mære| wære.  
 320 hat to hebbanne. swa heofon steor|ran.  
 bebugað bradne hwyrft. oð þ brim|faro. þæs  
 sæ faroða sand. geond sealtne| wæg.  
 me áre gryndeð. þ his únrima.  
 inwintra| worn. wurðan sceolde.

The addition or omission of the adverb *a* has no significant effect on sense or syntax, but, together with the inflectional difference **E** *unrim* **J** *únrim*, has a significant effect on metre. In **E**, line 40b is Type C-1; in **J**, the same line is Type B-1.

See also pp. 369 and 381, above.

<sup>782</sup>Jabbour, diss., p. 124.

**Az/Dan, E 70a/J 359a****E(Az)**

bædon bletsunge bearn Inworulde  
 70 ealle gesceaf|te ecne dryhten  
 þeoda waldend

**J(Dan)**

bædon bletsian. bearn| israela.  
 eall lánd gesceaft. écne drihten.|  
 360 ðeoda waldend.

Semantically, **E** *ealle gesceaf|te* refers to ‘all creatures’ generally; in **J**, the reference is more specifically to all terrestrial creatures. Metrically, **E** line 70a is a Type A-1 verse; in **J**, the verse is D-4.

While both readings make good sense and metre, Jabbour reports that the **E** reading is the more common. *Ealle gesceafte* is a common tag in Old English poetry; **J** contains the only occurrence of *eall landgesceaft*.<sup>783</sup>

**Addition/Omission Of Metrical Units (5 examples)****Dan, J 288****E(Az)**

6b isþin noma mære|  
 wlitig ȝwuldor fæst ofer wer þeode  
 sindon þine domas| ondæda gehwam  
 soðe geswiðde ȝgesige fæste.  
 10 eac| þinne willan inworuld spedum  
 ryhte mid ræde

**J(Dan)**

isþin nama mære.  
 285 wlitig ȝwul|dor fæst. ofer wer ðeode.  
 siendon þine dó|mas. indaga gehwam.  
 soðe ȝgeswiðde. ȝge|sige fæste.  
swa þu eac sylfa eart.  
 syndon| þine willan. onworuld spedum.  
 290 rihte ȝge|rume.

The addition or omission of the half-line has a minor effect on sense and syntax. In **E**, lines 8-11a occur as part of a series of clauses in which Azarias praises God’s name (lines 6b-7), his judgements (lines 8-9), and his desires (line 10-11a) before beginning his petition: ‘Your name is famous, radiant and glorious over the human-race; your judgements are truly strengthened and victorious in each of deeds; likewise your desires in worldly weal [are] just with counsel’. In **J**, line 288 interrupts the orderly progression of this praise by turning to praise God’s person between the second and third elements in the litany: ‘Your name is famous, radiant and glorious over the human-race; your judgements are true and strengthened

<sup>783</sup>See Jabbour, diss., p. 146.

and victorious in every day – as are you yourself also; your desires in worldly weal are just and generous’. While **E** is rhetorically smoother, there is an equally attractive emotional quality to the disruption in **J**. It is impossible to choose between the two.

Farrell notes that the additional line in **J** is one of seven single “half-lines” in *Daniel*.

There are no similarly short lines in *Azarias*.<sup>784</sup>

### **Az, E 57-58**

#### **E(Az)**

55b                                    seþone lig tosceaf|  
 halig 7heofonbeorht    hatan fyres  
þse bittra bryne    beorlgan sceolde  
forþæs engles ége    æfæstum brim.

#### **J(Dan)**

340                                    seðone| lig tosceaf.  
 halig 7heofon beorht.    hatan||| fyres.

In **E**, lines 57-58 are a purpose or result clause describing the effect of the angel’s actions on the flames: ‘Holy and heaven-bright, he thrust aside the hot flame of the fire, that the bitter conflagration, for dread of the angel, should avoid the pious threesome’.<sup>785</sup> Jabbour notes that this is the only example in which **E** contains complete metrical lines that are not found in **J** (apart from **E** 36/**J** 319 where the two manuscripts have a different reading).<sup>786</sup> While they are more than “essentially an elaboration of a foregoing idea,”<sup>787</sup> the lines are not necessary to the over all sense of the poem.

<sup>784</sup>Farrell, *Daniel and Azarias*, p. 20.

<sup>785</sup>Jabbour, diss., p. 142.

<sup>786</sup>Jabbour, diss., p. 142; cf. Farrell, *Daniel and Azarias*, pp. 92 (note to line 58b) and 42, who sees these lines as evidence of the importance of  $\bar{e}$ , “the concept of a law common to all men,” in the author’s original text of *Daniel*.

<sup>787</sup>Jabbour, diss., p. 142.

**Dan, J 343-344****E(Az)**

Tosweop ȝ||| toswenȝde þurh swiðes meah  
 60 liges leoman swa hyra lice nescod.|  
 acwæs inþam þofne þase engel cwom  
 windig ȝwynsum wede|re onlicust  
 þōn onsumeres tid sendeð weorþeð  
 dropena| dreorung mid dæges hwile.

**J(Dan)**

tosweop hine ȝtoswende. þurh þa swið|an miht.  
 ligges leoma. þhyre líce newæs.  
owiht| ge egled. ácheon andan sloh.  
fyron feondas| for fyren dædum.  
 345 þawæs onþam ofne. þær| se engel becwóm.  
 windig ȝwynsum. wedere gelicost.  
 þōn hit onsumeres tíð. sendeð weor|ðeð.  
 dropena drearung. ondæges hwile.  
 wearm|lic wolcna scúr.

The addition or omission of **J** 343-345 is linked to the verbal substitution **E** *scod* **J** *wæs* in 60b/342b (see above, p. 397). In **E**, the central idea of the clause – that the flames did not hurt the bodies of the Children – is conveyed lexically through *scod* ‘harmed’. In **J**, similar information is presented in the form of a participle phrase *newæs / owiht| ge egled* ‘not a whit was harmed’ – to which is added additional material on what the angel did next: ‘[he]<sup>788</sup> swept it back and brushed [it] aside by his great might so that not a whit was harmed on their body – but he flung the fire in anger upon their adversaries, for their wicked actions’.

**Dan, J 349****E(Az)**

Tosweop ȝ||| toswenȝde þurh swiðes meah  
 60 liges leoman swa hyra lice nescod.|  
 acwæs inþam þofne þase engel cwom  
 windig ȝwynsum wede|re onlicust  
 þōn onsumeres tid sendeð weorþeð  
 dropena| dreorung mid dæges hwile.  
 65 sewæs inþam fire forfrean| meahtum  
 halgum tohelpe

**J(Dan)**

tosweop hine ȝtoswende. þurh þa swið|an miht.  
 ligges leoma. þhyre líce newæs.  
 owiht| ge egled. ácheon andan sloh.  
 fyron feondas| for fyren dædum.  
 345 þawæs onþam ofne. þær| se engel becwóm.  
 windig ȝwynsum. wedere gelicost.  
 þōn hit onsumeres tíð. sendeð weor|ðeð.  
 dropena drearung. ondæges hwile.  
wearm|lic wolcna scúr. swylc bið wedera cyst.  
 350 swylc| wæs on þam fyre. fréan mihtum.  
 halgum| to helpe.

The addition or omission of **J** 349, when taken with other variants in the surrounding lines, affects both syntax and sense. The on-verse, **J** 349a, adds a further variant to the description in **J** 345-348 of the type of weather the Angel brings with him to the furnace. It is appositive to *hit*, line 347a, and *dropena drearung*, line 348a. The off-verse, **J** 349b, marks

the beginning of the next sentence, and refers to the effect of the Angel's presence through a simile: 'As is the finest of weathers, so it was in that fire...'. The addition or omission is linked to the substitution **E** *se* **J** *swylc* in line 65a/350a. See above, p. 386.

### **Dan, E 353-356**

#### **E(Az)**

66b wearð sehata lig  
to drifen ȝ| todwæsced þærþa dæd hwatan  
þry midgeþoncum þeoden| heredon

#### **J(Dan)**

351b wearð se háta líg.  
todrifen ȝto|dwæsced. þær þa dæd| hwatan.  
geond þone| ofen eodon. ȝse engel míd.  
féorh nerigende.| seðær feorða wæs.  
355 annanias ȝazarías.  
ȝ| misael. þærþamód hwatan.  
þry ongeðanc|um ðeoden here don.

**J** 353-356a describe the effect of the movement of the Children in the flames of the furnace:

The hot flame was driven back and quenched wherever those men of courageous conduct, Hananiah and Azariah and Mishael, walked through the furnace, and the angel with them, preserving their lives, who was the fourth one there.

Line 356a begins a new clause, in which the subsequent Song of the Three Children is introduced<sup>789</sup>: 'There the courageous-hearted three praised the Prince in their contemplations.'

In **E**, the description of the flame being driven back is combined with that of the Children praising God into a single sentence (lines 66b-68b): 'The hot flame was driven back and quenched wherever [or when] the courageous-hearted three praised the Prince in their contemplations.' Jabbour and Jones suggest that the omission of an equivalent for **J** 353-356 in **E** is the result of "memorial skip triggered by the parallel verses D352b (A67b) *þær þa daedhwatan* and D356b *þær þa modhwatan*, the nouns of which are practically synonymous as

<sup>788</sup>This translation ignores the problem of **J** *ligges leoma*. For a discussion, see above, p. 371.

<sup>789</sup>In the punctuation of *ASPR* 1 and 3, and of Jabbour, diss., **J** 356b-360a, and **E** 66b-71a, are treated as a single sentence. The sentence division followed here is that of Farrell, who places a period at the end of **J** 357b (although he follows the other editors in punctuating **E** 66b-71a as a single sentence). The difference is irrelevant for the argument presented here.

well as similar in sound and structure.”<sup>790</sup> It could equally well be the result of eyeskip. Both versions make good sense as written, however, and, as Jabbour notes, “little is lost in the omission.”<sup>791</sup>

### Reinterpretation of Existing Text (1 example)

#### Az/Dan, E 39a/J 322a

##### E(Az)

þuhinge hete þurh hleoþor cwidas  
 þæt þu hyra from|cynn onfyrn dagum  
 ycan wolde þhit æfter him  
 35 oncne|ryce cenned wurde  
 yced oneorþan þæt swa unrime  
 had to| hebban swa heofon steorran  
 bugað bradne hwearft oðbrim|flodas.  
swa waroþa sond ymb sealt wæter  
 40 yþe geond ear|grund þæt swa unrime  
 ymb wintra hwearft weorðan sceol|de

##### J(Dan)

315 þu him þgehéte. þurh| hleoðor cwyde.  
 þ þu hyra frum cyn. infyrn| dagum.  
 ícan wolde. þte æfter him.  
 oncneo|rissum. cenned wurde.  
 7seo mænigeo mære| wære.  
 320 hat to hebbanne. swa heofon steor|ran.  
 bebugað bradne hwyrft. oð þ brim|faro. þæs  
sæ faroða sand. geond sealtne| wæg.  
 me áre gryndeð. þ his únrima.  
 inwintra| worn. wurðan sceolde.

The reinterpretation **E** *swa waroþa* **J** *sæ faroða* has a significant effect on sense, syntax, and metre. **E** *waroþa* and **J** *-faroþa* are of similar meaning and identical inflection: both *waroð* and *-faroð* can be used in the sense ‘shore, bank’, and both words are genitive plurals modifying *sond/sand*. Syntactically, **J** *sæ faroða* is parallel to and a variation on *brim|faro. þæs* from the preceding line: ‘you promised them... to raise a race as the stars of heaven enclose the wide heaven, until the sands of the seashores, the seacoasts throughout the salt way, settle in the waves...’ In **E**, *swa* is a conjunction used correlatively with the adverb *swa* in line 36b to introduce a comparative clause parallel to lines 37b-38: ‘you promised them... to raise a race that, as uncountable as the stars of heaven [which] inhabit the broad horizon as far as the seas, as the sands of the beaches about the sea-water, the waves of the bottom of the sea, that it should be so uncountable in the course of winters’.<sup>792</sup>

<sup>790</sup>Jabbour, diss., p. 145; Jones[-Gyger], “*Daniel* and *Azarias* as Evidence for the Oral-Formulaic Character of Old English Poetry,” *MÆ* 35 (1966): 95-102, at p. 101.

<sup>791</sup>Jabbour, diss., p. 145.

<sup>792</sup>See Farrell, *Daniel and Azarias*, p. 91. Also, Krapp and Dobbie, *ASPR* 3, p. 270.

With *sæ faroða*, **J** line 322a is Type E-1 with alliteration on the first and last lifts.

With *swa waroþa*, **E** line 39a is Type B-1 with alliteration on the second lift only.

### Rearrangement Within The Line (5 examples)

#### *Az/Dan*, **E 18a/J 297a**

##### **E(Az)**

weþæs lifgende  
 worhton inwo|rulde eacþon wom dydon.  
yldran usse inofer hygdū|  
 þinbibodu bræcon burg sit tende  
 20 had ofer hogedon| halgan lifes

##### **J(Dan)**

295 weðæs lifgende.  
 worhton onworulde.| eac ðon wóm dyde.  
user yldran. for ofer|hygdum.  
 bræcon bebodo. burhsittendū|  
 had ofer hogedon. halgan lifes.

The rearrangement has no effect on metre, sense, or syntax. In both witnesses, the line is Type A-1.

For a discussion of the substitution, **E usse J user**, see p. 391.

#### *Az/Dan*, **E 19a/J 298a**

##### **E(Az)**

weþæs lifgende  
 worhton inwo|rulde eacþon wom dydon.  
 yldran usse inofer hygdū|  
 þin**bibodu bræcon** burg sit tende  
 20 had ofer hogedon| halgan lifes

##### **J(Dan)**

295 weðæs lifgende.  
 worhton onworulde.| eac ðon wóm dyde.  
 user yldran. for ofer|hygdum.  
bræcon bebodo. burhsittendū|  
 had ofer hogedon. halgan lifes.

In **E**, line 19a is Type A-1 (with anacrusis and resolution of the first lift); the equivalent line in **J** is Type A-1 with a resolved second lift. See also above, p. 404.

**Az/Dan, E 45a/J 328a****E(Az)**

gecyð cræft 7meaht nu| þec caldeas  
 45 7eac **fela folca** gefregen habban  
 þæt þu ana| eart ece dryhten  
 sige rof set tend 7soð meo tod  
 wuldres| waldend 7woruld sceafta

**J(Dan)**

gecyð cræft 7| miht. þþcaldeas.  
 7**folca fela**. gefrigen hab|bað.  
 ðaþe under heofenum. hæðene lifigeað.|  
 330 7þþu ána eart. éce drihten.  
 weroda waldend.| woruld gesceafta.  
 sigora settend. soð fæst| metod.

The rearrangement **E** *fela folca* **J** *folca fela* has no effect on sense or syntax but a significant effect on metre. In **E**, *7eac fela folca* is a Type C-1 line with principal lifts on *fela* (resolved) and *folca*<sup>793</sup>; in **J**, the equivalent line is Type B-1.

**Az/Dan, E 54a/J 338a****E(Az)**

ða ofroderum wearð  
 engel ælbeorhta ufon onsended|  
 wlite scyne wer inhis wuldor homan.  
**Cwomhim**þa toare| 7to ealdor nere  
 55 þurh lufan 7þurh lisse

**J(Dan)**

335b ðaof roderum wæs.  
 engel ælbeorht.| ufan onsended.  
 wlite scyne wer. onhiswul|dorhaman.  
 se**him cwóm** tofrefre. 7to| feorh nere.  
 mid lufan 7mid lisse.

The rearrangement of *him* and *cwom* in 54a/338a has no effect on sense, syntax or metre.

**Az/Dan, E 73a/J 362a****E(Az)**

B Letsige **þec** bilwit fæder  
 woruld sceafta wuldor| 7weorca gehwylc  
 75 heofonas 7englas 7hluttur| wæter

**J(Dan)**

362 **ÐE** Gebletsige. bylywit fæder.  
 woruld|cræfta wlite. 7weorca gehwylc.  
 heofon|nas 7englas. 7hluttur wæter.

The rearrangement of (*ge*)*bletsige* and *þe(c)* in **E** 73a/**J** 362a has an important effect on metre. **J** 362a is a Type C-2 line with alliteration on the first lift. In **E** *þec* takes a full stress as the last syllable in the half-verse, producing a line which is best scanned as a Type E-1 with a short half-lift and alliteration on the first syllable of the inflected verb. The rearrangement is linked to the addition or omission of the verbal prefix *ge-*. See above, p. 416.

<sup>793</sup>For parallels, cf. *Precepts* 67 *Nis nu fela folca þætte fyrngewritu*; *Daniel* 15 *þæt hie oft fela folca feore gesceodon*; and *Deor* 38 *Ahte ic fela wintra folgað tilne*.



### Rearrangement Of Metrical Units (1 example)

*Az/Dan*, E 47-48/J 331-332

**E(Az)**

gecyð cræft 7meaht nu| þec caldeas  
 45 7eac fela folca gefregen habban  
 þæt þu ana| eart ece dryhten  
sigē rof set tend 7soð meo tod  
wuldres| waldend 7woruld scaefta

**J(Dan)**

gecyð cræft 7| miht. þþcaldeas.  
 7folca fela. gefrigen hab|bað.  
 ðaþe under heofenum. hæðene lifigeað.|  
 330 7þþu ána eart. éce drihten.  
weroda waldend.| woruld gescaefta.  
sigora settend. soð fæst| metod.

As Jabbour notes, the transposition of these lines has no effect on sense or syntax as “the verses consist of a series of appositive epithets for the deity.”<sup>794</sup>

### Recomposition (1 example)

*Az/Dan*, E 40a/J 323a

**E(Az)**

þuhinge hete þurh hleoþor cwidas  
 þæt þu hyra from|cynn onfyrn dagum  
 ycan wolde þhit æfter him  
 35 oncne|ryce cenned wurde  
 yced oneorþan þæt swa untime  
 had to| hebban swa heofon steorran  
 bugað bradne hwearft oðbrim|flodas.  
 swa waroþa sond ymb sealt wæter  
 40 ybe geond ear|grund þæt swa untime  
 ymb wintra hwearft weorðan sceol|de

**J(Dan)**

315 þu him þgehéte. þurh| hleoðor cwyde.  
 þ þu hyra frum cyn. infyrn| dagum.  
 ícan wolde. þte æfter him.  
 oncneo|rissum. cenned wurde.  
 7seo mænigeo máre| wære.  
 320 hat to hebbanne. swa heofon steor|ran.  
 bebugað bradne hwyrft. oð þ brim|faro. þæs  
 sæ faroða sand. geond sealtne| wæg.  
me áre gryndeð. þ his únrima.  
 inwintra| worn. wurðan sceolde.

The most significant variation in the line is syntactic: **J** contains a main verb and prepositional phrase, **E** a noun and prepositional phrase. The two lines are obviously related, however: *ear|grund* : *in eare*<sup>795</sup> *gryndeð*. With the possible exception of the conjunction in l.321b (*oð:oð þ*), the variation requires no alteration to the surrounding text: *brim|flodas* and *brim|faro. þæs* (for *brimfaroðas*) can be accusative plural (the case required by **E**) or nominative plural as required by **J**. Similarly, *sand* can be either accusative singular (as in **E**), or nominative singular as required by **J**.

<sup>794</sup>Jabbour, diss., p. 138.

<sup>795</sup>Assuming *me áre* is a minim error for *in eare*.

## Conclusion

The poems discussed in this chapter differ from those discussed in Chapters Two and Three in both the contexts in which they are found and the nature of the variation they exhibit. Unlike the poems of the previous chapters – but like the majority of poems found in the corpus of Old English poetry as a whole – five of the six “Anthologised and Excerpted” poems survive with at least one witness in the major “poetic” codices. The ‘exception’, *Solomon and Saturn I*, survives in one copy as part of a comparable collection of prose and verse dialogues between its two main characters. In addition, the Anthologised and Excerpted poems exhibit both far more and far more significant textual variation. Where the variation exhibited by the poems discussed in Chapters Two and Three tended – even at its most profligate – to have a relatively insignificant effect on the sense and syntax of the passages in which it occurred, that separating the witnesses to the Anthologised and Excerpted poems is often far more significant. Syntactically significant differences of inflection, substitutions of graphically and lexically dissimilar forms, and the rearrangement in the order of elements within the line or across line boundaries are common to all six poems discussed in this chapter – but occur only sporadically among the “minor” poems discussed Chapters Two and Three. Five of the six poems exhibit examples of the addition, omission, substitution, or rearrangement of metrical units; all but Exeter Riddle 30 and the witnesses to the common text of the *Dream of the Rood/Ruthwell Cross Inscription* show “linked variants” involving necessary and coordinated changes to two or more elements in the common text.

This suggests in turn that the Anthologised and Excerpted poems were transmitted to a standard of accuracy different from those observed by the scribes of the poems discussed in Chapters Two and Three. Where the scribes of the Glossing, Translating, and Occasional poems showed themselves to be reluctant to intervene in the substantive details of their

received texts, those responsible for preserving the Anthologised and Excerpted poems appear to have been much more willing to edit and recompose their exemplars. Where the scribes of the Fixed Context poems showed themselves – with one exception – unwilling to move their verse texts outside of the prose frame in which they are characteristically found, the persons for responsible for transmitting the Anthologised and Excerpted poems appear to have felt free to excerpt, interpolate, and adapt their texts as necessary to suit the different (artistic and conceptual) ends to which they were to be put.

The evidence that the Anthologised and Excerpted poems were copied to a different standard of accuracy than poems found in Fixed or Glossing, Translating, and Occasional contexts has some important implications for our understanding of Anglo-Saxon scribal practice and the nature and reception of Old English verse in Anglo-Saxon England. These are discussed in the following, concluding, chapter.