Manuscript Variation in Multiple-Recension Old English Poetic Texts

The Technical Problem and Poetical Art

A Dissertation
Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School
of
Yale University
in Candidacy for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

by
Daniel Paul O'Donnell

Dissertation Director: Fred C. Robinson

May 1996

© Copyright by Daniel Paul O'Donnell, 1996

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Preface

In writing this dissertation I have enjoyed the help of a great many people and institutions. For financial support, I am indebted to the Woodrow Wilson Foundation for a Mellon Fellowship in the Humanities, the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada for a Doctoral Fellowship, the School of Graduate Studies in Yale University for a Graduate Fellowship, and Drs. W.B.A. Genee. Mr. Piet Genee has generously allowed me the use of his laser printer for my final copy.

For access to research materials, I thank the librarians and library officials of Yale University, Louisiana State University, the University of Toronto, Universiteit van Amsterdam, Rijksuniversiteit Leiden, and Rijksuniversiteit Utrecht. I am also grateful to the staff of the Dictionary of Old English, who allowed me extended access to their collection and helped arrange a carrel for my use in the summer of 1992.

I thank my friends Rolf Bremmer and Cees Dekker for making me feel at home in the Netherlands, and Douglas Holt, Malcolm Richardson, Jesse Gellrich, John Fischer and Panthea Reid for doing the same for me in Baton Rouge. In the course of a fairly peripatetic career, I have had the great benefit of their companionship and support – and in the case of Professors Fischer and Reid, of a bed in their house in the fall of 1994.

My greatest debts, however, are to my supervisor, my parents, and my wife. It was my supervisor, Professor Fred C. Robinson, who provided the immediate impetus for this project. It was at his suggestion that I wrote my first report on Kenneth Sisam's "The Authority of Old English Poetical Manuscripts," and I have benefited from his advice, prompt and thorough

criticism, and above all friendship ever since. To my parents, P.J. and M.A. O'Donnell, I owe my love of learning, my love of reading, and my love of the University. In my nascent career as a teacher and scholar I am following their example. That my dissertation is finished, I owe to my wife, Inge Genee. In the six years since we first met, I have turned to her for a patient ear, sensible advice, good example, and more recently, financial support and an apartment in Amsterdam. I can only hope that her dissertation has benefited half as much from my help as mine has from hers.

Table of Contents

Preface iii

Table of Contents v

Tables and Figures viii

Tables viii

Figures viii

Conventions ix

Abbreviations xi

Chapter 1 Introduction 1

About This Dissertation 16

Terminology 16

Scansion 17

Variant Catalogues 18

Chapter 2 Glossing, Translating, and Occasional Poems 19

"Cædmon's Hymn" (*ylda*-recension) 21

Psalms 90:16-95:2 (Paris Psalter, Eadwine's Psalter) 32

Textual Variants 36

Other Glossing Poems Psalms 142, 9, 1-4; "Cædmon's Hymn" (Northumbrian *aeldu*-recension) 48

"Cædmon's Hymn" (*aeldu*-recension) 49

Textual Variants 52

Psalms 142, 9, 1-4 (Paris Psalter; Eadwine Psalter) 53

Translating and Occasional Poems "Fragments of Psalms," "Gloria I," "Prayer," "Durham" 54

"Fragments of Psalms" 56

Textual Variants 57

"Gloria I" 63

Textual Variants 65

"Prayer" 72

Textual Variants 74

"Durham" 75

Textual Variants 76

Conclusion 81

Appendix Psalm 117:22 and "Menologium" lines 60-62 (PPs and ChronC[1]) 83

Textual Variants 85

Chapter 3 Fixed Context Poems 87

The Metrical Preface and Epilogue to the Pastoral Care 88

Manuscripts of the Old English *Pastoral Care* 89

Metrical Preface 90
Textual Variants 98
Metrical Epilogue 107
"Cædmon's Hymn" (*eorðan*-recension) 108
Manuscripts of the Old English *Historia* 112
Oxford, Corpus Christi College, 279, pt. ii (O/O^{uncorr}/O^{corr}) 115
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 41 (B_1) 116
Textual Variants 120
†London, British Library, Cotton Otho B. xi (London, British Library, Additional 43703 [C(N)]) 121
Oxford, Corpus Christi College, 279, pt. ii Uncorrected Text (O^{uncorr}) 122
Oxford, Corpus Christi College, 279, pt. ii Corrected (O^{corr}) 125
Cambridge, University Library, Kk. 3. 18 (Ca) 128
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Tanner 10 (T_1) 129
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 41 (B_1) 129
Tournai, Bibliothèque Municipale, 134 (To) 135
Poems of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* 136
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 173, Third Hand (ChronA^3) 144
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 173, Fifth Hand (ChronA^5) 148
London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. vi, First Hand (ChronB^1) 150
London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. i, Second Hand (ChronC^2) 156
London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. iv, Second Hand (ChronD^2) 157
Textual Variants 161
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 173 Third Hand (ChronA^3) 161
Battle of Brunanburh 161
Capture of the Five Boroughs 174
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 173 Fifth Hand (ChronA^5) 179
Coronation of Edgar 179
Death of Edgar 182
London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. vi, First Hand (ChronB^1) London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. i, Second Hand (ChronC^2) Recensional Variants 187
Battle of Brunanburh 187
Capture of the Five Boroughs 191
Coronation of Edgar 192
Death of Edgar 192
London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. vi, First Hand (ChronB^1) 193
Battle of Brunanburh 193
Capture of the Five Boroughs 199
Coronation of Edgar 201
London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. i, Second Hand (ChronC^2) 202
Battle of Brunanburh 202
London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. iv, Second Hand (ChronD^2) 206
Battle of Brunanburh 206

Capture of the Five Boroughs 221
Conclusion 222

Chapter 4 Anthologised and Excerpted Poems 225
Exeter Riddle 30a/b 246
Textual Variants 250
Exeter Riddle 35/The Leiden Riddle 255
Textual Variants 257
Solomon and Saturn I 264
Textual Variants 267
Dream of the Rood/Ruthwell Cross Inscription 287
Textual Variants 291
Soul and Body I and II 300
Textual Variants 302
Daniel and *Azarias* 359
Textual Variants 362
Conclusion 426

Chapter 5 Conclusion 428

Appendix 1 The Multiply Attested Poems 435

Appendix 2 Manuscripts and Sigla 439
Sigla Index 440
Manuscript Index 441

Bibliography 443

Tables and Figures

Tables

Multiply Attested Old English Poems Discussed by Selected Critics 10
Pointing In Bede's Latin Paraphrase of "Cædmon's Hymn" 22
Pointing In "Cædmon's Hymn," West-Saxon *eorðan*-recension 23
Pointing In "Cædmon's Hymn," West-Saxon *ylda*-recension 25
Pointing In "Cædmon's Hymn," Northumbrian *aeldu*-recension 50
Substantive Variants in the West-Saxon *eorðan*-recension of "Cædmon's Hymn" 110
Scribes and Witnesses of the *Chronicle* Poems 139

Figures

The Metrical Preface to the *Pastoral Care*: Manuscripts and Substantive Variation ..... Between Pages 94-95
The *eorðan*-recension of "Cædmon's Hymn" and the Old English *Historia ecclesiastica*: Manuscripts and Substantive Variation ..... Between Pages 115-116

Conventions

Citations from the multiply attested poems are edited diplomatically, although for ease of reference they are arranged by metrical rather than manuscript line. In citing Old English, the following conventions are used:

|	Manuscript line division
||	Manuscript line division at the end of a recto page
|||	Manuscript line division at the end of a verso page
___	Between words and half-lines, this symbol is used to indicate that the manuscript shows no space between the words joined by the line.
Bold	Bold and underlined letter(s) represent the variant being discussed.
H wæt	A space after a capital indicates a marginal or illuminated letter in manuscript.
\hwæt/	Word has been copied above the preceding text.

The following is a citation from a discussion of the inflectional ending of *westenes*, *Solomon and Saturn*, line 83:

B_1

Lamana| he is læce leoht| winci,ᵉndra
swil|ce he hisdeafra| duru deadra| tunge.
scild ig|ra scild scip|pendes seld
80 flodes| feriend folces ne|riend___
_yþayrfe| weard earma fixa|
wyrma wlenco wil|deora holt
westen**es**| weard weorð myn|ta geard

With manuscript line division and word spacing, the same text would appear as follows:

Lamana
he is læce leoht
þinci,ᵉndra sþil
ce he hisdeafra
duru deadra
tunge. scild ig
ra scild scip
pendes seld flodes
feriend folces ne
riendyþayrfe
þeard earma fixa
þyrma þlenco þil
deora holt þestenes
þeard þeorð myn
ta geard

Abbreviations

ASPR	George Philip Krapp and Elliott Van Kirk Dobbie, eds., *The Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records*, 6 vols. (New York: Columbia UP, 1931-53). Individual volumes cited by editor and volume number.
B.-T.	Joseph Bosworth, and T. Northcote Toller, eds., *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary Based on the Manuscript Collections of the Late Joseph Bosworth* (Oxford: OUP - Clarendon, 1898).
B.-T.(S)	T. Northcote Toller, ed., *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary Based on the Manuscript Collections of the Late Joseph Bosworth: Supplement* (Oxford: OUP - Clarendon, 1921).
Bessinger and Smith	J.B. Bessinger and P.H. Smith, eds, *A Concordance to the Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell, 1978).
Campbell, *OEG*	A. Campbell, *Old English Grammar* (1959; Oxford: OUP - Clarendon, 1991).
Clark-Hall	J.R. Hall, ed. *A Concise Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*, fourth edition with a supplement by Herbert D. Merritt, Medieval Academy Reprints for Teaching 14 (1960; Toronto: UTP, 1991).
Dobbie, *Manuscripts*	Elliott Van Kirk Dobbie, *The Manuscripts of Cædmon's Hymn and Bede's Death Song*: *With a Critical Text of the Epistola Cuthberti de obitu Bedæ* (New York: Columbia UP, 1937).
DOE	Angus Cameron, Ashley Crandell Amos, Antonette diPaolo Healey *et al*., eds. *Dictionary of Old English* (Toronto: Pontifical Institute for Mediaeval Studies, 1986-).
Jabbour, diss.	Alan Albert Jabbour, "The Memorial Transmission of Old English Poetry: A Study of the Extant Parallel Texts," diss., Duke U, 1969.
Ker, *Catalogue*	N. R. Ker, *A Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon*, Reissued with Supplement (1957; Oxford: OUP - Clarendon, 1990).
Mitchell, *OES*	Bruce Mitchell, *Old English Syntax* 2 vols. (Oxford: OUP Clarendon, 1985).
O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*	Katherine O'Brien O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*: *Transitional Literacy in Old English Verse*, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 4 (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990).
Sievers-Brunner	Karl Brunner, *Altenglische Grammatik nach der angelsächsischen Grammatik von Eduard Sievers*, 3te afl., Sammlung kurzer

Grammatiken germanischer Dialekte 3 (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1965).

Chapter 1
Introduction

Twenty-six poems and fragments of poems are known to have survived the Anglo-Saxon period in more than one witness.[1] These include poems from a variety of genres and material contexts: biblical narrative, religious poetry, riddles, charms, liturgical translations, proverbs, a preface and an epilogue, occasional pieces like "Durham," and historical poems like the *Battle of Brunanburh*. Their witnesses survive in three of the four principal manuscripts of Old English poetry, in the margins and blank spaces of manuscripts devoted to Latin texts, as constituents of vernacular prose histories and translations, and even in one case carved onto the face of a stone cross.

The importance of these texts to students of Old English poetry lies in the evidence they offer us of how Anglo-Saxon scribes approached the task of copying verse. The majority of Old English poems are found as single copies preserved in one or another of four principal codices: the Beowulf Manuscript, the Junius Manuscript, the Exeter Book, and the Vercelli Book. As a result, editors and critics of Old English poetry have been forced to rely to an extraordinary degree on the relatively few scribes responsible for copying these manuscripts for their knowledge both of the texts themselves and of more general aspects of Old English poetic art.[2] By allowing us to compare the work of two or more Anglo-Saxon scribes as they

[1]In arriving at this figure, I have counted the various recensions of "Cædmon's Hymn" and the surviving fragments of the metrical translation of the Psalms as separate poems. For a full list of the multiply attested poems and the manuscripts in which they occur, see Appendix 1 "The Multiply Attested Poems."

[2]For a critique of this evidence as it pertains to our knowledge of Old English metre, see Hoyt N. Duggan, "The Evidential Basis for Old English Metrics," *SP* 85 (1988): 145-63.

copy the same piece of poetry, the multiply attested poems provide us with what seems to be an ideal opportunity for determining how these scribes worked – the extent to which they preserved the text of their exemplars, or, if they were more willing to intervene, the nature and extent of the variants they introduced.

The trouble, however, is that the poems which survive in more than one witness do not offer a consistent testimony. Some poems – the West-Saxon *ylda*-recension of "Cædmon's Hymn" and the Metrical Epilogue to Alfred's translation of the *Pastoral Care* among them – exhibit almost no variation among their surviving witnesses apart from the occasional graphic error and minor orthographic or dialectal difference. Others – such as *Soul and Body* I and II, *Solomon and Saturn* I, and the common portion of *Daniel* and *Azarias* – on the other hand, show far more and far more significant textual variation. In addition to mechanical errors and dialectal variants similar to those found among the more conservatively transmitted poems, these texts, which include all five multiply-attested poems with witnesses in the four principal anthologies of Old English verse, also show variants which have a far greater effect on metre, sense, or syntax, including differences in the use of case, differences in the choice and arrangement of individual words within the line, and even differences in the arrangement and choice of individual half-lines and lines.

In the past, studies of the multiply attested poems have concentrated on describing and determining the origins of individual types of variants or the variation within individual poems or groups of poems. Variants or poems which do not fit the theory being expounded have been seen primarily as "exceptions" or have been used to set the (chronological or other) boundaries of the theory being proposed.

In this, the work of Alan Albert Jabbour is atypical only in the comprehensiveness of the sample examined.[3] The only scholar to deal explicitly with the variation in the entire corpus of multiply attested poems – he omits only Psalm 142:9, the second witness to which was discovered twenty years after his dissertation was completed[4] – Jabbour divides these texts into two main groups: a "control group" consisting of poems which "can be said with certainty to be scribally transmitted"[5] and which show a relatively low degree of substantive textual variation, and a "memorial group," the variants of which have a more significant effect on the passages in which they occur.

These categories are primarily contrastive. In theory, all Old English poems are either "memorial" or belong to the "control" group. The only exceptions are those poems which "chiefly because of their brevity, resist firm classification."[6] As Jabbour's terminology suggests, however, the "control group" – to which almost two thirds of the extant multiply attested poems belong – is intended primarily as a bench-mark against which the features of the "memorial group" can be compared. For one thing, it is defined solely in negative terms. It consists of those poems which, a few exceptions aside, do *not* show "demonstrably conscious emendation," examples of the addition or omission of half-lines and lines, inversions in the order of words or metrical units, variation in the use of prefixes, or variants which are

---

[3]Alan Albert Jabbour, "The Memorial Transmission of Old English Poetry: A Study of the Extant Parallel Texts," diss., Duke U, 1969. Jabbour's findings are summarised in a subsequent article, "Memorial Transmission in Old English Poetry," *ChR* 3 (1969): 174-90. Theoretically less sophisticated but otherwise similar arguments have been made about the variation specifically in *Soul and Body* I and II and *Daniel* and *Azarias* by Alison Jones Gyger. See: "Daniel and Azarias as Evidence for the Oral-Formulaic Character of Old English Poetry," *MÆ* 35 (1966): 95-102 and "The Old English *Soul and Body* as an Example of Oral Transmission," *MÆ* 38 (1969) 239-244.

[4]Patrick P. O'Neill, "Another Fragment of the Metrical Psalms in the Eadwine Psalter," *N&Q* 233 (1988): 434-6.

[5]Jabbour, diss., p. 51.

[6]Jabbour, diss., p. 206.

otherwise "strikingly different to the eye."[7] Moreover, differences among its various members are for the most part ignored. While Jabbour acknowledges the existence of differences in the amount and nature of the textual variation exhibited by the poems of both groups – differences which in the case of his "control group" will later provide Katherine O'Brien O'Keeffe with the bulk of her examples of "transitional literacy" [8] – he nevertheless makes little attempt to account for these differences systematically, and indeed, leaves them out of the final summary of his method entirely:

> In order to introduce a degree of precision in the analysis of parallel texts, a control group of parallel texts unquestionably transmitted scribally was isolated and analyzed for degree and type of substantive variation. Then, in successive chapters, the parallel texts of *Soul and Body* and of *Daniel* and *Azarias* were contrasted with the control group. What emerged was a memorial group distinguished from the control group not only because of a much higher frequency of substantive variation, but because of striking differences between the two groups in the type of variation. Once the two groups had been established, it remained only to examine a number of parallel texts which, chiefly because of their brevity, resisted firm classification as "scribal" or "memorial"...[9]

Other scholars, while less comprehensive in their samples, nevertheless take a similar approach to the internal differences within the corpus of multiply attested poetry. In his seminal article, "The Authority of Old English Poetical Manuscripts," for example, Kenneth Sisam excludes a number of poems from his discussion of the "aimlessness" of Old English poetic textual variation on the grounds of their late date or "unusual" pattern of transmission.[10] In contrast to the poems he chooses for his principal examples (*Solomon and Saturn* I, *Daniel* and *Azarias*, and *Soul and Body* I and II), however, these "exceptions" include some of the more conservatively transmitted of Old English poems, including "Cædmon's Hymn" and

---

[7]Jabbour, diss., pp. 67-70.

[8]See below, p. 5

[9]Jabbour, diss., p. 206.

[10]Kenneth Sisam, "The Authority of Old English Poetical Manuscripts," *Studies in the History of Old English Literature* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1953): pp. 32-3, fn. 1; pp. 34-36.

"Bede's Death Song." Forty years later, Kevin Kiernan dismisses all of Sisam's principal examples as being themselves either too late or too different from each other to allow any meaningful comparison,[11] and argues instead that "Cædmon's Hymn" and "Bede's Death Song" are the "only poems whose transmissions can be studied at all."[12]

The most original attempt at using differences within the sample of the multiply attested poems to establish the boundaries for a particular type of variation or theory of transmission is to be seen in the work of Katherine O'Brien O'Keeffe. Taking as her principal examples the West-Saxon *eorðan*-recension of "Cædmon's Hymn," *Solomon and Saturn* I, the Metrical Preface to the *Pastoral Care*, and certain witnesses to certain poems of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, O'Keeffe argues that the metrically, syntactically, and semantically appropriate substantive variation these texts exhibit are a result of the historical period at which they were copied – a period in which "readers of Old English verse read by applying oral techniques for the reception of a message to the decoding of a written text."[13] Poems which do not show similar, formulaically appropriate, variation – such as the marginal *ylda*-recension of "Cædmon's Hymn," and the later poems of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* – are used to place boundaries on the applicability of this type of transmission. The *ylda*-recension of "Cædmon's Hymn," which shows none of the fluidity found by O'Keeffe in her discussion of the main-text West-Saxon *eorðan*-text, demonstrates the role of "textual environment" in establishing the conditions under which "transitional literacy" operated.[14] The fact that later witnesses and poems of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* show less substantive textual variation

---

[11]Kevin S. Kiernan, Beowulf *and the* Beowulf *Manuscript* (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers UP, 1981), pp. 179-80.

[12]Kiernan, Beowulf *Manuscript*, p. 173.

[13]Katherine O'Brien O'Keeffe, *Visible Song: Transitional Literacy in Old English Verse*, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 4 (Cambridge: CUP, 1990), p. 191.

[14]O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, pp. 39-40 and 46.

than the earlier ones is cited as evidence that this "literacy" "was more likely in the period before the end of the tenth century than later."[15]

Presented like this, as carefully delimited accounts of specific types of variation or groups of poems, these studies seem unobjectionable, and indeed, in as much as the poems excluded or treated as a contrastive group by one critic are often used as principal examples by another, even complementary. Problems arise, however, when these studies – each of which, with the exception of the dissertation and article by Jabbour, involve the detailed examination of only a few major examples – are presented as if they were general descriptions of Anglo-Saxon scribal practice rather than what they are: accounts of limited types of variation or the variation in limited groups of multiply attested poems.

In some cases, the extrapolation is made by critics of the approach taken by a given scholar. In a recent article examining the validity of O'Keeffe's notions of the role of "transitional literacy" in the transmission of Old English poetry, for example, Douglas Moffat tests O'Keeffe's approach by applying it to two poems not among her principal examples: *Soul and Body* I and II, and the common text of *Daniel* and *Azarias*.[16] Analysing the variants in these two texts, Moffat finds numerous examples which do not fit O'Keeffe's definition of formulaic variation – that is to say, variants which, "conditioned by formulaic conventions,... are metrically, syntactically and semantically appropriate."[17] Using this evidence to call "into

---

[15]O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 136.

[16]Douglas Moffat, "Anglo-Saxon Scribes and Old English Verse," *Speculum* 67 (1992): 805-827. It should be noted that O'Keeffe frequently implies that her analysis does apply to *Soul and Body*, without giving any examples (for references, see below, fn. 22). Moffat also discusses the variation in *Soul and Body* I and II in his edition of the poem and in two articles: *The Old English* Soul and Body (Wolfeboro NH: D.S. Brewer - Boydell & Brewer, 1990); "A Case of Scribal Revision in the OE Soul and Body," *JEGP* 86 (1987): 1-8; and "The MS Transmission of the OE Soul and Body," *MÆ* 52 (1983): 300-302. In his articles and edition, Moffat draws heavily on two articles by P. R. Orton: "Disunity in the Vercelli Book *Soul and Body*," *Neoph* 63 (1979): 450-460; and "The Old English *Soul and Body*: A Further Examination," *MÆ* 48 (1979): 173-97.

[17]O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 41; see also Moffat, "Anglo-Saxon Scribes," pp. 810-811.

question the general applicability of the idea of the sensitive and competent Anglo-Saxon scribe,"[18] Moffat then suggests that textual reliability may be impossible to find in any Anglo-Saxon poetical manuscript:

> What I am suggesting here is the possibility, indeed, the likelihood, that the Old English poetical manuscripts, because of the complex nature of scribal performance, are textured or layered in a way that demands an adjustment in the way we treat them. They should not be looked at, at least initially, as "coherent" texts, that is, the unified product of a single mind, somewhat sullied by mechanical bungling in recopying or altered stylistically in some indistinguishable way by a sensitive and competent scribe. Rather, the possibility must be faced that they are composite products of two, or very likely more, minds which were not necessarily working toward the same end. That such texts, suffering heavily from what the traditional textual critics call interpolation, might exist is hardly surprising: they are common in Middle English and in Latin. That they should exist for Old English verse is, therefore, unexceptionable; however, that they exist creates special difficulties for modern critics. Once again, because of the peculiar nature of the evidence for Old English verse, specifically the lack of multiple copies of the verse to serve as a check against any one copy, the possibility of scribal intervention working against the poetic direction of the exemplar, and a series of such scribal interventions, must be unsettling. How is one to detect skillful or even competent interpolation if only a single copy of a work remains?[19]

More frequently, however, the attempt to extrapolate an interpretation of the origins and significance of the textual variation in one group of poems to the corpus as a whole is made by the author of the study itself. Thus despite the limited nature of their samples, both Sisam and Kiernan present their discussions of the variation exhibited by their principal examples as evidence of the general reliability of Anglo-Saxon scribes. Kiernan, arguing that the scribes of the *Beowulf* anthology were fundamentally accurate, takes what he implies are analogous examples from "Cædmon's Hymn" and "Bede's Death Song" (both of which are preserved in marginal contexts or as fixed constituents of vernacular prose framing texts) to demonstrate the extent to which a late witness might "accurately preserve its precedential

[18]Moffat, "Anglo-Saxon Scribes," p. 823.

[19]Moffat, "Anglo-Saxon Scribes," p. 826.

texts."[20] Sisam, on the other hand, sees his examples from *Solomon and Saturn* I, *Soul and Body* I and II, and *Daniel* and *Azarias* as calling into question the general authority of later manuscript copies of Old English poetic texts as a whole. While he excludes many of the chief examples of accurate transmission and admits that not all Old English texts exist in corrupt copies, he nevertheless argues that the variation his principal examples exhibit is a potential problem in the transmission of most Old English poems:

> My argument has been directed against the assumption that Anglo-Saxon poetical manuscripts are generally good, in the sense that, except for an inevitable sprinkling of errors, they faithfully reproduce the words of much older originals. It does not attempt to establish that all the poems have survived in bad texts... and there may be reasons for believing that some poems were lucky.... But when, as is usual for Old English poetry, only one late witness is available, there is no safety in following its testimony.[21]

O'Keeffe's claims about the general applicability of "transitional literacy" as an explanation for the variation found between manuscript copies of verse texts are even more comprehensive. Because she describes it as a form of *literacy*, O'Keeffe implies that the formulaically appropriate variation she finds between the witnesses to her principal examples is similarly characteristic of *all* poems which meet her chronological and contextual criteria. This leads her to include implicitly both poems like those cited by Moffat in which the variation between witnesses goes far beyond the simple substitution of formulaically appropriate elements, and, presumably, a poem like the Metrical Epilogue to the *Pastoral Care* – which shows almost no variation whatsoever despite the fact that it is found in two of the same pre-eleventh century manuscripts as its more variable companion, the Metrical Preface.[22]

---

[20]Kiernan, Beowulf *Manuscript*, p. 174.

[21]Sisam, "Authority," pp. 39-40.

[22]Although O'Keeffe never discusses the variation in *Soul and Body* I and II, the common text of *Daniel* and *Azarias*, or Exeter Riddle 30a/b directly, she mentions them repeatedly as further examples of the type of variation she finds in her principal examples, see (for *Soul and Body* I and II and Riddle 30a/b): pp. 65, 76,

The danger inherent in this use of a limited number of examples from the corpus of the multiply attested texts as the basis for more general conclusions about the nature of Anglo-Saxon scribal practice can be most easily appreciated if one considers the extent to which the poems' critics choose for their principal examples colour their understanding of poetic textual transmission in general:

79, 80 and 93; and (for *Soul and Body* I and II, Riddle 30a/b and *Daniel* and *Azarias*): p. 66, fn.58 and p. 138, fn.1. Except for citations in her Appendix on "Formulaic Systems in the *Metrical Preface* to Alfred's *Pastoral Care*" (pp. 97, 101 and 103), O'Keeffe does not mention the Metrical Epilogue to the *Pastoral Care* at all. The variation exhibited by its companion text, the Metrical Preface to the *Pastoral Care*, on the other hand, receives a whole chapter.

Table 1: Multiply Attested Old English Poems Discussed by Selected Critics[23]

Context and Poem Short-Title		Unreliable/Non-Literate Transmission			Formulaic Transm.	Accurate Transm.
		Sisam	Moffat	Jabbour[24]	O'Keeffe[25]	Kiernan[26]
Glossing and Translating Poems	*BDS*	–		±		
	Cæd(aeldu)	–		–		
	Cæd(ylda)	–		–	–	
Fixed Context Poems	*Cæd(eorðan)*	–		±		
	CPPref	–		–		
	CPEp	–		–		
	Brun	–		–		
	Capt	–		–		
	CEdg	–		–	–	
	DEdg	–		–	–	
Anthologised and Excerpted Poems	*MSol*			±		–
	Soul I & II					–
	Dan/Az					–
	Dream/RuthC	–		±		–

As the above table suggests, critics who see Old English poetic texts as being either fundamentally unreliable or the result of non-literate means of transmission (Sisam, Moffat, Jabbour), invariably choose poems from anthologies like the Exeter Book, Junius Manuscript, or – in the case of *Solomon and Saturn* I – Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 422, as their principal examples. O'Keeffe's argument that substantive textual variation in Anglo-Saxon

[23]The table lists all poems cited as principal positive examples by the selected critics (in the case of Jabbour, all poems described as certainly "memorial").

Legend:

	Principal example ("Memorial" in Jabbour)
–	Explicitly excluded from principal examples
±	Explicitly mentioned as doubtfully "memorial" (Jabbour only)
[blank]	Not discussed in any detail

[24]Jabbour discusses all poems found in more than one witness. All poems not included in this table belong to his control group or are "doubtful."

[25]O'Keeffe also explicitly excludes the later (metrically irregular) *Chronicle* poems *Death of Alfred* and *Death of Edward*.

poetry is a result of the formulaic engagement of the scribes responsible for its transmission, on the other hand, depends primarily on the evidence of poems which, with the exception of *Solomon and Saturn* I, are found exclusively as constituents of larger framing texts like the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* and the Old English translation to Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica*. And Kiernan bases his argument – that Anglo-Saxon scribes could produce substantively accurate copies of their exemplars under the right conditions – on yet a third group of principal examples, the majority of which are found in Latin manuscripts.

What is needed is an approach to the multiply attested poems which recognises the extent to which the variation these poems exhibit occurs for a variety of reasons and under a variety of circumstances. Rather than attempting to assign the variation these poems exhibit – a few "exceptions" aside – to any *single* scribal practice or habit, such an approach would instead attempt to explicate the full range of habits, techniques, and motivations influencing the way Anglo-Saxon scribes worked.

Hints of how such an approach might work are to be found in the work of Roy Michael Liuzza and Peter S. Baker.[27] Working in each case with different groups of poems, these critics emphasise the great variety of possible motivations which might prompt a scribe to vary his text. Taking his principal examples from a close analysis of the variation exhibited by the two surviving witnesses to Exeter Riddle 30, for example, Liuzza proposes a simple grammar of what he sees as the three main types of scribal variation:

> The first might be represented as A > a, a normalization of spelling or a variation in which the sense is not affected. This variation is the mainstay of the philologist; without it our knowledge of the English language would be seriously impoverished. The second may be represented as A > X, a plain error in which sense is garbled into

---

[26]Kiernan compares individual witnesses from the texts cited as principal examples rather than the variation exhibited by all surviving witnesses.

[27]Roy Michael Liuzza, "The Texts of the OE Riddle 30," *JEGP* 87 (1984): 1-15; Peter S. Baker, "A Little Known Variant Text of the Old English Metrical Psalter," *Speculum* 59 (1984): 263-81.

> nonsense; the detection and correction of this variation is the business of even the most cautious modern editor. A third variation, A > B, might change one sense into another, substituting familiar words for unfamiliar ones, inserting conjunctions or particles to clarify the assumed sense, or rearranging syntax and grammar, not always at the expense of the meter. This third sort of variation, though it may be minor in an individual instance and would be, in the absence of a duplicate text, imperceptible, could alter the rhetorical structure, and hence the style, of a passage. For this reason it is proper to think of the scribe as an "editor"; in a very real sense the scribe is the shaper, not merely the transmitter, of Old English poetry.[28]

In a similar vein Baker emphasises the extent to which scribes might vary for different reasons and under different circumstances, focusing his discussion on the differences in the variation exhibited by poems as diverse as the *Battle of Brunanburh*, the Metrical Preface and Epilogue to the *Pastoral Care*, and the Eadwine and Paris texts of Psalms 90:16.1-95:2.1:

> If such texts as C's *Brunanburh* and the Corpus 12 *Preface* and *Epilogue* show how faithfully Old English scribes were capable of following their exemplars, such texts as D's *Brunanburh* and those cited by Sisam show how many changes might be introduced into a text, whether as a result of memorial transmission, revision, or scribal incompetence. Thus it is impossible to generalize about "the authority of Old English poetical manuscripts": Neither a conservative nor an adventurous editorial philosophy will be correct if applied indiscriminately.[29]

It is possible, however, to go farther than this. For not only do poems like the *Battle of Brunanburh*, the common text of the Paris and Eadwine Psalters, and the poems "cited by Sisam" – *Daniel* and *Azarias*, *Soul and Body* I and II and *Solomon and Saturn* I – show different amounts and types of variation, they are also different types of poems, copied in different contexts and for different reasons. The *Battle of Brunanburh* is a historical poem celebrating a specific Anglo-Saxon victory and is found only in copies of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. The Old English translation of Psalms 90:16.1-95:2.1 translates and appears alongside the Latin equivalent of its text in both witnesses. And *Daniel* and *Azarias*, *Solomon and Saturn* I, and *Soul and Body* I and II are all found in at least one case as part of apparently

---

[28]Liuzza, "Riddle 30," p. 14.

[29]Baker, "Variant Text," p. 269.

unique anthologies of Old English verse and (in some cases) prose. In such circumstances, it seems reasonable to assume that the scribes responsible for copying these poems approached their work with different ideas as to the nature of the task at hand. Because their text was being used as a translation, for example, the scribes who copied Psalms 90:16.1-95:2.1 in the Eadwine and Paris psalters might reasonably be assumed to be less willing to alter the text of their exemplar on internal, formulaic grounds, than those responsible for copying *Soul and Body* I and II or the common portions of *Daniel* and *Azarias* in collections like the Exeter, Vercelli, or Junius codices. Similarly, scribes responsible for copying the poems of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* might reasonably be expected to treat their verse in more or less the same fashion as they do the historical prose with which they find it in their exemplars – introducing substantive innovation if that was their policy elsewhere in the manuscript; or not, if they were similarly conservative in their prose.

It is the thesis of this dissertation, moreover, that poems found in similar contexts will show similar amounts and types of textual variation. On the basis of a complete catalogue of the substantive textual variation exhibited by the witnesses to all metrically regular Old English poems known to have survived the Anglo-Saxon period in insular copies,[30] I argue that the corpus can be divided into three main contextual groups. Poems which, like the common text of Psalms 90:16.1-95:2.1, have been copied as glosses and translations in primarily Latin manuscripts will be found to show similarly low levels of significant

[30]A complete list of all poems known from two or more medieval witnesses can be found in Appendix 1. The following are too late or irregular to be included in this study: *Latin-English Proverbs*, *Death of Alfred*, *Death of Edward*, *Charm 5/10*; and the **Hr-Ld$_1$-CArms** sub-group of the West-Saxon *eorðan*-recension of "Cædmon's Hymn" (all metrically irregular); the Northumbrian *eordu*-recension of "Cædmon's Hymn," and "Bede's Death Song" (both show post-conquest or continental developments). For a discussion of the *eordu*-version of "Cædmon's Hymn," see: Daniel P. O'Donnell, "A Northumbrian Version of 'Cædmon's Hymn' (*eordu*-recension) in Brussels Bibliothèque Royale manuscript 8245-57 ff.62r^2-v^1: Identification, Edition and Filiation," forthcoming in: *New Essays on the Venerable Bede* (provisional title), edited by A.A. MacDonald and L. Houwen (Groningen, 1995). I am preparing a study of the **Hr-Ld$_1$-CArms** sub-

substantive textual variation. As I demonstrate in Chapter Two, this group can be extended to include all other metrically regular poems not copied as constituents of vernacular prose framing texts or as part of an anthology or compilation. Poems which, like the *Battle of Brunanburh*, are found as fixed constituents of larger framing texts, on the other hand, will show a different pattern of textual variation. While most witnesses to these poems show relatively few substantive variants, certain witnesses are far more innovative. As I demonstrate in Chapter Three, the differences between these poems can be shown in all but one case to be related to the pattern of variation found in the surrounding prose. Scribes who show themselves to have been conservative copyists of the framing texts in which these poems are found also produce the most conservative copies of the poems themselves; those who show themselves to be more willing to introduce substantive variation into their poetic texts, on the other hand, also almost invariably produce the most innovative copies of the accompanying frame. Finally, poems which, like *Soul and Body* I and II, the common text of *Daniel* and *Azarias*, and *Solomon and Saturn* I, survive with at least one witness in a compilation or anthology show a third pattern of textual variation. These poems – discussed in Chapter Four – are frequently excerpted from or interpolated into other texts and exhibit a variation which, in contrast to that found in the other two groups, appears at times to reflect the intelligent engagement of the reviser with the poem.

The argument presented here has some important implications for our understanding of Anglo-Saxon poetic practice. In the first place, it suggests that Old English poetry surviving in more than one witness may not be as representative of the general body of Old English verse as has been generally assumed. Although the multiply attested poetry appears at first glance to represent a broad range of styles and genres, on closer inspection it is clear that certain types

---

group of the West-Saxon *eorðan*-recension. The transmission of "Bede's Death Song" is discussed in

of manuscript contexts were more likely to produce multiple copies than others. In the general corpus of Old English poetry, for example, 65% of the approximately 31,000 lines of surviving verse is preserved in the four main 'Poetic Codices';[31] in the corpus of multiply attested poetry, however, these same codices supply less than a third of the surviving lines. Poems found as fixed constituents of vernacular prose framing works, on the other hand, are over-represented in the corpus of multiply attested verse. They account for approximately 27% of the lines found in more than one witness, versus about 9% of all surviving Old English poetry.

Secondly, the observation that Anglo-Saxon scribes copied differently depending on the context in which they were working suggests that they may have read – and perhaps even composed – these texts with different artistic expectations as well. That metrical, syntactical, and lexical differences exist between poems like *Beowulf* and poems like the metrical translation of the Psalms is obvious.[32] But other differences may also exist. As I argue in Chapter Four, for example, poems found in the anthologies differ from those in other contexts in that they are frequently transmitted as fragments rather than as coherent and discrete wholes. This, coupled with the fact that they appear to have travelled independently of any specific context or group of texts suggests that they also may have been seen as a body of verse which compilers and copyists of Old English poetry felt free to adapt, excerpt, or interpolate at will.

A full explication of the literary or textual implications of these contextual divisions is beyond the scope of this study, although I believe my findings support those of scholars like É.

Dobbie, *Manuscripts*.

[31]The figures in this paragraph are based on the contents and editorial line divisions in the *Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records*, vols. 1-6.

[32]See M. S. Griffith, "Poetic Language and the Paris Psalter: The Decay of the Old English Tradition," *ASE* 20 (1991): 167-86; also Patricia Bethel, "Anacrusis in the Psalms of the Paris Psalter," *NM* 90 (1989): 33-43.

Ó Carragáin and Patrick Conner who have examined the relationship of context and content in individual manuscripts.[33] As I argue in my conclusion, moreover, I believe a similar comparative approach may also prove fruitful in the examination of the variation exhibited by the witnesses to different types of prose texts. First, however, it is necessary to examine the nature, bounds, and characteristic features of the textual variation exhibited by each of the three main contextual groups of multiply attested Old English poetry. This is the work of the following chapters.

About This Dissertation

Terminology

In this study, a "substantive variant" is any form which affects sense, metre, or syntax. This category includes both readings which make good metre, sense, and syntax, and nonsense forms produced by graphic error or scribal misapprehension. "Potentially significant substantive variants" are forms which subsequent readers might reasonably be assumed to interpret as legitimate Old English, whether or not they make good sense, syntax and/or metre. "Significant substantive variants" are alternative readings which make more-or-less acceptable sense, metre, and syntax. Thus, in the *eorðan*-recension of "Cædmon's Hymn," the **B_1** reading *wuldor godes*[34] (for **T_1 To C**(**N**) **O** and **Ca** *wuldorfæder* [and orthographic variants]) is a significant substantive variant: both forms make reasonable sense, metre, and syntax, and subsequent scribes in the **B_1** tradition would be unlikely to reject the innovative form on

[33]See: É. 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; and "The Vercelli Book as an Ascetic Florilegium," diss., Queen's U, 1975; Patrick W. Conner, *Anglo-Saxon Exeter: A Tenth Century Cultural History*, Studies in Anglo-Saxon History 4 (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1993).

[34]The sigla in this and the following two examples are discussed at the appropriate places in Chapter 3 (see the following footnotes for references) and are listed in Appendix 2, "Manuscripts and Sigla."

internal grounds alone.[35] **ChronD** *heord|weal* for **ChronA** *bord|weal* **ChronB ChronC** *bordweall* in the *Battle of Brunanburh*, line 5b, on the other hand, is a potentially significant substantive variant.[36] While *heordweal* is acceptable Old English in its own right, the word makes no sense and is unmetrical in context. Subsequent scribes in the **ChronD** tradition might be expected to recognise that something was wrong, but would not necessarily be able to reconstruct the original reading from the form in their exemplar. Indeed, they might even be misled into searching for metrically and syntactically appropriate synonyms to the **ChronD** form. **ChronA** *cul bod ge hna des* for **ChronB ChronC ChronD** *cumbol gehnastes* (and orthographic variants) in the *Battle of Brunanburh*, line 56a, finally, is simply substantive.[37] It affects – and in this case destroys – sense, metre, and/or syntax without being meaningful or metrically or syntactically appropriate in its own right. While subsequent scribes faced with such forms may or may not be able to recover the original reading – **ChronG** (a direct descendant of **ChronA**) reads *cumbelgehnades*, correctly guessing the first half without changing the second – they would be unlikely to accept them as legitimate Old English.

Scansion

Scansion in this dissertation in the main follows John C. Pope's restatement of Eduard Sievers's five types.[38] This differs from Sievers's original system in the addition of subtype A-4 (which brings together all Type A verses with a short second lift), the inclusion of Siever's subtypes C-1 and C-2 under a single verse-type (C-1), and the use of the designation C-2 for

[35]See below, Chapter 3, p. 131.

[36]See below, Chapter 3, p. 208.

[37]See below, Chapter 3, p. 171.

[38]John C. Pope, *The Rhythm of Beowulf: An Interpretation of the Normal and Hypermetric Verse-Forms in Old English Poetry* (New Haven: Yale, 1942), pp. 238-241. A more convenient version of this restatement is to be found in *Seven Old English Poems*, Second Edition (New York: Norton, 1981), pp. 109-116. See also E. Sievers, "Zur Rhythmik des germanischen Alliterationsverses I," *PBB* 10 (1885): 209-314; "Zur

Siever's original Type C-3 (i.e. Type C with a short second lift). I differ from Pope (and Sievers) in my analysis of Type A-3 verses. Following A.J. Bliss,[39] I consider these to consist of a single stressed and alliterating element preceded by one or more particles. My analysis of alliterating finite verbs also follows Bliss.[40]

Variant Catalogues

The variant catalogues included for each text include all substantive textual variants in the corpus of multiply-attested metrically regular alliterative poetry – with the exception of dialectal, phonological, or orthographic variants (such as the syncopation of unstressed or half-stressed vowels after long syllables) with a purely metrical effect. Corrections and erasures are discussed as relevant (see in particular, pp. 122-127).

Rhythmik des germanischen Alliterationsverses II," *PBB* 10 (1885): 415-545; and *Altgermanische Metrik*, Sammlung kurzer Grammatiken germanischer Dialeckte (Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1893).

[39]A.J. Bliss, *The Metre of Beowulf* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958), esp. §§9-11.

[40]Bliss, *Metre*, §§12-29.

Chapter 2
Glossing, Translating, and Occasional Poems

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

In her discussion of "The Developing Text of Cædmon's *Hymn*," Katherine O'Brien O'Keeffe notes the existence of a remarkable contrast in the type and amount of textual variation found between the exemplars of the two main West-Saxon recensions of "Cædmon's Hymn."[41] On the one hand, there are the six surviving witnesses to the West-Saxon *eorðan*-recension. In nine lines of text, the witnesses to this version of the poem – five of which are found within the main text of the West-Saxon translation of Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica*[42] – show seven variants which O'Keeffe considers to be metrically, syntactically, and semantically appropriate.[43] On the other hand, there are the five surviving eleventh and twelfth-century copies of the West-Saxon *ylda*-recension.[44] The witnesses to this text – all of which are found in manuscripts of the Latin *Historia* – show only one substantive variant among them, the marginally sensible reading *word* in Winchester, Cathedral I (**W**), line 4b for *ord* in all other manuscripts. After pointing out that this difference in variation cannot be attributed to

---

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

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

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

[44]Two witnesses to the *ylda*-text, San Marino CA, Huntington Library, HM 35300 (**SanM**) and Cambridge, Trinity College R.5.22 (**Tr_1**), date from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Neither is of any textual value. In addition to numerous nonsense forms, there is one potentially significant variant, **SanM** *æ*, line 2b, for *and* in all other witnesses. This is almost certainly the result of the scribal misunderstanding of the abbreviation, ⁊. For an example of the opposite mistake – the misunderstanding of *æ* as ⁊, cf. **CUL_{Ffi27}**

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

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

---

ȝðelwold **Hickes** *Æðelwold*, in "Durham," l. 14b (discussed below, p. 81). The odd form **Tr$_1$** *euca*, l. 9b for *frea* in all other manuscripts is presumably to be explained graphically.

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

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

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

"Cædmon's Hymn" (*ylda*-recension)

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

---

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

when compared with the general consistency of the grammatical pointing found between witnesses to Bede's paraphrase of the Hymn in the Latin *Historia*.

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

	Placement of points by clause (Points follow indicated words)							
Witness	caelesti s	creatoris	illius	gloriae	deus	extitit	tect i	creavit
L	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
M						×		
Tib$_{cii}$		×				×	×	×
Tib$_{Axiv}$	×	×		×	×	×	×	×
Tr$_{R75}$	×		×	×		×	×	×
W	×	×		×	×	×	×	×
H	×		×	×		×	×	×
Bd	×	×		×	×	×	×	×
Roy$_{13CV}$	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Ld	×		×	×	×	×	×	×
Mg	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
Ln	×		×	×	×	×	×	×
Tr$_{1}$	×	×		×	×	×	×	×
Hr	×		×	×	×	×	×	×

As O'Keeffe notes, most pre-twelfth-century English copies of the Latin *Historia* punctuate Bede's paraphrase of the Hymn in a nearly identical fashion (Table 1).[49] Twelve of the fourteen known English manuscripts of the *Historia* divide the paraphrase into three main clauses, *nunc... gloriae*, *quomodo... extitit*, and *qui... creavit*.[50] The majority of these manuscripts then divide these three clauses into a number of regular subdivisions, separating the four "variations on the direct object" of *laudare* in the first clause (*auctorem regni celestis,*

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

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

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

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

potentiam creatoris, *consilium illis*, and *facta patris gloriae*), and marking the ends of dependent clauses (*cum sit aeternus deus*, and *qui primo filiis hominum caelum pro culmine tecti*) in the second and third.[51]

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

	Placement of points by clause (expressed in half-lines)																
Witness	1a	1b	2a	2b	3a	3b	4a	4b	5a	5b	6a	6b	7a	7b	8a	8b	9a	9b
T_1								×				×						×
B_1														×				×
O																		×
Ca					×		×					×						×

In contrast, only one witness to a vernacular text of "Cædmon's Hymn" employs a similarly consistent grammatical system of punctuation (Table 2).[53] This manuscript, a tenth-century copy of the Old English translation of the *Historia* and *eorðan*-recension of the Hymn in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Tanner 10 (**T_1**),[54] uses points at the ends of lines 4b, 6b, and 9b to divide the Old English text into its three main sentences, *nu sculon herigean... ór on|stealde*, lines 1-4b, *he ærest sceop... halig scyppend*, lines 5-6b, and *þamiddungeard... frea ælmihtig*, lines 7-9b.[55] Of these points, only the last, that marking the end of the poem at line 9b, is

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

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

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

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

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

found in the three other surviving twelfth-century or earlier manuscripts of the *eorðan*-recension.[56] The most lightly punctuated of the three, the early eleventh-century Oxford, Corpus Christi College, 279, pt. ii (**O**), contains no punctuation at all apart from this final point. A second eleventh-century copy of the recension, Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 41 (**B_1**) has points at the ends of lines 7b and 9b, the former separating *mann cynnes*| *weard*, the first subject of the final clause of the poem, from its subsequent variants, *écedrihten*, line 8a, and *frea ælmihtig*, line 9b. The fourth and most heavily punctuated witness to the *eorðan*-recension, Cambridge, University Library, Kk. 3. 18 (**Ca**), uses four points, at the ends of lines 3a, 4a, 6b and 9b. Like **T_1**, this witness uses the point at the end of line 6b to separate the final clause of the poem from the preceding text. With the point at the end of line 3a, it divides the first sentence into its component clauses, *nu we sceolan herigean... wera*| *wuldor fæder*, lines 1-3a and *swa he wuldres... ord onstealde*, lines 3b-4b, while the point at the of line 4a divides the second of these two clauses in half, separating the verbal phrase, *ord onstealde*, from its preceding subject and genitive complement, *swa he wuldres gehwæs* / *ece drihten*, in lines 3b-4a. [57]

---

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

[57]I do not understand O'Keeffe's reading of the syntactic function of the punctuation in this manuscript. In comparing the punctuation of "CUL Kk. 3. 18 [**Ca**] and its probable exemplar [**T_1**]," she suggests that "the later manuscript clearly added points to separate the variant objects, but pays no attention to the full stop wanting after *onstealde*" (pp. 44-5). The "variant objects" of *herigean* are *heofon rices weard* (l.1b), *metodes mihte* (l.2a), *mod ge þanc* (l.2b) and *wera*| *wuldor fæder* (l.3a). The first point in this witness occurs *after* the last of these objects and immediately precedes the beginning of the next clause, *swa he wuldres ge hwæs... ord onstealde*.

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

	Placement of points by clause (expressed in half-lines)																	
Witness	1a	1b	2a	2b	3a	3b	4a	4b	5a	5b	6a	6b	7a	7b	8a	8b	9a	9b
H		×	×	×	×			×			×				×			
W[59]	?	?	×				?		×				?					×
Mg		×	×	×	×			×			×							×
Ln		×	×	×	×			×		×	×	×						×

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

[58]This table omits the evidence of the illegible **Bd** and late **SanM** and **Tr_1**.

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

[60]In addition to the punctuation of the fourteenth- and fifteenth-century **SanM** and **Tr_1**, the following discussion ignores the punctuation of the eleventh-century Oxford, Bodleian Library, 163 (**Bd**). The text of this witness has been badly damaged and its punctuation is irrecoverable.

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

ylda bearnum / *heofon to hrofe* (lines 5a-6a) from the subsequent elaboration of its subject, *halig scyppend* (line 6b) and the final "clause" *middangearde... frea ælmyhtig* (lines 7-9). Oxford, Lincoln College, Lat. 31, ff.14-113 (**Ln**) joins **Mg** and **H** in placing a point at the end of line 6a, but does so for a different reason. When taken with unique points in this manuscript at the ends of lines 5b and 6b, the point at the end of 6a serves to break the clause *he ærust ge*|*scop... halig scyppend* into its component parts in a fashion similar to that used in the first main clause of the poem in all three manuscripts: subject, verb and indirect object (*he ærust ge*|*scop ylda bearnum*), in lines 5a-5b; direct object and modifying prepositional phrase (*heofon to hrofe*) in line 6a; the appositive epithet for the subject, *halig scyppend* in line 6b.

The punctuation of **W** stands apart from that of the other witnesses to the *ylda*-recension and is the most difficult to account for. This witness contains three points: one at the end of the poem after line 9b (also found in **Mg** and **Ln**), and two others at the end of lines 2a and 5a.[62] The point at the end of line 2a divides the direct objects of *herian* in two, separating *heofonrices we*[*ard*] and *metoḍ des mihte* (lines 2a and 3a respectively) on the one hand from *ond his modgeþanc* and *wurc wuldorfæder* (lines 3b and 4a) on the other. While the absence of a point at the end of the first clause makes it difficult to determine the function of the point at line 2a precisely, one possibility is that the scribe understood the four objects of *herian* as referring to essentially two things, God the person and his qualities. In this reading, the punctuation of lines 1-3 in **W** suggests that *modgeþanc* and *wurc* are to be understood essentially as repetitions of the first two objects, *modgeþanc* corresponding to *heofonrices we*[*ard*] (God the person), and *wurc wuldorfæder* corresponding to *metoḍ des mihte* (his works

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

aeldu-recension, an earlier and apparently distantly related version[65] found in the two earliest known manuscripts of the Latin *Historia,* St. Petersburg, Public Library, Lat. Q. v. i. 18 (**L**) and Cambridge, University Library, Kk. 5. 16 (**M**).[66] For purposes of comparison, I have reproduced the texts of **H** and **M**:

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

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

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

Of these, the readings of the *ylda*-recension in lines 1a, 4b, 5a, and 9a (*on*), can all be paralleled from other recensions of the poem and presumably represent variants introduced into the text at an early date, if not by Cædmon himself.[67] The readings in lines 3b, 7a, 8b and

---

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

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

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

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

9a (*foldum*), on the other hand, are more problematic. As Dobbie has argued, they are probably to be understood as corruptions introduced into the *ylda* version of the poem at the time it was first translated into West-Saxon:

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

In marking their texts, the scribes of the *ylda*-recension appear to have recognised these difficulties. The corruptions which Dobbie suggests render the poem as a whole difficult if not impossible to construe – *gehwilc*, line 3b, *middangearde*, line 7a, *tida*, line 8b, and *foldum* line 9a – are marked off from the rest of the poem in all twelfth-century or earlier witnesses except **W**. All scribes except **W** isolate the ungrammatical *wundra gehwilc* with points preceding and following the clause in which it occurs (lines 3b-4b). The scribes of **H Mg** and **Ln** set off *middangearde*, line 7a, *tida*, line 8b and *foldum* line 9a, all of which are found in the last three lines of the poem, with a point after the last readily sensible clause, interpreted as *He ærest gesceop... heofon to hrofe*, lines 5-6a, in **H** and **Mg**, and *he ærust ge scop... halig scyppend*, lines 5-6b in **Ln**. As noted above, the scribe of **W** isolates the final lines of the poem with a point after the last recognisable verb in the text, *ge sceop*, line 5a.

Taken together, this consistency in the substantive details of their common text and innovation in the interpretative details of their individual punctuation suggest that the scribes

---

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

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

of the *ylda*-recension of "Cædmon's Hymn" understood what they were copying, recognised that their text was flawed, but were unwilling or not allowed to fix its errors. That the scribes of this recension placed a premium on accuracy of reproduction is also suggested, moreover, by their general dialectal and orthographic uniformity. In addition to its single substantive textual variant, the substitution of the stressed **W** *word* for **H Bd Ln Mg** *ord*, line 4, the four recoverable eleventh and twelfth-century witnesses to the *ylda*-recension contain the following accidental variants:

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

Leaving aside the corrections of minor scribal errors (most of which are found in the work of the somewhat careless **W** scribe), we are left with twenty variants which might be described as representing genuine phonological or orthographic differences: four examples of alteration

between *y*:*i* (lines 2a, 3b, 6b and 9b),[69] five examples of the confusion of medial or final vowels (*u* and *o*, lines 2a and 3a; *e*, *u*, and *æ*, line 5a; *e* and *o*, line 6a),[70] one example of late West-Saxon smoothing between *w* and *r* (line 3a),[71] one example of diphthongisation by an initial palatal (line 5a),[72] one example of the falling together of *ī* and *ig* (line 9b),[73] one example of a back spelling *ea* for West-Saxon *æ* (line 9b),[74] two examples of the loss of consonants (*h*-, line 6a and *-g*-, line 7a), one example of the graphic simplification of geminates (line 7b),[75]and three differences in the orthographic representation of similar sounds (*k* : *c*, line 7b; and *ch* : *c*, lines 4a and 8a). On the whole, this suggests that the scribes of the West-Saxon *ylda*-recension were a relatively careful group of copyists, writing a fairly standard dialect – and it is tempting to attribute the lack of substantive variation they introduce into their texts to their perhaps unusual interest in preserving the literal details of their exemplars.

That this was not the principal reason for their substantive accuracy, however, is demonstrated by the similarly low level of substantive variation found between the two surviving witnesses to the Old English metrical translation of Psalms 90:16-95:2. Whereas in the *ylda*-recension of "Cædmon's Hymn," the lack of substantive variation between witnesses was matched by a similar stability in the accidental details of orthography and dialect, in the case of Psalms 90:16.1-95:2.1, the substantive stability of the text occurs in the face of wholesale orthographic and dialectal variation.

---

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

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

[71]Campbell, *OEG*, §321.

[72]Campbell, *OEG*, §181.

[73]See Campbell, *OEG*, §267.

[74]Cf. Campbell, *OEG*, §329.2.

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

Parallel texts of the Old English metrical translation of Psalms 90:16.1-95:2.1 survive in two manuscripts, the Paris Psalter (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Lat. 8824, **PPs**) and Cambridge, Trinity College, R. 17. 1 (**EPs**), a manuscript known variously as "Eadwine's Psalter," "The Canterbury Psalter," and "Eadwine's Canterbury Psalter."[76] In both witnesses, the Old English text appears alongside a Latin version of the Psalms. In **PPs**, Psalms 90:16.1-95:2.1 are found as part of a continuous prose and verse translation of the Psalter which has been copied in parallel columns alongside the Roman text in a single hand.[77] In **EPs**, the equivalent text is found at the appropriate place of an otherwise lexical interlinear gloss to the Roman version. This Psalter, an elaborate production with three versions of the Latin text in parallel columns, marginal scholia and Latin glosses, and interlinear Old French and Old English translations, is the work of numerous scribes.[78] The metrical Old English portion of the interlinear gloss has been copied in a hand different from those responsible for both the

---

[75]Campbell, *OEG*, §66.

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

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

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

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

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

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

[80]Baker, "Variant Text," pp. 270-71; Kenneth Sisam and Celia Sisam, "The Psalm Texts," in: *The Paris Psalter*, Colgrave, ed., pp. 15-17 at p. 17. In addition, Baker and the Sisams suggest that the odd word division of the tag *worulda woruld* (**PPs** *woruld aworuld* **EPs** *worul æwor*ł) in Psalm 91:6.6 in both manuscripts may be derived from an earlier common exemplar (see "Variant Text," p. 270 and "The Psalm Texts," p. 17 and fn. 68). This word-division can be paralleled elsewhere, however, and is equally likely to be the result of chance. Cf. "Gloria I" **Jn$_{121}$** *onworuld aworuld* **CC$_{201}$** *on worlda world*, line 41a.

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

93:15.2b; **EPs** *eælle* (**PPs** *ealle*), Psalm 91:8.2b;[82] and for unstressed *e* and *o* in inflectional endings, prepositions, and pronouns: **EPs** *On|findæn* (for *onfinden*, present subjunctive plural; **PPs** *Onfindað*, plural imperative), Psalm 93:8.1a; **EPs** *syndæn* (**PPs** *syndon*), Psalm 92:6.1a. Conversely, the Kentish spelling *e* is generally preferred to West-Saxon *æ̆*: **EPs** *er* (**PPs** *ær*), Psalm 94:11.2a; **EPs** *cweð* (**PPs** *cwæð*), Psalm 94:10.3a;[83] Non-Kentish features include: the use of *io* for both *i̯o* and *e̯o* (obscuring the normal later Kentish distinction between *īo* [from historical *īo* and *ēo*] and *e̯o* [from historical *i̯o* and *e̯o*]): e.g. **EPs** *sni ome* **PPs** *sneome* (historical *īo*), Psalm 93:18.3b; **EPs** *stiop cildæ* **PPs** *steopcil|da* (for historical *ēo*), Psalm 93:6.2a[84]; and the use of *i* rather than the *e* for West-Saxon 'festes' and 'unfestes' *y* (**PPs** *y*): **EPs** *hige* **PPs** *hyge*, Psalm 94:10.4b; **EPs** *sindon* **PPs** *syndon*, Psalm 93:8.2b.[85]

Other differences separating the two recensions include: the sporadic omission of final vowels in **EPs**: **EPs** *oðð þe* (**PPs** *oðð**e** þe*), Psalm 91:3.3a; **EPs** *Ahefðe|* (**PPs** *A hef**e** þe*), Psalm 93:2.1a; **EPs** *gefultumed|* (**PPs** *geful|tume**d**e*), Psalm 93:15.2a; minim errors and other graphic mistakes in the use of consonants: **EPs** *þo**nnn**e* (for expected *þo**nn**e* as in **PPs**), Psalm 91:6.1a; **EPs** *ðe**ð*** (for *þe**t***, **PPs** *þæt*), Psalm 93:8.1a; **EPs** ***H**efre* (for ***n**efre*, **PPs** ***N**æfre*), Psalm 93:12.1a; reverse spellings, assimilations and the spurious addition of consonants: **PPs** *geo**n*** (for **EPs** *geo**nd***), Psalm 90:16.2b; **EPs** *cneo**wr**isse* (for **PPs** *cneo**r**isse*), Psalm 94:9.4a; **EPs** *sin*

---

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

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

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

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

*ni**ng**ræ* (for **PPs** *synni**g**ra*), Psalm 91:6.2a; **EPs** *u**rr**iht* (for **PPs** *u**nr**iht*), Psalm 93:13.2a; **EPs** *onworu**l** æwor**ł*** (for *on worul**d**æ woruld*, **PPs** *onworul**d** aworuld*), Psalm 91:6.6a; **EPs** *meæ**h**|* (for *meæ**ht***, **PPs** *miht*), Psalm 93:1.1b; **PPs** *fo**w**eor|það* (for *fo**rw**eorþað*, **EPs** *for weorðæð*), Psalm 91:8.2b; **EPs** *eæ**lr**e*, corrected from *eæ**ll**e* (for **PPs** *ea**lr**a*), Psalm 93:8.2b; **EPs** *æ**gh**ylcne* (for **PPs** *æ**ghw**ylcne*), Psalm 93:1.2b; **PPs** *æ**gh**ær* (for *æ**ghw**ær*, **EPs** *æghwer*), Psalm 91:9.3b; **EPs** *ge**w**erfeþ* corrected from *geferfeþ* (for *ge**hw**erfeþ*, **PPs** *gehw|yrfed*), Psalm 93:13.1b; dittography and eye-skip: **PPs** ***heaheh**sta* (for ***heah**esta*, **EPs** *heæhste*), Psalm 91:7.2a; **EPs** *Forðon is se|* ***micla god kining**.| ofer eall| manne| godu* (for: *Forðon is se* ***micla god mihtig drihten ⁊ se micla kining*** *ofer eall manne godu*; cf. **PPs** *Forðon isse* ***micla| god mihtig drihten| ⁊se micla cynincg***| *ofer eall mannagodu*), Psalm 94:3.1a-2b.

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

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

Textual Variants

Inflectional Difference (5 examples)

MPs (PPs/EPs), 91:8.1a

PPs

1 Þ inuðin**e** feond fæc|ne drihten
oneorð|wege ealle foweor|það.
ꝛweorðað to wre|cene wide ealle
þaþe| unrihtes æror worh|tan;|

EPs

1 hinu ðin**re** feond fæcne| drihten
on eorðwege| eælle for weorðæð.
ꝛ| weorðæþ to|wrecene wide| eælle
ðæ þæunriht es| eror worhtæn|

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

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

The most likely explanation for the **EPs** form is as a back-spelling of the assimilation of *r*. Examples of assimilation involving *r* in this manuscript include: **EPs** *u**rr**iht* (**PPs** *u**nr**iht*), Psalm 93:13.2a, and **EPs** *eæl**r**e* corrected from *eæl**l**e* (**PPs** *ea**lr**a*), Psalm 93:8.2b.

MPs (PPs/EPs), 93:2.1a

PPs

1 A hef**e** þe onellen. eor|þan dema
gyld ofer| hydigum swa hi æ̀r| grame worhton;|

EPs

1 Ahefðe| onhellen eorðæn demæ.|
gild ofer hidegum| swæ hi er| græmæ| worhton

Exaltare qui iudicas terram redde retributionem superbis

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

[87]Sievers-Brunner, §372 Anm.

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

***MPs* (PPs/EPs), 93:8.1a**

PPs	**EPs**
1 O nfind**að** þæt ȝongeo|tan. þeonfolce nu____ _un|wiseste ealra syndon| dysigehwæt hwygu deopeþæt oncnawan.|	1 On|find**æn** ðeð. ȝon geoton| þe onfolce nu unwiseste| eælre sindon||| disige hwethwygu. deope| þet oncnæwæn.

Intelligite nunc qui insipientes estis in populo et stulti aliquando sapite

PPs *Onfindað* is a plural imperative; **EPs** *On|findæn* a plural present subjunctive (with *æ* for *e*). While the use of an imperative plural places the first verb of the **PPs** text into closer agreement with the Latin Psalm, the plural present subjunctive in **EPs** is consistent with the tense and mood of the second, rhetorically parallel, verb in both witnesses: **EPs** *on geoton* **PPs** *ongeo|tan* (with *a* and *o* for *e* respectively).[88] As Baker remarks in his note to the line:

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

There are two explanations for this variant. Either the translation of both Latin imperative plurals by Old English subjunctive plurals is an innovation in the tradition represented by **EPs** – an innovation which has subsequently but only partially been adopted in the **PPs** tradition – or the imperative plural in **PPs** represents the innovation (presumably

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

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

through the influence of the accompanying Latin) while the original translator of the Psalms used plural subjunctives to translate the Latin imperatives. That the second possibility is the most likely – and that the influence of the Latin text in **PPs** was unconscious – is suggested by the inconsistency of **PPs**. Had the **PPs** scribe *intended* either to adapt his text to follow the reading of the **EPs** or to alter his text to make it more like the Latin verses it translates, we would have expected to find similar changes in *both* verbs.[90]

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

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

Nisi quia dominus adiuvasset me paulominus habitaverat in inferno anima mea

EPs *gefultumed* (for **PPs** *geful|tumede*) is one of three examples of the loss of final *-e* in the **EPs** version of Psalms 90:16.1-95:2.1, presumably in this case by anticipation of the end of the manuscript line. The two other examples of the loss of this letter are similarly graphic, eyeskip being the most likely explanation in each case (**EPs** *oðð þe* : **PPs** *oððe þe*, Psalm 91:3.3a, p. 34, above, and **EPs** *Ahefðe* **PPs** *A hefe þe*, Psalm 93:2.1a, above p. 36).

As the context requires an inflected verb, the **PPs** reading is to be preferred. Both forms make acceptable metre, however. In **PPs** *geful|tumede* is either Type C-1 line (with resolution of the second lift) or (with the syncopation of *-um-* after a long syllable) Type C-2.[91] In **EPs**, *gefultumed* can only be scanned as Type C-2.

[90]This sort of linkage is an important feature of the variation between witnesses of multiply-attested poems in the major anthologies. See below, Chapter 4. There is one example among the poems discussed in this chapter, **Jn$_{121}$** *haliges gastes* **CC$_{201}$** *halige gastas*, "Gloria I," l.43b. See below, p. 66

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

***MPs* (PPs/EPs), 93:16.1a**

PPs

1 G ific **þæs** sægde. þmin| sylfes fot.
ful sarli|ce asliden nære
þame| mildheortnes mihti|gan drihtnes
gefultu|mede þicfeorh ahte.|

EPs

1 Gif ic **ðet**| segde. þ min silfes fot.|
ful sarlice. asliden| nere.
þæ me mildheortnes| mihtigan drihtnes
gefultumede þic| feorh ahte.

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

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

Substitution of Unstressed Words and Elements (3 examples)

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

PPs

1 **Þ i**nuðine feond fæc|ne drihten
on eorð|wege ealle foweor|það.
ȝ weorðað to wre|cene wide ealle
þaþe| unrihtes æror worh|tan;

EPs

1 **hinu** ðinre feond fæcne| drihten
on eorðwege| eælle for weorðæð.
ȝ| weorðæþ to| wrecene wide| eælle
ðæ þæunriht es| eror worhtæn|

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

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

---

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

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

Baker suggests that **PPs** has the better reading – albeit without recognising the possibility that **EPs** *hinu* might be for *heonu*.[94] *Þi* occurs in a similar sense on two other occasions in the metrical Psalms (Psalm 58:3.1 *Þi nu mine sawle,* Lat. *quia*; and Psalm 72:10.1 *Þinu fyren fulle fol|dan æhta*, Lat. *ecce*). Baker suggests that the variation between *h* and *þ* can be explained graphically.[95]

***MPs* (PPs/EPs), 93:9.6b**

PPs	**EPs**
5 ȝ seþe| ege healdeð eallum| þeodum ȝhis þrea| nesí **<u>þær</u>** for awiht| se þe men læreð| micelne wisdom.|	5 ȝ seðe ege healdað. eallum| ðeodum. ȝ his ðrea| nesio **<u>þæ</u>**[96]for awiht| seðe men læreð micel| ne wisdom|

Qui corripit gentes non arguet qui docet hominem scientiam

EPs *þæ* is presumably for the unstressed adverb *þa* ‘then’. **PPs** *þær* is a locative/temporal adverb ‘there/then’. The two words are syntactically and metrically equivalent and both make good sense in context.

***MPs* (PPs/EPs), 94:7.2a**

PPs	**EPs**
2 <u>wæ|r**un**</u> wehis fælefolc| ȝhis fægere sceap	2 <u>wer**um**</u> we his fele folc‖ ȝhis fægere sceæp.|

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

EPs *werum* is ostensibly the dative plural of *wer* ‘man’. **PPs** *wæ|run* is the plural preterite indicative of *bēon* ‘to be’ (with *u* for unstressed *a*). As a verb is required by context, the **EPs** reading is almost certainly the result of a minim error. Metrically, **PPs** is Type A-3(2b). As *werum* ‘by/to/for men’ would be stressed, the equivalent line in **EPs** is unmetrical.

---

[94]Baker, “Variant Text,” p. 279.

[95]Baker, “Variant Text,” p. 279.

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

Substitution of Stressed Words and Elements (4 examples)

***MPs* (PPs/EPs), 93:4.2b**

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

Pronuntiabunt et loquentur iniquitatem loquentur omnes qui operantur iniustitiam

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

***MPs* (PPs/EPs), 93:18.1a**

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

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

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

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

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

PPs

1 N uic feowertig folce| þyssum
wintra ri|mes wunade neah.
áá. ȝsymble cwæð ȝ|eac swa oncneow___
_þ| híonheortan hyge| dys**egedan**.|

EPs

1 Nu ic| feow ertig folce ðyssū|
wintra rimes. wunedæ| neah
áá ȝsimble cweð.| ȝeac ȝ swa on cneow.|
þet hi on heo rtan hige dis**egan**.|

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

EPs *disegan* is the present subjunctive plural (with *a* for unstressed *e* in the final syllable) of *dys(i)gan* 'act foolishly, blaspheme'; **PPs** is the plural preterite indicative (with *a* for *o*) or subjunctive (with *a* for *e*). As Baker notes, the **EPs** reading "stands closer to the reading of the Roman Psalter (*errant*),"[97] while **PPs** makes better metre. In **PPs**, the line is Type D-1 line with resolution in both principal lifts; in **EPs**, the line is unmetrical. Either **EPs** is the result of the influence of the Latin text, or **PPs** has been altered to improve the metre. Examples of the graphic influence of the Latin text in **EPs** are discussed below, pp. 43, 44, 45 and 46. In Psalm 93:8.1a, the Latin Psalm appears to have affected the tense and mood of **PPs** *Onfindað*. See above, p. 37.

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

PPs

1 H íwegas mine wihte| neoncneowan
þætic| ær on yrre aðebe|nemde
gifhíonmi|ne reste **ricene**| eodon|||

EPs

1 hi wegæs mine wihte| neon cneowan.
þ ic er on| yrre æðe be nemde
gif hi on mine| reste. **ricenedon**| eodon.||

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

PPs *ricene* is an adverb 'instantly'. **EPs** *ricenedon* is ostensibly the third person plural preterite of *recenian* 'to pay, recount'. While both forms are metrically possible, the **EPs** form is syntactically and sensically impossible. It is presumably to be explained as eyeskip (*ricen**e** **e**odon* > *ricenedon*) or an anticipation of the ending of the next word, *eodon*.

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

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

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

MPs (PPs/Eps), 90:16.3b

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

***MPs* (PPs/Eps), 91:1.1b**

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

Bonum est confiteri domino et psallere nomini tuo altissime

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

***MPs* (PPs/Eps), 94:2.1a**

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

Preoccupemus faciem eius in confessione et in psalmis iubilemus ei

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

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

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

***MPs* (PPs/Eps), 94:10.3b**

PPs

1 N uic feowertig folce| þyssum
wintra ri|mes wunade neah.
áá. ȝsymble cwæð ȝ|eac swa oncneow____
_þ| híonheortan hyge| dysegedan.|

EPs

1 Nu ic| feow ertig folce ðyssū|
wintra rimes. wunedæ| neah
áá ȝsimble cweð.| ȝeac ⊐ swa on cneow.|
þet hi on heor tan hige disegan.|

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

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

Addition/Omission of Prefixes (1 example)

***MPs* (PPs/Eps), 93:13.2b**

EPs

1 H wylc þonne gen a___gehw|yrfed byð.
þæt he on| unriht eft ne cyrre|
oððe hwylc nymeðme| þic mán fleo.
ȝmid| riht heortū rædes| þence;

PPs

1 hwilc ðonne gena gewerfeþ| bið
þ he on urriht eft ne| **on** cyrre.
oððe wilc nimeð| me þet ic| man fleo.
ȝmid| riht heo rtum| redes ðence

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

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

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

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

will increase their punishments, if they do not reform first at the end' (Homl.S.13).[105] The prefix falls on the medial dip of a Type A-1 line; its addition or omission is metrically insignificant.

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

MPs (PPs/Eps), 92:7.1a

PPs

1 Þ ingewitnes is weor|cum geleafsum
ꝯmid| soðe is swiðegetreowed.|

EPs

1 þin ge|witnes is **drihten** weorcū ge|leæfsum.
ꝯmid soðe is swiðe| getrewæþ

Testimonia tua domine credibilia facta sunt nimis

The addition of *drihten* takes **EPs** closer to the Latin text of the Psalm, but breaks the metre. In **PPs**, Psalm 92:7.1a is Type B-1; in **EPs**, the equivalent line is unmetrical. As Baker suggests, the addition is almost certainly the result of the influence of the Latin text.[106] The word is written above and slightly to the left of Latin *domine*. For the addition or ꝯ to **EPs** under similar circumstances, see above, pp. 43, 44, and 45.[107]

MPs (PPs/Eps), 93:18.2a

PPs

1 N eæt fyligeð þé ahwær| facen ne unriht
ðu||| ge fæstnast facen| sares.

EPs

1 Ne etfligeð| þe æhwe r____facen ne unriht|
þu ge festnæst **eæc**.| facen sares.

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

The addition or omission of **EPs** *eæc* (i.e. *eac*) 'also' has a significant effect on metre, but none on sense or syntax. The adverb is not found in the equivalent portion of the Latin text, an adjective clause introduced by *qui*, and is a fairly colourless sentence adverb.[108] As the last word of the half line, *eæc* takes a full stress and serves as the last lift of a Type B-1 verse in

---

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

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

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

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

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

Addition/Omission across Line Boundaries (1 example)

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

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

Quoniam deus magnus dominus et rex magnus super omnes deos

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

Rearrangement of Elements within the Line (1 example)

***MPs* (PPs/Eps), 93:7.1b**

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

Et dixerunt non videbit dominus nec intelliget deus iacob

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

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

the **EPs** reading is grammatically possible, it is non-sensical in context. The subject of *gesawe*/*sæwe* is *drihten* line 93:7.2a.

The line is Type A-3 in both manuscripts (an unusual type for the off-verse). The rearrangement has no effect on metre.

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

Two other metrically regular multiply-attested poems are found in manuscripts of the Latin texts they "gloss": the Northumbrian *aeldu*-recension of "Cædmon's Hymn," and a second, brief fragment from the metrical translation of the Psalms in the Paris and Eadwine Psalters (Psalm 142:9).[110] Although these poems are obviously ultimately related to those discussed above, their witnesses are, with the exception of the **PPs** version of Psalm 142:9, textually independent. The Northumbrian *aeldu*- and West-Saxon *ylda*-recensions of "Cædmon's Hymn" share some key readings, but a direct connection between the two texts is ruled out on the grounds of date, dialect, and the existence of a number of recensional differences.[111] Similarly, while Psalm 142:9 and Psalms 90:16.1-95:2.1 have been copied in

[110]Two other versions of "Cædmon's Hymn" are found in copies of the Latin *Historia*. One, a Northumbrian text similar to that of the West-Saxon *eorðan*-recension (the Northumbrian *eordu*-recension) is found in three continental manuscripts of the *Historia*, all of which can be traced to a single insular exemplar: Dijon, Bibliothèque Municipale 574 (**Di**), Paris Bibliothèque Nationale, 5237 (**P_1**), and Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale, 8245-57 (**Br**). The identification of **Br** and a discussion of the relationships between these witnesses can be found in my article, "A Northumbrian Version of 'Cædmon's Hymn' (*eordu*-recension) in Brussels Bibliothèque Royale Manuscript 8245-57, ff. $62r^2$-v^1: Identification, Edition and Filiation,' forthcoming in *New Essays on the Venerable Bede*, ed. A.A. MacDonald and L. Houwen.

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

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

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

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

"Cædmon's Hymn" (*aeldu*-recension)

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

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

---

[112]See below, p. 53.

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

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

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

caedmon istud carmen, and is surrounded by chronological notes on Northumbrian history, and glosses to a number of Latin words and phrases, all but one of which are found in *Historia*.[116]

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

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

The witnesses to this recension of the Hymn contain only two points, each unique to the witness in which it occurs (Table 4). In **L**, the sole mark of punctuation comes at the end of the text after line 9b. In **M**, a point after line 6b separates the third clause of this recension, *thamiddun geard... frea allmectig* from the preceding text (Table 2). In her discussion of the punctuation in the various recensions of "Cædmon's Hymn," O'Keeffe suggests that the light punctuation these two witnesses exhibit is indicative of the transitional nature of the responsible scribes' literacy:

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

Textual Variants

Substitution of Unstressed Words (1 example)

***Cæd*(*aeldu*), 6a**

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

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

Substitution of Stressed Words (1 example)

***Cæd*(*aeldu*), 6a**

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

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

---

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

[122]See above, fn. 121.

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

[127]Campbell, *OEG*, §66.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

[133]**B_1**, a manuscript of the Old English translation of the *Historia*, for example, also contains copies of two multiply-attested poems in its margins in addition to a version of the *eorðan*-recension of "Cædmon's

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

"Fragments of Psalms"

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

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

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

Textual Variants

Inflectional Difference (3 examples)

MPs (Jn$_{121}$/PPs), 58:1.3b

Jn$_{121}$	**PPs**
3 alysme fram| laðum þeme **<u>lugeon</u>**. risanwillað nymþe| þume ræd gife.|	3 alysme| fram laðum. þeme| **<u>lungre on</u>** _risan wil|lað. nymðeþu me ræd| geofe;|||

et ab insurgentibus in me libera me

Jn$_{121}$ *lugeon* (**PPs** *lungre on*) appears to be the result of the scribal misapprehension of the poetic adverb *lungre* 'immediately' and the sentence adverb *on*, perhaps as the preterite

[135]On the other hand, **PPs** has *sawl* for **J** *sawul* in Ps 118.175.1a.

plural of the strong 2 verb *lēogan* ‘deceive, belie, betray’.[136] This makes acceptable sense in context but is unmetrical. In **PPs**, Psalm 58:1.3b is a Type B-1 line with the *lungre* and *on* taking stress.

***MPs* (Jn$_{121}$/PPs), 89:18.3b**

Jn$_{121}$	**PPs**
1 G eseoh| þine scealcas swǽsum eagum.	1 B eseohon þinesceal|cas___swæsūeagū
ꝯonþin| agenweorc écedrihten.	ꝯon| þinagen weorc ece| drihten.
ꝯheorabearn| geréce bliðum móde.	ꝯheora be|arngerece____bliðe mode.|

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

Jn$_{121}$ *bliðum* is dative singular; **PPs** *bliðe* is instrumental singular. This is a common variation in Old English and has no appreciable effect on sense, metre, or syntax.[137] For a further example, see “Prayer,” line 10b, p. 74, below.

***MPs* (Jn$_{121}$/PPs), 102:5.4b**

Jn$_{121}$	**PPs**
1 Heðe gesige fæste. soðre mildse	1 H eþegesige fæste soðre||| miltse
ꝯðe mild|||heorte mode getrymede.	ꝯðemildhe|orte. mode getry|mede
eart ðu edniwe| éarne gelicost.	eart þu edneo|we earne gelicast|
ongeoguðe. nu. gleaw geworden.|	ongeogoðe nú gleawe| ge worden.

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

In **Jn$_{121}$**, *gleaw* is an adjective ‘keen’ serving as the complement of *geworden*, parallel to *gelicost* in line 3; in **PPs**, the complement of *ge worden* is *gelicast* and *gleawe* is either an adverb ‘keenly’ or the weak form of the nominative singular masculine adjective (with *e* for

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

[137] Mitchell, *OES*, §1345.

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

Substitution of Unstressed Words and Elements (1 example)

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

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

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

In **Jn$_{121}$**, the subject of the sentence is the nominative singular demonstrative adjective *S e*. In **PPs**, it is the nominative singular third person masculine form of the personal pronoun, *H e*. In **Jn$_{121}$**, Psalm 102:4.1a is presented formally an adjective clause modifying *drihten*, Psalm 102:1.1. This is the same syntax as the Latin Psalm. In **PPs**, the equivalent text is presented as a principal clause. Of the two readings, however, **PPs** is to be preferred. In the syntactically parallel Psalms 102:3 and 102:5, both **PPs** and **Jn$_{121}$** begin with *he*, despite the use of the relative pronoun *qui* in the corresponding Latin text.[138] As in the case of the inflectional variation **PPs** *Onfindað* **EPs** *On\|findæn* in Psalm 93:8.1a (discussed above, p. 37), the **Jn$_{121}$** form is probably to be ascribed to the influence of the Latin text. Had the scribe responsible for the innovation in the **Jn$_{121}$** tradition intended to alter his text, we would expect the translation of Psalms 102:3 and 102:5 to begin with *se* as well. Perhaps significantly, the initial *Q* in Psalm 102:4 is of a different type from that found at the beginning of the preceding and following verse.[139]

---

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

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

Substitution of Prefixes (1 example)

***MPs* (Jn$_{121}$/PPs), 89:18.1a**

Jn$_{121}$	**PPs**
1 **G eseoh**| þine scealcas swæsum eagum.	1 **B eseoh**on þinesceal|cas___swæsūeagū
ȝonþin| agenweorc écedrihten.	ȝon| þinagen weorc ece| drihten.
ȝheorabearn| geréce bliðum móde.	ȝheora be|arngerece____bliðe mode.|

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

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

Substitution of Stressed Words and Elements (1 example)

***MPs* (Jn$_{121}$/PPs), 89:15.2b**

Jn$_{121}$	**PPs**
1 G ehweorfus hwæthwygu. halig drihten.	1 G ehweorf ushwæ hwi|ga haligdrihten|
wes| ðinum scealcum wel eað **bene**.	wes þinum scealcū| wel eað **beḍe**.|

Conuertere domine aliquantulum et deprecabilis esto super seruos tuos

The uncorrected form in **PPs**, *eaðmede* ‘humble’, while generally suited to a religious context, does not fit the specific text of this Psalm. The corrected form, **PPs** *eað beḍe* ‘easily entreated’, is synonymous with **EPs** form *eað bene*.[141] As the point under the *d* of the **PPs** form suggests, however, the scribe appears to have intended to go further and correct his original form to *eað bene*, but stopped – either because he forgot to complete his correction by adding the *n* or because he recognised that his half-corrected form was synonymous with the reading of his exemplar. The variation does have a slight effect on the metre. **Jn$_{121}$** and the uncorrected **PPs** reading both produce Type D-1 lines; in its corrected form, the **PPs** line is a Type D-2.

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[142]Mitchell, *OES*, §2846.

[143]Mitchell, *OES*, §3968.

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

***MPs* (Jn$_{121}$/PPs), 89:18.1a**

Jn$_{121}$

1 G eseoh| þine scealcas swǽsum eagum.
ꝯonþin| agenweorc écedrihten.
ꝯheorabearn| geréce bliðum móde.

PPs

1 B eseoh**<u>on</u>** þinesceal|cas___swæsūeagū
ꝯon| þinagen weorc ece| drihten.
ꝯheora be|arngerece____bliðe mode.|

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

The addition or omission of *on* has a minimal effect on sense and syntax. Although *on* is often found with *besēon*, it is not required: e.g. *beseoh (respice) and gehyr me* (Psalm 12:3).[145] As it occurs on the internal dip of a Type A-1 line the addition has no significant effect on metre.

Rearrangement of Elements within the Line (1 example)

***MPs* (Jn$_{121}$/PPs), 69:1.2a**

Jn$_{121}$ (f.43v)

1 W es drihtengod. deore fultum
beheald| **<u>drihtenme</u>**. ꝯmehraðe syððan
geful|tuma æt feorh þearfe.|

PPs

1 W es drihten god. de|ore fultum.
be he|ald **<u>drihten me</u>** ꝯ| me hraðe syþþan|
ge fultuma æt| feorh þearfe;

Jn$_{121}$ (f.51r)

1 W es drihtengod deore| fultum.
beheald **<u>medrihten</u>**. ꝯmehraðe| syððan.
gefultuma æt feorh þearfe.|

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

The variation in the order of *drihten* and *me* between **Jn$_{121}$** (f.43v) and **PPs**, and **Jn$_{121}$** (f.51r) has an important effect on metre but none on sense or syntax. To the extent that the line is metrical at all, the reading of **PPs** and **Jn$_{121}$** f.43v is a particularly heavy Type D-4 with anacrusis, *beheald*, *drihten*, and *me* all taking a full stress. **Jn$_{121}$** f.51r, however, is a slightly more regular Type A-1 with anacrusis. A distinctive feature of all three versions is the use of the inflected verb *beheald* for alliteration in preference to the stressed noun *drihten*.[146]

---

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

[146]The more usual pattern, corresponding to the **PPs** and **Jn$_{121}$** f.43v readings without the anomalous alliteration, is to be seen in Psalms 69:1.1a *Wes drihten god* and 64:6.1a *Gehyr us hælend god*. Both are Type B-1.

"Gloria I"

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

expected *þancung* (as in **CC$_{201}$**) , line 45b. **CC$_{201}$** has one obvious uncorrected error not in **Jn$_{121}$**, **CC$_{201}$** *heriað heriað* by dittography in line 36a, and the two manuscripts have what appear to be three inflectional errors in common: an oblique forms (-)*frofre* for expected the expected nominative singular (-)*frofor* (two times, lines 13a and 15b), and the use of the strong accusative singular masculine form of *halig* to modify a feminine accusative singular noun *heortlufan* in line 29a, *halig**ne** heortlufan* (both witnesses).

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

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

Textual Variants

Inflectional Difference (5 examples)

Glor I, 5a

Jn$_{121}$

Syþe wuldor ꝯlof. wide| geopenod.
geond ealleþeoda. þanc ꝯwylla|
mægen ꝯmildse. ꝯealles modes lufu
soð| fæstra sib. ꝯðines sylfes dom.
5 worulde| gewlitegod. swaðu wealdan miht.
eall eorðan| mægen ꝯuplyfte.
wind ꝯwolcna.

CC$_{201}$

Sy þe wuldor ꝯlof. widege opnod.
geond ealle þeoda. þanc ꝯwilla.|
mægen ꝯmildse. ꝯealles modeslufu.
soð fæs tra sib. ꝯþines-| -silfes dóm.
5 world gewlitegod. swaþu wealdan miht.
eall eorðan -| mægen. ꝯup lifte
wind. ꝯwolcna

The variants **Jn$_{121}$** *worulde* **CC$_{201}$** *world* reflect either a difference in case or a simple variation in declensional forms. As a feminine *i*-stem, *woruld* can be declined with an accusative in *-e* or *-∅*, although the endingless form is more common in the poem (the accusative singular of *woruld* occurs twice more in "Gloria I" and is endingless in both manuscripts both times: see lines 34a and 41a).

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

Glor I, 7b

Jn$_{121}$		**CC$_{201}$**	
7	wealdest| eall onriht.	7	wealdest eall**e** on riht.|

Jn$_{121}$ *eall* is the object of *wealdan*: "You wield all [things] for the best."[151] **CC$_{201}$** *ealle* is used adverbially with an absolute form of the verb: "You rule entirely for the best."[152] The addition or omission of the ending has little effect on the metre. It falls in the second dip of a Type E* line in both manuscripts and metrical parallels for both lines can be found elsewhere in the corpus, e.g. (for **Jn$_{121}$**) *ēcan līfes blǣd*, *Seafarer* line 79b; (for **CC$_{201}$**) *hrūsan heolstre bewrāh*, *Wanderer*, line 23a.

---

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

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

***Glor I*, 43b**

Jn$_{121}$

ȝ onworuld aworuld wúnað. ȝrixað
cyning| innanwúldre. ȝhis þagecorenan.
héah|þrýnnesse halig**es** gast**es**.
wlítige énglas.| ȝwuldorgyfe.
45 soð esibbe. sawla þan gung.|
modes miltse.

CC$_{201}$

And on worlda world. wunað ȝrixað.
cyninc innan wuldre.| ȝhis þa ge corenan.
heah þrymnesse. halig**e** gast**as**.|
wlitige englas. ȝwuldorgife.
45 soðe sibbe. sawla þáncung.|
modes mildse.

This is the only variant in the poems discussed in this chapter in which syntactically coordinated and necessary ("linked") changes are made to more than one element in the text. In **CC$_{201}$**, *halige gastas* is nominative plural and subject of *wunað* and *rixað*, line 41b, parallel to *cyninc*, line 42a, *ge corenan*, line 42b, *wlitige englas*, line 44a, *wuldorgife*, line 44b, *sibbe*, line 45a, *þáncung*, line 45b, and *mildse*, line 46a. In **Jn$_{121}$**, *haliges gastes* is (possessive) genitive singular modifying *héah|þrýnnesse*, line 43a. The variation has no effect on metre. The substitution **Jn$_{121}$** *héah|þrýnnesse* **CC$_{201}$** *heah þrymnesse* in line 43a is discussed below, p. 67.

***Glor I*, 47a**

Jn$_{121}$

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

CC$_{201}$

þarisseomæste lufu
halig dom**es**‖ heofonassyndon
þurh þine écan word æghwar fulle.|
swasynd þine mihta ofer middan eard.
50 swutole. ȝgesýne| þæt þuhig silf worhtest.

The variation **Jn$_{121}$** *halig|domas* **CC$_{201}$** *halig domes* is the result either of a difference in the interpretation of the syntax of the passage as a whole or of the falling together of *a* and *e* in unstressed syllables. If the **Jn$_{121}$** spelling is not the result of the confusion of unstressed *e* and *a*, then **Jn$_{121}$** *halig|domas* is nominative plural, and is to be read in syntactic apposition to *mæste lufu*, line 46b; if the variation is not intentional, however, the compound is genitive singular and functions as the object of *fulle*, line 48b. As Holthausen notes, the **CC$_{201}$** reading

shows a marked similarity to the *te deum*: *pleni sunt coeli et terra majestatis gloriae tuae,* and *haligdomes* is almost certainly to be preferred.[153]

***Glor I,* 55b**

Jn$_{121}$	**CC$_{201}$**
þuge|cyddest þ.	þugecyddest þ.
þaðu mihtig god. mán geworhtest.|	þaðu mihtiggod| mangeworhtest.
55 ȝhim ondydest. oruð. ȝsaw**ul**.	55 ȝhim ondydest orð ȝsaw**le**.
sealdest word| ȝgewitt. ȝwæstma gecynd.	sealdest word -| - ȝgewitt. ȝwæst magecynd.
cyddest þine cræftas|	cyddest þine cræftas.

Jn$_{121}$ *sawul* (adopted by all editors except Ure) is either the nominative singular or an example of an Anglian endingless accusative singular.[154] If intended for a nominative singular, it destroys the syntax of the sentence as an accusative is required by the context. **CC$_{201}$** *sawle* is accusative singular.

As *sāwol* has a long first syllable, the variation does not affect the metre of the line. Line 55b is Type A-1 in both manuscripts.

Substitution of Stressed Words and Elements (1 example)

***Glor I,* 43a**

Jn$_{121}$	**CC$_{201}$**
ȝ onworuld aworuld wúnað. ȝrixað	And on worlda world. wunað ȝrixað.
cyning| innanwúldre. ȝhis þagecorenan.	cyninc innan wuldre.| ȝhis þa ge corenan.
héah|**þrýnnesse** haliges gastes.	heah **þrymnesse**. halige gastas.|
wlítige énglas.| ȝwuldorgyfe.	wlitige englas. ȝwuldorgife.
45 soðesibbe. sawla þan gung.	45 soðe sibbe. sawla þáncung.|
modes miltse.	modes mildse.

The origin of this variant probably lies in the superficially liturgical appearance of the immediate context, compounded by the etymological confusion of *þrymness* and *þrynness* in late Old English.[155] At a purely lexical level, **Jn$_{121}$** *héah\|þrýnnesse* 'Holy Trinity' is an

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

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

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

appropriate choice for lines 41-46a. The remaining words and tags in these lines (all cited in their **Jn$_{121}$** form), *haliges gastes, onworuld aworuld, cyning innan wuldre, gecorenan* and *wlitige englas*, are all perfectly suited to a discussion of God and the Holy Trinity. As Roberta Frank has argued recently, moreover, *þrymnys* 'mightiness' (**CUL$_{Ffi27}$** *heah þrymnesse*) had become increasingly associated with *þrynnys* 'trinity' in late Old English.

The sense and syntax of the passage make clear, however, that lines 41-46a are concerned not with the makeup and nature of the Holy Trinity, but more generally with the inhabitants and perquisites of heaven. The words the **Jn$_{121}$** scribe appears to have associated with the Holy Trinity refer instead to the hosts of angels and souls in heaven. While **Jn$_{121}$** *héah|þrýnnesse* can be construed as an example of the analogical extension of *-e* to the nominative singular of feminine nouns (examples are reported by Campbell from all dialects except Kentish),[156] or, more regularly, as an oblique singular (**CUL$_{Ffi27}$** *heah þrymnesse* is dative or genitive singular), neither construction makes much sense in the local context of **Jn$_{121}$**. As a nominative plural, *héah|þrýnnesse* "High Trinities," would be too much of a good thing. But it makes just as little sense to speak in the dative or genitive singular of the "High Trinity *of the Holy Spirit*," **Jn$_{121}$** *héah|þrýnnesse haliges gastes*.

A better reading is to follow **CC$_{201}$** and take the nouns in lines 42-46a as roughly appositive to each other, serving together as the subjects of the plural verbs *wunað ȝrixað* in line 41b. In this reading *heahþrymnesse* is genitive or dative singular '(chosen bands) of high mightiness' or '(live and rule) through high mightiness', while *gecorenan*, *halige gastas* (as in **CUL$_{Ffi27}$**), and *wlitige englas* are all understood to refer to the hosts of angels and serve with

---

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

[156]Campbell, *OEG*, §592.f.

cyninc innan wuldre, ꝥwuldorgife, soðe sibbe, and *sawla þáncung* as the subject of the two verbs in line 41b.[157]

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

***Glor I*, 23b (2 variants)**

Jn$_{121}$	**CC$_{201}$ 20-23**
20 þusettest on| foldan. swyðe feala cynna.	20 þu settest onfoldan. swiðe fela cynna.|
ꝥtosyndrodosthig.| syððon onmænego.	ꝥtosyndrodesthig. siððan onmanega
þugewrohtest éce gód.| ealle gesceafta.	þuge worhtest. écegod| ealle gesceafta.
onsyx dagum. **ꝥonþone**| seofoðan þugerestest.	onsixdagū. seofoðan þuge restest.

The variation **Jn$_{121}$** *ꝥonþone*\| *seofoðan* : **CC$_{201}$** *seofoðan* involves two independent additions or omissions, both of which affect metre and syntax.

The first is the addition or omission of the conjunction *ond*. In **Jn$_{121}$** the clause *ꝥonþone*\| *seofoðan þugerestest* is related to the preceding clause *þugewrohtest... onsyx dagum* syndetically. In **CC$_{201}$**, the relationship of the equivalent clauses *þuge worhtest... onsixdagū* and *seofoðan þuge restest* is asyndetic. While the **CC$_{201}$** reading more "abrupt" as Ure has suggested, both forms of parataxis are common.[158]

The second addition or omission involves the preposition and definite article, **Jn$_{121}$** *onþone* **CC$_{201}$** ∅. In **Jn$_{121}$** an attempt appears to have been made to distinguish between duration of time and point in time through use of contrasting dative and accusative prepositional objects: **Jn$_{121}$** *onsyx dagum* (dative, duration of time), line 23a, **Jn$_{121}$** *onþone*\| *seofoðan* (accusative, point in time), line 23b. This is at odds with the conventional account of the idiom, in which the accusative is said to represent duration-in-time, and the dative, point-in-time. As Bruce Mitchell notes, however, this "classical" pattern does not always

[157]Dobbie and Ure read *heahþry**mn**esse halig**es** gast**es*** "with the high might of the Holy Ghost" for l. 43b, mixing the **Jn$_{121}$** and **CC$_{201}$** readings.

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

hold,[159] and the scribe of **Jn$_{121}$** or an exemplar may have found it sufficient simply to establish a grammatical distinction between the two phrases. The omission of *on þone* from **CC$_{201}$** is an example of the non-repetition of elements which can supplied from a coordinate clause, in this case, the preposition, demonstrative article and (as in **Jn$_{121}$**) noun *dæge*.[160]

Metrically, the **CC$_{201}$** reading is to be preferred, although most editors read **Jn$_{121}$**.[161] While the line is Type A-1 in both witnesses, **Jn$_{121}$** *ꝛonþone* adds an unusually heavy four-syllable anacrusis.

***Glor I*, 31a**

Jn$_{121}$
31 ꝛnu ꝓsýmble. þinesoðan weorc.
ꝛðinmy-|cele miht. manegum swytelað.
swaþine| cræftas héo. cýðaþ wíde.
ofer éalle wóruld.| éce stándeþ.

CC$_{201}$
31 Andnusymle þine soðan weorc.
ꝛþin micele miht manegū| swutelað.
swaþine cræftas híg cyðað wide.
ofer ealle world| ece standað.

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

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

***Glor I*, 48a**

Jn$_{121}$
þærisseo mæste lufu.
halig|domas heofonas syndon.
þurhþine écan| æghwær fulle.
swasyndon. þinemihta ofer| middan geard.
50 swutele ꝛgesyne ꝥ ðu hysylf| worhtest.

CC$_{201}$
þarisseomæste lufu
halig domes‖ heofonassyndon
þurh þine écan **word** æghwar fulle.|
swasynd þine mihta ofer middan eard.
50 swutole. ꝛgesýne| þæt þuhig silf worhtest.

The omission of *word* from **Jn$_{121}$** is almost certainly the result of a scribal error, perhaps by anticipation of the end of the manuscript line: *word* is necessary for sense and syntax, though the line is a metrically acceptable Type A-3 with the omission. For similar

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

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

[161]Dobbie, *ASPR* 6, p. 75; Ure, *Benedictine Office*, pp. 83 and 122. Holthausen for his part assumes the loss of material after *gerestest* and rearranges **Jn$_{121}$** as a Type B-1 line followed by a defective verse ("Zur Textkritik altenglischer Dichtungen," *ESt* 37 [1907]: 198-211, at 202):

examples of the loss of monosyllables from the final stress of Type B and E lines, see Psalm 83:18.2a (**PPs** ∅ **EPs** *eæc*, p. 46 above); and "Durham," line 6a (**Hickes** ∅ **CUL$_{Ffi27}$** *is*, p. 80 below).

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

***Glor I*, 13b**

Jn$_{121}$

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

CC$_{201}$

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

Lines 8-13 consists of a series of epithets for God the Father, God the Son (and, in **Jn$_{121}$**, God the Holy Spirit), arranged around the second person singular substantive verb *eart*, line 8a. The omission of *⁊h alig gast* by the scribe of **CC$_{201}$** is presumably the result of simple oversight, perhaps through anticipation of the Latin verse immediately following the line in both manuscripts. The omission corresponds to a metrical unit.

Reinterpretation of Existing Text (1 example)

***Glor I*, 26a**

Jn$_{121}$

þawæs geforðad þin| fægere wéorc.
þusúnnan dæg; sýlf halgó|dest.
⁊gemǽrsodest hine mánegum tohélpe|

CC$_{201}$

þawæs| geforðod þin fægere weorc.
⁊þusunnan dæg silf halgodest.
⁊þumærsodest hine manegum tohelpe.

The origin of this variant seems to be the reinterpretation of the verbal prefix *ge-* by the scribe of **CC$_{201}$** as an 'incorrect' nominative plural form of the second person pronoun *ge*. In **Jn$_{121}$** the verb of the clause *⁊gemǽrsodest hine mánegum tohélpe* is *gemǣrsian*, and the subject the same as that of line 25, but not repeated.[162] In **CC$_{201}$**, the verb is *mǣrsian*, and the subject, *þu*, is repeated in both lines. This is less usual syntax, but still acceptable: Mitchell

---

Jn$_{121}$ 23-*24a on syx dagum and on þone seofoðan þu gerestest...

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

The variant has no effect on metre.

"Prayer"

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

---

[162]Mitchell, *OES*, §1715.

[163]Mitchell, *OES*, §1714-15.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

Textual Variants

Inflectional Difference (1 example)

***Pr*, 10b**

LPs	**Jul$_{Aii}$**
Eala frea brihta folces| scyppend.	Æla frea beorhta. folkes scippend.
Gemilda þin mod me togode.	Gemilsa þyn| mod. me to gode.
10 Syle| ðine are þin**um** earminge	10 sile þyne are. þyn**e** earminge.|

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

Substitution of Stressed Words and Elements (1 example)

***Pr*, 9a**

LPs	**Jul$_{Aii}$**
Eala frea brihta folces| scyppend.	Æla frea beorhta. folkes scippend.
Gemilda þin mod me togode.	**Gemilsa** þyn| mod. me to gode.
10 Syle| ðine are þinum earminge	10 sile þyne are. þyne earminge.|

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

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

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

LPs	**Jul$_{Aii}$**
Sebið earming þeon| eorðan her	Se byð earming. þeo on eorðan her.
dæges ȝnihtes deoflū compað	dæiges ȝ nihtes.| deoflon campað.
ȝhis| willan wyrcð wahim þære myrigðe.	ȝ hys willan wyrcð. wa him þære| mirigðe.
þonne hand| lean hafað ȝsceawað	þonne **he ða** handlean. hafað ȝ sceawað.
15 butan he þæs yfles ærge swice|||	15 bute he þæs yfeles. ær geswyce.

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

---

[174]Mitchell, *OES*, §1345.

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

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

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

"Durham"

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

Textual Variants

Inflectional Difference (5 examples)

***Dur*, 4a**

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

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

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

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

***Dur*, 4a**

Hickes 6-10	**CUL$_{Ffi27}$**
Weor ymb eornað.|	weor. ymbeor|nad.
Ea**n** yðum strong.| And ðerinne wunað.|	eayðum. stronge. ⁊ ðer inne wu|nað
Fisca feola kinn.| On floda gemong.|	5 f̛ola fisca. kyn. onfloda ge mon|ge.

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

***Dur*, 5b**

Hickes 6-10	**CUL$_{Ffi27}$**
Weor ymb eornað.|	weor. ymbeor|nad.
Ean yðum strong.| And ðerinne wunað.|	eayðum. stronge. ⁊ ðer inne wu|nað
Fisca feola kinn.| On floda **gemong**.|	5 f̛ola fisca. kyn. onfloda **ge mon|ge**.

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

Poem, 41b, *werum on gemonge*, Exeter Riddle 31, 4a, and *eorlum on gemonge*, Exeter Riddle 31, 11b.[181]

If the **CUL$_{Ffi27}$** form is not an example of the spurious addition of *-e*, the variant does have an effect on the metre: *on flōda gemong* (**Hickes**) is a Type B-2 line, *on flōda gemonge* (**CUL$_{Ffi27}$**) a Type A-1 with anacrusis.

***Dur*, 6a**

Hickes 1-12

Is ðeos burch breome.| Geond breoten rice.|
Steopa gestaðolad.| Stanas ymb utan.|
Wundrum gewæxen.| Weor ymb eornað.|
Ean yðum strong.| And ðerinne wunað.|
Fisca feola kinn.| On floda gemong.|
And ðer**e** gewexen.| Wuda festern mycel.|

CUL$_{Ffi27}$

Is ðeos burch. breome geond breoten| rice
steppa ge staðolad stanas ymbu|tan
wundrū. ge wæxen. weor. ymbeor|nad.
eayðum. stronge. ⁊ ðer inne wu|nað
fi̊ola fisca. kyn. onfloda ge mon|ge.
⁊ ðærge wexen is wuda fæstern| micel.

There are two possibilities for this variation. The first is that **Hickes** *ðere* is a back spelling of *ðær* with the spurious addition of a final *-e*. The second is that the **Hickes** form is a dative singular feminine form of the demonstrative pronoun "in that [place]," with the feminine noun *burch*, line 1a as antecedent.[182] Whether or not the **Hickes** reading is intentional, the variant falls on the initial dip of a Type A-3 line and has little effect on metre.

***Dur*, 20b**

Hickes 32-37

Eardiað æt ðem eadige.| In inðem mynstre.|
Unarimeda reliquia.|
Ðær monige wundrum gewurðað.|
Ðe **writa** seggeð.|
Mid ðene drihtnes werdomes bideð.|

CUL$_{Ffi27}$

Eardiæð. ætðem eadige in| inðem minstre
un arimeda. reliquia.|
ðe monia wund rumge. wurðað.
ðes| ðe **writ**. seggeð.
midd ðene drihnes.| werdomes. bideð.|||

The variation **Hickes** *writa* **CUL$_{Ffi27}$** *writ* is between the singular and plural of the neuter strong noun *writ* (with **Hickes** *-a* for *-u*), 'writings' vs 'writ'. As **Hickes CUL$_{Ffi27}$** *seggeð* can be singular or plural (with *eð* for expected *að*), both readings make acceptable

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

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

sense and syntax. The variation has a minimal effect on metre as both versions involve Type C-1 lines: in **Hickes** the first stress is resolved; in **CUL$_{Ffi27}$** it is long by position.

Substitution of Unstressed Words and Elements (1 example)

***Dur*, 20a**

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

The two readings are syntactically and metrically equivalent. *Ðe* and *ðær* are used "interchangeably" in Old English to introduce "adjective clauses of place."[183]

Substitution of Stressed Words and Elements (1 example)

***Dur*, 17b**

Hickes 25-31	**CUL$_{Ffi27}$**
Is ðerinne mid heom.| Æðelwold bisceop.|	IS ðer inne midd heom.| ꝯðelwold , biscop.
And breoma bocera Beda.| And Boisil abbet.|	ꝯbreoma bocera. be|ḍ,ḍa ꝯboisil abbot.
Ðe clæne Cuðberchte.| On gicheðe.	ðe clene cudberte on| gecheðe
Lerde lustum.| And he **his** lara wel genom.|	lerde. lustum. ꝯhe **wis** lara| welgenom.

Hickes *his* is the third person possessive pronoun. For alliterative reasons, the **CUL$_{Ffi27}$** form is most likely the result of a graphic confusion of *w* and *h*. As the genitive plural of an otherwise unattested compound 'wise-teachings', **CUL$_{Ffi27}$** *wis lara* adds a non-alliterating lift to the beginning of the off-verse. In **Hickes**, *his* is unaccented. Neither version is metrically orthodox.

[183]Mitchell, *OES*, §2474.

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

***Dur*, 20b**

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

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

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

***Dur*, 6a**

Hickes 11-12	**CUL$_{Ffi27}$**
And ðere gewexen.| Wuda festern mycel.|	6 ⁊ ðærge wexen **is** wuda fæstern| micel.

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

Reinterpretation of Existing Material (1 example)

***Dur*, 14b**

Hickes 25&26	**CUL$_{Ffi27}$**
Is ðerinne mid heom.| Æðelwold bisceop.|	14 IS ðer inne midd heom. ꝥðelwold. biscop.

The **CUL$_{Ffi27}$** reading is by the misapprehension of *æ* as *ꝥ*. For an example of the opposite mistake in a late manuscript, cf. **SanM** *æ* **Bd H Ln Mg Tr$_1$ W** *ꝥ*, "Cædmon's Hymn" (*ylda*-recension), line 2b.[184]

Rearrangement within the Line (1 example)

***Dur*, 5a**

Hickes 6-10		**CUL$_{Ffi27}$**	
	Weor ymb eornað.|		weor. ymbeor|nad.
Ean yðum strong.|	And ðerinne wunað.|	eayðum. stronge.	ꝥ ðer inne wu|nað
Fisca feola kinn.|	On floda gemong.|	5 **f̓ola fisca. kyn**.	onfloda ge mon|ge.

Both manuscripts make equally good sense (with the exception of the erroneous correction *f̓ola* in **CUL$_{Ffi27}$**). In **CUL$_{Ffi27}$**, line 5a is Type C-1; in **Hickes**, the equivalent verse is best scanned as a Type A-1 with full stress on *feola* and *Fisca* and a half-stress on *kinn*.

Conclusion

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Similar amounts and types of textual variation are found among the more innovative witnesses to the "Fixed Context" poems discussed in Chapter Three. This might suggest that the **ChronC** text of the "Menologium" should be classified with the work of such innovative "Fixed Context" scribes as that of the Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 41 ($\mathbf{B_1}$) version of "Cædmon's Hymn" or the London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. vi (**ChronB**) version of the *Battle of Brunanburh*[188] – were it not that the **ChronC**$^{\mathbf{1}}$ scribe appears to have been a relatively conservative copyist of the *Chronicle*'s opening annals (as we have no other witnesses to "Maxims II" or the rest of the Menologium, and as the *Chronicle* poems in **ChronC** are all copied by later scribes, we have no material with which we can compare the **ChronC**$^{\mathbf{1}}$ scribe's verse performance directly).[189] As none of the variants between **PPs** and **ChronC**$^{\mathbf{1}}$ have a particularly significant effect on sense, syntax, or metre, and as the most significant variant –involving the substitution of stressed elements **ChronC**$^{\mathbf{1}}$ -*warum* **PPs** -*tudrum* – involves the use of a more common word in **ChronC**$^{\mathbf{1}}$ for a nonce form in **PPs**, it is perhaps just as likely that the **ChronC**$^{\mathbf{1}}$ version of Psalm 117:22 has undergone the same kind of memorial trivialisation responsible for such modern "familiar" quotations as "blood, sweat, and tears" (for Churchill's "blood, toil, tears and sweat"),[190] "money is the root of all evil" (for

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

[189]A brief discussion of the relationship between the **ChronC**$^{\mathbf{1}}$ version of the early *Chronicle* entries and its probable exemplar (**ChronB**) can be found Simon Taylor, ed, *MS B.* The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A Collaborative Edition 4 (Cambridge: Brewer, 1983), pp. xxxviii-xxxix.

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

the King James translation, "the love of money is the root of all evil"),[191] and "gilding the lily" (for Shakespeare's "to gild refinèd gold, to paint the lily").[192]

Textual Variants

Substitution of Unstressed Words (1 example)

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

ChronC[1]	**PPs**
þǣn dream gerist˙	
wel| wide gehwær˙ swa se witega sang.	
60 Þis is se dæg˙ **þæne**| drihten ús.	1 Þ is ys se dæg **þehine**| drihten us.
wisfæst worhte˙ wera cneorissū.	wisfæ|st ge worhte wera cneorissum
eallū| eorðwarum˙ eadigū tóblisse.	eall|um eorðtudrum| eadgum toblisse˙

The substitution **ChronC[1]** *þǣn* (i.e. *þone*) **PPs** *þehine* has no significant effect on sense, syntax, or metre. Both forms are found introducing adjective clauses in Old English.[193] The variants fall on the preliminary dip of a Type B-1 line in both manuscripts.

Substitution of Stressed Words and Elements (1 example)

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

ChronC[1]	**PPs**
þǣn dream gerist˙	
wel| wide gehwær˙ swa se witega sang.	
60 Þis is se dæg˙ þæne| drihten ús.	1 Þ is ys se dæg þehine| drihten us.
wisfæst worhte˙ wera cneorissū.	wisfæ|st ge worhte wera cneorissum
eallū| eorð**warum**˙ eadigū tóblisse.	eall|um eorð**tudrum**| eadgum toblisse˙

The substitution **ChronC[1]** *-warum* **PPs** *-tudrum* has a limited effect on sense and metre. In **PPs**, the first syllable of *-tudrum* is long, and the verse is Type D*1; in **ChronC[1]**, the first syllable of *warum* is short, and the verse is Type D*2. As both words can be translated approximately as 'inhabitants of earth', the substitution has no significant effect on sense. The **PPs** form is a nonce occurrence.

---

[191] 1Tim 6:7.

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

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

Addition/omission of Prefixes (1 example)

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

ChronC[1]

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

PPs

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

The addition or omission of *ge-* has no significant effect on sense or syntax and a minor effect on metre. In **ChronC[1]**, *wisfæst worhte* is Type A-2a; in **PPs**, the equivalent verse is Type A*. *Gewyrcan* (as in **PPs**) and *wyrcan* (as in **ChronC[1]**) are synonyms.

Chapter 3
Fixed Context Poems

Metrical Preface and Epilogue to the Pastoral Care; *"Cædmon's Hymn"* (*West-Saxon* eorðan-*recension*); *Poems of the* Anglo-Saxon Chronicle

A second type of manuscript transmission is found among the witnesses to seven poems of regular alliterative metre which have been copied as constituents of larger vernacular prose framing texts: the Metrical Preface and Epilogue to the *Pastoral Care*; the West-Saxon *eorðan*-recension of "Cædmon's Hymn" (a version found with one exception exclusively in manuscripts of the Old English translation of the *Historia ecclesiastica*); and four poems from the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*: the *Battle of Brunanburh* (937); the *Capture of the Five Boroughs* (942); the *Coronation of Edgar* (973); and the *Death of Edgar* (975).[194] In contrast to the poems discussed in the preceding section, these "Fixed Context" poems do not show any generically consistent pattern of substantive textual variation but differ instead from poem to poem and witness to witness in the amount and type of the substantive variation they exhibit.

What these poems have in common, however, is that their variation is as a rule directly comparable to that found in the surrounding prose texts of each witness. Indeed, with the notable exception of two specific types of variants in the Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 173 (**ChronA**) witness to the *Battle of Brunanburh*, there is very little evidence to suggest that the scribes responsible for copying these poems treated their verse any differently from the prose with which they copied it . Like the prose framing texts in which they are found, the

[194]Two other *Chronicle* poems are metrically irregular and are omitted from this study: *Death of Alfred* (1036) and *Death of Edward* (1065). See O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 125 and fn. 62.

witnesses to the Fixed Context poems appear to have varied according to the intentions of the scribe or scribes responsible for the framing text as a whole, his or their grasp of its material, or innate competence as copyist(s). Among the Fixed Context poems, the most innovative witnesses are generally those which transmit the most innovative versions of the prose frame; scribes and traditions which show themselves to have been conservative transmitters of the framing text, on the other hand, tend to pass on the most conservative copies of the poetry these texts contain.

The Metrical Preface and Epilogue to the Pastoral Care

The most striking evidence of the relationship between textual innovation in the prose framing text and Fixed Context poems is to be seen in the nature and distribution of substantive variants among the witnesses to the Metrical Preface and Epilogue to the Old English translation of the *Pastoral Care*. Although both poems are found as constituents of the same framing text, they nevertheless appear at first glance to have been copied to vastly different standards of substantive textual "accuracy." The Metrical Preface, sixteen lines long and surviving in five witnesses, exhibits ten substantive variants: four differences of inflection, one substitution of stressed words or elements, three examples of the addition or omission of unstressed words or elements, one example of the addition or omission of a prefix, and one example of the addition or omission of a stressed word or element. The Metrical Epilogue, in contrast, thirty lines long and surviving in two witnesses, displays no substantive variants at all. As we shall see, this difference is not to be attributed to differences in the number of witnesses in which each poem is found or in the scribes responsible for copying each version, but to the textual history of the framing text. The substantive textual variants exhibited by the surviving witnesses to the Metrical Preface are restricted with one exception to two late

representatives of a single, highly innovative tradition of the *Pastoral Care* as a whole. In addition, they agree closely with the pattern of textual innovation introduced by the scribes of these manuscripts (and those of their exemplars) into the surrounding prose. Outside of these two manuscripts (neither of which contains a copy of the Metrical Epilogue), both poems are transmitted to almost identical standards of textual accuracy in all surviving witnesses.

Manuscripts of the Old English *Pastoral Care*

The Old English translation of the *Pastoral Care* is known to have survived the Anglo-Saxon period in six insular manuscripts, ranging in date from the late ninth to the late eleventh centuries[195]: Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 20, A.D. 890-7 (**Hat_{20}**); †London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. xi, A.D. 890-7 (**Tib_{Bxi}**); Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 12, s.x[2] (**CC_{12}**); †London, British Library, Cotton Otho B. ii, s. x/xi (**$Otho_{Bii}$**); Cambridge, Trinity College, R. 5. 22, s. x/xi (**Tr_1**); and Cambridge, University Library, Ii. 2. 4, s. xi, third quarter (**CUL_{Ii24}**).[196] One of these manuscripts, **Tib_{Bxi}**, was almost completely destroyed in fires at

[195]The sigla used in this discussion of the *Pastoral Care* have been formed according to the principles discussed in Appendix 2. For the convenience of readers, the following table presents the correspondences between the sigla used by Dobbie (*ASPR* 6), Dorothy M. Horgan (several articles; for references, see fnn. 199 and 209), and Ingvar Carlson (reference fn. 199):

Manuscript	Sigla	Horgan	Carlson	Dobbie
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 12	**CC_{12}**	CC	C12	D
Cambridge, Trinity College, R. 5. 22	**Tr_1**	T	R5	T
Cambridge, University Library, Ii. 2. 4	**CUL_{Ii24}**	U	I2	– –
London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. xi	**Tib_{Bxi}**	Ci	C	– –
London, British Library, Junius 53 (a transcription of London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. xi)	**Jn_{53}**	J	Ju	J
London, British Library, Cotton Otho B. ii	**$Otho_{Bii}$**	Cii	C.ii	– –
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 20	**Hat_{20}**	H	H	H

[196]Dobbie incorrectly states that **CUL_{Ii24}** "does not contain either of the verse texts," *ASPR* 6, p. cxv.

Ashburnham house in 1731 and the British Museum bindery in 1865[197]; with the exception of a few charred fragments still in the British Library, our only knowledge of its text comes from a seventeenth-century transcription by Francis Junius, now preserved in the Bodleian Library as Junius 53 (**Jn$_{53}$**). A second manuscript, **Otho$_{Bii}$**, was also seriously damaged in the Cottonian fire of 1731, where it lost twenty-seven of its pre-fire total of eighty-two leaves. The lost material included a copy of the Metrical Preface.[198] Variant readings recorded by Junius in the margins of **Jn$_{53}$** provide us with our only knowledge of the lost portions of this manuscript.[199]

Metrical Preface

The Metrical Preface was copied in all six witnesses to the *Pastoral Care*, and, if we count Junius's transcript of **Tib$_{Bxi}$**, survives in five. As such it is among the best attested of all Old English poems, both in terms of the number of its surviving witnesses and in the length and consistency of its chronological record. While "Cædmon's Hymn" (with twenty-one witnesses) and "Bede's Death Song" (with thirty-five witnesses) are found in more medieval manuscripts and have a longer textual history,[200] of their individual recensions only the West-

[197]Ker, ed., *The Pastoral Care*, Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile 6 (Copenhagen: Rosenkilde & Bagger, 1956), p. 13.

[198]Ker, *Catalogue*, art. 175.

[199]Junius records two readings from the Metrical Preface of **Otho$_{Bii}$**: **Otho$_{Bii}$** *sealtne* (**Tib$_{Bxi}$(Jn$_{53}$)** *saltne*), l.2a; **Otho$_{Bii}$** *læste* (**Tib$_{Bxi}$(Jn$_{53}$)** *læsðe*), l.16b. In both cases **Otho$_{Bii}$** agrees with **Hat$_{20}$**. Junius's transcription is not letter-perfect, especially of *varia lectio* from **Otho$_{Bii}$**. In an appendix comparing Junius's transcription of **Tib$_{Bxi}$** and **Otho$_{Bii}$** with the surviving fragments of the manuscripts themselves, Ingvar Carlson reports an average of one mistake per thirty-five words in the transcription of **Tib$_{Bxi}$**, and an average of one mistake per twenty-five words in that of the *varia* from **Otho$_{Bii}$** (Ingvar Carlson, ed., *The Pastoral Care: Edited from British Museum Cotton Otho B.ii*, Completed by Lars- G. Hallander, Mattias Löfvenberg, and Alarik Rynell, 2 vols., Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis: Stockholm Studies in English 34 and 48 [Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell International, 1975, 1978], v. 1 pp. 158-9). For additional comments on Junius's reliability, see also: Dorothy M. Horgan, "The Old English Pastoral Care: the Scribal Contribution," *Studies in Earlier English Prose*, ed. Paul E. Szarmach (Albany: SUNY, 1986) 109-28, esp. pp. 124-5; and Karl Jost, "Zu den Handschriften der *Cura Pastoralis*," *Anglia* 37 (1913): 63-68.

[200]The most up-to-date list of witnesses for both texts is: Fred C. Robinson and E. G. Stanley, eds., *Old English Verse Texts from Many Sources: A Comprehensive Collection*, Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile 23 (Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1991).

Saxon *eorðan*-text of "Cædmon's Hymn" has as long a textual record or survives in as many twelfth-century or earlier insular manuscripts.[201] Likewise, while the parallel text of the *Dream of the Rood* and the Ruthwell Cross Inscription has possibly a longer textual record, its two surviving copies both belong to different recensions of the text and, in contrast to the relatively regular appearance of the Metrical Preface from the late ninth to the eleventh centuries, are found in witnesses separated by an interval of as much as three hundred years.[202]

The Metrical Preface is also the only poem in the corpus for which strong evidence exists to suggest that surviving witnesses were copied under its author's supervision. In its two earliest manuscripts, **Tib$_{Bxi}$** and **Hat$_{20}$**, the Metrical Preface appears to have been copied independently of the main translation of the *Pastoral Care*. In **Hat$_{20}$** it appears with Alfred's Prose Preface on a single bifolium sewn in before the first quire of the main text. The hand of the Prose Preface is found nowhere else in the manuscript, but is thought by N. R. Ker to be the same as that responsible for the main text of **Tib$_{Bxi}$**.[203] The hand of the verse Preface he considers to be similar to, but a more practiced version of, the principal hand of the main

[201]All pre-twelfth-century manuscripts of "Bede's Death Song" are continental, and, with the possible exception of The Hague, Koninklijke Bibliotheek, 70. H. 7, are derived from a single (lost) insular antecedent (Dobbie, *Manuscripts*, pp. 49-50, supplemented by *ASPR* 6, pp. civ-cvii; Ker, "The Hague Manuscript of the *Epistola Cuthberti de obitu bedæ* with Bede's Death Song," *MÆ* 8 [1939]: 40-4; and K. W. Humphreys, and Alan S. C. Ross, "Further Manuscripts of Bede's 'Historia Ecclesiastica', of the 'Epistola Cuthberti de Obitu Bedae', and Further Anglo-Saxon Texts of '*Cædmon's Hymn*' and '*Bede's Death Song*'," *N&Q* 220 [1975]: 50-55). Of the recensions of "Cædmon's Hymn," the Northumbrian *aeldu*-recension is found in two eighth-century manuscripts (see above, Chapter 2, p. 49); the Northumbrian *eordu*-recension in three fourteenth- and fifteenth-century continental exemplars (derived from a single or two closely related lost insular antecedents; see: Daniel P. O'Donnell, "A Northumbrian Version of 'Cædmon's Hymn' (*eordu*-recension) in Brussels Bibliothèque Royale Manuscript 8245-57 ff.62r^{2}-v^{1}: Identification, Edition and Filiation," forthcoming in: *New Essays on the Venerable Bede* [provisional title], ed. A.A. MacDonald and L. Houwen); the West-Saxon *ylda*-recension in hands of the mid-eleventh to mid twelfth centuries (see above, Chapter 2, pp. 21 ff.); and the West-Saxon *eorðan*-recension primarily in manuscripts of the tenth, eleventh and, in the case of the possibly continental **To**, twelfth centuries (see below, pp. 112 ff.).

[202]The *Dream of the Rood* is found in the late tenth-century Vercelli Book (Vercelli, Biblioteca Capitolare, CXVII); the Ruthwell Cross Inscription is carved around the edges of an eighth-century stone cross in Dumfriesshire, Scotland, but may not be as old as the cross itself. For a summary of recent views on the issue, see below, p. 287 and fnn. 612 and 613.

[203]Ker, *Pastoral Care*, p. 22.

text.[204] Although nothing can be said for certain about the codicology of **Tib$_{Bxi}$**, Wanley's description of the manuscript suggests that its prefaces also were written in a hand other than that used for the main text.[205] Ker's examination of its fragmentary remains also suggests that they were copied on a separate sheet.[206] As Sisam argues, these features suggest that the prefaces were still being worked on after the main text of the translation was first sent out for multiplication.[207]

Whether it is the result of authorial oversight, the royal associations of its framing text, or simply the interest and care of its first scribes, the earliest copies of the Metrical Preface show almost no substantive textual variation. The only exception, a variation between the dative instrumental cases in second part of the compound conjunction/adverb **Hat$_{20}$** *Forðæm* (**Tr$_1$** *for þæm þe* **CUL$_{Ii24}$** *for þam*) : **Tib$_{Bxi}$**(**Jn$_{53}$**) **CC$_{12}$** *forðon*, line 8a, is commonly found in multiply-attested texts and has no effect on the sense or metre of the passage in which it occurs.[208]

Instead, it is the late tenth- or early eleventh-century **Tr$_1$** and late eleventh-century **CUL$_{Ii24}$** which show the most and most significant variation in the poem. In addition to sharing the dative case with **Hat$_{20}$** in line 8a, these two manuscripts are between themselves responsible for all nine of the poem's remaining textual variants. On three occasions, **Tr$_1$** and **CUL$_{Ii24}$** agree in readings not found in the earlier manuscripts: two inflectional variants: **Tr$_1$** **CUL$_{Ii24}$** *romwarena* : **Hat$_{20}$** *romwara* (**Tib$_{Bxi}$**(**Jn$_{53}$**) *Romwara* **CC$_{12}$** *róm wara*), line 9b; **Tr$_1$**

[204]Ker, *Pastoral Care*, p. 22.

[205]Wanley, p. 217: "Utraque præfatio, sicut in Cod. Werferthiano, ab aliena manu scripta, Codici præmittitur."

[206]Ker *Pastoral Care*, p. 22.

[207]Kenneth Sisam, "The Publication of Alfred's Pastoral Care," *Studies in the History of Old English Literature* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1953): 140-47, at pp. 142-44.

[208]A detailed discussion of the individual variants in the Metrical Preface can be found below, pp. 98-107.

CUL$_{Ii24}$ *me*; **Hat$_{20}$ Tib$_{Bxi}$(Jn$_{53}$)** *min* (**CC$_{12}$** *mín*), line 11a; and one example of the addition of a prefix: **Tr$_{1}$** *beþorftan* (**CUL$_{Ii24}$** *be þorftan*) : **Hat$_{20}$ Tib$_{Bxi}$(Jn$_{53}$) CC$_{12}$** *ðorfton*, line 15b. On two further occasions, **Tr$_{1}$** exhibits a unique reading not found in **CUL$_{Ii24}$** or **Hat$_{20}$ Tib$_{Bxi}$(Jn$_{53}$) CC$_{12}$**: one involving the substitution of stressed elements: **Tr$_{1}$** *eorð|bugendū*: **CUL$_{Ii24}$** *egbugendum* (**Hat$_{20}$ Tib$_{Bxi}$(Jn$_{53}$)** *iegbuendum* **CC$_{12}$** *iegbu|endum*), line 3a; and a second, the addition of an unstressed particle: **Tr$_{1}$** *for þæm þe* : **CUL$_{Ii24}$** *for þam* (**Hat$_{20}$** *Forðæm*) **Tib$_{Bxi}$(Jn$_{53}$) CC$_{12}$** *forðon*, line 8a. The most variable of all manuscripts, **CUL$_{Ii24}$**, has four unique readings not found in **Tr$_{1}$** or the earlier manuscripts: one difference of inflection: **CUL$_{Ii24}$** *mærða*: **Tr$_{1}$** *merþum* (**Hat$_{20}$** *mær|ðum* **Tib$_{Bxi}$(Jn$_{53}$) CC$_{12}$** *mærðum*), line 10b; two examples of the addition of unstressed particles: **CUL$_{Ii24}$** *for þam he* : **Tr$_{1}$ Hat$_{20}$ Tib$_{Bxi}$(Jn$_{53}$) CC$_{12}$** ∅, line 13b; and one example of the omission of a stressed word: **CUL$_{Ii24}$** ∅ **Tr$_{1}$ CC$_{12}$** *gregorius* (**Hat$_{20}$ Tib$_{Bxi}$(Jn$_{53}$)** *Gregorius*), line 6a.

The significance of this lop-sided distribution of textual variants among the witnesses to the Metrical Preface to the *Pastoral Care* becomes apparent when it is compared to what is known of the textual stemma of the witnesses to the framing text as a whole (Figure 1). As Dorothy Horgan and Ingvar Carlson have demonstrated, it is possible to divide the manuscripts of the *Pastoral Care* into four main textual groups: **Tib$_{Bxi}$-CC$_{12}$**, **Hat$_{20}$**, **Otho$_{Bii}$**, and **Tr$_{1}$-CUL$_{Ii24}$**.[209] For the most part, these groups are separated by scribal errors and relatively minor differences of wording or syntax. The two earliest manuscripts, **Tib$_{Bxi}$** and **Hat$_{20}$**, although in all likelihood copied at the same time and in the same scriptorium,[210] belong to two different branches of the text: **Hat$_{20}$**, addressed to Wærferð, bishop of Worcester, has no known

[209]Horgan, "The Relationship Between the O.E. MSS. of King Alfred's Translation of Gregory's Pastoral Care," *Anglia* 91 (1973): 153-69; "The Lexical and Syntactic Variants Shared by Two of the Later MSS of Alfred's Translation of Gregory's Cura Pastoralis," *ASE* 9 (1981): 213-21; and "Scribal Contribution." See also Carlson, *Cotton Otho B.ii*, v. 1, pp. 28-9.

[210]Sisam, "Publication," pp. 141-144; Ker, *Catalogue*, arts. 196, 386.

descendants but shows some affinity with the texts of three later manuscripts: **Otho$_{Bii}$**, **Tr$_1$**, and **CUL$_{Ii24}$**.[211] **Tib$_{Bxi}$**, which has a blank for the addressee of Alfred's Prose Preface and is assumed to have been copied for use in the king's "headquarters,"[212] is closely related to the tenth-century **CC$_{12}$**, although this latter manuscript cannot be directly descended from the text of **Tib$_{Bxi}$** as it is recorded by Junius in **Jn$_{53}$**.[213] A third group is represented by **Otho$_{Bii}$**. The prose preface of this manuscript was destroyed in the Cottonian fire, but is reported by Junius to have been addressed to Hehstan, bishop of London.[214] Like **Hat$_{20}$**, it has no surviving direct relatives, but shares enough common omissions and errors with **Tr$_1$** and **CUL$_{Ii24}$** to suggest that all three manuscripts must be derived ultimately from a single early antecedent.[215] **Tr$_1$** and **CUL$_{Ii24}$** make up the fourth and final textual strand of the *Pastoral Care*. The youngest of the two manuscripts, **CUL$_{Ii24}$**, is addressed to Wulfsige, bishop of Sherborne, from whose copy it is clearly descended. **Tr$_1$** omits the Prose Preface (and hence the addressee of its exemplar) but shares enough unique readings with **CUL$_{Ii24}$** as to make it certain that they share a common – and heavily edited – ancestor.[216]

---

[211]Carlson, *Cotton Otho B.ii*, v. 1, pp. 28-9; see also Horgan, "Relationship," p. 166.

[212]Sisam, "Publication," p. 142.

[213]Carlson, *Cotton Otho B.ii*, v. 1, pp. 27-28 lists "c. 25" readings in which "C [i.e. **Tib$_{Bxi}$**] shows inferior readings to H [**Hat$_{20}$**]" and **CC$_{12}$** agrees with **Hat$_{20}$**, versus "c. 5" readings in which **Tib$_{Bxi}$** and **CC$_{12}$** agree in an "inferior reading" against **Hat$_{20}$**. He also reports that **Hat$_{20}$** and **CC$_{12}$** never agree in an inferior reading against **Tib$_{Bxi}$**.

[214]Ker, *Catalogue*, art. 175.

[215]Carlson, *Cotton Otho B.ii*, v. 1, pp. 30-31; Horgan "Scribal Contribution," p. 120. The identity of this earlier manuscript can only be guessed at. As Horgan and Sisam suggest, it was presumably one of the original manuscripts sent by Alfred to secondary centres for copying (Metrical Preface, ll. 11b-15a; see also Horgan, "Scribal Contribution," p. 120; "Relationship," esp. pp. 165-166; Sisam "Publication," p. 141). On dialectal and historical grounds, Horgan has suggested variously the copies sent to Plegmund and Swiðulf as the most likely candidates (Horgan, "Relationship," pp. 165-166 and 168 [Plegmund]; "Scribal Contribution," p. 120 [Swiðulf]).

[216]Horgan, "Scribal Contribution," p. 120; "Variants," *passim*; "Relationship," pp. 161-164. Also Carlson, *Cotton Otho B.ii*, v. 1, p. 30.

It is the nature of this ancestor that is most important for our understanding of the amount, type, and distribution of the substantive textual variation among the witnesses to the Metrical Preface. With the exception of **Tr_1** and **CUL_{Ii24}**, the manuscripts of the *Pastoral Care* have been as a rule conservatively – or at worst, carelessly – copied . While the different textual groups show some evidence of sporadic revision in their prose – particularly in the case of the **Tib_{Bxi}-CC_{12}** group, which, when it differs from **Hat_{20}** and **$Otho_{Bii}$**, transmits a text that Carlson reports to be generally "more faithful the Latin original"[217] – the greater part of their variation is to be attributed to scribal error, haplography in particular.[218] The text of **CUL_{Ii24}** and **Tr_1**, in contrast, shows strong evidence of deliberate "editorial" intervention by the scribe or scribes of their common antecedent.[219] At a syntactic level, these changes include variation in the use of prepositions, in the choice of connecting words and particles, in the order of words within the phrase, in the use of case, tense, and mood, and in the preferred forms of negation.[220] At the level of vocabulary and style, Horgan also reports the frequent "use of synonyms and hyponyms instead of or alongside" the forms found in other manuscripts,[221] a "very large" number of variants involving the substitution of verbal, nominal and adjectival prefixes,[222] and a general tendency towards "clarification" or "explanation" through the addition of words understood from context in other witnesses (nouns, adjectives, articles, possessive pronouns, and pronominal subjects), and the substitution of relative clauses for

[217]Carlson, *Cotton Otho B.ii*, v.1, p. 29.

[218]Horgan, "Relationship," *passim*; Carlson, *Cotton Otho B.ii*, v.1, pp. 29-32.

[219]Horgan, "Relationship," p. 221; also "Scribal Contribution," pp. 120-124; and "Relationship," pp. 161-164, 166-168. See also Carlson, *Cotton Otho B.ii*, v.1, pp. 30-31.

[220]Horgan, "Variants," pp. 217-220; also "Scribal Contribution," p. 120; "Relationship," p. 162.

[221]Horgan, "Variants," p. 215.

[222]Horgan, "Variants," pp. 214-215.

"shorter elements" such as compound verbs, adjective-noun pairs and accusative-infinitive constructions.[223]

When the variant types recorded by Horgan (and similar types noted by Carlson) in her investigations into the **Tr$_1$** and **CUL$_{Ii24}$** versions of the *Pastoral Care* as a whole are compared to those found in the text of the Metrical Preface in these two manuscripts, the result is a near-perfect match. Of the three variants shared by **Tr$_1$** and **CUL$_{Ii24}$**, only one, the relatively insignificant substitution of the weak genitive plural **Tr$_1$ CUL$_{Ii24}$** *romwarena* for the strong declensional form in **Hat$_{20}$** *romwara* (**Tib$_{Bxi}$**(**Jn$_{53}$**) *Romwara* **CC$_{12}$** *róm wara*) in line 9b, is not of a type mentioned by Horgan in her discussion of the prose. The addition of the verbal prefix *be-* to **Tr$_1$** *beþorftan* **CUL$_{Ii24}$** *be þorftan* (**Hat$_{20}$ Tib$_{Bxi}$**(**Jn$_{53}$**) **CC$_{12}$** *ðorfton*), line 15b, belongs to what Horgan reports to be one of the most common variants separating **Tr$_1$** and **CUL$_{Ii24}$** from the other manuscripts of the *Pastoral Care*.[224] The substitution of the pronominal object **Tr$_1$ CUL$_{Ii24}$** *me* for the possessive adjective **Hat$_{20}$ Tib$_{Bxi}$**(**Jn$_{53}$**) *min* (**CC$_{12}$** *mín*) in line 11a, likewise, is only one of a number of examples of the "rationalisation of forms" cited by Horgan in her analysis of the prose text.[225]

The same is true of the readings found in only one or another of the individual manuscripts in this group, the majority of which have parallels among the variants recorded by Horgan from the common text of **Tr$_1$** and **CUL$_{Ii24}$**. In some cases, these variants are doubtlessly to be attributed to scribes working after the **Tr$_1$** and **CUL$_{Ii24}$** traditions diverged.

---

[223]Horgan, "Variants," p. 221.

[224]Horgan, "Variants," pp. 214-5.

[225]Although Horgan cites the "rationalisation of forms" as a category of variation only once and does not tie the term to any specific examples ("Relationship," p. 162), she supplies several examples in which the **Tr$_1$ CUL$_{Ii24}$** form can be ascribed to the influence of surrounding forms: e.g. **Tr$_1$ CUL$_{Ii24}$** *seo is modor* for **Hat$_{20}$ Tib$_{Bxi}$(Jn$_{53}$) CC$_{12}$** *se is modur* (214/14), in which the antecedent for *se*/*seo* is the masculine weak noun *willa*: *gif se yfla willa ðone onwald hæfð ðæs ingeðonces, se is modur ælces yfeles* (222/13-14). Textual references to the Prose Preface here and elsewhere are by page and line number of Henry Sweet,

The omission of *gregorius* from **CUL$_{Ii24}$** line 6a, for example, is almost certainly to be explained as eyeskip on the part of the scribe of **CUL$_{Ii24}$** or an exemplar. Likewise, the substitution of the genitive plural *mærða* in **CUL$_{Ii24}$** for the dative plural in **Tr$_1$** and all other manuscripts is perhaps more easily explained as the spontaneous influence of the ending of *romwarena* from the preceding (manuscript and metrical) line of the poem than as a survival of the common antecedent which has been removed independently by the scribe of **Tr$_1$**.[226] In other cases, however, the correspondence between the prose variation recorded by Horgan and the verse variation exhibited by these two witnesses to the Metrical Preface is so strong as to suggest that the differences between the two copies have their origins in alternatives already present in their common antecedent.[227] The substitution of stressed elements in **Tr$_1$** *eorð|bugendū* : **CUL$_{Ii24}$** *egbugendum* (**Hat$_{20}$ Tib$_{Bxi}$**(**Jn$_{53}$**) *iegbuendum* **CC$_{12}$** *iegbu|endum*), line 3a, for example, is paralleled by many similar substitutions throughout the prose in both manuscripts[228]: **Tr$_1$ CUL$_{Ii24}$** *deofles* **Hat$_{20}$ Tib$_{Bxi}$** *fiondes* (463/12); **Tr$_1$** *neat* (with *orf* in the "outer margin"), **CUL$_{Ii24}$** *orf* **Hat$_{20}$ Tib$_{Bxi}$**(**Jn$_{53}$**) **CC$_{12}$** *neat* (173/20); **CUL$_{Ii24}$** *lusta* for **Hat$_{20}$** *scylda* (407/20).[229] The addition of *þe* to **Tr$_1$** *for þæm þe* (**CUL$_{Ii24}$** *for þam* **Hat$_{20}$** *Forðæm* **Tib$_{Bxi}$**(**Jn$_{53}$**) **CC$_{12}$** *forðon*), line 8a, and of *forþam* and *he* to **CUL$_{Ii24}$** *for þæm he het* **Tr$_1$** *het* (**Hat$_{20}$** *heht*), line 13b, likewise, are to be attributed to the same impetus for explanation and

---

ed., *King Alfred's West-Saxon Version of the Pastoral Care*, EETS o.s. 45 and 50 (London: Kegan Paul, 1871-72).

[226]For a discussion of this independence in **CUL$_{Ii24}$**, however, see Horgan "Variants," p. 214. Horgan also cites unique readings from **CUL$_{Ii24}$** and (less frequently) **Tr$_1$** throughout her list of textual variants, pp. 215-222.

[227]On the basis of interlinear readings in **Tr$_1$**, Horgan assumes that the ancestor of **Tr$_1$** and **CUL$_{Ii24}$** was edited in large part interlinearly ("Variants," p. 214).

[228]All examples from Horgan "Variants," p. 215. When relevant, readings from **Otho$_{Bii}$** are taken from Carlson, *Cotton Otho B.ii*.

[229] Horgan does not cite the **Tr$_1$** or **CC$_{12}$** readings. The text is missing from **Tib$_{Bxi}$** and **Otho$_{Bii}$**.

clarification found in the examples Horgan supplies of the addition of "understood" words and explanatory clauses to the common text of **Tr$_1$** and **CUL$_{Ii24}$**.[230]

Textual Variants

Inflectional Difference (4 examples)

CPPref (Hat$_{20}$-CUL$_{Ii24}$-Tr$_1$:Tib$_{Bxi}$(Jn$_{53}$)-CC$_{12}$), 8a

Tr$_1$
for **þæm** þe he ma ncynnes mæst gestriende.|
rodera wearde. romwarena betst
manna mod weligost. merþum| gefrægost.

Hat$_{20}$
For**ðæm** hemonncynnes mæst.| gestriende.
rodra wearde romwara betest
monna modwelegost mær|ðum gefrægost.

CUL$_{Ii24}$
for **þam** he| man cynnes mæst gestrinde
rodera wearde romwarena| betst.
manna mod weligost mærða gefrægost.

Tib$_{Bxi}$(Jn$_{53}$)
for**ðon**| he moncynnes. mæst gestrynde.
rodra wearde.| Romwara betest.
monna mod welegost. mærðum| gefrægost.

CC$_{12}$
for**ðon** hemon,| cynnes mæst gestriende.
rodera| wearde róm warabetst.
monna| mod welegost mærðum gefræ| gost.

The only variant which does not involve a unique reading in one or both of **Tr$_1$** or **CUL$_{Ii24}$**, the two case endings are syntactically, metrically and semantically equivalent. **Tr$_1$** *for þæm þe*[231] **CUL$_{Ii24}$** *for þam* and **Hat$_{20}$** *Forðæm* are all dative singular; **Tib$_{Bxi}$(Jn$_{53}$) CC$_{12}$** *forðon* is instrumental singular. Both cases are found regularly with *for* in adverbial and conjunctive contexts with little difference in sense or usage.[232]

[230]See particularly Horgan, "Variants," §§ I.6.a and II.B.2.b, pp. 220, 221. A similar tendency can be seen in the revision of Wærferð's translation of Gregory's *Dialogues*, where *þe* is used to distinguish "a relative adverb or a conjunction from the simple adverb," and is added to or replaces the demonstrative pronoun in introducing relative clauses. See David Yerkes, *Syntax and Style in Old English*: *A Comparison of the Two Versions of Wærferth's Translation of Gregory's Dialogues* Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies 5 (Binghamton, NY: CEMERS, 1982), §§ 11, 12 and 15.

[231]The addition of *þe* to **Tr$_1$** is discussed below. See p. 103.

[232]For a discussion of the relative frequency of the two forms in Old English prose and poetry, see Mitchell, *OES* §§3035-36; and J. van Dam, *The Causal Clause and Causal Prepositions in Early Old English Prose* (Groningen and Djakarta, 1957). I have not been able to consult two theses dealing with the topic mentioned by Mitchell in §§3035-36: E. M. Liggins, 'The Expression of Causal Relationship in Old English Prose' (unpublished PhD diss., University of London, 1955), and Mitchell, 'Subordinate Clauses in Old English Poetry' (unpublished PhD diss., Oxford University, 1958).

***CPPref* (CUL$_{Ii24}$-Tr$_1$: Hat$_{20}$-Tib$_{Bxi}$(Jn$_{53}$)-CC$_{12}$), 9b**

Tr$_1$
for þæm þe he ma ncynnes mæst gestriende.|
rodera wearde. romwar**ena** betst
10 manna mod weligost. merþum| gefrægost.

Hat$_{20}$
Forðæm hemonncynnes mæst.| gestriende.
rodra wearde romwar**a** betest
10 monna modwelegost mær|ðum gefrægost.

CUL$_{Ii24}$
for þam he| man cynnes mæst gestrinde
rodera wearde romwar**ena**| betst.
10 manna mod weligost mærða gefrægost.

Tib$_{Bxi}$(Jn$_{53}$)
forðon| he moncynnes. mæst gestrynde.
rodra wearde.| Romwar**a** betest.
10 monna mod welegost. mærðum| gefrægost.

CC$_{12}$
forðon hemon,| cynnes mæst gestriende.
rodera| wearde róm war**a**betst.
10 monna| mod welegost mærðum gefræ| gost.

The variation is declensional: **Tr$_1$ CUL$_{Ii24}$** *romwarena* is weak; **Hat$_{20}$** *romwara* (**Tib$_{Bxi}$(Jn$_{53}$)** *Romwara* **CC$_{12}$** *róm wara*), strong.[233] The variation has no effect on sense or syntax and a minor effect on metre: in **Hat$_{20}$ Tib$_{Bxi}$(Jn$_{53}$) CC$_{12}$** the line is Type E with a short half-lift (a rare form) [234]; in **Tr$_1$ CUL$_{Ii24}$**, the half-lift is resolved.

***CPPref* (CUL$_{Ii24}$: Hat$_{20}$-Tib$_{Bxi}$(Jn$_{53}$)-CC$_{12}$-Tr$_1$), 10b**

Tr$_1$
for þæm þe he ma ncynnes mæst gestriende.|
rodera wearde. romwarena betst
10 manna mod weligost. merþ**um**| gefrægost.

Hat$_{20}$
Forðæm hemonncynnes mæst.| gestriende.
rodra wearde romwara betest
10 monna modwelegost mær|ð**um** gefrægost.

CUL$_{Ii24}$
for þam he| man cynnes mæst gestrinde
rodera wearde romwarena| betst.
10 manna mod weligost mærð**a** gefrægost.

Tib$_{Bxi}$(Jn$_{53}$)
forðon| he moncynnes. mæst gestrynde.
rodra wearde.| Romwara betest.
10 monna mod welegost. mærð**um**| gefrægost.

CC12
forðon hemon,| cynnes mæst gestriende.
rodera| wearde róm warabetst.
10 monna| mod welegost mærð**um** gefræ| gost.

CUL$_{Ii24}$ *mærða* is a partitive genitive, dependent on *gefrægost* and syntactically parallel to the genitives *romwarena* (line 9b) and *manna* (line 10a): 'best of Romans,... most talented of men, most known of famous deeds'. In **Tr$_1$ Hat$_{20}$ Tib$_{Bxi}$(Jn$_{53}$)** and **CC$_{12}$**, *mærðum*

[233]Campbell, *OEG* §610.7, esp. p. 246.

[234]John C. Pope, *Seven Old English Poems*, Corrected Edition ed. (1981; Norton; New York: Bobs-Merrill, 1966), p. 116; E. Sievers, "Zur Rhythmik des germanischen Alliterationsverses I," *PBB* 10 (1885): 308-9.

(and accidental variants) is a plural dative of specification: '(most known) for famous deeds'.[235] While both readings are syntactically and metrically appropriate, **CUL$_{Ii24}$** is logically nonsensical – as a predicate adjective, *gefrægost* refers to *he* (i.e. St. Augustine) rather than a specific action. Presumably the **CUL$_{Ii24}$** scribe was influenced by the syntactic parallelism of line 9b and 10a. A similar motivation may be responsible for the variation between the first person accusative pronoun and possessive adjective in **Tr$_1$ CUL$_{Ii24}$** *me* : **Hat$_{20}$ Tib$_{Bxi}$(Jn$_{53}$)** *min* (**CC$_{12}$** *mín*), line 11a (see below, p. 100).

The variation has no metrical effect.

***CPPref* (CUL$_{Ii24}$-Tr$_1$: Hat$_{20}$-Tib$_{Bxi}$(Jn$_{53}$)-CC$_{12}$), 11a**

Tr$_1$

Seððan **me** onenglesc ælfræd cynincg
awęnde. worda| gehwilc. ꝯme his writerum
sende ꝟ suþ ꝯ norþ. het him swylcra ma
bringan.| beþære bysene.
þæt hehis bisceopum
sendan myahte.
for þæm hi his| sume beþorftan.
þa þe leden spræce læste cuþon.

Hat$_{20}$

Siððan **min** onenglisc ælfred kyning
Awende| worda gehwelc ꝯmehis writerum
sende suð ꝯnorð heht.him| swelcra má
brengan biðære bisene ðæthe his biscepum
sen|dan meahte. Forðæm hihis sume ðorfton.
Ðaðe læden. spræ|ce læste cuðon :7 :7

CUL$_{Ii24}$

Siððan| **me** on englisc ælfryd cyning
awende worda ge hwilc. ꝯ| me his writerū
sende. suð ꝯ norð.
for þam he het him swil-|cra ma
brengan be þære bysyne þ he his biscopū
sendan||| meahte
for þam hi his sume be þorftan
þa þe leden spræce| læste cuðon.

Tib$_{Bxi}$(Jn$_{53}$)

Siððan **min** on Englisc. Ælfred| kyning.
awende worda gehwelc. ꝯ me his write-| rum.
sende suð ꝯ norð. heht him swelcra ma.|
brengan be ðære bysene.
þæt he his biscepum.|
sendan meahte. forðæm hie his. sume ðorfton|
ða þe Læden spræce. læsðe cuðon :-|

CC$_{12}$

sið ðan **mín** onenglisc ælf|fred cyníng.
áwende worda ge|hwelc. ꝯméhis writerum___
_sendesuð| ꝯnorð___hehthim swelcra má.
bren|gan beðære bisene ðæt hehis| biscepum
sendan meahte. for|ðæmhiehis sume ðorfton
ðaðe||| læden spræce læste cuðon :7|

The variation **Tr$_1$ CUL$_{Ii24}$** *me* : **Hat$_{20}$ Tib$_{Bxi}$(Jn$_{53}$)** *min* (**CC$_{12}$** *mín*) affects the interpretation of the entire clause in which it is found. In **Hat$_{20}$ Tib$_{Bxi}$(Jn$_{53}$) CC$_{12}$**, *min* (and

[235]See Mitchell, *OES* §1356.

orthographic variants) is a possessive adjective modifying *worda gehwelc*, the object of *awende*, l. 12a: 'Later, King Alfred translated each of **my** words into English...'. In **Tr$_1$** **CUL$_{Ii24}$** *me* is an accusative personal pronoun syntactically parallel to *worda gehwelc* and serving as a direct object of *awende*: 'Later, King Alfred translated **me** into English, each of words...'.

Like use of the genitive plural **CUL$_{Ii24}$** *mærða* in line 10b for the dative in all other manuscripts, this variation may have its origins in a desire for local rhetorical parallelism. With the substitution of *me* for *min*, the clause of lines 11-12a becomes syntactically parallel to the following clause of lines 12b-13a: both begin with a first person accusative singular personal pronoun as direct object, follow with an adverbial phrase and end with a rhyming inflected verb. This parallelism is emphasised further in both manuscripts by the placement of a point after *sende* in the middle of line 13a (and after the inflected verb *awęnde* and infinitive *bringan* in the middle of lines 12a and 14a in **Tr$_1$**) in addition to the regular metrical points at the ends of the half-lines 12a and 13a[236]:

[236]O'Keeffe suggests that the punctuation in these lines in **Tr$_1$** may be the result of a flaw in the poem's metre: "Line 12b is technically poor, since it places *writerum*, the word carrying alliteration, in secondary position. The scribe promotes *writerum* to first stressed position by adding *sende* to the half-line" (*Visible Song*, p. 93). Since the first syllable of *wrīterum* is long, there is no reason to assume that the alliterating syllable does not occupy the first lift of the off-verse (in this case a perfectly regular Type C-2). The fact that the scribes of both manuscripts place points at the line boundaries of 12a and 13a and after *sende* (and in **Tr$_1$** *awęnde*) also seems to rule out O'Keeffe's second suggestion, that the points after the inflected verbs in both manuscripts may indicate that "the scribe... pointed these lines as prose, very much in agreement with his practice of pointing in the translation of the *Regula Pastoralis*, where he points by clause" (*Visible Song*, p. 93). *Worda gehwilc* and *suþ and norþ* (the material between the points in **Tr$_1$** lines 12a and 13a) are neither rhetorical clauses nor metrically acceptable units (the "analogous" readings O'Keeffe supplies from the Metrical Psalms – *worda þinra* and *worda æghwylc* – are both Type A lines and hence not metrically parallel). See *Visible Song*, p. 92, fn. 43 and cf. Campbell, *OEG* §90 for the scansion of the first syllable of *ǣghwelc*-.

CUL_{Ii24}, ll. 11-13a[237]

Siððan
me on englisc ælfryd cyning awende worda ge hwilc. ⁊
me his writerū sende. suð ⁊ norð.

Tr_1, ll. 11-13a[238]

Seððan me onenglesc. ælfræd cynincg awȩnde. worda
gehwilc. ⁊me his writerum sende ˖ suþ ⁊ norþ.

Substitution of Stressed Words and Elements (1 example)

CPPref (Tr_1: Hat_{20}-$Tib_{Bxi}(Jn_{53})$-CC_{12}-CUL_{Ii24}), 3a

Tr_1

Þis ærent gewryt augustinus.
ofer sealtne sæ. suþan brohte.
eorð|bugendū. swa hit ær fore
adihtnode. dryhtnes cempa.
5 rome| papa

Hat_{20}

Þis ærend gewrit Agustinus.
ofersealtne sæ suðan brohte.|
iegbuendum swahit ær fore
Adihtode dryhtnes cempa
5 rome| papa.

CUL_{Ii24}

Ðis ærynd ge writ Agustinus
ofer sealtne sæ suðan| brohte.
egbugendum swa hit ær fore
adihtode driht-|nes cempa
5 rome papa

$Tib_{Bxi}(Jn_{53})$

Ðis ærend gewrit. Agustinus.
ofer saltne sæ.| suðan brohte.
iegbuendum. swæ hit ær. fore
adih.|tode. dryhtnes cempa.
5 ~~Gregorius~~ Rome papa.|

CC_{12}

Ðis ærend gewrit águstinus
ofer|sealt ne sæ suðan brohte.
iegbu|endum swa hit ær fore
adihtode| dryhtnes cempa
5 rome papa

Tr_1 *eorð|bugendū* is vague: for readers of Alfred's translation, the importance of Augustine's mission was not simply that he brought the *Cura Pastoralis* to 'people' living overseas, but that he brought it specifically to the *iegbuendum*, the inhabitants of the British Isles. Horgan reports that similar ("sometimes misguided") substitutions are found in both **Tr_1** and **CUL_{Ii24}**.[239] As the compound *eorðbu*(*g*)*end*(-) is very common in verse (forty-one occurrences in various spellings), O'Keeffe suggests that the **Tr_1** form may be the result of a formulaic substitution.[240] There are three other occurrences of *iegbu*(*g*)*end*(-) in Old English

[237]Manuscript line-division and punctuation.

[238]Manuscript line-division and punctuation.

[239]Horgan, "Variants," p. 214.

[240]O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 93.

poetry, all in texts associated with the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*: *Menologium,* line 185a, *Coronation of Edgar*, line 4a, and *Death of Edgar*, line 37a.[241]

The substitution has no effect on syntax or metre.

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

***CPPref* (Tr_1: Hat_{20}-$Tib_{Bxi}(Jn_{53})$-CC_{12}-CUL_{Ii24}), 8a**

Tr_1
for þæm **þe** he ma ncynnes mæst gestriende.|
rodera wearde. romwarena betst
manna mod weligost. merþum| gefrægost.

Hat_{20}
Forðæm hemonncynnes mæst.| gestriende.
rodra wearde romwara betest
monna modwelegost mær|ðum gefrægost.

CUL_{Ii24}
for þam he| man cynnes mæst gestrinde
rodera wearde romwarena| betst.
manna mod weligost mærða gefrægost.

$Tib_{Bxi}(Jn_{53})$
forðon| he moncynnes. mæst gestrynde.
rodra wearde.| Romwara betest.
monna mod welegost. mærðum| gefrægost.

CC_{12}
forðon hemon,| cynnes mæst gestriende.
rodera| wearde róm warabetst.
monna| mod welegost mærðum gefræ| gost.

The addition or omission of *þe* has no effect on sense or syntax. Variation in the use of *þe* is common with *forþæm* in both adverbial and conjunctive contexts.[242]

The variant adds or subtracts an unstressed syllable from the initial dip of a Type C-1 line and has no significant effect on metre.

[241]Bessinger and Smith.

[242]Mitchell, *OES* §3011. Based on Liggins, diss., pp. 197-98, 66 and 70.

***CPPref* (CUL$_{Ii24}$: Hat$_{20}$-Tib$_{Bxi}$(Jn$_{53}$)-CC$_{12}$-Tr$_{1}$), 13b (2 variants)**

Tr$_1$

Seððan me onenglesc ælfræd cynincg
awęnde. worda| gehwilc. ꝯme his writerum
sende ꝛ suþ ꝯ norþ. het him swylcra ma
bringan.| beþære bysene.
þæt hehis bisceopum
sendan myahte.
for þæm hi his| sume beþorftan.
þa þe leden spræce læste cuþon.

Hat$_{20}$

Siððan min onenglisc ælfred kyning
Awende| worda gehwelc ꝯmehis writerum
sende suð ꝯnorð heht.him| swelcra má
brengan biðære bisene ðæthe his biscepum
sen|dan meahte. Forðæm hihis sume ðorfton.
Ðaðe læden. spræ|ce læste cuðon :7 :7

CUL$_{Ii24}$

Siððan| me on englisc ælfryd cyning
awende worda ge hwilc. ꝯ| me his writerū
sende. suð ꝯ norð.
for þam he het him swil -|cra ma
brengan be þære bysyne þ̄ he his biscopū
sendan||| meahte
for þam hi his sume be þorftan
þa þe leden spræce| læste cuðon.

Tib$_{Bxi}$(Jn$_{53}$)

Siððan min on Englisc. Ælfred| kyning.
awende worda gehwelc. ꝯ me his write-| rum.
sende suð ꝯ norð. heht him swelcra ma.|
brengan be ðære bysene.
þæt he his biscepum.|
sendan meahte. forðæm hie his. sume ðorfton|
ða þe Læden spræce. læsðe cuðon :-|

CC$_{12}$

sið ðan mín onenglisc ælf|fred cyníng.
áwende worda ge|hwelc. ꝯméhis writerum___
_sendesuð| ꝯnorð___hehthim swelcra má.
bren|gan beðære bisene ðæt hehis| biscepum
sendan meahte. for|ðæmhiehis sume ðorfton
ðaðe||| læden spræce læste cuðon :7|

The addition of *for þam* and *he* to **CUL$_{Ii24}$** has a significant effect on syntax, but none on metre.

In **CUL$_{Ii24}$**, *for þam* introduces a "clause of explanation," used to "amplify, explain or suggest the reason for, a statement"[243] – in this case why Alfred sent the *Pastoral Care* south and north to his scribes: '[King Alfred] ...sent me southwards and northwards to his scribes, for he ordered them to produce more of the same according to this model, that he might send [them] to his bishops...'. In **Tr$_1$ Hat$_{20}$ Tib$_{Bxi}$(Jn$_{53}$) CC$_{12}$**, ll. 13b-15a follow asyndetically on the preceding sentence: '[King Alfred] ...sent me southwards and northwards to his scribes; he ordered them to produce more of the same according to this model that he might send [them] to his bishops...'.

The addition of *he* to **CUL$_{Ii24}$**, is related to the change in syntax brought on by the introduction of *for þam*. In **CUL$_{Ii24}$**, the pronoun is the subject of the clause; in **Tr$_1$ Hat$_{20}$ Tib$_{Bxi}$(Jn$_{53}$)** and **CC$_{12}$**, the clauses are joined asyndetically with non-repetition of the subject.[244] Both are acceptable syntax.

The additions to **CUL$_{Ii24}$** are probably to be attributed to the same propensity to clarification and explication noted by Horgan in her analysis of the main text of **Tr$_1$** and **CUL$_{Ii24}$**.[245] It is also possible, however, that they were prompted by a reinterpretation of an exemplar in *heht* (as in **Hat$_{20}$ Tib$_{Bxi}$(Jn$_{53}$)** and **CC$_{12}$**) as *he het*. As both words fall on the preliminary drop of a Type B-1 line, the addition or omission of *for þam* and *he* has no metrical effect.

[243]Liggins, diss., cited in Mitchell, *OES* § 3015.

[244]Mitchell, *OES* §1690.

[245]Horgan "Variants," p. 220.

Addition/Omission of Prefixes (1 example)

***CPPref* (CUL_{Ii24}-Tr_1: Hat_{20}-$Tib_{Bxi}(Jn_{53})$-CC_{12}), 15b**

Tr_1

Seððan me onenglesc. ælfræd cynincg
awęnde. worda| gehwilc. ꝯme his writerum
sende ꝟ suþ ꝯ norþ. het him swylcra ma
bringan.| beþære bysene.
þæt hehis bisceopum
sendan myahte.
for þæm hi his| sume **be**þorftan.
þa þe leden spræce læste cuþon.

Hat_{20}

Siððan min onenglisc ælfred kyning
Awende| worda gehwelc ꝯmehis writerum
sende suð ꝯnorð heht.him| swelcra má
brengan biðære bisene ðæthe his biscepum
sen|dan meahte. Forðæm hihis sume ðorfton.
Ðaðe læden. spræ|ce læste cuðon :7 :7

CUL_{Ii24}

Siððan| me on englisc ælfryd cyning
awende worda ge hwilc. ꝯ| me his writerū
sende. suð ꝯ norð.
for þam he het him swil -|cra ma
brengan be þære bysyne þ he his biscopū
sendan||| meahte
for þam hi his sume **be** þorftan
þa þe leden spræce| læste cuðon.

$Tib_{Bxi}(Jn_{53})$

Siððan min on Englisc. Ælfred| kyning.
awende worda gehwelc. ꝯ me his write-| rum.
sende suð ꝯ norð. heht him swelcra ma.|
brengan be ðære bysene.
þæt he his biscepum.|
sendan meahte. forðæm hie his. sume ðorfton|
ða þe Læden spræce. læsðe cuðon :-|

CC_{12}

sið ðan mín onenglisc ælf|fred cyníng.
áwende worda ge|hwelc. ꝯméhis writerum___
_sendesuð| ꝯnorð___hehthim swelcra má.
bren|gan beðære bisene ðæt hehis| biscepum
sendan meahte. for|ðæmhiehis sume ðorfton
ðaðe||| læden spræce læste cuðon :7|

The addition or omission of the prefix has no obvious effect on sense or syntax. Horgan notes that the addition of prefixes is a common feature of **Tr_1** and **CUL_{Ii24}**.[246] The variation does affect metre, however. In **Hat_{20} $Tib_{Bxi}(Jn_{53})$ CC_{12}** the line is a Type C-1 with a resolved first stress. To the extent that the **Tr_1 CUL_{Ii24}** line is metrical, it is Type A-1 with a metrically suspicious four anacrustic syllables.

[246]Horgan, "Variants," pp. 214-5.

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

***CPPref* (CUL$_{Ii24}$: Hat$_{20}$-Tib$_{Bxi}$(Jn$_{53}$)-CC$_{12}$-Tr$_1$), 6a**

Tr$_1$
5 riht spel monig
gregorius. gleaw mód geond wód.
þurh sefan| snytro. searo þanca hord.

Hat$_{20}$
5 ryhtspell monig.
Gregorius gleawmod gindwód
ðurh| sefan snyttro searo ðonca hord.

CUL$_{Ii24}$
5 riht spel monig.
– – – gleaw mod geond|wod
þurh sefan snytro searo þanca hord.

Tib$_{Bxi}$(Jn$_{53}$)
5 ryht spell monig.
Gregorius. gleaw mod. gind wod.|
ðurh sefan snyttro. searo ðonca hord.

CC$_{12}$
5 ryht|spel monig.
gregorius gleawmod| geondwód
ðurh sefan snyttro| searo ðonca hord.

The omission of expected *gregorius* from **CUL$_{Ii24}$** is presumably to be explained as a result of syntactic or sensical eyeskip. Since the subject of lines 5b-7 is the same as that of lines 3b-5a and since *gregorius* is appositive to the nominative adjective *gleaw mod*, the proper noun is neither syntactically nor sensically necessary.

The word *is* metrically necessary, however. Perhaps the unusual double alliteration[247] in the off-verse led the scribe of **CUL$_{Ii24}$** into accepting line 6b as a metrically complete long line.

Metrical Epilogue

Although there seems little reason to doubt that the Metrical Epilogue was intended to follow Alfred's translation of the *Pastoral Care* as the last item in the translation,[248] it has

[247]Although no other verse in this poem alliterates on either /g/ or /j/, two lines in the presumably contemporary *Metrical Epilogue* do: line 10 *gierdon... gode* and line 23 *Gregorius... gegiered*.

[248]Dobbie argues that "there is nothing in the metrical epilogue to connect it inescapably with the *Pastoral Care*, except perhaps the mention of Gregory in l. 23" (*ASPR* 6, p. cxii). In addition to the reference to Gregory, the poem's water imagery also seems to provide a connection with the last section of the prose, in which St. Gregory explains how he was *gened... ðæt ic nu hæbbe mænege men gelæd to ðæm stæðe fullfremednesse on ðæm scipe mines modes* 'compelled... to lead many men to the shore of perfection in the ship of my mind' and prays to John his interlocutor for the *on ðæm scipgebroce ðisses andweardan lifes sum bred geræce ðinra gebeda, ðæt ic mæge on sittan oð ic to londe cume* 'the plank of thy prayers in the shipwreck of this present life, that I may sit on it till I come to land...' (text and translation: Sweet, *King Alfred's Version*, pp. 466 and 467). A further reference to water is found in a citation of John 4:13-14

suffered more seriously than the Metrical Preface from the vicissitudes of fire and age. It survives in only two manuscripts, **Hat$_{20}$** and **CC$_{12}$** – although, as all but one of the remaining manuscripts of the *Pastoral Care* end defectively, it seems likely that its original circulation was wider than the number of surviving copies would suggest.[249]

As was the case with the variation found among the witnesses to the Metrical Preface, the lack of variation found between the witnesses to the Metrical Epilogue can be best explained in terms of the habits and interests of the scribes responsible for its surviving copies. Its two witnesses, although members of different textual groups, are the work of demonstrably careful scribes; scribes who, with the exception of a single relatively minor difference in case (see above, p. 98), transmit substantively identical versions of the Metrical Preface. In copying the Metrical Epilogue, these same scribes – assisted, in the case of **Hat$_{20}$** by an even more accomplished colleague[250] – copy their texts to an equally high standard of substantive accuracy.

"Cædmon's Hymn" (*eorðan*-recension)

As we have just seen, substantive textual variation among the witnesses to the Metrical Preface and Epilogue of the Old English *Pastoral Care* is restricted with one exception to the

---

which follows the Metrical Epilogue in **Hat$_{20}$**: *qui biberit aquā quā ego do dicit dns samaritane, fiet in eo fons aquae salientis in vitam eternā* (Vulgate: *qui autem biberit ex aqua quam ego dabo ei, non sitiet in aeternum: sed aqua quam ego dabo ei fiet in eo fons aquae salientis in vitam aeternam*). I am indebted to Fred C. Robinson for drawing my attention to this gloss.

[249]Junius's copy of **Tib$_{Bxi}$** breaks off mid-way through Chapter 49 (with *ic mæge hieran ðine stemne*, 380/15); **Otho$_{Bii}$** ends in Chapter 56 (*þa sculon*, 433/25); and **CUL$_{Ii24}$** in the middle of the last sentence of the last Chapter (*oð ic to lande cume*, Chapter 65, 467/25). Only **Tr$_1$** (which also omits the Prose Preface) can be said to have omitted the Epilogue for certain: its text ends with the last sentence of Chapter 65 (*minra agenra scylda*, 467/27), and the colophon: *Deos gratias. Amen.* (Ker, *Catalogue*, art. 88).

[250]The main scribe of **Hat$_{20}$**, believed by Ker to be responsible for the Metrical Preface (see above, p. 203 and fn. 203), copies most of the first 10 lines of the Metrical Epilogue (to *gode*, l. 10b and the bottom of f. 98r). The manuscript's "minor" hand – a much more accomplished scribe – takes over at the top of the verso and arranges the text of the Epilogue in the form of an inverted triangle which tapers to a point in the middle of the page. For a facsimile, see Robinson and Stanley, eds., *EEMF* 23, plates 6.2.2.1-6.2.2.2.

late tenth-/early eleventh- and late eleventh-century representatives of a single innovative textual tradition of the framing translation. When – as is the case with the Metrical Epilogue and all but the **Tr$_1$** and **CUL$_{Ii24}$** texts of the Metrical Preface – the poem was transmitted outside of this innovative tradition, the responsible scribes copied their texts with a minimum of substantive variation.

In contrast, the surviving witnesses to the West-Saxon *eorðan*-recension of "Cædmon's Hymn" exhibit a substantive variation which is both more frequent and more widely distributed across the textual groups of the framing text. By O'Keeffe's count, the five witnesses to the *eorðan*-recension of the Hymn found in copies of the Old English *Historia* contain seven variants which are "gramatically and semantically appropriate"[251]; by my own count, there are at least 15 substantive variants in the poem's six known witnesses which have a potentially significant effect on sense, metre, or syntax:

[251] *Visible Song*, p. 39. The variants she lists are as follows: "*nu/nu we* [l.1a]; *weorc/wera/weoroda* [l.3a]; *wuldorfaeder* [*sic*, for *wuldorfæder*]/*wuldorgodes* [l.3a]; *wundra/wuldres* [l.3b]; *gehwaes* [*sic*, for *gehwæs*]*/fela* [l.3b]; *or/ord* [l.4b]; *sceop/gescop* [5a]." Not included in this total are three variants from London, British Library, Additional 43703 (**N**) which O'Keeffe – probably correctly – discounts as being the likely result of Nowell's own copying errors (*Visible Song*, p. 39; see also below, p. 142, fn. 310); three unique variants from **B$_1$**: *herigan sculon*, l. 1a; *astealde*, l. 4b; and *þe*, l. 7a; and the variants from the marginal version of the *eorðan*-recension in Tournai, Bibliothèque Municipale, 134 (**To**). This last manuscript is not mentioned in O'Keeffe's chapter or index. Jabbour discusses nine variants: *ne*/*nu*, *we*/∅, l. 1a; *weorc/weoroda/wera*, l. 3a; *wundra*/*wuldres*, l. 3b; *or*/*oord*/*ord*, l. 4b; *sceop*/*gesceop*, l. 5a; *eorðan*/*eorþū*, l. 5b; *teode*/*eode*, l. 8b; *firum*/*finū*, l. 9a (diss., pp. 195-196, 197).

Table 1: Substantive Variants in the West-Saxon eorðan*-recension of "Cædmon's Hymn"*[252]

	C(N)	**O**	**Ca**	**T_1**	**B_1**	**To**[253]
1a	**Ne**	Nu	Nu	Nu	Nu	Nu
	∅	∅ *corr. to* **we**	we	∅	**we**	we
	sculon her gean	sculan herian	sceolan herigean	sculon herigean	**herigan sculon**	sceolon herian
3a	**weoroda**	**wero** *corr. to* **wera**	wera	weorc	weorc	weorc
	wul:|dor fæder	wuldor fæder	wuldor fæder	wuldor fæder	wuldor **godes**	wulder fæder
3 b	wundra	wundra	**wuldres**	wundra	wund ra	wundra
	gewhwæs *corr. to* gehwæs	ge hwæs	ge hwæs	gehwæs	**fela**	gehwæs
4 b	or	oór *corr. to* **oór,^{d}**	ord	ór	**ord**	**ær**
	onstealde (f.146v)[254]	onstealde	onstealde	on|stealde	**astealde**	astealde
5a	scop	**gesceop**	ge|scóp	sceop	sceop	sceop
5 b	**eorþū**	eorðan	orðan *corr. to* ,eorðan	eorðan	eorðan	eorðan
6 b	sc,^{y}pend	scyppend	scyppend	scyppend	scyp|pend	**drihten**
7a	þa	ða	þa	þa	**þe**	þa
8a	eode	teo de	teode	teode	teode	teode
9a	finū	firum	firū	firum	fyrum	firum
	foldan	**folda**, *corr. to* folda,^{n}	foldan	foldan	foldan	foldan

By either reckoning, this is a lot of variation for a nine line poem – especially when it is compared with the almost complete lack of substantive variation found among the witnesses to the roughly contemporary West-Saxon *ylda*-recension of the poem, or the two eighth-century witnesses to the Northumbrian *aeldu*-recension discussed in Chapter Two.[255] Comparing the *ylda*-and *eorðan*-texts, O'Keeffe has suggested that the more extensive

[252]Potentially significant variants in bold face. The manuscripts to which these sigla refer are listed beginning on p. 112 below. A list and explanation of all sigla used in this dissertation can be found in Appendix 2.

[253]O'Keeffe does not include the variants from **To** in her discussion of the variants in "Cædmon's Hymn."

[254]The catchword at the foot of f. 145r reads: *onsteald*.

[255]See pp. 21 ff. and 49 ff.

variation exhibited by the witnesses to the *eorðan*-text is evidence of the fundamentally formulaic approach its scribes took towards the transmission of Old English poetry, the results of which she contrasts with the type of contamination inevitable in all longer copying tasks:

> When we examine the variations in the five tenth- and eleventh-century records of the West Saxon [sc. *eorðan*-] version, we see in the despair of the textual editor palpable evidence of a fluid transmission of the *Hymn* somewhere between the formula-defined process which is an oral poem and the graph-bound object which is a text. We see a reading activity reflected in these scribal variants which is formula-dependent, in that the variants observe metrical and alliterative constraints, and which is context-defined, in that the variants produced arise within a field of possibilities generated within a context of expectations. The mode of reading I am proposing operates by suggestion, by 'guess' triggered by key-words in formulae. It is a method of reading which is the natural and inevitable product of an oral tradition at an early stage in its adaptation to the possibilities of writing. These five records of Cædmon's *Hymn* give evidence of a reading activity characterized by intense reader inference, where the reader uses knowledge of the conventions of the verse to 'predict' what is on the page. Variance in an oral tradition is made inevitable by the subjectivity of the speaker (and hearer), but is constrained by impersonal metre and alliteration. The writing of a poem acts as a very powerful constraint on variance, and in the face of such constraint, the presence of variance argues an equally powerful pull from the oral.
>
> The process of copying manuscripts is rarely simply mechanical. Given the normal medieval practice of reading aloud, or at least of sub-vocalizing, the scribe likely 'heard' at least some of his text. And copying done in blocks of text required the commission of several words or phrases to short-term memory. The trigger of memory is responsible for various sorts of contamination, and this is most easily seen, for example, in the importation of Old Latin readings into the copying of the Vulgate Bible. Quite another sort of memory-trigger is responsible for 'Freudian' substitutions in a text. Here the substitutes, if syntactically correct, are usually not semantically or contextually appropriate.
>
> The presence of variants in Cædmon's *Hymn*, however, differs in an important way from the appearance of memorial variants in biblical or liturgical texts. Both sorts depend to some degree on memory, but the variants in Cædmon's *Hymn* use memory not to import a set phrase but to draw on formulaic possibility. Reception here, conditioned by formulaic conventions, produces variants which are metrically, syntactically and semantically appropriate. In such a process, reading and copying have actually become conflated with composing. The integral presence of such variance in transmitting the *Hymn* in *AE [i.e. the *eorðan*-recension] argues for the existence of a transitional state between pure orality and pure literacy whose evidence is a reading process which applies oral techniques for the reception of a message to the decoding of a written text.[256]

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

As we shall see, however, the variation found among the witnesses to the West-Saxon *eorðan*-recension of "Cædmon's Hymn" has less to do with the formulaic responsiveness of the scribes involved in its transmission than with the attitude these scribes (or the scribes of their antecedents) take towards the framing text as a whole. As was the case with the Metrical Preface and Epilogue to the *Pastoral Care*, the most innovative versions of the *eorðan*-recension of "Cædmon's Hymn" are found in the most innovative witnesses to the framing prose text of the Old English translation of the *Historia* and show roughly similar amounts and types of textual variation. While the most innovative versions of this recension of the Hymn are not restricted to a single branch of the framing text, the variation they exhibit can be shown to match the demonstrable extra-poetical interests of the scribes responsible for copying them.

Manuscripts of the Old English *Historia*

As it has come down to us, the Old English *Historia* survives in five insular manuscripts dating from the first quarter of the tenth century to the second half of the eleventh[257]: Oxford, Bodleian Library, Tanner 10, s.x^{1} (**T$_1$**); †London, British Library, Cotton Otho B. xi, s.x^{med} (**C**; this manuscript was damaged in the Cotton fire and is known primarily from a sixteenth-century transcript by Lawrence Nowell, London, British Library, Additional 43703 [**N**][258]); Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 41, s.xi^{1} (**B$_1$**); Oxford, Corpus Christi College, 279, pt. ii, s.xi^{in} (**O**); Cambridge University Library, Kk. 3. 18, s.xi^{2} (**Ca**). A sixth copy of the *eorðan*-recension of the Hymn is found as a gloss to Bede's Latin paraphrase of

[257]The sigla used in this section are as in Dobbie, *Manuscripts*, pp. 8-9. For **O** a distinction is made between the uncorrected and corrected texts of the Hymn. For the uncorrected form, the siglum **O^{uncorr}** is used; the corrected text is represented by the siglum **O^{corr}**; forms which are the same in both the uncorrected and corrected versions are indicated by the siglum **O**.

[258]Nowell's transcript also contains a copy of **ChronG**. See below, p. 138, fn. 303.

the poem in the margins of a twelfth-century and perhaps continental version of the Latin *Historia*, †Tournai, Bibliothèque Municipale, 134 (**To**).[259]

Since the early eighteenth century, the manuscripts of the Old English *Historia* have been divided into two textual groups: **T_1 B_1** and **C**(**N**) **O Ca**.[260] Of these, **C**(**N**) **O Ca** show the least internal variation, especially **O** and **Ca** which are particularly close and probably linearly related.[261] **T_1** and **B_1**, on the other hand, show far more internal variation. While they share a number of common errors and omissions, the text of **B_1** in particular has been freely handled, and contains many unique readings not found in any other manuscript.[262]

As was the case with the *Pastoral Care*, the textual stemma implied by the framing text of the Old English *Historia* helps clarify the distribution of variants among the witnesses to the poem it contains (Figure 2). Like the framing text, the two earliest manuscripts of the *eorðan*-recension reproduce relatively similar texts.[263] With the exception of the unique, non-sensical, and probably sixteenth-century variants **C**(**N**) *ne* **T_1** *nu*, line 1a, **C**(**N**) *eorþū* **T_1** *eorðan*, line 5b, **C**(**N**) *eode* **T_1** *teode*, line 8a, and **C**(**N**) *finū* **T_1** *firum*, line 9a,[264] these two originally tenth-century records are separated by a single substitution, **C**(**N**) *weoroda* **T_1**

---

[259]See Ker, *Catalogue*, art. 387. The manuscript was destroyed in 1940. A facsimile can be found in *EEMF* 23, pl. 2.20.

[260]See: Raymond J.S. Grant, *The B-Text of the Old English Bede*: *A Linguistic Commentary*, Costerus n.s. 73 (Amsterdam: Rodophi, 1989), pp. 5-7; Dorothy Whitelock, "The Old English Bede," *Proc. Brit. Acad.* 48 (1962): 57-90 (esp. p. 81, fn. 22); Thomas Miller, ed., *The Old English Version of Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, EETS os 95, 110 (London: EETS, 1890-1898), v.1 pp. xxiv-xxvi; and Jacob Schipper, ed. *König Alfreds Übersetzung von Bedas Kirchengeschichte*, 2 vols., Bibliothek der angelsächsichen Prosa 4 (Leipzig: Georg H. Wigand, 1898-1899), pp. xi-xxxv. For a modified view of this traditional division, see Grant, *The B-Text*, p. 6. His modified stemma does not affect the following discussion.

[261]Schipper, *König Alfreds Übersetzung*, p. xix; Both Dobbie (*Manuscripts*, p. 213) and Schipper (*König Alfreds Übersetzung*, p. xix) cite Zupitza (*Altenglisches Übungsbuch*, 2nd edition [Vienna: 1881] p. iv) as the first to notice this relationship. I have been unable to consult the 2nd edition.

[262]Miller, *The Old English Version*, v.1, p. xxv; Schipper, p. xxxiv; Grant, *The B-Text*, pp. 10-11 *et passim*.

[263]On the relationship of **T_1** and **B_1**, see Miller, *The Old English Version*, v.1, pp. xxv.

[264]See O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 39; Jabbour, diss., pp. 195-196; Dobbie, *Manuscripts*, p. 25.

weorc, line 3a.[265] As is again true of the framing text, there is also very little variation between the individual members of the **C**(**N**) **O Ca** group. While the manuscripts at the farthest ends of this branch, **C**(**N**) and **Ca**, contain quite different texts of the Hymn, all but two of the variants which separate them are transcription errors in **C**(**N**) or can be traced to corrections made in **O**. In its uncorrected state, **O**$^{\textbf{uncorr}}$ has only three readings (apart from the transcription errors in **C**(**N**)) which are not found in **C**(**N**): a substitution of the stressed synonyms **O**$^{\textbf{uncorr}}$ *wero* (**O**$^{\textbf{corr}}$ *wera*) for **C**(**N**) *weoroda*, line 3a; the addition of the prefix *ge-* to **C**(**N**) *scop* (**O** *gesceop*), line 5a; and the inflectional difference, **O**$^{\textbf{uncorr}}$ *folda* (**O**$^{\textbf{corr}}$ *folda,*^{n}) for **C**(**N**) *foldan***,** l. 9a. In its corrected state, **O**$^{\textbf{corr}}$ supplies all but one of the readings in **Ca**, the only innovation in the latter manuscript being the inflectional difference and substitution of synonyms **Ca** *wuldres* **O** *wundra*, line 3b. In the other tradition, **To**, despite its lack of a framing text, shows an affinity with and lies somewhere between the **T**$_{\mathbf{1}}$ and **B**$_{\mathbf{1}}$ versions of the Hymn. Like **T**$_{\mathbf{1}}$ and **B**$_{\mathbf{1}}$, **To** has *weorc* for **C**(**N**) *weoroda* (**O**$^{\textbf{corr}}$ **Ca** *wera*). Like **B**$_{\mathbf{1}}$, it adds *we* to line 1a (**B**$_{\mathbf{1}}$ **O**$^{\textbf{corr}}$ *we*; **T**$_{\mathbf{1}}$ **C**(**N**) **O**$^{\textbf{uncorr}}$ **Ca** ∅) and reads *astealde* for **T**$_{\mathbf{1}}$ *on*|*stealde* (**C**(**N**) **O Ca** *onstealde*) **B**$_{\mathbf{1}}$ *astealde*, line 4b. Like **T**$_{\mathbf{1}}$ (and the members of the **C**(**N**) **O Ca** group), **To** has *sceolon herian* for **B**$_{\mathbf{1}}$ *herigan sculon*, line 1a; *wulder fæder* for **B**$_{\mathbf{1}}$ *wuldor godes*, line 3a; *gehwæs* for **B**$_{\mathbf{1}}$ *fela*, line 3a; and *þa* for **B**$_{\mathbf{1}}$ *þe*, line 7a. Its two unique variants, **To** *ær* (**T**$_{\mathbf{1}}$ *ór* **C**(**N**) *or* **O**$^{\textbf{uncorr}}$ *oór* **B**$_{\mathbf{1}}$ **Ca** *ord* **O**$^{\textbf{corr}}$ *oór,*^{d}), line 4b, and **To** *drihten* (**T**$_{\mathbf{1}}$ **O Ca** *scyppend* **B**$_{\mathbf{1}}$ *scyp*|*pend* **C**(**N**) *sc,*^{y}*pend*), line 6b, both have the look of scribal errors: *ær* for *ord/or* is presumably to be explained as a graphic error, while *drihten* for *scyppend* may reflect the influence of the same word in lines 4a and 8a.

[265] An annotated catalogue of potentially significant substantive variation in this recension of the Hymn follows below, pp. 121-136.

This leaves us with two witnesses which are between them responsible for the introduction of the bulk of the textual variation into each textual group: **B_1**, and the corrected **O**.

Oxford, Corpus Christi College, 279, pt. ii (O/O^{uncorr}/O^{corr})

As mentioned above, in its uncorrected form, **O^{uncorr}** presents a text relatively close to that of **C**(**N**). Apart from the four transcription errors in **C**(**N**) (*ne*, *eorþū*, *eode* and *finū*, see above, p. 113), **O^{uncorr}** introduces three forms not found in **C**(**N**), two of which are non-sensical: **O^{uncorr}** *wero* (**O^{corr} Ca** *wera* **C**(**N**) *weoroda* **T_1 B_1 To** *weorc*), line 3a; **O** *gesceop* (**C**(**N**) *scop*; **T_1** *sceop*), line 5a; and **O^{uncorr}** *folda* (**O^{corr}** *folda,ⁿ*; **C**(**N**) **Ca T_1 B_1 To** *foldan*), line 9a. In its corrected form, **O^{corr}** fixes *folda* and *wero* and adds another two potentially significant substantive variants: **O^{corr}** *we* (**O^{uncorr} C**(**N**) **T_1** ∅; **Ca B_1 To** *we*), line 1a; and **O^{corr}** *oór;ᵈ* (**O^{uncorr}** *oór* **C**(**N**) *or* **T_1** *ór*; **Ca B_1** *ord*; **To** *ær*), line 4b.

As all but one of the sensible, and syntactically and metrically appropriate variants introduced into the **O**-text of the Hymn are by correction (and as a result involve the alteration of text already committed to parchment), these variants lack by definition the spontaneity implicit in O'Keeffe's definition of "transitional" copying as a "reading activity characterized by intense reader inference, where the reader uses knowledge of the conventions of the verse to 'predict' what is on the page," and in which scribes produce syntactically, metrically and semantically appropriate variants "by suggestion, by 'guess' triggered by key-words in formulae."[266] As all but one of the variants in **O** are found in other recensions of the Hymn (and in the marginal West-Saxon *ylda*-text in particular),[267] moreover, it seems likely that the scribe responsible for **O^{corr}** either collated his text against a manuscript in which a copy of the

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

ylda-recension was found[268] or knew such a text by heart and corrected his exemplar to match the version with which they were more familiar.[269] That this second possibility is the more likely is suggested by the reading *wera* in line 3a: had the corrector of **O** had a copy of another recension of the Hymn in front of him, we would expect him to substitute *weorc*, the reading (with dialectal and orthographic variation) of all witnesses to all recensions of the Hymn except **C**(**N**), **O** and **Ca**. *Wera* 'of men', which is graphically and metrically similar to *weorc* 'work(s)' but closer to the **C**(**N**) reading *weoroda* 'of hosts' in sense and grammar, on the other hand, looks very much like what we might describe as a memorial conflation were it not by correction. It reduces the Type D*2 or D*4 metre of the **C**(**N**) version of line 3a to a Type D-2 or D-4 (as in all other recensions of the Hymn) without dramatically changing the sense of the "original" reading in **C**(**N**). Recognising that the **C**(**N**) form was incorrect, the scribe of **O**$^{\textbf{corr}}$ appears to have corrected his original *wero* (for *weoroda*?) by supplying a form which is semantically and grammatically similar to the form in **C**(**N**), but metrically equivalent to that in all other versions of the Hymn.

As Miller and Schipper note, similar corrections are found throughout the **O** text of the *Historia*.[270]

Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 41 ($\mathbf{B_1}$)

The eleventh-century $\mathbf{B_1}$ is by far the most innovative witness to any version of "Cædmon's Hymn." It contains seven variants not found in its closest relative, $\mathbf{T_1}$, all of

---

[267]The exception is *wera*, line 3. As noted below, this substitution does bring the **O**$^{\textbf{corr}}$ version of line 3a into a closer metrical congruence with the *ylda*-text, however. See also p. 125.

[268]The **O** scribe does not adopt the two nonsensical readings of the *ylda*-recension, *gehwilc* and *tida* (see above, Chapter 2, pp. 27-29). This may indicate that a second, corrected copy of the *ylda*-text was in circulation, or it may be further evidence to suggest that the preservation of the corruptions in the marginal texts of the Hymn was the result of deliberate scribal attempts at literal accuracy; working outside of the margins, the **O** scribe may have felt free to change the parts that did not make sense.

[269]Both possibilities are discussed briefly by Jabbour, diss., p. 197.

which are metrically, syntactically and semantically appropriate. Of these, three are found in other witnesses to the *eorðan*-recension of the *Hymn* and, as they are also the readings of the *ylda*-text, are perhaps to be ascribed to a conscious or unconscious conflation of the *eorðan*-recension with another version: **B_1** *we* for **T_1 C(N) O^{uncorr}** ∅ (**O^{corr} Ca To** *we*; all manuscripts of the *ylda*- and Northumbrian *eordu*-recensions), line 1a; **B_1** *ord* for **T_1** *ór* **C(N)** *or* **O^{uncorr}** *oór* (**O^{corr}** *oór*,^{d} **Ca** *ord*; all manuscripts of the *ylda*-recension except **W**), line 4b; and **B_1** *astealde* for **T_1** *on|stealde* (**C(N) O Ca** *onstealde*) **To** *astealde*, line 4b.

The remaining four variants, however, are both unique to **B_1** and metrically, syntactically, lexically, or visually striking. The inversion of *sculon herigan*, line 1a, has no effect on sense or syntax, but changes the metre to a Type B-1 from the Type A-3 line found in all other manuscripts of the Hymn.[271] The substitution of the relative marker **B_1** *þe* for the temporal adverb *þa* (and orthographic variants) in the other manuscripts of the *eorðan*-recension, in contrast, has no effect on metre, but a significant effect on syntax. **B_1** *wuldor godes* (for *wuldorfæder* and variants in all other manuscripts), line 3a, while having no effect on sense, metre, or syntax, cannot be the result of a graphic substitution of homographs. **B_1** *fela* (for *gehwæs* and variants in all other witnesses), line 3b, is equally striking graphically, and has an effect on both metre and syntax.

All these variants make good sense, metre, and syntax, and seem, as a result, to be among the best evidence for the type of "formulaic" reading O'Keeffe suggests is responsible for the textual variation among witnesses to various multiply attested poems. Except that there is nothing particularly formulaic about them. As striking and as appropriate as they are, the variants introduced into the poetic text of "Cædmon's Hymn" in **B_1** correspond in frequency

---

[270]Miller, *The Old English Version*, v.1, pp. xviii-xx; Schipper, *König Alfreds Übersetzung*, p. xiii.

and type to the more general pattern of variation found throughout the prose of the main text of the Old English *Historia* in this manuscript,[272] and as such are less likely "the natural and inevitable product of an oral tradition at an early stage in its adaptation to the possibilities of writing,"[273] or a product of memorial transmission,[274] than the result of a demonstrable editorial tendency in the tradition leading up to the **B$_1$** text.[275] Indeed, as the following extract from Miller's edition (based at this point on **T$_1$**)[276] and his collation of **B$_1$** for the page on which "Cædmon's Hymn" appears demonstrates, alterations of vocabulary, inflection, and syntax are as frequent in the surrounding prose of Book IV, Chapter 24 as they are in the Hymn itself[277]:

1	**T$_1$**	Þa **cwæð**
	B$_1$	[MS p. 321] þa **andswarode**
2	**T$_1$**	**he**: Hwæt sceal ic singan? **Cwæð he**: Sing me frumsceaft. Þa
	B$_1$	**he ȝ cwæð** hwæt sceal ic [MS p. 322] singan? **ða cwæð**: Sing me frumsceaft. Þa
3	**T$_1$**	he ða þas andsware onfeng, þa ongon he sona singan **in herenesse**
	B$_1$	he ða þas andsware onfeng, þa ongan he sona singan **on herunge**

---

[271]The variants mentioned in this paragraph are discussed in greater detail in the catalogue of textual variants. See below, pp. 129-134

[272]An exhaustive treatment of the textual variation between **B$_1$** and **T$_1$** can be found in Grant, *The B-Text*.

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

[274]The conclusion of Jabbour, diss., pp. 199-200.

[275]According to Ker, **B$_1$** was copied by two scribes working simultaneously beginning at pp. 1 and 207 (*Catalogue*, art. 32). "Cædmon's Hymn" (p. 322) was copied by the second scribe. Grant reports no major differences between the two scribes in terms of the alterations introduced in their sections: "it has not been found productive to distinguish the changes wrought to the Bede text by the individual scribes. Neither of the scribes emerges as any more responsible than his colleagues for the alterations, and any commentary on differences between the practices of various scribes would properly have to be directed to B's exemplar in any case" (*The B-Text*, p. 11). The creativity of the second scribe in particular has been frequently discussed. In "'Bede's' Envoi to the Old English *History*: an Experiment in Editing" (*SP* 78 [1981]: 4-19), Robinson suggests that the second scribe has actually composed an entire poem and put it into the mouth of Bede at the end of the Old English *Historia*.

[276]Miller, *The Old English Version*, v.1, p. xxii.

[277]Text and line numbers are from Miller, *The Old English Version*, v.1, p. 344 (**Tr$_1$**) and v.2, pp. 408-410 (**B$_1$**). I have printed substantive variants from **B$_1$** in bold-face. Miller records one emendation to **T$_1$** in the apparatus to his edition, *Gode wyrðes* for **T$_1$** *godes wordes*, l.17; I have restored the **T$_1$** reading. As Miller gives only the textual variants from **B$_1$**, readings from that manuscript in normal type are extrapolated from the text of **T$_1$**.

4 **T₁** Godes Scyppendes þa fers ȝ þa word þe he næfre gehyrde, þære
B₁ Godes Scyppendes ða uers ȝ þa word **godes** þe he næfre **ær ne** gehyrde,

5 **T₁** endebyrdnesse **þis is**.... ["Cædmon's Hymn"]
B₁ **ne heora** endebyrdnesse... ["Cædmon's Hymn"]

15 **T₁** Þa aras he from þæm slæpe, ȝ eal, **þa þe** he slæpende song, fæste
B₁ Þa aras he fram þam slæpe, ȝ eall **ðæt he** slæpende sang **he hyt** fæste

16 **T₁** **in** gemynde hæfde. ȝ þæm wordum sona monig word in þæt ilce
B₁ **on** gemynde hæfde. ȝ þam wordum sona monig word in þ ylce

17 **T₁** gemet **Godes wordes** songes togeþeodde. Þa com he on **morgenne**
B₁ gemet **gode wyrðes** sanges **þær** togeþeodde. Þa cóm he on **morgen**

18 **T₁** to þæm túngerefan, þe his ealdormon wæs: sægde him hwylce gife
B₁ to ðam túngerefan, **se** ðe his ealdorman wæs: sæde him hwylce gyfe

19 **T₁** he **onfeng**; ȝ he hine sona to þære abbudissan gelædde ȝ hire **þa**
B₁ he **onfangen hæfde**; ȝ he hyne sona to þære abbodessan gelædde ȝ hyre **þ**

20 **T₁** cyðde ȝ sægde. Þa heht heo gesomnian ealle þa gelæredestan men...
B₁ cyðde ȝ sæde. Þa het heo gesamnian ealle þa gelære[MS p. 323]destan menn...

Among the substantive variants on this – not unusual – page from the **B₁** text of the *Historia* are many which agree in type with the innovations found in the same manuscript's text of "Cædmon's Hymn": inflectional differences: **B₁** *gode* **T₁** *godes*, line 17; **B₁** *morgen* **T₁** *morgenne*, line 17; **B₁** *onfangen hæfde* **T₁** *onfeng*, line 19; substitutions of nouns: **B₁** *herunge* **T₁** *herenesse*, line 3; **B₁** *wyrðes* **T₁** *wordes*, line 17; of prepositions and conjunctions: **B₁** *on* **T₁** *in*, lines 3 and 16; **B₁** *ðæt he* **T₁** *þa þe*, line 15; **B₁** *þ* **T₁** *þa*, line 19; the addition or omission of adjectives and verbs: **B₁** *andswarode*, line 1, **B₁** *godes*, line 4; and of prepositions, pronouns, adverbs and conjunctions: **B₁** *ȝ*, line 2; **B₁** *ða*, line 2; **T₁** *he*, line 2; **B₁** *ær*, line 4; **B₁** *ne*, lines 4 and 5; **B₁** *heora*, line 5; **B₁** *he*, line 15; **B₁** *hyt*, line 15; **B₁** *þær*, line 17; **B₁** *se*, line 18.

The closeness of this correspondence can be demonstrated beyond doubt, when the innovation introduced into the **B₁** text of the Hymn is compared to that catalogued by Grant from the Old English *Historia* as a whole.[278] The addition of *we* to line 1a of the **B₁** text of "Cædmon's Hymn," for example, is paralleled by "83" examples in the *Historia* in which **B₁**

shows the addition of a "noun or pronoun as the subject or object" of a verb which appears without an explicit subject or object in **T₁**.[279] Substitutions of stressed elements such as **B₁** -*godes* ("Cædmon's Hymn," line 3b), *ord* ("Cædmon's Hymn," line 5b), or, from the prose cited above, **B₁** *herunge* **T₁** *herenesse*, line 3; **B₁** *wyrðes* **T₁** *wordes*, line 17, are with over 360 occurrences among the most frequent variants cited by Grant from the **B₁** text.[280] Variation in the choice of adjectives is also frequent (approximately 150 examples), although "Cædmon's Hymn" line 3a is the only example Grant cites of a substitution involving *fela* or *gehwa*.[281] The substitution *astealde* for *onstealde* is but one example of hundreds of similar variants in the use of prefixes with nouns, adjectives, adverbs and verbs cited by Grant.[282] The substitution of the relative pronoun for *þa* in "Cædmon's Hymn," line 7a, likewise is only one of numerous examples of the (correct and incorrect) substitution or addition of the relative particle in **B₁**.[283]

Textual Variants

The following catalogue is arranged on a manuscript-by-manuscript basis. It includes all potentially significant substantive variants found among the witnesses to the Hymn, with the exception of the four nonsensical transcription errors in **C**(**N**) discussed above (p. 113). As

[278]All variants and counts from the main text of the **B₁** *Historia* cited in this and the following paragraphs are from Grant, *The B-Text*.

[279]Grant, *The B-Text*, pp. 331-2, 336-7. The figure "83" is given on p. 331. Although Grant does not break his count down into separate figures for nouns and pronouns, all but one of the examples he cites involve the addition of a pronoun.

[280]"Cædmon's Hymn" line 3b is the only example of variation between *-god* and *-fæder* listed by Grant; variation between **B₁** *god* and **T₁** *drihten* (and, less frequently, vice versa), however, is relatively common. In Grant's citations, **B₁** substitutes *god*(-) for **T₁** *driht*(*e*)*n*(-) five times, **B₁** *driht*(*e*)*n*(-) for **T₁** *god*- twice. **B₁** and **T₁** have *god*(-) for *driht*(*e*)*n*(-) in other manuscripts of the *Historia* twice. See *The B-Text*, pp. 51-2.

[281]Grant, *The B-Text*, pp. 98-108.

[282]For examples see Grant, *The B-Text*, pp. 84-9 (nouns); 109-110 (adjectives); 127 (adverbs); and 197-218 (verbs). The "Cædmon's Hymn" variant does not appear in Grant's lists of variants involving verbal prefixes or substitutions.

[283]Grant, *The B-Text*, pp. 131-132 and 143-4.

some innovations occur – presumably independently – in both manuscript groups, there is some duplication in the forms cited.

†London, British Library, Cotton Otho B. xi
(London, British Library, Additional 43703 [C(N)])

Substitution of Stressed Words and Elements (1 example)

Cæd(eorðan) (C(N)), 3a

T_1

1 Nu sculon herigean heofon|rices weard
meotodes meahte ⁊his modgeþanc
weorc| wuldor fæder swahe wundragehwæs
ece drihten ór on|stealde.

C(N)

1 Ne sculon her gean heofon rices we:|ard
metodes mihte . Ond his mod geþonc
weoroda wul:|dor fæder swa he wundra gewhwæs
ece drihten or|| onstealde.

B_1

1 Nuweherigan sculon| heofonrices weard
metodes mihte| ⁊hismod geþanc
weorc wuldor godes| swahe wund ra fela
écedrihten ord| astealde

O^{corr}

1 Nu^{we} sculan herian heofon|rices weard
metodes mihte ⁊hismod geþonc
werawuldor fæder swahe wundra ge hwæs|
ecedryhten oór,^{d}onstealde

To

1 Nu we sceolon herian heofonrices weard.
metodes mihte ⁊ his mod|geþanc
weorc wulder fæder swa he wundra gehwæs.
ece drihten ær| astealde.

Ca

1 Nu we| sceolan herigean heofon rices weard
metodes mihte ⁊his mod ge þanc.
wera| wuldor fæder. swa he wuldres ge hwæs
ece drihten. ord onstealde

The substitution **C(N)** *weoroda* **T_1 B_1 To** *weorc* (**O^{uncorr}** *wero* **O^{corr} Ca** *wera*) affects sense, metre, and syntax. In **T_1 B_1 To** (and all other recensions of the Hymn), *weorc* is to be construed as the subject or object of *sculon herian* (and orthographic variants), line 1a,[284] with *wuldorfæder* (and orthographic variants) a subordinate genitive of specification: 'work of the Glorious Father'. In **C(N)**, however, *weoroda* is itself a genitive plural, modifying *wul:|dor fæder* (in this case to be construed as an accusative singular): 'Glorious Father of hosts'. This leaves *sculon* without a *logical* candidate for the syntactically necessary expressed subject, although it is grammatically possible to construe *we:|ard*, *mihte* and *mod geþonc* as

[284]Mitchell, "Cædmon's Hymn, Line 1: What is the Subject of *Scylun* or its Variants," *LSE* 16 (1985): 190-97.

nominatives.[285] In **C**(**N**), with *weorc* (as in **T₁**), line 3a is to be scanned as a Type D-2 or D-4, with resolution of the first stress; with *weoroda*, the equivalent line is Type D*2 or D*4.[286]

The **O**$^{\textbf{uncorr}}$ and **O**$^{\textbf{corr}}$ (**Ca**) forms are discussed below. See pp. 123 and 125.

Oxford, Corpus Christi College, 279, pt. ii
Uncorrected Text (O$^{\text{uncorr}}$)

Inflectional Difference (1 example)

Cæd(*eorðan*) (O$^{\text{uncorr}}$), 7a

T₁

5 he ærest sceop eorðan bearnū
heofontohrofe| halig scyppend.
þamiddangeard moncynnes weard
ece| drihten æfter teode
firum **foldan** frea ælmihtig.

C(N)

5 he ærest scop eorþū bearnū
heofon tohrofe| halig sc,ʸpend.
þa middan geard mon cynnes weard
ece| drihten æfter eode
finū **foldan** frea ælmihtig.

B₁

5 he ærest sceop eorðan bear|num
heofon tohrofe halig scyp|pend
þemiddan geard mann cynnes| weard
écedrihten æfter teode|
fyrum **foldan** frea ælmihtig.

O$^{\text{uncorr}}$

5 heærest gesceop| eorðan bearnum
heofon to hrofe halig| scyppend
ðamiddon geard moncynnes weard
ecedrihten æfterteo de
firum**folda** frea| ælmihtig.

To

5 he ærost sceop eorðan bearnū.
heofon to hrofe. halig| drihten.
þa middan eard mancynnes weard
ece drihten æfť teode.|
firum **foldan**. frea ælmihtig.

Ca

5 he æres ge|scóp___,eorðan bearnū
heofon to rofe halig scyppend.
þa middan geard mon-|cynnes weard
ece drihtī æfī teode
firū **foldan** frea ælmihtig.

O$^{\text{uncorr}}$ *folda* (**T₁ B₁ To C**(**N**) **Ca** *foldan*, **O**$^{\text{corr}}$ *folda,*^{n}) is almost certainly the result of a graphic oversight. A second possibility, that *folda* preserves a form similar to *foldu* (the reading of the Northumbrian *aeldu*-recension) and shows the falling together of unstressed *-a*

[285] For objections to taking *sculon* as 'we must', see Mitchell, "Cædmon's Hymn, Line 1," p. 192. Mitchell's article is concerned in the first instance with the reading of the Northumbrian *aeldu*-recension and the **T₁** version of the *eorðan*-recension of the poem. His suggestion – that *weorc* (and orthographic and dialectal variants) be understood as the subject of "*scylun* or its variants" – does not work in the case of **C(N)** or **O**$^{\text{uncorr}}$. These two witnesses have the genitives *weoroda* and *wera* respectively for the nominative/accusative plural *weorc* of **T₁**. For a further discussion of the point, see below, p. 127.

[286] Pope argues that line 3 is to be scanned as a Type D-2 with *wuldor* "pronounced as one syllable, *Wuldr*" and the first syllable of *fæder* understood as an unresolved short half-stress (*Seven Old English Poems*, p. 113 and fn. 34). If *wuldor* is scanned as a dissyllable, the line is Type D-4 and the stress on *fæder* resolved.

and *-u*, is less likely given the predominately West-Saxon character of the translation. The expected West-Saxon form would be *foldan*.[287]

Substitution of Stressed Words and Elements (1 example)

***Cæd*(*eorðan*) (O^{uncorr}), 3a**

T_1

1 Nu sculon herigean heofon|rices weard
meotodes meahte ⁊his modgeþanc
weorc| wuldor fæder swahe wundragehwæs
ece drihten ór on|stealde.

C(N)

1 Ne sculon her gean heofon rices we:|ard
metodes mihte. Ond his mod geþonc
weoroda wul:|dor fæder swa he wundra gewhwæs
ece drihten or|| onstealde.

B_1

1 Nuweherigan sculon| heofonrices weard
metodes mihte| ⁊hismod geþanc
weorc wuldor godes| swahe wund ra fela
écedrihten ord| astealde

O^{uncorr}

1 Nu sculan herian heofon|rices weard
metodes mihte ⁊hismod geþonc
werowuldor fæder swahe wundra ge hwæs|
ecedryhten oór onstealde

To

1 Nu we sceolon herian heofonrices weard.
metodes mihte ⁊ his mod|geþanc
weorc wulder fæder swa he wundra gehwæs.
ece drihten ær| astealde.

Ca

1 Nu we| sceolan herigean heofon rices weard
metodes mihte ⁊his mod ge þanc.
wera| wuldor fæder. swa he wuldres ge hwæs
ece drihten. ord onstealde

The substitution **O^{uncorr}** *wero* **C**(**N**) *weoroda* (**O^{corr} Ca** *wera*) **T_1 B_1 To** *weorc* is non-sensical. For his part, Dobbie suggests that the **O^{uncorr}** form is evidence that **C**(**N**) *weoroda* is the original reading of the **C**(**N**) **O Ca** group:

> In O, *wera* was originally written *wero*, the *o* then being corrected to *a* by the addition of a long stroke across the upper right-hand side of the letter. The scribe of O may have found *weroda* in his copy, corresponding to the *weoroda* of C, and emended it to *wera*, though why he should have done so is not evident, unless to be rid of the excessively long expanded D2 type line with the double resolution of stress.[288]

Jabbour, on the other hand, argues that the change was more likely independent in both manuscripts:

> [Dobbie] goes on to argue that *weoroda* (in the form *weroda*) developed first, then was emended to *wera* by C [*sic*: for **O**?]. But the explanation involves more difficulties than the explanation which it set out to avoid. Why one scribe could not

[287]Campbell, *OEG* § 615. *Foldu* is discussed in Campbell, *OEG* § 616.

[288]Dobbie, *Manuscripts*, p. 31.

have transcribed *weorc* as *wera*, while two others could have successively converted *weorc* to *weoroda* and *weroda* to *wera* is hard to fathom. In all likelihood the scribe of C [*sic*: for **O**?] (or an ancestor) had before him either *werc* or *weorc* (probably the latter), which to his eye looked like *wera* or *weora*. If he thought he saw *weora*, he assumed the *o* to be from another dialect and dropped it. Or, to complicate matters, the form *weoroda* in C may have been introduced by the Renaissance transcriber of that now destroyed text.[289]

The case is ultimately undecidable. For a discussion of the **C**(**N**) and **O**$^{\textbf{corr}}$ (**Ca**) forms, see pp. 121 and 125.

Addition/Omission of Prefixes (1 example)

***Cæd*(*eorðan*) (O$^{\textbf{uncorr}}$), 5a**

T_1

5 he ærest sceop eorðan bearnū
heofontohrofe| halig scyppend.

C(N)

5 he ærest scop eorþū bearnū
heofon tohrofe| halig sc,ʸpend.

B_1

5 he ærest sceop eorðan bear|num
heofon tohrofe halig scyp|pend

O

5 heærest **ge**sceop| eorðan bearnum
heofon to hrofe halig| scyppend

To

5 he ærost sceop eorðan bearnū.
heofon to hrofe. halig| drihten.

Ca

5 he æres **ge**|scóp ___,eorðan bearnū
heofon to rofe halig scyppend.

The addition or omission of *ge* has no effect on sense or syntax. Without the prefix, the line is a Type B-1; in **O** and **Ca**, it is a Type B-2. Both readings can be paralleled from other recensions of the Hymn.[290]

[289] Jabbour, diss., p. 214.

[290] *gesceop* is the reading of the West-Saxon *ylda*-recension. All other versions omit the prefix.

Oxford, Corpus Christi College, 279, pt. ii
Corrected (O^{corr})

Substitution of Stressed Words and Elements (2 examples)

Cæd(eorðan) (O^{corr}), 3a

T_1

1 Nu sculon herigean heofon|rices weard
meotodes meahte ⁊his modgeþanc
weorc| wuldor fæder swahe wundragehwæs
ece drihten ór on|stealde.

C(N)

1 Ne sculon her gean heofon rices we:|ard
metodes mihte. Ond his mod geþonc
weoroda wul:|dor fæder swa he wundra gewhwæs
ece drihten or|| onstealde.

B_1

1 Nuweherigan sculon| heofonrices weard
metodes mihte| ⁊hismod geþanc
weorc wuldor godes| swahe wund ra fela
écedrihten ord| astealde

O^{corr}

1 Nu^{we} sculan herian heofon|rices weard
metodes mihte ⁊hismod geþonc
werawuldor fæder swahe wundra ge hwæs|
ecedryhten oór,^{d}onstealde

To

1 Nu we sceolon herian heofonrices weard.
metodes mihte ⁊ his mod|geþanc
weorc wulder fæder swa he wundra gehwæs.
ece drihten ær| astealde.

Ca

1 Nu we| sceolan herigean heofon rices weard
metodes mihte ⁊his mod ge þanc.
wera| wuldor fæder. swa he wuldres ge hwæs
ece drihten. ord onstealde

Assuming that a common antecedent in the **O**-**C** tradition read either *weoroda* or *wera* (see above, pp. 121 and 123), the substitution **O^{corr} Ca** *wera* **C**(**N**) *weoroda* (**O^{uncorr}** *wero*) has no effect on syntax, and a minor effect on sense and metre. Syntactically, the two readings are identical: **O^{corr} Ca** *wera* and **C**(**N**) *weoroda* are both genitive plurals modifying *wuldorfæder* (and orthographic variants). Semantically, God is the *wuldor fæder* of 'men' in **O^{corr} Ca**, and of 'hosts' in **C**(**N**). Metrically, the **O^{corr} Ca** reading produces a Type D-2 or D-4 line with resolution of the first lift. As mentioned above (p. 116), this is metrically closer to the reading of all other recensions of the poem (a Type D-2 or D-4 with a long first lift). The **C**(**N**) form is Type D*2 or D*4.

***Cæd*(*eorðan*) (O^{corr}), 4b**

T_1

1 Nu sculon herigean heofon|rices weard
meotodes meahte ⁊his modgeþanc
weorc| wuldor fæder swahe wundragehwæs
ece drihten **ór** on|stealde.

C(N)

1 Ne sculon her gean heofon rices we:|ard
metodes mihte. Ond his mod geþonc
weoroda wul:|dor fæder swa he wundra gewhwæs
ece drihten **or**|| onstealde.

B_1

1 Nuweherigan sculon| heofonrices weard
metodes mihte| ⁊hismod geþanc
weorc wuldor godes| swahe wund ra fela
écedrihten **ord**| astealde

O^{corr}

1 Nu^{we} sculan herian heofon|rices weard
metodes mihte ⁊hismod geþonc
werawuldor fæder swahe wundra ge hwæs|
ecedryhten **oór**^{d} onstealde

To

1 Nu we sceolon herian heofonrices weard.
metodes mihte ⁊ his mod|geþanc
weorc wulder fæder swa he wundra gehwæs.
ece drihten **ær**| astealde.

Ca

1 Nu we| sceolan herigean heofon rices weard
metodes mihte ⁊his mod ge þanc.
wera| wuldor fæder. swa he wuldres ge hwæs
ece drihten. **ord** onstealde

The substitution **O^{corr}** *oór*^{d} (i.e. *ord*, the reading of **B_1**, **Ca** and all members of the *ylda*-recension except **W**) **O^{uncorr}** *oór* (i.e. *or*, the reading of **T_1 C**(**N**) and all witnesses to the Northumbrian *aelda*- and *eordu*-recensions) has no effect on sense, metre, or syntax. The two words are synonymous and metrically and syntactically equivalent. The **To** reading *ær* is discussed below, p. 135.

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

***Cæd*(*eorðan*) (O^{corr}), 1a**

T$_1$

1 Nu sculon herigean heofon|rices weard
meotodes meahte ⁊his modgeþanc
weorc| wuldor fæder swahe wundragehwæs
ece drihten ór on|stealde.

C(N)

1 Ne sculon her gean heofon rices we:|ard
metodes mihte. Ond his mod geþonc
weoroda wul:|dor fæder swa he wundra gewhwæs
ece drihten or|| onstealde.

B$_1$

1 Nu**we**herigan sculon| heofonrices weard
metodes mihte| ⁊hismod geþanc
weorc wuldor godes| swahe wund ra fela
écedrihten ord| astealde

O^{corr}

1 Nu^{we},sculan herian heofon|rices weard
metodes mihte ⁊hismod geþonc
werawuldor fæder swahe wundra ge hwæs|
ecedryhten oór,onstealde

To

1 Nu **we** sceolon herian heofonrices weard.
metodes mihte ⁊ his mod|geþanc
weorc wulder fæder swa he wundra gehwæs.
ece drihten ær| astealde.

Ca

1 Nu **we**| sceolan herigean heofon rices weard
metodes mihte ⁊his mod ge þanc.
wera| wuldor fæder. swa he wuldres ge hwæs
ece drihten. ord onstealde

The addition of *we* to line 1a in **O^{corr}** has an important effect on sense and syntax but little on metre. In **O^{uncorr}**, the subject of *sculan* in line 1 is unexpressed, missing, or, less logically, to be construed as *weard*, and/or *mihte* and/or *mod geþonc*.[291] In **O^{corr}**, as in **B$_1$** and all witnesses to the West-Saxon *ylda*- and Northumbrian *eordu*-recensions, the subject of *sculan* is *we*, while *weard*, *mihte* and *mod geþanc* are objects of *herian*.[292]

The addition or omission of *we* adds or removes an unstressed syllable from the preliminary dip of a Type A-3 line (Type B-1 in **B$_1$**[293]). It has no significant metrical effect.

[291]See above, p. 121, and Mitchell, "Cædmon's Hymn, Line 1," p. 192.

[292]See Dobbie, *Manuscripts*, pp. 43-48, esp. 44-45.

[293]See below, p. 134.

Cambridge, University Library, Kk. 3. 18
(Ca)

Inflectional Difference (1 example) and Substitution of Stressed Words and Elements (1 example)

***Cæd(eorðan)* (Ca), 3b**

T_1

1 Nu sculon herigean heofon|rices weard
meotodes meahte ⁊his modgeþanc
weorc| wuldor fæder swahe **wundra**gehwæs
ece drihten ór on|stealde.

C(N)

1 Ne sculon her gean heofon rices we:|ard
metodes mihte. Ond his mod geþonc
weoroda wul:|dor fæder swa he **wundra** gewhwæs
ece drihten or|| onstealde.

B_1

1 Nuweherigan sculon| heofonrices weard
metodes mihte| ⁊hismod geþanc
weorc wuldor godes| swahe **wund ra** fela
écedrihten ord| astealde

O

1 Nu^we sculan herian heofon|rices weard
metodes mihte ⁊hismod geþonc
werawuldor fæder swahe **wundra** ge hwæs|
ecedryhten oór,^d onstealde

To

1 Nu we sceolon herian heofonrices weard.
metodes mihte ⁊ his mod|geþanc
weorc wulder fæder swa he **wundra** gehwæs.
ece drihten ær| astealde.

Ca

1 Nu we| sceolan herigean heofon rices weard
metodes mihte ⁊his mod ge þanc.
wera| wuldor fæder. swa he **wuldres** ge hwæs
ece drihten. ord onstealde

The substitution and inflectional difference **Ca** *wuldres* **O C(N) T_1 To** *wundra* (**B_1** *wund ra*) are presumably to be attributed to the influence of surrounding forms. The substitution *wuldr-* for *wundr-* most likely reflects the influence of the first element of *wuldor fæder* in the preceding half-line[294]: *wuldor* and *wundor* are "often confused" in Old English[295] and the variation has no semantic or metrical effect.

The use of a genitive singular by the **Ca** scribe is more problematic, however. When used substantively in the sense 'each one (thing), each one', *gehwa* usually goes with a genitive plural noun or adjective.[296] Presumably the **Ca** ending is be explained as anticipation of the similar ending on the following noun, the genitive singular adjective *ge hwæs*.

[294]Dobbie, *Manuscripts*, p. 28.

[295]Clark-Hall, *wundor*.

[296]B.-T.(S) *gehwá*, definition A.I(2a).

Oxford, Bodleian Library, Tanner 10
(T_1)

There are no readings in this witness which are not found in other copies of the Hymn. With the exception of four transcription errors and the substitution **C**(**N**) *weoroda* **T_1** *weorc*, the text of **C**(**N**) and **T_1** agree closely. See above, p. 113.

Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 41
(B_1)

Substitution of Unstressed words and Elements (1 example)

***Cæd*(*eorðan*) (B_1), 7a**

T_1

5 he ærest sceop eorðan bearnū
heofontohrofe| halig scyppend.
þamiddangeard moncynnes weard
ece| drihten æfter teode
firum foldan frea ælmihtig.

C(N)

5 he ærest scop eorþū bearnū
heofon tohrofe| halig sc,ypend.
þa middan geard mon cynnes weard
ece| drihten æfter eode
finū foldan frea ælmihtig.

B_1

5 he ærest sceop eorðan bear|num
heofon tohrofe halig scyp|pend
þemiddan geard mann cynnes| weard
écedrihten æfter teode|
fyrum foldan frea ælmihtig.

O

5 heærest gesceop| eorðan bearnum
heofon to hrofe halig| scyppend
ðamiddon geard moncynnes weard
ecedrihten æfterteo de
firumfolda,n frea| ælmihtig.

To

5 he ærost sceop eorðan bearnū.
heofon to hrofe. halig| drihten.
þa middan eard mancynnes weard
ece drihten æfť teode.|
firum foldan. frea ælmihtig.

Ca

5 he æres ge|scóp___,eorðan bearnū
heofon to rofe halig scyppend.
þa middan geard mon-|cynnes weard
ece drihtī æftī teode
firū foldan frea ælmihtig.

In **B_1**, the relative particle *þe* introduces an adjective clause (lines 7-9) modifying *he* (5a) and its variants *halig scyp|pend* (6b), *mann cynnes| weard* (7b), *écedrihten* (8a) and *frea ælmihtig* (9b): ‘he, the Holy Creator, first made heaven as a roof for the men of earth, who, the Guardian of Mankind, the Eternal Lord, the Lord Almighty, afterwards appointed the middle-earth, the land, for men’. In the other witnesses to this recension, the equivalent lines are an adverbial clause of time introduced by the conjunction *þa*: ‘he, the Holy Creator, first made

heaven as a roof for the men of earth; then [He], the Guardian of Mankind, the Eternal Lord, the Lord Almighty, afterwards appointed the middle-earth, the land, for men'.

The variation has no metrical effect.

Substitution of Prefixes (1 example)

***Cæd*(*eorðan*) (B_1), 4b**

T_1

1 Nu sculon herigean heofon|rices weard
meotodes meahte ⁊his modgeþanc
weorc| wuldor fæder swahe wundragehwæs
ece drihten ór **on**|stealde.

C(N)

1 Ne sculon her gean heofon rices we:|ard
metodes mihte. Ond his mod geþonc
weoroda wul:|dor fæder swa he wundra gewhwæs
ece drihten or|| **on**stealde.

B_1

1 Nuweherigan sculon| heofonrices weard
metodes mihte| ⁊hismod geþanc
weorc wuldor godes| swahe wund ra fela
écedrihten ord| **a**stealde

O

1 Nu^{we}, sculan herian heofon|rices weard
metodes mihte ⁊hismod geþonc
werawuldor fæder swahe wundra ge hwæs|
ecedryhten oór,^{d} **on**stealde

To

1 Nu we sceolon herian heofonrices weard.
metodes mihte ⁊ his mod|geþanc
weorc wulder fæder swa he wundra gehwæs.
ece drihten ær| **a**stealde.

Ca

1 Nu we| sceolan herigean heofon rices weard
metodes mihte ⁊his mod ge þanc.
wera| wuldor fæder. swa he wuldres ge hwæs
ece drihten. ord **on**stealde

The substitution **B_1 To** *astealde* **T_1** *on*|*stealde* (**C**(**N**) **O Ca** *onstealde*) has no effect on sense, metre, or syntax. *Astealde* in various dialectal spellings is the form used in all other recensions of the poem.[297]

[297]See Dobbie, *Manuscripts*, pp. 43-48.

Substitution of Stressed Words and Elements (3 examples)

Cæd(eorðan) (B_1), 3a

T_1

1 Nu sculon herigean heofon|rices weard
meotodes meahte ⁊his modgeþanc
weorc| wuldor **fæder** swahe wundragehwæs
ece drihten ór on|stealde.

C(N)

1 Ne sculon her gean heofon rices we:|ard
metodes mihte. Ond his mod geþonc
weoroda wul:|dor **fæder** swa he wundra gewhwæs
ece drihten or|| onstealde.

B_1

1 Nuweherigan sculon| heofonrices weard
metodes mihte| ⁊hismod geþanc
weorc wuldor **godes**| swahe wund ra fela
écedrihten ord| astealde

O

1 Nu^we^ sculan herian heofon|rices weard
metodes mihte ⁊hismod geþonc
werawuldor **fæder** swahe wundra ge hwæs|
ecedryhten oór,^q^onstealde

To

1 Nu we sceolon herian heofonrices weard.
metodes mihte ⁊ his mod|geþanc
weorc wulder **fæder** swa he wundra gehwæs.
ece drihten ær| astealde.

Ca

1 Nu we| sceolan herigean heofon rices weard
metodes mihte ⁊his mod ge þanc.
wera| wuldor **fæder**. swa he wuldres ge hwæs
ece drihten. ord onstealde

The substitution in l. 3b of B_1 *wuldor godes* for *wuldorfæder* (and orthographic variants) in all other manuscripts of the poem, although clearly not the result of a graphic misconstruction, has no effect on metre or syntax, and only a minor effect on sense.

Cæd(eorðan) (B_1), 3b

T_1

1 Nu sculon herigean heofon|rices weard
meotodes meahte ⁊his modgeþanc
weorc| wuldor fæder swahe wundra**gehwæs**
ece drihten ór on|stealde.

C(N)

1 Ne sculon her gean heofon rices we:|ard
metodes mihte. Ond his mod geþonc
weoroda wul:|dor fæder swa he wundra **gewhwæs** 1
ece drihten or|| onstealde.

B_1

1 Nuweherigan sculon| heofonrices weard
metodes mihte| ⁊hismod geþanc
weorc wuldor godes| swahe wund ra **fela**
écedrihten ord| astealde

O

1 Nu^we^ sculan herian heofon|rices weard
metodes mihte ⁊hismod geþonc
werawuldor fæder swahe wundra **ge hwæs**|
ecedryhten oór,^q^onstealde

To

1 Nu we sceolon herian heofonrices weard.
metodes mihte ⁊ his mod|geþanc
weorc wulder fæder swa he wundra **gehwæs**.
ece drihten ær| astealde.

Ca

1 Nu we| sceolan herigean heofon rices weard
metodes mihte ⁊his mod ge þanc.
wera| wuldor fæder. swa he wuldres **ge hwæs**
ece drihten. ord onstealde

The substitution B_1 *fela* T_1 **To** *gehwæs* (**O Ca** *ge hwæs* **C**(**N**) *gewhwæs*) affects syntax and metre. In all other manuscripts of the West-Saxon *eorðan-*, Northumbrian *aeldu-* and

Northumbrian *eordu*-recensions of the Hymn, *gehwæs* (and orthographic variants) is modified by the preceding genitive *wundra* (**Ca** *wuldres*) and itself modifies the accusative singular noun *ord* or *or* in l. 4b.[298] In **B$_1$**, the indeclinable form *fela* is probably to be understood as an accusative object of *astealde*, l. 4b, itself.

With the substitution, **B$_1$** is a Type B-1 line. It is Type B-2 type line in all other witnesses.

***Cæd*(*eorðan*) (B$_1$), 4a**

T$_1$

1 Nu sculon herigean heofon|rices weard
meotodes meahte ⁊his modgeþanc
weorc| wuldor fæder swahe wundragehwæs
ece drihten **ór** on|stealde.

C(N)

1 Ne sculon her gean heofon rices we:|ard
metodes mihte. Ond his mod geþonc
weoroda wul:|dor fæder swa he wundra gewhwæs
ece drihten **or**|| onstealde.

B$_1$

1 Nuweherigan sculon| heofonrices weard
metodes mihte| ⁊hismod geþanc
weorc wuldor godes| swahe wund ra fela
écedrihten **ord**| astealde

O

1 Nu^we^ sculan herian heofon|rices weard
metodes mihte ⁊hismod geþonc
werawuldor fæder swahe wundra ge hwæs|
ecedryhten **oór**^d^ onstealde

To

1 Nu we sceolon herian heofonrices weard.
metodes mihte ⁊ his mod|geþanc
weorc wulder fæder swa he wundra gehwæs.
ece drihten **ær**| astealde.

Ca

1 Nu we| sceolan herigean heofon rices weard
metodes mihte ⁊his mod ge þanc.
wera| wuldor fæder. swa he wuldres ge hwæs
ece drihten. **ord** onstealde

The substitution **B$_1$** *ord* for **T$_1$** *ór* has no significant effect on sense, metre, or syntax.

See above, p. 126. The **To** reading *ær* is discussed below, p. 135.

[298]The West-Saxon *ylda*-text is corrupt at this point. See above, Chapter 2, p. 27-29.

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

***Cæd*(*eorðan*) (B_1), 1a**

T_1

1 Nu sculon herigean heofon|rices weard
meotodes meahte ꝯhis modgeþanc
weorc| wuldor fæder

C(N)

1 Ne sculon her gean heofon rices we:|ard
metodes mihte. Ond his mod geþonc
weoroda wul:|dor fæder

B_1

1 Nu**we**herigan sculon| heofonrices weard
metodes mihte| ꝯhismod geþanc
weorc wuldor godes|

O

1 Nu[we] sculan herian heofon|rices weard
metodes mihte ꝯhismod geþonc
werawuldor fæder

To

1 Nu **we** sceolon herian heofonrices weard.
metodes mihte ꝯ his mod|geþanc
weorc wulder fæder

Ca

1 Nu **we**| sceolan herigean heofon rices weard
metodes mihte ꝯhis mod ge þanc.
wera| wuldor fæder.

The addition of *we* to B_1 has a significant effect on sense and syntax but a minimal effect on metre. In T_1, the most likely subject of *sculon* is *weorc*, as in the Northumbrian *aeldu*- recension of "Cædmon's Hymn."[299] The addition of *we* as the subject of *sculon* to B_1 implies that *weorc* is to be construed as an accusative singular or plural. For a discussion of a similar addition in the **C**(**N**) **O Ca** recension, see above, p. 127.

[299]Mitchell, "Cædmon's Hymn, Line 1," 190-97, esp. pp. 192-3.

Rearrangement within the Line (1 example)

Cæd(*eorðan*) (B_1), 1a

T_1

1 Nu **sculon herigean** heofon|rices weard
meotodes meahte ⁊his modgeþanc
weorc| wuldor fæder swahe wundragehwæs
ece drihten ór on|stealde.

C(N)

1 Ne **sculon her gean** heofon rices we:|ard
metodes mihte. Ond his mod geþonc
weoroda wul:|dor fæder swa he wundra gewhwæs
ece drihten or|| onstealde.

B_1

1 Nuwe**herigan sculon**| heofonrices weard
metodes mihte| ⁊hismod geþanc
weorc wuldor godes| swahe wund ra fela
écedrihten ord| astealde

O

1 Nu^we^, **sculan herian** heofon|rices weard
metodes mihte ⁊hismod geþonc
werawuldor fæder swahe wundra ge hwæs|
ecedryhten oór,^d^onstealde

To

1 Nu we **sceolon herian** heofonrices weard.
metodes mihte ⁊ his mod|geþanc
weorc wulder fæder swa he wundra gehwæs.
ece drihten ær| astealde.

Ca

1 Nu we| **sceolan herigean** heofon rices weard
metodes mihte ⁊his mod ge þanc.
wera| wuldor fæder. swa he wuldres ge hwæs
ece drihten. ord onstealde

B_1 *herigan sculon* for *sculon herian* (and orthographic variants) in all other witnesses to "Cædmon's Hymn" affects metre but not sense or syntax. With the reversal, **B_1** is a Type B-1 line with double resolution; in all other manuscripts of the Hymn, the line is Type A-3 with a resolution of the alliterating stress.

Tournai, Bibliothèque Municipale, 134
(To)

Substitution of Stressed Words and Elements (2 examples)

Cæd(*eorðan*) (To), l. 4b

T_1

1 Nu sculon herigean heofon|rices weard
meotodes meahte ⁊his modgeþanc
weorc| wuldor fæder swahe wundragehwæs
ece drihten **ór** on|stealde.

C(N)

1 Ne sculon her gean heofon rices we:|ard
metodes mihte. Ond his mod geþonc
weoroda wul:|dor fæder swa he wundra gewhwæs
ece drihten **or**|| onstealde.

B_1

1 Nuweherigan sculon| heofonrices weard
metodes mihte| ⁊hismod geþanc
weorc wuldor godes| swahe wund ra fela
écedrihten **ord**| astealde

O

1 Nu^we sculan herian heofon|rices weard
metodes mihte ⁊hismod geþonc
werawuldor fæder swahe wundra ge hwæs|
ecedryhten **oór,ᵈonstealde**

To

1 Nu we sceolon herian heofonrices weard.
metodes mihte ⁊ his mod|geþanc
weorc wulder fæder swa he wundra gehwæs.
ece drihten **ær**| astealde.

Ca

1 Nu we| sceolan herigean heofon rices weard
metodes mihte ⁊his mod ge þanc.
wera| wuldor fæder. swa he wuldres ge hwæs
ece drihten. **ord** onstealde

The substitution **To** *ær* for **T_1** *ór* (**C**(**N**) *or* **O^{uncorr}** *oór*) **B_1** *ord* (**O^{corr}** *oór,ᵈ* **Ca** *ord*) has an important syntactic effect. While the word itself is neither unmetrical nor non-sensical, the substitution of an adverb for an accusative noun leaves *astealde*, l. 4b, without an object[300] and the genitive *wundra gehwæs* in l. 3b without a word to govern it: '...as He, Eternal Lord, first appointed of each of wonders'.

The substitution has no metrical effect.

[300] All unambiguously transitive examples of *āstellan* given by B.-T. and B.-T.(S) have an accusative object.

***Cæd*(*eorðan*) (To), l. 6b**

T_1
5 he ærest sceop eorðan bearnū
heofontohrofe| halig **scyppend**.
þamiddangeard moncynnes weard
ece| drihten æfter teode
firum foldan frea ælmihtig.

C(N)
5 he ærest scop eorþū bearnū
heofon tohrofe| halig **sc,ypend**.
þa middan geard mon cynnes weard
ece| drihten æfter eode
finū foldan frea ælmihtig.

B_1
5 he ærest sceop eorðan bear|num
heofon tohrofe halig **scyp|pend**
þemiddan geard mann cynnes| weard
écedrihten æfter teode|
fyrum foldan frea ælmihtig.

O
5 heærest gesceop| eorðan bearnum
heofon to hrofe halig| **scyppend**
ðamiddon geard moncynnes weard
ecedrihten æfterteo de
firumfolda,n frea| ælmihtig.

To
5 he ærost sceop eorðan bearnū.
heofon to hrofe. halig| **drihten**.
þa middan eard mancynnes weard
ece drihten æfť teode.|
firum foldan. frea ælmihtig.

Ca
5 he æres ge|scóp___,eorðan bearnū
heofon to rofe halig **scyppend**.
þa middan geard mon-|cynnes weard
ece drihť æfť teode
firū foldan frea ælmihtig.

The substitution **To** *drihten* for *scyppend* (and orthographic variants) in all other manuscripts of "Cædmon's Hymn" has no effect metre and syntax. Both epithets make sense in context, although *scyppend* 'creator' is more appropriate than *drihten* 'lord' in a sentence about how God 'made' the earth and heavens. The substitution is probably most easily attributed to the unconscious repetition of *drihten* in line 4a or an anticipation of the same word in line 8a.

Poems of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*

The poems discussed above all have been "fixed" in the sense that each has been copied as an integral part of a single coherent framing text. With the single exception of the marginal **To**, copies of the *eorðan*-recension of "Cædmon's Hymn" have all been found at the same place in Book IV Chapter 24 in manuscripts of the Old English translation of Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica*. The Metrical Preface and Epilogue to the *Pastoral Care*, similarly, although not integral to the translation of Gregory's *Cura pastoralis per se*, are nevertheless

never found in any other context, and, as the special treatment they receive in their earliest witnesses suggests, were considered from the beginning to be an important part of Alfred's conception of the work as a whole.

The poems of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* are both like and unlike these other poems. On the one hand, the *Chronicle* poems are clearly "fixed" in the sense that they are part of the main text of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, are always found in the same place in the witnesses which contain them, and, despite their at times considerable artistic merit, are never found anywhere else. On the other hand, however, the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* is itself far from a single coherent framing text. While most *Chronicle* manuscripts are based on a common, centrally distributed core text and make use of other common additions, their common sections have been so frequently revised, corrected, expanded, and edited in the individual witnesses as to make it nearly impossible for us to speak of "a copy of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*" in the same way we can speak of **Hat$_{20}$** or **CUL$_{Ii24}$** as "copies" of the Old English translation of the *Pastoral Care*.[301]

In the case of the four metrically regular *Chronicle* poems, this complexity is reflected in the dates and relationships of the scribes responsible for copying the surviving witnesses. The poems are known to have been copied in at least five manuscripts, although not all four

[301]This is a common-place of *Chronicle* criticism. For a recent statement, see David Dumville and Simon Keynes, "General Editors' Forward," in Janet Bately, ed., *MS. A*, The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A Collaborative Edition 3 (Cambridge: Brewer, 1986). A basic review of the *Chronicle*'s growth is given in Charles Plummer, ed., *Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel*: *A Revised Text*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1899), v.2, pp. cxiv-cxvii. This account has not been superseded, although some of its details have been qualified in subsequent work. See in particular, Bately, "The Compilation of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* 60 B.C. to A.D. 890: Vocabulary as Evidence," *Proceedings of the British Academy* 64 (1978), 93-129; and "The Compilation of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, Once More," *LSE* n.s. 16 (1985), 7-26; Whitelock, ed., *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*: *A Revised Translation* with David C. Douglas and Susie I. Tucker (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1961), pp. xixxiv; and Campbell, ed., *The Battle of Brunanburh* (London: Heinemann, 1938), pp. 1-7.

appear in each witness[302]: Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 173, s. ix/x-xi^{2} (**ChronA**); London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. vi, s. x^{2} (**ChronB**); London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. i, s. s.xi^{1}-xi^{2} (**ChronC**); London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. iv, s. xi^{med}-xi^{2} (**ChronD**); and †London, British Library, Cotton Otho B. xi, s. xi^{1} (**ChronG**). Of these, the last witness, **ChronG**, was almost completely destroyed in the Cotton fire. Its pre-fire text was transcribed by Lawrence Nowell (in **N**, along with the **C**-text of the Old English *Historia*), and also served as the basis for an edition by Abraham Wheloc. Neither transcription is diplomatic: in Wheloc's edition, the text of **ChronG** has been freely emended, generally with readings from **ChronA**, while Nowell later revised his transcript on the basis of his work with other *Chronicle* witnesses.[303]

The metrically regular poems these witnesses contain were copied by six scribes, working at various dates from the mid-tenth to the mid-eleventh centuries:

---

[302]In the following discussion, a superscript number following a MS siglum is used to indicate that the work of a specific scribe is being referred to. Thus **ChronA^{3}** is used for the work of the third scribe in **ChronA**; **ChronA^{5}** refers to the work of the fifth scribe. The use of a siglum without a superscript hand number indicates either that the entire manuscript is intended, or that the specific scribe responsible for the form is irrelevant.

[303]Angelika Lutz, ed., *Die Version G der angelsächsischen Chronik: Rekonstruktion und Edition* Münchener Universitäts-Schriften, Philosophische Fakultät 11 (München: Wilhelm Fink, 1981), pp. lvii-lxv; Campbell, *Brunanburh*, pp. 133-134. A copy of Nowell's transcript made by William Lambarde (Dublin, Trinity College, 631) before Nowell reworked his text, can be used to help reconstruct Nowell's original transcription. Because of its late position in the textual history of the *Chronicle* and its lack of descendants, the text of **ChronG** is cited only in passing in the following discussion. As with all other manuscripts discussed in this chapter, the variation introduced by the scribe of **ChronG** into his poetic texts closely resembles the variation he introduces into his prose. For a discussion of the type of variation introduced by the **ChronG** scribe in general, see Lutz, *Die Version G*, pp. cli-cxciii, esp. pp. clv-clxii. Individual variants from the *Battle of Brunanburh* are discussed in Campbell, *Brunanburh*, pp. 133-144, esp. 141-143. Detailed discussion of the innovations in both prose and verse in **ChronG** can be found in the notes to Lutz, *Die Version G*. Nowell revised his transcription of the *Chronicle* more extensively than he did his transcription of the **C** witness to the Old English translation of the *Historia*. See Grant, "Lawrence Nowell's Transcript of BM Cotton Otho B.xi," *ASE* 3 (1974): 111-124; and Lutz, *Die Version G*, p. lii.

Table 2: Scribes and Witnesses of the Chronicle *Poems*[304]

	ChronA	**ChronG**	**ChronB**	**ChronC**	**ChronD**
Brun (937)	| Hand 3 (s.x^{med})	| Hand 2 (s. xi^{1})	| Hand 1 (s.x^{2})	| Hand 2 (s.xi^{2})	| Hand 2 (s.xi^{med})
Capt (942)	|	|	|	|	|
CEdg (973)	| Hand 5(s.xi^{in})	|	|	|	
DEdg (975)	|	|	|	|	

In two manuscripts, **ChronB** and **ChronG**, the entire text of the *Chronicle*, including all four metrically regular poems, is the work of a single scribe. In a third manuscript, **ChronC**, the four metrically regular poems are also the work of a single scribe, the second. **ChronA** is the work of as many as twenty-three pre- and post-conquest scribes,[305] of which two – working at an interval of between fifty and seventy-five years – are responsible for the four metrically regular poems. The fifth witness, **ChronD**, is also the work of more than one scribe, the second of which is responsible for the *Battle of Brunanburh* and *Capture of the Five Boroughs*.

As we have come to expect from our examination of the other Fixed Context poems, the amount and type of the unique textual variation the individual witnesses to these poems exhibit varies from scribe to scribe.[306] With nineteen potentially significant substantive unique variants in seventy-three metrical lines of text, the **ChronD^{2}** scribe's version of the *Battle of Brunanburh* contains almost one and a half times as much unique variation as the next most variable text of the same poem, **ChronA^{3}** (thirteen potentially significant substantive variants) and nearly four times as much as the least variable copy, that of scribe **ChronC^{2}** (five potentially significant substantive variants). Likewise, while the majority of unique readings

[304]Hand numbers and dates are derived from Bately, *MS. A*, pp. xxi-xlvi; Simon Taylor, ed., *MS B.*, The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A Collaborative Edition 4 (Cambridge: Brewer, 1983), p. xxiii-xxvii; Lutz, *Die Version G*, pp. xxix-xxx; and Ker, *Catalogue*, arts. 39, 180, 188, 191 and 192.

[305]For a summary of views on the number of scribes in this manuscript, see Bately, *MS. A*, p. xxi.

[306]A complete catalogue of the potentially significant substantive variation in the metrically regular *Chronicle* poems follows below, pp. 161-222.

in **ChronD**^{2} involve the "substitution" of words through the misinterpretation of individual graphs and are to be attributed to the demonstrable carelessness of the **ChronD**^{2} scribe as a copyist, the two most common variants in the **ChronB**^{1} copies of the *Battle of Brunanburh* and *Capture of the Five Boroughs* involve the apparently intelligent substitution of metrically, sensically and syntactically appropriate prefixes and stressed words by a scribe who appears to have been in the process of revising his exemplar.

The *Chronicle* poems are unusual, however, in that the variation they exhibit can also differ from poem to poem *within* the work of a single scribe. The **ChronA**^{3} scribe's copy of the *Battle of Brunanburh* contains thirteen unique, potentially significant substantive variants: five differences of inflection, one example of the addition or omission of unstressed elements, and seven examples of the syntactic or semantic reinterpretation of existing text. In his copy of the *Capture of the Five Boroughs*, however, the same scribe introduces five variants: two differences of inflection, two examples of the substitution of stressed words and elements, and one example of the addition or omission of an unstressed word or element – but no examples of the type of textual reinterpretation responsible for the majority of the variants introduced into his copy of the *Battle of Brunanburh*. Similarly, **ChronB**^{1}, whose copies of the *Battle of Brunanburh* and *Capture of the Five Boroughs* exhibit a number of sensible and syntactically and metrically appropriate readings not found in either the closely related text of **ChronC**^{2} or the more distant **ChronA**^{3}, copies the later *Chronicle* poems *Coronation of Edgar* and *Death of Edgar* with only relatively superficial substitutions of synonyms and syntactically equivalent forms distinguishing it from the unrelated **ChronA**^{5} version.

Restricting herself primarily to the differences between the scribes responsible for the *Chronicle* poems, O'Keeffe has suggested that the variation they introduce is time-dependent. On the one hand, she argues, the unique, metrically, syntactically, and semantically

appropriate variants exhibited by the tenth- and early eleventh-century **ChronA**[3] and **ChronB**[1] versions of the *Battle of Brunanburh* and the *Capture of the Five Boroughs* indicate the "transitional" state of scribes responsible for copying them:

> The variants of [Chron]A and [Chron]B in the verses of [the] *A*[*nglo-*]*S*[axon] *C*[*hronicle* annals] 937 and 942, which arise so close to the time of composition, reveal the pressure which the old oral ways of understanding and remembering must have exerted. Their scribes are not poets but readers who see, hear and produce richly contextual variants. They must have thought they were faithful and accurate. Accurate they were not, but faithful they were, in their fashion.[307]

The fact that neither the eleventh-century **ChronC**[2] and **ChronD**[2] witnesses to the *Battle of Brunanburh* and *Capture of the Five Boroughs*, nor any witnesses to the late tenth century poems *Coronation of Edgar* and *Death of Edgar* show similar amounts and types of variants, on the other hand, suggests to O'Keeffe the extent to which the "old ways" of copying decayed in the course of the next century:

> If we look for such [viz. "authentically formulaic"] variants in the A and B copies of the poems for 973 and 975 [the *Coronation of Edgar* and the *Death of Edgar*], however, we will be disappointed. Scribe 5 of A, working in the early eleventh century, is too distant from his material. Judging from a comparison of the full records of the *Chronicle* versions in both B and C, the relevant scribe of C probably had *B as his exemplar for 937 and 942 and B as his exemplar for 973 and 975. This copyist, working in the mid-eleventh century, produces a fairly accurate record, certainly with none of the interesting and suggestive variants of the earlier two. The scribe of D, working somewhat later, provides certain interesting variants to be sure, but they are revelatory of his unfamiliarity with the formulaic and lexical context of his material. Indeed, for the two rhythmic entries for 1036 and 1065, which C and D share, variation is limited to orthography and substitution (by D) of prose paraphrases for otherwise rhythmical lines.[308]

The trouble, however, is that this apparently chronological distribution of variants among the witnesses to the *Chronicle* poems is unusual. In the case of the witnesses to the other Fixed Context poems discussed above, it has been if anything the *later* rather than the earlier witnesses which have shown the most substantive textual innovation, and the earlier,

---

[307]O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 125.

[308]O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, pp. 124-125.

ninth- and tenth-century witnesses have been consistently the most conservative. The most innovative witnesses to the Metrical Preface to *Pastoral Care* (as indeed to the *Pastoral Care* itself) were the late tenth-/early eleventh-century **Tr$_1$** and late eleventh-century **CUL$_{Ii24}$** – while the manuscripts of the late ninth- and mid tenth-century (**Hat$_{20}$**, **Tib$_{Bxi}$**(**Jn$_{53}$**) and **CC$_{12}$**) exhibited almost no variation whatsoever. Similarly, in the case of the *eorðan*-recension of "Cædmon's Hymn," the most innovative scribes were those of the early eleventh-century, **B$_1$**, and the corrector of **O**, while the scribes of the tenth-century **T$_1$** and **C**(**N**), and of the late twelfth-century **Ca** were all responsible for only minimal amounts of substantive textual innovation.

This is important because the apparently conservative tenth-century scribe of the **C**(**N**) text of "Cædmon's Hymn" is most probably the same as that responsible for the – in O'Keeffe's terms – "formulaic" versions of the *Battle of Brunanburh* and *Capture of the Five Boroughs* in **ChronA^3**.[309] As we have seen above (p. 113), the **C** text of the *eorðan*-recension of "Cædmon's Hymn" as recorded by Nowell in **N** exhibits five potentially significant substantive variants, all but one of which are obvious transcription errors and, most likely, are to be attributed to its modern transcriptionist.[310] The only exception is the substitution of the stressed word **C**(**N**) *weoroda* for **T$_1$ B$_1$ To** *weorc* – a reading which, while it adversely affects the poem's syntax, is nevertheless metrically and semantically appropriate to its immediate context and involves a graphically somewhat similar form. In contrast, the **ChronA^3** copies of the *Battle of Brunanburh* and *Capture of the Five Boroughs* exhibit eighteen unique variants,

[309]Ker, *Catalogue*, arts. 39 (p. 58), 180. Bately, *MS. A*, p. xxxv. The connection is not mentioned in O'Keeffe. The same scribe is also probably responsible for the Leech Book (London, British Library, Royal D. xvii).

[310]Other than the early date of the original manuscript, there is no inherent reason why these nonsensical readings cannot be attributed to the original scribe of **C(N)**. As we shall see below in the work of **ChronD^2**, Anglo-Saxon scribes can make similar or worse errors. As similar errors are not recorded by

all of which can be attributed to the scribe of **ChronA**[3] or a predecessor. As we shall see, the majority of these variants belong to two distinct types, occur with one exception in the *Battle of Brunanburh*, and can be attributed for the most part to difficulties the **ChronA**[3] scribe seems to have had with the poem's many poetic and rare words; when these variants are excluded from consideration, the **ChronA**[3] scribe introduces approximately the same type of variants in all surviving examples of his prose and verse.

As we shall see in the following pages, the different patterns of substantive variation exhibited by the various witnesses to the *Chronicle* poems have less to do with the dates at which the scribes responsible for their reproduction worked than with their demonstrable interests, abilities, and intentions. Like the scribes responsible for copying the fixed-context poems discussed above, the scribes of the *Chronicle* poems rarely copy their verse any differently from their prose. On the few occasions on which they do, the differences between their verse and prose practice can be tied to differences in the nature of the verse being copied, or in the relationship of their copy to its exemplar. As was the case with the *eorðan*-recension of "Cædmon's Hymn" and the Metrical Preface and Epilogue to the *Pastoral Care*, the most innovative scribes of the *Chronicle* poems are also the most innovative scribes of the surrounding *Chronicle* prose, while the most conservative copyists of the prose are also the most conservative copyists of the verse.

The pages which follow examine the habits of the five scribes responsible for copying the verse texts in Chronicles A through D. They are followed on pages 161-222 by an annotated catalogue of the textual variation they introduce, arranged on a manuscript-by-manuscript, scribe-by-scribe, and poem-by-poem basis.

Bately from the stint of this scribe in **ChronA**, however, it seems a fair inference that the nonsensical variants in **C(N)** are Nowell's.

Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 173, Third Hand (ChronA^{3})

With the exception of the scribes responsible for the rhythmical poems on the *Death of Alfred* (1036) and the *Death of Edward* (1065) in **ChronC** and **ChronD**, the third scribe of **ChronA** has the shortest stint of all scribes responsible for the *Chronicle* poems.[311] His work comprises a single entry on f. 9v (the annal for A.D. 710) and eleven or twelve entries on ff. 26v-27v (from 924 to 946 or perhaps 955).[312] Including the entry for 955, these annals contain a total of 683 words, of which the *Battle of Brunanburh* and *Capture of the Five Boroughs* account for 420 or 61%. Five of the prose annals in this stint (annals 924, 931, 932, 934, 940, and 955) are either unique to **ChronA** (and its immediate descendent **ChronG**), or textually unrelated to accounts of the same event in the other *Chronicle* witnesses. This reduces the total amount of text available for comparison with other manuscripts by 103 words, and raises the proportion of words found in the verse texts to 72%.

Despite its small size, however, this sample is sufficient to demonstrate that the **ChronA^{3}** scribe copied his verse and prose essentially alike. With the exception of a single specific type of variant – involving in all but one example poetic, rare, or nonce words and variants found in the *Battle of Brunanburh* – the majority of the potentially significant substantive innovations in the **ChronA^{3}** verse texts have either an obviously graphic origin or parallels in prose copied by the same scribe.[313] The omission of *þæra* from *Battle of Brunanburh,* line 26a (**ChronA^{3}** *þæ* : **ChronB^{1}** *þara*| *ðe* [**ChronC^{2}** *þaraðe* **ChronD^{2}** *þæra þe*]), for example, while making good sense and metre, is almost certainly the result of

[311]See Ker, *Catalogue*, arts. 191 and 192.

[312]Bately, *MS. A*, pp. xxxiv-v. There has been some dispute over whether A.D. 955 is in the hand of **ChronA^{3}** or of "another scribe, practicing the same style as scribe 3" (Bately, *MS. A*, p. xxxiv). Bately assigns 955 to **ChronA^{3}**, and is followed here. For an opposing view, see: Dumville, "The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and the Origins of English Square Minuscule Script," *Wessex and England: Six Essays on Political, Cultural, and Ecclesiastical Revival* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1992), pp. 62-3. The dispute has no significant effect on the argument advanced here.

eyeskip. The use of singular case endings **ChronA**[3] *guma norþerna* for the plurals of **ChronB**[1] **ChronC**[2] *guman norðerne* (**ChronD**[2] *guman norþærne*), *Battle of Brunanburh* in line 18b, likewise, can be paralleled by the same scribe's use of the plural noun *gewealdan* for the singular *gewealde* in the prose annal for 944: **ChronA**[3] *to gewealdan* **ChronB**[1] **ChronC**[2] **ChronD**[2] *to gewealde*, 944.[314] The substitution of the stressed graphically similar forms **ChronA**[3] *maga* **ChronB**[1] *mægcea* (**ChronC**[2] *mecga*) **ChronD**[2] *mægþa*, *Capture of the Five Boroughs*, line 2a, and **ChronA**[3] *gebegde* **ChronB**[1] *gebǽded* (**ChronC**[2] **ChronD**[2] *gebæded*), *Capture of the Five Boroughs*, line 9b, has one parallel in the prose: **ChronA**[3] *fæc* **ChronB**[1] **ChronC**[2] *fyrst*, 942, with similar variants being found in the work of other scribes throughout the manuscript.[315] The addition or omission of ⁊ occurs twice in verse copied by **ChronA**[3] (*Battle of Brunanburh*, line 56a[316]; *Capture of the Five Boroughs*, line 8a) and is relatively common in the work of the later scribe **ChronA**[5] (three occurrences, all in verse) and earlier scribe **ChronA**[1] (nine times, all prose).[317]

The only variants in which the scribe of **ChronA**[3] differs significantly from his prose practice involve the reinterpretation (usually misinterpretation) of individual nouns, adjectives and verbs found in the other witnesses. In four cases – three of which involve the substitution of simplices for compounds (or vice versa) – **ChronA**[3] has a form as or more appropriate than that found in the other witnesses: **ChronA**[3] *secgas hwate* **ChronB**[1] *secgaswate* (**ChronC**[2]

---

[313]The forms cited in this and the following paragraphs are discussed more fully below, pp. 161-179.

[314]Bately, *MS. A*, p. cxx. The use of "a plural not a singular verb in sequences relating to an army or collective body of people" where other manuscripts have a singular form is a frequent variation in **ChronA**[1] and **ChronA**[2] (for examples, see Bately, *MS. A*, p. cxx §i [f]).

[315]Lists of examples are found in Bately, *MS. A*, pp. cxvii (nouns and adjectives) and cxix (verbs). **ChronA**[3] *fæc* for **ChronB**[1] **ChronC**[2] *fyrst* is mentioned on p. cxvii.

[316]This example is by correction and is believed by Bately and Lutz to be in a different hand; it is not discussed in the catalogue of examples below. See Bately, *MS. A*, p. 72, fn. 8; Lutz, *Die Version G*, p. 222.

[317]Bately, *MS. A*, pp. cxv-cxvi. See below, pp. 149

ChronD[2], *secga swate*), *Battle of Brunanburh*, line 13a; **ChronA**[3] *æra gebland* **ChronB**[1] *eargebland* (**ChronC**[2] *ear gebland* **ChronD**[2] *eár gebland*), *Battle of Brunanburh*, line 26b; **ChronA**[3] *bradbrimu* **ChronB**[1] *brade brimu* (**ChronC**[2] *bradebrimu* **ChronD**[2] *brade bri|mu*), *Battle of Brunanburh*, line 71a; and **ChronA**[3] *humbra éa* **ChronB**[1] *humbranéa* (**ChronC**[2] *hunbranéa* **ChronD**[2] *himbran ea*) *Capture of the Five Boroughs*, line 4b. In most cases, however, the **ChronA**[3] reading is metrically, syntactically, semantically, or formulaically more problematic. The **ChronA**[3] forms in the *Battle of Brunanburh*, lines 56a and 62b – **ChronA**[3] *hira land* for **ChronB**[1] *íraland* (**ChronC**[2] *yraland* **ChronD**[2] *yra land*) and **ChronA**[3] *hasewan|padan* for **ChronB**[1] *hasopadan* [**ChronC**[2] *hasu padan*] **ChronD**[2] *hasu wadan*) – for example, are sensible and syntactically appropriate, but metrically suspect: with the substitution of *hira* for the first element in *yraland* (and orthographic variants) in line 56a, **ChronA**[3] *eft hira land* is unmetrical; with the reinterpretation of *hasopadan* (and variants) in line 62b, the **ChronA**[3] scribe converts a regular Type C-1 line into an A-1 with an abnormally long three syllable anacrusis. The remaining variants, **ChronA**[3] *cnearen flot* for **ChronB**[1] *cnear onflot* (**ChronC**[2] *cnear||ónflót* **ChronD**[2] *cneár onflod*), *Battle of Brunanburh*, line 35a; **ChronA**[3] *cul bod ge hna des* **ChronB**[1] **ChronC**[2] *cumbol gehnastes* (**ChronD**[2] *cumbol ge hnastes*), *Battle of Brunanburh*, line 49b; **ChronA**[3] *he eardes* **ChronB**[1] **ChronC**[2] **ChronD**[2] *heardes*, *Battle of Brunanburh*, line 25a; and **ChronA**[3] *weealles* **ChronB**[1] **ChronC**[2] **ChronD**[2] *wealas*, *Battle of Brunanburh*, line 72b, are simply nonsense. While *o* and *i* are frequently confused in unstressed syllables in later manuscripts, the use of *en* for the preposition *on* in line 35a is quite unparalleled in the corpus of multiply attested poetry, suggesting, along with the manuscript word-division, that the **ChronA**[3] scribe misinterpreted an exemplar's **cnearr on* as a single (nonsense) word; the spacing of **ChronA**[3] reading *cul bod ge hna des*, line 49a, similarly, suggests that the scribe was attempting to sound out a word he was unfamiliar with;

in lines 25a and 72b, the **ChronA**^{3} spellings *he eardes* and *weealles* may be evidence either of an attempt to indicate the lengthening of short vowels and diphthongs before lengthening groups, or that a scribe of **ChronA**^{3} tradition misinterpreted both forms as a combination of pronoun + noun or adjective.

In addition to their problems with sense, syntax, and metre, the majority of these 'poetic' variants in the **ChronA**^{3} scribe's work also share two other significant features. In the first place, all but two (the reinterpretation of *heardes* and *wealas* as **ChronA**^{3} *he eardes* and **ChronA**^{3} *weealles* in the *Battle of Brunanburh* lines 25a and 72b) involve rare or poetic words – in five cases, words which are either unique to the *Battle of Brunanburh* or are found at most in one other text: *cnearr* 'ship' (probably a Scandinavian loan-word),[318] occurs twice in Old English, as a simplex in *Battle of Brunanburh* line 35a and as the second half of the compound **ChronA**^{3} *nęgled cnearrū* (**ChronB**^{1} *nægled cnear*|*rum* **ChronC**^{2} *negledcnearrum* **ChronD**^{2} *dæg gled ongarum*), *Battle of Brunanburh* line 53b; *yraland*, *Battle of Brunanburh*, line 56a is attested only here and in *Orosius*[319]; *cumbolgehnastes*, *Battle of Brunanburh*, line 49b and *hasopadan*, *Battle of Brunanburh*, line 62b, are nonce compounds, although their simplices, *cumbol*, *gehnastes*, *hasu* and *pad* are all found elsewhere in Old English, primarily in poetic contexts.[320]

Secondly, all but one of these variants are found in the **ChronA**^{3} scribe's text of the *Battle of Brunanburh*. With the exception of the variation between the compound and

[318]Campbell, *Brunanburh*, pp. 108-109.

[319]Campbell, *Brunanburh*, pp. 116-117.

[320]*Cumbol* is found as a simplex in *Andreas* (ll. 4 and 1204), *Beowulf* (l. 2505), *Daniel* (l. 180), *Judith* (l. 332), *Exodus* (l. 175); and as the first element of a compound in *Juliana* (ll. 395 and 637), *Judith* (ll. 243 and 259), and, in the only occurrence (other than in the *Battle of Brunanburh*) outside of the four major codices, *Psalm 50* ([BL Cotton Vespasian D. vi] (l. 11); *gehnastes* is found as the second element of *hopgehnastes* twice in Exeter Riddle 30 (ll. 27 and 60), *wolcengehnastes*, Exeter Riddle 3 (l. 60), and as the simplex *gehnaste* in *Genesis* (l. 2015).

simplices **ChronA**[3] *humbra éa* **ChronB**[1] *humbranéa* (**ChronC**[2] *hunbranéa* **ChronD**[2] *himbran ea*) in *Capture of the Five Boroughs* line 4b, the **ChronA**[3] version of the *Capture of the Five Boroughs* does not contain any examples of the reinterpretation of text like those found in *Battle of Brunanburh* – and certainly none involving such non-sensical or non-metrical mistakes as *he eardes*, *weealles*, *cnearen flot*, *cul bod ge hna des*, *hira land*, and *hasewan*| *padan*.

Taken together, these features suggest that the **ChronA**[3] scribe, far from being a poetically sensitive reader of Old English verse, was in fact troubled by the unusual and poetic vocabulary he found in the *Battle of Brunanburh* – and was willing to remove this vocabulary when he failed to understand it. When not confronted with unusual and poetic words – as he was not in the *Capture of the Five Boroughs*, his *Chronicle* prose, or his copy of the *eorðan*-recension of "Cædmon's Hymn" – the **ChronA**[3] scribe copied his text to a relatively high standard of substantive accuracy, allowing himself only the occasional difference in inflection and verbal substitution.[321]

Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 173, Fifth Hand (ChronA[5]**)**

The scribe of **ChronA**[3] ends his work with the annal for 946 or 955.[322] After short passages by two further scribes (Bately's scribes 4 and 4a), a fifth major scribe copies the annals for 973-1001, including the *Coronation of Edgar* and *Death of Edgar*.[323] With the exception of the two poems, the annals copied by this scribe are unique to **ChronA** and its linear descendant **ChronG**.[324]

[321]Cf. Bately, *MS. A*, p. xciii, and O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 120.

[322]See above, p. 90, and fn. 312.

[323]Bately, *MS. A*, pp. xxxvii-xxxviii.

[324]Bately, *MS. A*, pp. xcii-xciii.

With no texts available to serve as a control, and with the possibility that **ChronC**^{2} is a direct copy of **ChronB**^{1} for the equivalent annals (see below, pp. 150-152) it is impossible to compare the prose and verse performance of the **ChronA**^{5} scribe or determine which tradition of the two poems is the most innovative.[325] In four cases, **ChronA**^{5} has a more strained, nonsensical, or metrically or formulaically problematic reading than common text of **ChronB**^{1} **ChronC**^{2}: **ChronA**^{5} *corðre micelre* **ChronB**^{1} *corðremycclum* **ChronC**^{2} *corþre mycclum* (**ChronA**^{5} *micelre* shows the incorrect gender), *Coronation of Edgar*, line 2a; **ChronA**^{5} *agan* **ChronB**^{1} **ChronC**^{2} *get* (**ChronA**^{5} is unmetrical and non-sensical), *Coronation of Edgar*, line 13b; **ChronA**^{5} ∅ **ChronB**^{1} *ða* **ChronC**^{2} *þa* (**ChronA**^{5} is syntactically strained), *Coronation of Edgar*, line 19b; **ChronA**^{5} *soðboran* **ChronB**^{1} *woðboran* **ChronC**^{2} *woð boran* (the **ChronB**^{1} **ChronC**^{2} reading is more common in poetry), *Death of Edgar*, line 33a. The remaining readings in which **ChronA**^{5} stands against **ChronB**^{1} and **ChronC**^{2}, however, all make good sense, metre and syntax. The majority of these variants can be paralleled from the prose and poetry of **ChronB**^{1}, although none are so characteristic of that scribe's work as to rule out the possibility that they originate in the **ChronA**^{5} tradition. The use of *weorþan* for *beon* (**ChronA**^{5} *wæs* **ChronB**^{1} **ChronC**^{2} *wearð*, *Death of Edgar*, line 16a), for example, is a feature of **ChronB**^{1}, which has *wearð* for **ChronC**^{2} *wæs* six times between 653 and 946, and agrees with **ChronC**^{2} in reading *wearð* against **ChronA** *wæs* on another five occasions.[326] The addition or omission of ⁊ in *Death of Edgar*, lines 24a and 29a, likewise, is typical of **ChronB**^{1}, which omits a conjunction present in other versions of the *Chronicle* eighteen times

[325]The variants cited in this paragraph are more fully discussed below, pp. 179-186.

[326]In the annals 797, 800, 838, 868 (2×) and 916 in the Mercian Register (Taylor, *MS. B*, p. xciii). Taylor adds that "This is one of the features shared by BC before 653 and after 946," but gives no examples (*MS. B*, p. xciii). Bately reports that **ChronA** has *wæs* for **ChronB ChronC** *wearð* as main verb or auxiliary on five occasions: 592, 633, 882, 904, 975. In 592 and 975 **ChronB ChronC** agree with **ChronD** (and **ChronE** in 592); in 633 **ChronB ChronC** agree with **ChronE** (Bately, *MS. A*, p. cxix).

between 726-879[327]; in **ChronA**^{5}, the frequency with which ȝ is omitted or added in comparison to other witnesses varies from hand to hand[328]: **ChronA**^{1} has ȝ for **ChronB ChronC ChronD** ∅ five times, and ∅ for **ChronB ChronC ChronD** ȝ four times, all in prose entries; **ChronA**^{3} has ȝ for **ChronB ChronC ChronD** ∅ once (by correction, *Battle of Brunanburh*, line 56a); **ChronA**^{5} has ȝ for **ChronB ChronC** ∅ three times (*Death of Edgar*, lines 10b,[329] 24a, and 29a). The use of *in* for *on* is a feature of **ChronA**, the scribes of which prefer *in* to **ChronB ChronC** (and **ChronD ChronE**, where applicable) *on* on eighteen occasions, including *Death of Edgar*, line 6a.[330] Variation between ƿ (*þæt*) and *þær* occurs three times in **ChronA** and **ChronB**^{1} **ChronC**^{2} [331]: on two occasions, annals 633 and 975 (i.e. *Death of Edgar*), **ChronA** has *þæt* for **ChronB ChronC** *þær*/*ðær*; on one further occasion, annal 895, **ChronA** has *þær* for **ChronB ChronC** *þæt*; Bately finds "the A reading preferable to the reading of BCDE" in all three cases.[332] The addition or omission of *eac* from **ChronA**^{5} (**ChronA**^{5} ∅ **ChronB**^{1} **ChronC**^{2} *eac*, *Death of Edgar*, line 29a) is the only variant for which no definite trend is mentioned by Bately or Taylor.

London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. vi, First Hand (ChronB^{1})

ChronB is the work of a single scribe writing in the third quarter of the tenth century. The last entry is for AD 977, and, as the manuscript is written throughout in insular square

[327]Annals 726, 755 (7×), 812, 827, 836, 856, 868 (2×), 874, and 879 (Taylor, *MS. B*, pp. lxxxix-xc).

[328]Bately, *MS. A*, pp. cxv-cxvi.

[329]Probably a later addition; this variant is not included in the catalogue of variants below. See also, Bately, *MS. A*, p. 77 and fn. 3.

[330]Bately, *MS. A*, pp. cxvii-cxviii; also "Compilation," pp. 104 and 126.

[331]Bately, *MS. A*, p. cxxii.

[332]Bately, *MS. A*, p. cxxii.

minuscule (a type of script which gradually lost favour towards the end of the tenth century[333]), it can be dated with reasonable certainty to the period 977-c.1000.[334]

ChronB is very closely connected to **ChronC**, in some cases indeed, so closely as to suggest that it may have served at times as the latter manuscript's immediate exemplar.[335] The major exception to this is for the annals 653-946, where the two manuscripts are separated by several omissions, additions, and alternative readings.[336] This is particularly true of the annal numbers in this section, which with a few exceptions are missing from **ChronB** but present in **ChronC**. With the annal for 947, the two witnesses are again very close, although they are not necessarily directly related.[337]

The traditional view of the relationship between **ChronB** and **ChronC** sees both manuscripts as the product of independent traditions descending from a hypothetical common exemplar, to which Plummer gave the siglum Γ.[338] In this view, the missing annal numbers in **ChronB** are assumed to have been lost through a intermediate exemplar which was defective for the years 653-946.[339] More recently, however, Taylor has proposed a more complicated relationship between the two manuscripts. He argues that **ChronC** had **ChronB** as its exemplar until 652, the exemplar of **ChronB** for 653-946, and either **ChronB** or **ChronB** and another manuscript for 947-977.[340] In addition, he suggests that the loss of the annal numbers

---

[333]Taylor, *MS. B*, p. xxxiii.

[334]Taylor, *MS. B*, p. xxxiii.

[335]Taylor, *MS. B*, pp. xxxvi-xlix; Whitelock, *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, pp. xiii-xiv; Ker, *Catalogue*, art. 191, esp. p. 252.

[336]Taylor, *MS. B*, p. xxviii *et passim*.

[337]Taylor, *MS. B*, p. xliv; Whitelock, *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, pp. xiii-xiv; Ker, *Catalogue*, art. 191, esp. p. 252.

[338]Plummer, pp. lxxxviii-lxxxix.

[339]Whitelock, *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, p. xiii; Plummer, pp. lxxxvii-xc.

[340]Taylor, *MS. B*, pp. xxxiv-lxii, esp. xxxiv-xxxviii and l-li. This argument extends work by Whitelock (*Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, pp. xiii-xiv) and Ker (*Catalogue*, art. 191, esp. p. 252).

from **ChronB** for the annals 652-946 comes not as a result of a defective intervening exemplar in the post-Γ **ChronB** tradition, but of a thorough-going though incomplete revision of his exemplar by the **ChronB^{1}** scribe.[341] In addition to the removal of the annal numbers, Taylor also points to numerous other erasures, additions, omissions, and substitutions throughout the prose and verse of this section as evidence of the **ChronB^{1}** scribe's efforts at revision.[342]

This explanation of the relationship between **ChronB** and **ChronC** is important because it helps to account both for the substantive innovation in the **ChronB^{1}** versions of the *Battle of Brunanburh* and the *Capture of the Five Boroughs*, and, just as importantly, the relatively low levels of variation found among the **ChronB^{1}**, **ChronC^{2}** and **ChronA^{5}** texts of the *Coronation of Edgar* and *Death of Edgar*. In her discussion of the variation in the *Battle of Brunanburh* and *Death of Edgar*, O'Keeffe mentions three variants which she argues are "suggestive" of what she considers to be the **ChronB^{1}** scribe's formulaic sensibility: two differences in the use of prefixes (**ChronB^{1}** *forslegen* **ChronA^{3}** *beslagen* [**ChronC^{2}** *besle*|*gen* **ChronD^{2}** *beslægen*], *Battle of Brunanburh*, line 42a; **ChronB^{1}** *afylled* **ChronA^{3} ChronC^{2} ChronD^{2}** *gefylled*, *Battle of Brunanburh*, line 67a); and one substitution of stressed words (**ChronB^{1}** *forgrunden* **ChronA^{3} ChronC^{2} ChronD^{2}** *ageted*, *Battle of Brunanburh*, line 18a).[343] To these may be added another six unique substantive variants in the **ChronB^{1}** text of these poems: three inflectional differences: **ChronB^{1}** *sexan* **ChronA^{3} ChronD^{2}** *seaxe* (**ChronC^{2}** *sexe*), *Battle of Brunanburh*, line 70a; **ChronB^{1}** *hæþenum* **ChronA^{3}** *hæþenra* (**ChronC^{2}** *hæ*|*þenra* **ChronD^{2}** *hæðenra*), *Capture of the Five Boroughs*, line 10a; **ChronB^{1}** *denum* **ChronA^{3} ChronD^{2}** *dæne* (**ChronC^{2}** *dene*), *Capture of the Five Boroughs*, line 8b; one

[341]Taylor, *MS. B*, pp. xxxiv-lxii, esp. xxxiv-xxxviii and l-li.

[342]Taylor, *MS. B*, pp. l-lxii.

[343]O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 120.

substitution of an unstressed word: **ChronB[1]** *þ* **ChronA[3] ChronD[2]** *oð* **ChronC[2]** *oþ* (and orthographic variants), *Battle of Brunanburh*, line 16a; and two examples of the substitution of a stressed word: **ChronB[1]** *sake* **ChronA[3] ChronC[2]** *sæcce* (**ChronD[2]** *secce*), *Battle of Brunanburh*, line 4a; **ChronB[1]** *sace* **ChronA[3] ChronC[2]** *sæcce* **ChronD[2]** *sęcge*, *Battle of Brunanburh*, line 42a.

As we have come to expect, all but two of these changes correspond to innovations found elsewhere in the prose of this "revised" section of the manuscript. The two substitutions of verbal prefixes mentioned by O'Keeffe are matched by another twelve instances of the addition, omission or substitution of prefixes in the prose of the **ChronB[1]** annals 653-946: six in which **ChronB[1]** "has a prefix different from that employed in the other texts" of the *Chronicle*[344]; four in which **ChronB[1]** is the only witness with a prefix; and two in which words appear without a prefix in **ChronB[1]** alone.[345] Substitutions of nouns, verbs and adjectives are also relatively common in both the poetry and prose: in addition to O'Keeffe's example from *Battle of Brunanburh*, Taylor reports five examples of the substitution of non-homographic nouns, verbs and adjectives, and three which, like **ChronB[1]** *sace*, *sake* (for *sæcce*), lines 4a and 42a , involve graphically similar forms.[346]

The same is true of other unique variants in the **ChronB[1]** copies of the *Battle of Brunanburh* and *Capture of the Five Boroughs*. The substitution of *þ* for *oð* (as in *Battle of*

---

[344]Taylor, *MS B*, p. xcviii.

[345]Taylor, *MS. B*, p. xcviii.

[346]Non-homographs: **ChronB[1]** *onfon* **ChronA ChronC ChronD** (*ge*)*þicg*(*e*)*an*, 755; **ChronB[1]** *wurdon* **ChronA ChronC ChronD** *fulgon*, 755; **ChronB[1]** *liþ* **ChronA ChronD ChronE** *resteþ*, 716; **ChronB[1]** *for* **ChronA ChronC ChronD** *eode*, 886; **ChronB[1]** *mæssan* **ChronA ChronC ChronD** *tide*, 759; Homographic substitutions: **ChronB[1]** *Bryttas* **ChronC** (**ChronA ChronD**) *Bryttwealas*, 682/3; **ChronB[1]** *wæron* **ChronA ChronC ChronD** *wicodon*, 894; **ChronB[1]** *foran* **ChronA ChronC ChronD** *ferdon*, 737; **ChronB[1]** *nan* **ChronA ChronC ChronD** *nænig*. See Taylor, *MS. B*, pp. lix-lx, xcvii. The distinction between homographic and non-homographic substitutions is my own. Taylor mixes the two in both his lists.

Brunanburh, line 16a) is reported by Taylor to be a "distinctive" feature of the **ChronB**[1] scribe's work from 755-937, where it occurs a total of ten times.[347] The use of the weak form *seaxan* for *seaxe* in *Battle of Brunanburh*, line 70a, though not a unique variant elsewhere in **ChronB**[1], does occur as a recensional variant in 473, where **ChronB ChronC** have *engle* to **ChronA ChronE** *englan*.[348] The two remaining unique readings in **ChronB**[1], *hæþenum*, *Capture of the Five Boroughs*, line 10a and *denum*, *Capture of the Five Boroughs*, line 8b, are, as Taylor suggests, the likely result of the mechanical influence of surrounding forms.[349]

Taylor's suggestion that the scribe of **ChronB**[1] was revising the section from 653-946 also explains a second feature of his poetic performance – the relative lack of substantive innovation in the two later poems, the *Coronation of Edgar* (973) and the *Death of Edgar* (975). As O'Keeffe and Bately note, neither the *Coronation of Edgar* nor the *Death of Edgar* exhibit much substantive variation in their three surviving witnesses.[350] As we have seen above (pp. 140-141), O'Keeffe attributes this to a combination of late scribes in **ChronA**[5] and **ChronC**[2] and the renewal of a close relationship between **ChronB** and **ChronC** for the annals after 947. Were this explanation correct, however, we would still expect to find more substantive variation than we do between **ChronA**[5] and the common text of **ChronB**[1] and **ChronC**[2]. Even if we assume that the scribe of **ChronA**[5] is too late to be properly "formulaic" – an assumption which, as noted above (pp. 141-143), is unwarranted given the fact that the other Fixed Context poems discussed in this chapter have all shown more variation in their later rather than their earlier witnesses – and even if we assume that **ChronC**[2] is following **ChronB**[1] closely enough from 947 on to preclude any independent

[347]Taylor, *MS. B*, p. lvii.

[348]Taylor, *MS. B*, p. xciv, fn. 155.

[349]Taylor, *MS. B*, p. lviii.

[350]O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, pp. 124-5; Bately, *MS. A*, p. xci.

variation between the two manuscripts, we would nevertheless expect to find more "formulaic" variants than we do between the work of the tenth century – and in O'Keeffe's terms – "formulaic" scribe of **ChronB**[1] and the unrelated (though eleventh century) **ChronA**[5].

As we have seen above in our discussion of **ChronA**[5] (pp. 149-150), however, the three witnesses to these poems show surprisingly little variation that is metrically, semantically or syntactically appropriate *and* significant. The most appropriate variants separating the two traditions are either graphically similar or have relatively little metrical, semantic or syntactic effect: *weorþan* : *beon* (*Death of Edgar*, line 16a), *in* : *on* (*Death of Edgar*, line 6a), *þ* : *þær* (*Death of Edgar*, line 8b); *soðboran* : *woðboran* (*Death of Edgar*, line 33a); the addition or omission of *ȝ* (*Coronation of Edgar*, lines 24a, and 29a) and of *eac* (*Death of Edgar*, line 29a). Those which have the greatest effect on sense, metre, or syntax, on the other hand, are almost invariably problematic, causing syntactic difficulties in the case of the omission of *þa* from **ChronA**[5] *Coronation of Edgar*, line 19b; metrical difficulties in that of the substitution **ChronA**[5] *agan* **ChronB**[1] **ChronC**[2] *get*, *Coronation of Edgar*, line 13b; and agreement difficulties in that of inflectional difference **ChronA**[5] *corðre micelre* **ChronB**[1] *corðre mycclum* (**ChronC**[2] *corþre mycclum*), *Coronation of Edgar*, line 2a.

What we do not find in these two poems is the type of semantically, syntactically and metrically appropriate *and* significant innovation characteristic of the **ChronB**[1] versions of the *Battle of Brunanburh* and the *Capture of the Five Boroughs*, with its inflectional differences and substitutions of prefixes and stressed words – substitutions of prefixes and stressed words **ChronB**[1] *forslegen* **ChronA**[3] *beslagen* (**ChronC**[2] *besle|gen* **ChronD**[2] *beslægen*), *Battle of Brunanburh*, line 42a; **ChronB**[1] *forgrunden* **ChronA**[3] **ChronC**[2] **ChronD**[2] *ageted*, *Battle of Brunanburh*, line 18a; and inflectional differences **ChronB**[1] *hæþenum* **ChronA**[3] *hæþenra* (**ChronC**[2] *hæ|þenra* **ChronD**[2] *hæðenra*), *Capture of the Five Boroughs*, line 10a; and

ChronB[1] *dænum* **ChronA[3] ChronD[2]** *dæne* (**ChronC[2]** *dene*), *Capture of the Five Boroughs*, line 8b.

If, as Taylor suggests, however, the absence of annal numbers in **ChronB[1]** from 652-946 is the result of an incomplete attempt at revision by the **ChronB[1]** scribe, then the relative lack of substantive innovation between the **ChronB[1]**-**ChronC[2]** and **ChronA[5]** versions of the *Coronation of Edgar* and the *Death of Edgar* indicate that the revision was either less intensive or largely accomplished after the annal for 946. Rather than the result of the **ChronB[1]** scribe's formulaic sensibility, the difference in the nature and amount of the textual innovation exhibited by **ChronB[1]** versions of the *Battle of Brunanburh* and *Capture of the Five Boroughs* on the one hand and the *Coronation of Edgar* and the *Death of Edgar* on the other is to be attributed to the editorial intentions of the scribe in question. In the first two poems – both of which occur in the section in which the scribe of **ChronB[1]** appears to be revising his source, and for which the scribe of **ChronC[2]** felt compelled to turn to another manuscript to supplement the text of **ChronB[1]** – the variation introduced by the scribe of **ChronB[1]** is in keeping with that found in the corresponding prose; by the time he came to copy the second set of verse texts, the **ChronB[1]** scribe had either stopped his revision or adopted a less innovative approach.

London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. i, Second Hand (ChronC[2])

The mid-eleventh-century scribe of **ChronC[2]** is the least innovative of all scribes responsible for copying the *Chronicle* poems. His work exhibits six substantive variant readings not found in the other witnesses to these texts, all in the *Battle of Brunanburh*.[351]

[351]Both Campbell and P. R. Orton attribute these variants to the **ChronC[2]** scribe (*Brunanburh*, p. 111; Orton "'The Battle of Brunanburh', 40b-44a: Constantine's Bereavement," *Peritia* 4 (1985): 243-50 at p. 248). As they occur in the *Battle of Brunanburh* only, and as the *Battle of Brunanburh* (with the *Capture of the Five Boroughs*) is found in the section which Taylor suggests the **ChronB[1]** scribe was attempting to revise,

Only one of the five variants (the addition of *his* in l. 41b) has a significant effect on the sense of the passage in which it occurs.[352] As five of the six variants occur on unstressed syllables and involve the same type of metrically and syntactically insignificant variation we have seen in the work of all but the most careful scribes of the glossing texts discussed in Chapter 2, moreover, it is impossible to rule out unconscious error or graphic variation as a possible source for most of the **ChronC**^{2} scribe's innovations.

London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. iv, Second Hand (ChronD^{2})

Of the four surviving witnesses to the first two *Chronicle* poems, the mid-eleventh-century **ChronD** shows by far the greatest number of unique substantive variants. The manuscript has been written in five or more hands, of which the second is responsible for both the *Battle of Brunanburh* and *Capture of the Five Boroughs*.[353] In their eighty-six lines, the **ChronD**^{2} scribe introduces twenty-two variants with a potentially significant effect on sense, metre, or syntax of the two poems: four differences of inflection, twelve examples of the substitution of stressed words and elements, one example of the addition or omission of unstressed words and phrases, one example of the addition or omission of a prefix, three examples of the reinterpretation of already existing text, and one example of the addition or omission of text corresponding to a metrical unit.[354]

Very few of these variants offer truly appropriate alternative readings. Of the four unique inflectional endings in the *Battle of Brunanburh* and *Capture of the Five Boroughs*, for example, three involve a confusion of gender: **ChronD**^{2} *se... gesceaft* **ChronA**^{3} *sio... gesceaft*

---

it is also possible that the "innovations" of **ChronC**^{2} are really from **Γ**, the hypothetical common exemplar of **ChronB**^{1} and **ChronC**^{2}, but were "edited out" of the **ChronB**^{1} revision.

[352]See below, p. 205.

[353]Ker, *Catalogue*, art. 192.

[354]These variants are discussed in greater detail below, pp. 206-222.

(**ChronB[1] ChronC[2]** *seo... gesceaft*), *Battle of Brunanburh*, line 16b; **ChronD[2]** *deopne*| *wæter* **ChronA[3]** *deop wæter* (**ChronB[1] ChronC[2]** *deopwæter*), *Battle of Brunanburh*, line 55a; **ChronD[2]** *þisneiglande* **ChronA[3]** *þis*| *eiglande* (**ChronB[1]** *þyseglande* **ChronC[2]** *þys iglande*), *Battle of Brunanburh*, line 66a; and the fourth a non-sensical substitution of a genitive for the nominative singular: **ChronD[2]** *eadmundes* **ChronA[3] ChronB[1] ChronC[2]** *eadmund*, *Capture of the Five Boroughs*, line 13b. Six of the twelve substitutions of stressed words in this manuscript, likewise, involve changes to a single consonant in the **ChronA[3] ChronB[1] ChronC[2]** form – in most cases as the result of an obvious graphic error: **ChronD[2]**: **ChronD[2]** *heord*|*weal* **ChronA[3]** *bord*|*weal* (**ChronB[1] ChronC[2]** *bordweall*), *Battle of Brunanburh*, line 5b; **ChronD[2]** *ræd* **ChronA[3] ChronB[1] ChronC[2]** *sæd*, *Battle of Brunanburh*, line 20a; **ChronD[2]** *flod* **ChronA[3] ChronB[1] ChronC[2]** *flot*, *Battle of Brunanburh*, line 35a; **ChronD[2]** *hal* **ChronA[3] ChronB[1] ChronC[2]** *hár*, *Battle of Brunanburh*, line 39a; **ChronD[2]** *cuð heafóc* **ChronA[3]** *guð hafóc* (**ChronB[1]** *guþhafoc* **ChronC[2]** *guðhafoc*), *Battle of Brunanburh* 64a; **ChronD[2]** *gife* **ChronA[3] ChronC[2]** *fife* (**ChronB[1]** *fífe*), *Capture of the Five Boroughs*, line 5b. Three other substitutions, although not the result of an error in a single letter, are nevertheless almost certainly graphic in origin: one substitution of a stressed word or element: **ChronD[2]** *sęcge* **ChronA[3] ChronC[2]** *sæcce* **ChronB[1]** *sace*, *Battle of Brunanburh*, line 42a; and two examples of the reinterpretation of existing text: **ChronD[2]** *inwuda* **ChronA[3]** *inwidda* (**ChronB[1] ChronC[2]** *inwitta*), *Battle of Brunanburh*, line 46a; **ChronD[2]** *dæg gled ongarum* **ChronA[3]** *nęgled cnearrū* (**ChronB[1]** *nægled cnear*|*rum* **ChronC[2]** *negledcnearrum*), *Battle of Brunanburh*, line 53b.

Of variants involving more than a simple graphic misunderstanding, three involve difficulties with poetic or nonce words on the part of **ChronD[2]**: **ChronD[2]** *mycel scearpum* for the nonce compound **ChronB[1] ChronC[2]** *mylenscearpum* (**ChronA[3]** *mylen scearpan*), *Battle*

of Brunanburh, line 24a; **ChronD**^{2} *hryman* (early West-Saxon *hrīeman*, non West-Saxon *hrēman*) 'lament' for the poetic **ChronA**^{3} **ChronB**^{1} **ChronC**^{2} *hreman* (early West-Saxon and non West-Saxon *hrēman*) 'exult', *Battle of Brunanburh*, line 39b; and the nonsense form **ChronD**^{2} *dyflig* for the nonce word **ChronA**^{3} *difel|in* (**ChronB**^{1} *dyflen* **ChronC**^{2} *dyflin*, i.e. 'Dublin'), *Battle of Brunanburh*, line 55b. In a fourth example, the **ChronD**^{2} reading is metrically, syntactically and semantically appropriate but formulaically less common: **ChronD**^{2} *feohte* **ChronA**^{3} *ge|feohte* (**ChronB**^{1} **ChronC**^{2} *gefeohte*), *Battle of Brunanburh*, line 28a. In a fifth, **ChronD**^{2} substitutes a metrically, syntactically, and semantically appropriate but non-poetic word for a poetic reading in **ChronB**^{1} **ChronC**^{2}: **ChronD**^{2} *mægþa* 'of the clan' for **ChronA**^{3} *maga* 'of the young men' (or 'of the kinsmen') and **ChronB**^{1} *mægcea* (**ChronC**^{2}, *mecga*) 'of men', *Capture of the Five Boroughs*, line 2a. A sixth, **ChronD**^{2} *inecga* **ChronB**^{1} *mecea* (**ChronC**^{2} *meca*; **ChronA**^{3} *mæcan*), *Battle of Brunanburh*, line 40a, involves the substitution of a semantically equivalent prepositional phrase (probably the result of an original minim error) for a noun in **ChronB**^{1} **ChronC**^{2}.

In only two cases does the **ChronD**^{2} form offer an apparently genuine alternative to those of the other witnesses: the addition of the unstressed particle *þe* to *Battle of Brunanburh*, line 51b: **ChronD**^{2} *þæsþe* **ChronA**^{3} **ChronB**^{1} **ChronC**^{2} *þæs*; and the substitution of the first element in the poetic compound **ChronD**^{2} *heora|flyman* **ChronA**^{3} *here fleman* (**ChronB**^{1} *herefly|man* **ChronC**^{2} *here|flymon*), *Battle of Brunanburh*, 23a.[355]

The general lack of appropriate variation in **ChronD**^{2} is all the more surprising given the relative independence of the **ChronD** text. The only representative of the northern recension of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* to include the *Chronicle* poems, **ChronD** comprises what Whitelock has described as a "a conflation of the northern recension with another text of

the [Southern] Chronicle."[356] As it is unlikely that **ChronA**, **ChronB** or **ChronC** were the direct ancestor of the southern elements in this compilation, and as, as Whitelock notes, "the task of conflating the two texts cannot have been easy,"[357] we might expect to find more evidence than we do of thoughtful emendation similar to that found in the "corrected" sections of **ChronB**[1].

Instead, as Whitelock and Plummer note, the mixture of conservatism and carelessness which characterises the **ChronD**[2] treatment of the *Battle of Brunanburh* and *Capture of the Five Boroughs* is also characteristic of the manuscript as a whole. On the one hand, the scribes of **ChronD** do not appear to have made much effort to update the language or contents of their exemplar. Plummer reports the **ChronD** version of the *Chronicle* to be relatively free of the late forms, spellings and syntax which mark the slightly later, but closely related Peterborough Chronicle (**ChronE**).[358] On the other hand, however, this orthographic and syntactic conservatism is not matched by a similarly careful attitude towards the details of the text itself. At a textual level, Plummer reports **ChronD** to be "full of mistakes and omissions" and "from first to last very inaccurately and carelessly written" when it is compared with the applicable sections of **ChronE** and **ChronA ChronB ChronC**.[359] In addition, Whitelock and Plummer both record numerous occasions on which the compiler of **ChronD** has joined material from his two sources in a "clumsy" and repetitive fashion.[360] As was also true of the

---

[355]This last example may also be the result of a late back-spelling. See below, p. 210.

[356]Whitelock, *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, pp. xiv-xv; *Peterborough Chronicle*, with an appendix by Cecily Clark, Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile 4 (Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1954), pp. 28-29; and Plummer, lxxviii-lxxix.

[357]Whitelock, *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, p. xv.

[358]Plummer p. lxxx; Whitelock, *Peterborough Chronicle*, pp. 28-29

[359]Plummer, p. lxxxi; for examples, see Plummer, p. lxxxii, fn. 2 and lxii, fn. 2.

[360]See Whitelock, *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, p. xv; Plummer, pp. lxxxi-lxxxii. Both writers use "clumsy" to describe the **ChronD** compiler's efforts.

work of the scribes of **ChronA**[3], **ChronA**[5], **ChronB**[1] and **ChronC**[2], the scribe of **ChronD**[2] does not appear to have strayed far from his prose practice in copying his verse.

Textual Variants

The following sections treat the substantive variation among witnesses to the *Chronicle* poems on a manuscript-by-manuscript, scribe-by-scribe and then poem-by-poem basis. A separate section between **ChronA**[5] and **ChronB**[1] examines "recensional" variants in which **ChronB**[1] and **ChronC**[2] agree in a reading different from **ChronA**[3] and **ChronD**[2] (pp. 187-192). These are presumably to be ascribed to their common archetype, Plummer's hypothetical Γ (see above, pp. 150-152).

Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 173
Third Hand (ChronA[3])

Battle of Brunanburh

Differences of Inflection (4 examples)

***Brun* (ChronA[3]), 17b**

ChronA[3]

þær læg secg mænig.
garū ageted. gum**a** norþern**a**.|
ofer scild scoten. swilce scittisc eác.
20 werig wíges sæd.

ChronC[2]

þærlæg secgmonig.|
garum ageted. gum**an** norðern**e**.
ofer scyldscoten swilce| scyttisc eac.
20 werig wig ges sæd.

ChronB[1]

þærlægsecg manig.
garum forgrunden.| gum**an** norðern**e**.
oferscyldsceoten swylce scyttisceac.|
20 werig wiggessæd.

ChronD[2]

þær| læg secg monig.
garum ageted gum**an** norþærn**e**.|
ofer scyld sceoten swylce scyttisc eác.
20 werig wiges| ræd

In **ChronA**[3], the noun-adjective pair *guma norþerna* is nominative singular; in **ChronB**[1] **ChronC**[2] and **ChronD**[2], *guman norðerne* (**ChronD**[2] *guman norþærne*) is nominative plural. Syntactically, the **ChronA**[3] reading is to be preferred, given the use of a singular form of the participle *scoten* (**ChronB**[1] **ChronD**[2] *sceoten*) in line 19a of all witnesses. The plural noun and adjective in **ChronB**[1] **ChronC**[2] **ChronD**[2] is perhaps to be ascribed to the

influence of the preceding collective, *secg mænig*, l. 17b. Similarly rapid transitions from the plural/collective to the concrete singular can be paralleled from the battle scenes in *Beowulf*.[361]

The variants are metrically identical. As both require that the scribe make a corresponding change elsewhere in his text, the variants are linked.

***Brun* (ChronA^{3}), 26b**

ChronA^{3}

myrce| newyrndon.
25 he eardes hond plegan. hæleþa nanum
þæmid anlafe.| ofer **æra gebland**.
onlides bosme. land gesohtun.
fæge toge|feohte.

ChronC^{2}

myrce| newyrndon.
25 heardes handplegan hæleþa namū.
þaraðemid| anlafe. ofer **ear gebland**
onliþes bosme landgesohton.
fæge| togefeohte

ChronB^{1}

myrce| newyrndon.
25 heardes handplegan hæleþananum.
þara| ðemid anlafe ofer**eargebland**.
onlides bosme landge|sohtan.
fægetogefeohte.

ChronD^{2}

myrce newyrndon.
25 heardes hand plegan hæleþa| nanum.
þæra þemid anlafe ofer **eár gebland**.|
onlides bosme land gesohton.
fage to feohte

The variation between compound and simplices **ChronA^{3}** *æra gebland* **ChronB^{1}** *eargebland* (**ChronC^{2}** *ear gebland* **ChronD^{2}** *eár gebland*) has no effect on sense and a slight effect on metre. The **ChronB^{1} ChronC^{2} ChronD^{2}** form is found twice more in the poetic corpus: *Metres of Boethius*, VIII. 30a (ofer ear*geblond*), and *Elene* l. 239a: *ofer earhgeblond*.[362] There are no further examples of the **ChronA^{3}** reading, although O'Keeffe cites similar collocations from *Andreas*, line 532a (*aryða geblond*) and Exeter Riddle 3, line 22a (*eare geblonden*) as possible parallels.[363]

In line 71a, **ChronA^{3}** has the compound *bradbrimu* for *brade brimu* (and orthographic variants) in **ChronB^{1} ChronC^{2} ChronD^{2}** (see below, p. 165).

---

[361]Campbell, *Brunanburh*, pp. 103-4. A discussion of **ChronA^{3}** ll. 17b-20a and other examples of such rapid transitions between plural, collective, and singular nouns from *Beowulf* can be found in O'Donnell, "The Collective Sense of Concrete Singular Nouns in *Beowulf*: Emendations of Sense," *NM* 92 (1991) 433-440.

[362]See Campbell, *Brunanburh*, p. 107. O'Keeffe misses the second occurrence in her discussion of the line (*Visible Song*, p. 120).

[363]O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 120.

The variation has a slight effect on metre. In **ChronA**^{3} the line is a Type B-2; in **ChronB**^{1} **ChronC**^{2} **ChronD**^{2} it is Type B-1

***Brun* (ChronA^{3}), 40a**

ChronA^{3}

swilce þær| eác sefroda. mid fleame cō.
onhis cyþþe norð. costontinus.|
hár hilde ring. hreman neþorfte.
40 **mæcan** gemanan. he wæs| his mæga sceard.
freonda gefylled. ónfolcstede.
beslagen| ætsæcce. ꝛhis sunu forlet.
ónwæl stowe. wundun fer grunden.|
giungne ætguðe.

ChronC^{2}

Swilce| þǽr eac sefroda midfleame cóm.
onhis cyððe norð. constan|tinus.
hár hilderinc. hreman neðorfte.
40 **meca** gemanan. her| wæs hismaga sceard.
freonda gefylled. onhis folcstede.
besle|gen ætsæcce. ꝛhissunu forlet
onwælstowe. wundum forgrunden.|
geongne æt guþe.

ChronB^{1}

S wylce þær eacsefróda mid fleamecóm.
onhiscyþþe| norð constantínus.
hárhilderinc hremanneþórfte|||
40 **mecea** gemanan her wæs his magasceard.
freonda| gefylled on folcstede.
forslegen ætsace ꝛhissunu for|let.
onwælstowe wundum forgrunden.
geongne ætguþe|

ChronD^{2}

swylce þæreác sefroda mid| fleame com
onhis cyððe norð constantinus|
hal hylde rínc hryman neþorfte.
40 **inecga** ge|manan hewæshis mæga. sceard
freonda ge|fylled onfolc stede
beslægen ætsȩcge. ꝛhissunu| forlæt.
onwæl stowe wundum forgrunden.|
geongne ætguþe

Of the three readings for this line, two – **ChronB**^{1} **ChronC**^{2} *mec*(*e*)*a gemanan* '(in/of) the fellowship of swords' and **ChronD**^{2} *inecga ge*|*manan* 'in the fellowship of swords' – make sense, syntax, and some metre. The third, **ChronA**^{3} *mæcan gemanan*, is nonsensical.

In **ChronA**^{3}, *mæcan* is presumably a corruption of either *mæcga*, the genitive plural of *mæcg* 'man', or *mec*(*e*)*a*, genitive plural of *mēce* 'sword' and the reading of **ChronB**^{1}-**ChronC**^{2}. Campbell considers this second possibility the less likely, however, as "*mece* is nowhere else spelt with *æ*" and as **ChronA**^{3} (and **ChronD**^{2}) read *mecum* correctly in line 24a.[364] Since **ChronD**^{2} *inecga ge*|*manan* 'in the fellowship of swords' makes sense and is roughly synonymous with the reading of **ChronB**^{1} and **ChronC**^{2}, however, it is perhaps more likely that **ChronA**^{3} *mæcan* also comes from an original **meca*.[365] Perhaps the **ChronA**^{3}

[364]Campbell, *Brunanburh*, pp. 110-111.

[365]Campbell reports the **ChronD**^{2} reading as *mecga*, adding that "the *m* might be read as *in*" (*Brunanburh*, p. 88 and fn. 1). There is a clear space between the first and second minim of the "m" in facsimile, however.

scribe was bothered by the poet's use of such a "striking and original" kenning for battle.[366] The addition of final *-n* to **ChronA**^{3} may be the result of an anticipation of the ending of the following word or the misconstruction of *mæcan* as a weak adjective in agreement with *gemanan*. It is in any case further evidence of the **ChronA**^{3} scribe's difficulty with the poem.[367]

The **ChronB**^{1} **ChronC**^{2} reading *mec(e)a gemanan* 'fellowship of swords' and the **ChronD**^{2} reading *inecga ge|manan* 'in the fellowship of swords' are broadly equivalent semantically and syntactically. In **ChronB**^{1} **ChronC**^{2}, *mec*(*e*)*a* is a genitive dependent on *gemanan*, which is itself genitive or dative singular and governed by *hreman*, line 39b (while Bosworth and Toller give no examples of *hrēman* governing a simple case ending without a preposition, Campbell reports that the related adjective *hrēmig* appears "sometimes governing the gen., but usually the dat."[368]). In **ChronD**^{2}, *inecga ge|manan* is presumably to be read as a prepositional phrase modifying *hrȳman* 'cry out', 'lament' (the verb of **ChronD**^{2} line 39b). In this case, *gemanan* is to be construed as accusative or dative singular, modified by the genitive plural *ecga*. *Gemāna* is frequently found in similar prepositional phrases.[369] Given the **ChronD**^{2} scribe's demonstrated difficulties with the script of his exemplar and the failure of his version of the line to show double alliteration, a scribal misinterpretation of an initial minim in *inecga* seems the most likely explanation for his reading.

See Robinson and Stanley, *EEMF* 23, pl. 14.1.5.2, line 6, and cf. Dobbie, *ASPR* 6, p. 148, who incorrectly reports a space between *in* and *ecga*.

[366]Campbell, *Brunanburh*, p. 110.

[367]Campbell, *Brunanburh*, p. 110; For a possibly similar example of inflectional attraction, see **ChronB**^{1} *saxan*: **ChronA**^{3} **ChronC**^{2} **ChronD**^{2} *se(a)xe*, l.70a; a further example of a scribe making an adjective from an apparently unfamiliar word is **ChronD**^{2} *dyflig* for **ChronA**^{3} *difel|in* (**ChronB**^{1} *dyflen* **ChronC**^{2} *dyflin*), *Battle of Brunanburh*, l. 55b; see below, p. 214.

[368]Campbell, *Brunanburh*, p. 110; for *hrēman* 'exult', see B.-T.(S) *hréman*.

[369]B.-T.(S) *gemána*. An example with *on* is given in definition III 'fellowship, association, society, intercourse'.

Of the three variants, only that in **ChronD**^{2} affects metre significantly. Whether **ChronA**^{3} *mæcan* is intended for *mecga* or *mēca*, the **ChronA**^{3} **ChronB**^{1} and **ChronC**^{2} versions of line 40 are all Type A-1 with double alliteration. In **ChronD**^{2}, *inecga ge*|*manan* is best scanned as a Type A-1 line with an anacrustic preposition and delayed alliteration.

The **ChronD**^{2} and **ChronB**^{1} **ChronC**^{2} forms are mentioned briefly below, pages 189 and 218.

***Brun* (ChronA^{3}), 71a**

ChronA^{3}

newearð wæl mare.
ón þis| eiglande. æfer gieta.
folces gefylled. beforan þissū.
sweordes| écgum. þæs þeus segað béc
ealdeuðwitan. siþþan eastan hider.|
engle ȝseaxe. upbecoman.
ofer **bradbrimu**. brytene sohtan.
wlance wigsmiþas. weealles ofer coman.
eorlas arhwate. eard| begeatan.|

ChronB^{1}

newearð| wælmáre.
onþyseglande æfregyta.
folces afylled befo|ran þyssum.
sweordes ecgum þæs þeus secggeaþ béc.
ealde|uþwitan syþþan eastan hider.
engle ȝsexan upp becoman.|
ofer**brade brimu**. brytenesohtan
wlance wigsmiþas.| wealas ofercoman
eorlas arhwate. eardbegeaton.|

ChronC^{2}

newearð wælmare
onþys iglande æfregyta.|
folces gefylled beforan þyssum.
swurdes ecgum. þǽsðeús| segað béc.
ealde uþwitan. siððan eastanhider
engle ȝsexe.| uppbecomon.
ofer**bradebrimu** bretene sohton.
wlance| wig smiðas. wealas ofercomon.
eorlas árhwáte eard be|geaton.

ChronD^{2}

newearð wæl mare.
onþisneiglande æfregitá.|
folces gefylled beforan þyssum.
sweordes ecgum| þæs þeus segað béc.
ealde uðwitan siððan eastan|hider
engle ȝseaxe úpbecomon.
ofer**brade bri|mu** britene sohton
wlance wigsmiðas wealas| ofer comon.
eorlas arhwæte eard begeaton;|

ChronA^{3} *brad* can be construed as either the first element of a compound, *bradbrimu*, or an example of an endingless neuter accusative plural in apposition to *brimu*. In **ChronB**^{1} **ChronC**^{2} **ChronD**^{2} *brade* is an example of the late neuter accusative plural in *-e*.[370] *Ofer brad brimu* occurs once more in the poetic corpus (*Genesis*, line 2194a). There are no further examples of the **ChronB**^{1} **ChronC**^{2} **ChronD**^{2} reading.

[370]Campbell, *Brunanburh*, p. 120. See also Campbell, *OEG* §641.

In **ChronA**^{3} the line is Type C-2; in **ChronB**^{1} **ChronC**^{2} **ChronD**^{2} Type B-1 with a resolved second stress.

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

***Brun* (ChronA^{3}), 26a**

ChronA^{3}

myrce| newyrndon.
25 he eardes hond plegan. hæleþa nanum
þæmid anlafe.| ofer æra gebland.
onlides bosme. land gesohtun.
fæge toge|feohte.

ChronC^{2}

myrce| newyrndon.
25 heardes handplegan hæleþa namū.
þaraðemid| anlafe. ofer ear gebland
onliþes bosme landgesohton.
fæge| togefeohte

ChronB^{1}

myrce| newyrndon.
25 heardes handplegan hæleþananum.
þara| ðemid anlafe ofereargebland.
onlides bosme landge|sohtan.
fægetogefeohte.

ChronD^{2}

myrce newyrndon.
25 heardes hand plegan hæleþa| nanum.
þæra þemid anlafe ofer eár gebland.|
onlides bosme land gesohton.
fage to feohte

Although it makes good sense and metre as written, the **ChronA**^{3} *þæ* is almost certainly an eyeskip for ***þæra þe***.[371] A similar variant occurs in Psalm 93:09.6b: **PPs** *þær* **EPs** *þæ* (see above, Chapter 2, p. 40). The scribe of **ChronG** normalises the **ChronA**^{3} reading to *þe*.[372]

As the omission falls in the preliminary dip of a Type C line, it has no effect on metre.

[371]Cf. Bately, *MS. A*, p. cxxxix, who includes the variant as a possible example (with *dæne* [**ChronG** *dene*], *Capture of the Five Boroughs*, l.8b) of *æ* for WS *e* in stressed syllables.

[372]Campbell, *Brunanburh*, p. 106; Lutz, *Die Version G*, p. 219.

Reinterpretation of Existing Elements (7 examples)

***Brun* (ChronA[3]), 13a**

ChronA[3]

10 hord ꝯhámas. het tend| crungun.
sceotta leoda. ꝯscip flotan.
fæge feollan. feld dæn,ⁿede||
secgas hwate. sið þan sunne úp.
onmorgentíd. mære tun gol.
15 glad ofer| grundas. godes condel beorht.
eces drihtnes. oð sio æþele gesceaft.|
sahtosetle.

ChronC[2]

10 hord ꝯhamas| hettend crungon.
scotta leode. ꝯscypflotan.
fæge feollan| feld dennade.
secga swate. siððan sunne upp.
onmorgentid.| mære tungol.
15 gladofer grundas. godes candel beorht
eces| drihtnes oþseo æþele gesceaft
sáhtósetle.

ChronB[1]

10 hórd ꝯhámas hettend crungon
scotta leode| ꝯscip flotan.
fægefeollan feld dennade.
secgaswate siþþan| sunne upp.
onmorgentíd mære tungol
15 glad ofergrun|das godes candel beorht.
ecesdrihtnes. þseo æþele gesceaft|
sah tosetle.

ChronD[2]

10 hord. ꝯhamas heted crungon|
scotta leode. ꝯscipflotan.
fæge feollon feld dennode.|
secga swate siþþan sunne úp.
onmorgen tíd mære| tungol.
15 glad ofergrundas godes candel beorht.|
eces drihtnes. oð se æþele gesceaft.
sahtoseꝫtle

As Campbell has suggested, the origin of this variant is most likely a scribal error on the part of **ChronA[3]** or a predecessor:

> *Secgas hwate* is readily explained as a corruption of *secga swate*: if a scribe took the second *s* to belong to the first word, he would be very likely to make the meaningless *wate* into *hwate*. The error was probably due to the scribe of A, for it occurs in his MS. at the turn of a page, and this may have led to his losing the thread of what he was writing.[373]

Bately and O'Keeffe note that the form can be made to make some sense, however, "if the preceding half-line [*feld dæn,ⁿede*]... is understood parenthetically."[374] In this reading, **ChronA[3]** *secgas hwate* 'bold men' is interpreted as the subject of *feollan* line 12a, while line 12b – **ChronA[3]** *feld dæn,ⁿede* (**ChronG** *feld dynede*) – is understood in an absolute sense as 'the field resounded'.[375] In **ChronB[1]** **ChronC[2]** and **ChronD[2]**, the reading *secga swate*

[373]Campbell, *Brunanburh*, p. 100.

[374]O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 119 (for "Crawford" here and elsewhere in this section of O'Keeffe's chapter, read "Campbell"); Bately, *MS. A*, p. cx.

[375]See Bately 1986, p. cx. This reading assumes that **ChronA[3]** *dæn,ⁿede* **ChronB[1]** **ChronC[2]** *dennade* **ChronD[2]** *dennode* are for West-Saxon *dynede* as in **ChronG**. See Robinson, "Lexicography and Literary

(**ChronB[1]** *secgaswate*) 'with the blood of men' is an instrumental governed by **ChronB[1]** **ChronC[2]** *dennade* **ChronD[2]** *dennode*.

In addition to its effect on syntax and sense, the reinterpretation also affects metre. In **ChronB[1]** **ChronC[2]** **ChronD[2]**, line 13a is Type A-1 with two long lifts. In **ChronA[3]**, it is Type A-4 with a short second lift. As Campbell and O'Keeffe note, both types are attested elsewhere in the corpus.[376]

***Brun* (ChronA[3]), 25a**

ChronA[3]

myrce| newyrndon.
25 **he eardes** hond plegan. hæleþa nanum
þæmid anlafe.| ofer æra gebland.
onlides bosme. land gesohtun.
fæge toge|feohte.

ChronC[2]

myrce| newyrndon.
25 **heardes** handplegan hæleþa namū.
þaraðemid| anlafe. ofer ear gebland
onliþes bosme landgesohton.
fæge| togefeohte

ChronB[1]

myrce| newyrndon.
25 **heardes** handplegan hæleþananum.
þara| ðemid anlafe ofereargebland.
onlides bosme landge|sohtan.
fægetogefeohte.

ChronD[2]

myrce newyrndon.
25 **heardes** hand plegan hæleþa| nanum.
þæra þemid anlafe ofer eár gebland.|
onlides bosme land gesohton.
fage to feohte

The **ChronA[3]** forms here and in line 72b (*weeallas*, **ChronB[1]** **ChronC[2]** **ChronD[2]** *wealas*) either are the result of a reinterpretation *heardes* and *weallas* as two independent parts of speech, or reflect an antecedent in which *ea* was spelled *eea* before consonants which caused lengthening in late Old English.[377]

If the **ChronA[3]** scribe interpreted *he eardes* as two words, the variation affects both sense and metre. The third person pronoun *he* cannot be the subject of the plural verb

---

Criticism: A Caveat," *Philological Essays in Old and Middle English Language and Literature in Honour of Herbert Dean Meritt*, ed. James Rosier (The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 1970), 99-110, at p. 107; for a summary of critical opinion on the word, see Joseph Harris, "'Brunanburh' 12b-13a and Some Skaldic Passages," *Magister Regis: Studies in Honor of Robert Earl Kaske*, ed. Robert Groos with Emerson Brown Jr., Thomas D. Hill, Giuseppe Mazzotta and Joseph S. Wittig (New York: Fordham, 1986), 61-68. This discussion supersedes Campbell's note to the line in *Brunanburh*, pp. 100-101.

[376]Campbell, *Brunanburh*, pp. 99-100; O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, pp. 118-119, and fn. 32.

[377]Campbell, *Brunanburh*, p. 106.

wyrndon, line 24b, and *eardes hondplegan* 'hand-play (i.e. battle) of the earth' is strained. In **ChronB**[1] **ChronC**[2] and **ChronD**[2], the line is a Type D*2; with *he*, **ChronA**[3] would be a type D*2 with anacrusis. **ChronA**[3] *weeallas* is discussed below, p. 172.

***Brun* (ChronA[3]), 35a**

ChronA[3]

þærge flemed wearð.
norð manna bregu.| nede gebeded.
tolides stefne. litle weorode.
35 cread **cnearen** flot.| cyning utgewat.
ónfealene flod. feorh generede.

ChronC[2]

þær geflymed wearð.
norðmanna| brego neade gebæded.
tolides stefne lytle werode
35 cread **cnear||ón**flót cining út géwat.
onfealoneflod feorh génerode.

ChronB[1]

þærge|flymed wearð.
norðmanna brego nede gebǽded.
to|lides stefne lytle weorode.
35 cread **cnear on**flot| cing ut gewát.
onfealone flód feorh generede.|

ChronD[2]

þær geflymed wearð|
norð manna brego. neade ge bæded
tolides| stæfne lytle weorode.
35a creat **cneár on**flod| ----
---- feorh generode.

ChronA[3] *cnearen* is presumably a slip for *cnear on*, perhaps due to the unfamiliarity of *cnear*(*r*), an Old Norse loanword attested in Old English only in the *Battle of Brunanburh* (here and as the second half of the compound *nęgled cnearrū*, line 53b).[378] A second possibility, that the **ChronA**[3] scribe intended *en* for the preposition *in*/*on* is unlikely. While the falling together of unstressed vowels like *e* and *a* is frequent in later manuscripts,[379] the use of *en* for the preposition *on* is unparalleled in the corpus of multiply-attested poems. In **ChronG** the form is corrected to *cnear on*.[380]

[378]Campbell, *Brunanburh*, pp. 108-9. At line 53b the forms are: **ChronA**[3] *nęgled cnearrū* **ChronB**[1] *nægled cnear|rum* **ChronC**[2] *negledcnearrum* **ChronD**[2] *dæg gled ongarum*.

[379]Campbell, *OEG* § 379.

[380]Lutz, *Die Version G*, p. 85.

***Brun* (ChronA[3]), 49b**

ChronA[3]

midheora herelafū.| hlehhan neþorftun.
þ heo beaduweorca. beteran wurdun.
ón camp stede. **cul bod ge hna des**
garmit tinge. gumena ge|mo tes.
wæpen gewrixles. þæs hi ón wæl felda.
wiþead weardes.| afaran plegodan.

ChronB[1]

midheora herelafum hlihhan| neþorftan.
þhie beado weorca beteran wurdan.
oncamp|stede **cumbol gehnastes**.
gármittinge gumena gemótes.|
wæpen gewrixles þæshie onwæl felda.
wiþeadweardes. eafo|ran plegodan.

ChronC[2]

midhyra here lafum| hlihhan neðorftun.
þhi beadoweorca beteran wurdon.
oncamp|stede **cumbol gehnastes**.
gar mit tin ge gumena gemotes.
wæpen| gewrixles. þæs hionwælfelda
wið eadweardes aforan plegodon.|

ChronD[2]

mid hyra here leafum hlybban neþorf|tan.
þæt hi beado weorca beteran wurdon.
on| campstede **cumbol ge hnastes**.
gár mittunge| gumena gemotes.
wæpen ge wrixles. þæsþehi| on wæl felda
wiðeadweardes áfaran plegodon;|

The **ChronA[3]** form *cul bod ge hna des* appears to represent less a coherent reading than an attempt at deciphering a nonce compound. *Culbod* and *gehnades* are nonsense words. Although line 49b is the only occurrence of *cumbolgehnastes* as a compound,[381] the elements *cumbol* 'banner' and *gehnast* 'clash' are found elsewhere in Old English both as simplices and in compounds. With one exception (*cumbolgebrec*, Psalm 50 [British Library, Cotton Vespasian D. vi], line 11), however, these words are found exclusively in poems from the four major codices: *Genesis*, *Exodus*, and *Daniel* (Junius Manuscript); *Andreas* (Vercelli Book); *Juliana*, Exeter Riddle 3 (Exeter Book); *Beowulf* and *Judith* (*Beowulf* Manuscript).[382]

The correction *ł cumbel* appears interlinearly, apparently in the same hand as that responsible for **ChronG** (where the word appears as *cumbelgehnades*).[383]

[381]Campbell, *Brunanburh*, p. 113.

[382]Bessinger and Smith. See above, p. 147 and fn. 320

[383]Lutz, *Die Version G*, pp. 86, 221; Campbell, *Brunanburh*, p. 113.

***Brun* (ChronA[3]), 56a**

ChronA[3]

gewitan him þa nor[þ] men. nęgled cnearrū.|
dreorig daraðalaf. óndingesmere.
55 oferdeop wæter. difel|in secan.
⁊eft **hira** land. æwiscmode.

ChronB[1]

Gewitan himþa norðmenn nægled cnear|rum
dreorig daroðaláf ondyngesmere.
55 oferdeopwæter| dyflensecean.
eft **íra**land æwiscmóde.

ChronC[2]

Gewiton hymþa norðmenn. negledcnearrum
dreoridare|þalaf ondinges mere.
55 oferdeopwæter dyflinsecan.
eft| **yra**land æwiscmode.

ChronD[2]

G ewiton him þa norð men dæg gled ongarum|
dreorig dareða láf ondyniges mere
55 ofe,ʳdeopne| wæter dyflig secan.
eft **yra** land æwisc mode.|

Both readings make sense, though the **ChronB[1] ChronC[2] ChronD[2]** version has better metre. In its uncorrected form, **ChronA[3]** is to be translated '(to seek) their land again' and is unmetrical.[384] With the addition of ⁊ before *eft*, the **ChronA[3]** on-verse is a poor Type B-2 verse. *Eft* alliterates in preference to *land*, and the line shows a suspicious distribution of sentence particles into both dips. In **ChronB[1] ChronC[2] ChronD[2]** the half-line is translated '(to seek) the land of the Irish again' and is Type B-1.

Campbell suggests that the **ChronA[3]** reading may be the result of the scribe's unfamiliarity with the noun *ira* or *yra* for 'Irish' which "occurs only here, and in the account of the voyages of Ohtere in the Cotton MS. of the O.E. Orosius.... The words *Irland* and *Iras* are unknown in O.E. before the tenth century."[385]

In **ChronG**, the line appears as ⁊ *heora land* (i.e. without *eft*) and fails to alliterate.[386]

[384]O'Keeffe describes the line as a "weak D4 type," apparently assigning the possessive pronoun *hira* an unusually heavy stress, and placing the alliteration on the adverb *eft* in preference to the noun *land* (*Visible Song*, p. 120).

[385]Campbell, *Brunanburh*, p. 116.

[386]Lutz, *Die Version G*, pp. 86, 222.

***Brun* (ChronA[3]), 62b**

ChronA[3]

60 letan him behindan. hræ͛bryttian.
salu wig|padan. þone sweartan hræfn.
hyrned nebban. ⁊þanehase**wan**|padan.
earn æftan hwit. æses brucan.
grædigne guð hafóc.| ⁊þæt græge deor.
65 wulf ónwealde.

ChronC[2]

60 leton hymbehindon hrá brittigan.
salowig padan þoneswear|tan hrefn.
hyrned nebban. ⁊þonehasu padan
earn æftan| hwit. æses brucan.
grædigne guðhafoc ⁊þgrægedeor.
65 wulf| onwealde.

ChronB[1]

60 letan himbehindan hraw| bryttigean.
salowig pádan þone sweartan hræfn.
hyrned| nebban ⁊þone hasopadan.
earn æftan hwit. æses brucan.|
grædigne guþhafoc ⁊þgrægedeor.
65 wulfonwealde.

ChronD[2]

60 læton him behindan hra bryttinga.
salowig padan| þone sweartan hræfn
hyrnet nebban. ⁊þone| hasu wadan
earn æftan hwit æres brucan.
græ|||digne cuð heafóc. ⁊þætgregedeor.
65 wulfonwealde|

ChronB[1] *hasopadan* (**ChronC[2]** *hasu padan*) is to be preferred to **ChronA[3]** *hasewan*|*padan* on metrical grounds. In **ChronB[1]** **ChronC[2]** (and **ChronD[2]**) the line is Type C-1 with resolution of the first lift; **ChronA[3]** is a Type A-1 with a three syllable anacrusis.[387]

The **ChronA[3]** reading seems most likely the result of a misinterpretation of the nonce compound *hasupadan* as a strong adjective + noun. As the form is preceded by the definite article, and as a weak adjective would be expected in such a position (cf. *þone sweartan hræfn* in line 61b)[388], the scribe then 'corrected' *hasu* to *hasewan*, a weak declension accusative feminine adjective. Bately also sees the **ChronA[3]** reading as a result of the **ChronA[3]** scribe's tendency towards "prosaic diction."[389]

[387]For examples of similar anacrusis in later poems, see Patricia Bethel, "Anacrusis in the Psalms of the Paris Psalter," *NM* 89 (1988): 33-43, esp. p. 34.

[388]Campbell, *Brunanburh*, p. 119.

[389]Bately, *MS. A*, p. xciii.

***Brun* (ChronA[3]), 72b**

ChronA[3]

newearð wæl mare.
ón þis| eiglande. æfer gieta.
folces gefylled. beforan þissū.
sweordes| écgum. þæs þeus segað béc
ealdeuðwitan. siþþan eastan hider.|
engle ȝseaxe. upbecoman.
ofer bradbrimu. brytene sohtan.
wlance wigsmiþas. **weealles** ofer coman.
eorlas arhwate. eard| begeatan.|

ChronB[1]

newearð| wælmáre.
onþyseglande æfregyta.
folces afylled befo|ran þyssum.
sweordes ecgum þæs þeus secggeaþ béc.
ealde|uþwitan syþþan eastan hider.
engle ȝsexan upp becoman.|
oferbrade brimu. brytenesohtan
wlance wigsmiþas.| **wealas** ofercoman
eorlas arhwate. eardbegeaton.|

ChronC[2]

newearð wælmare
onþys iglande æfregyta.|
folces gefylled beforan þyssum.
swurdes ecgum. þǽsðeús| segað béc.
ealde uþwitan. siððan eastanhider
engle ȝsexe.| uppbecomon.
oferbradebrimu bretene sohton.
wlance| wig smiðas. **wealas** ofercomon.
eorlas árhwáte eard be|geaton.

ChronD[2]

newearð wæl mare.
onþisneiglande æfregitá.|
folces gefylled beforan þyssum.
sweordes ecgum| þæs þeus segað béc.
ealde uðwitan siððan eastan|hider
engle ȝseaxe úpbecomon.
oferbrade bri|mu britene sohton
wlance wigsmiðas **wealas**| ofer comon.
eorlas arhwæte eard begeaton;|

Like **ChronA[3]** *he eardes*, line 25a, **ChronA[3]** *weealles* represents either a spelling of *ea* as *eea* before lengthening groups or a reinterpretation of the proper noun *wealas* as a pronoun + noun. If **ChronA[3]** is not an orthographic variant, lines 65b-73 are presumably to be understood as two sentences:

> Never yet in this island before this, by what books tell us, ancient sages, was a greater slaughter of a folk felled by the edge of the sword since the Angles and the Saxons, proud warriors, came hither from the east, sought out Britain over the broad seas. We, warriors eager for glory, overcame all, conquered the land.[390]

In **ChronB[1]** **ChronC[2]** **ChronD[2]** lines 65b-73 form a single sentence in which *wealas* serves as the object of *ofercoman*. The **ChronG** form is uncertain.[391]

Metrically, **ChronB[1]** **ChronC[2]** **ChronD[2]** are Type D*1; if *weealles* is not simply an orthographic variant, the equivalent line in **ChronA[3]** is unmetrical and does not alliterate.

[390]Adapted from Whitelock, *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, p. 70.

[391]Wheloc reads *Wealles*, Nowell *we eallas*; see Lutz, *Die Version G*, pp. 87 and 224.

Capture of the Five Boroughs

Differences of Inflection (2 examples)

***Capt* (ChronA[3]), 4b**

ChronA[3]

Heread mund cyning engla þeoden
maga| mundbora myrce geeode
dyre dæd fruma| swa dor scadeþ
hwitanwylles geat. ⁊**humbra éa**
brada brim|strēā burga fife
ligoraceaster ⁊lin cylene.
⁊snotingahā| swylce stanfordéac
deora by

ChronB[1]

H er eadmund cing engla þeoden.
mæcgea mund bora myrce| geeode.
dyredædfruma swa dor sceadeþ.
hwitanwylles| geat. ⁊**humbranéa**.
brada brím stream burga fífe.
ligera|ceaster ⁊lind kylne.
snotingahám swylce stanford eac.|
⁊deoraby

ChronC[2]

Her eadmundcing englaþéoden
mecga mundbora myrce| ge eode.
dyredædfruma swádor sceadeþ.
hwitan wylles geat.| ⁊**hunbranéa**.
bradabrimstream burga fife.
ligeracester| ⁊lindcylne.
snotingaham. swilce stanford eac.
⁊deoraby|

ChronD[2]

Her eadmund cyning| engla þeoden
mægþa mund bora myrce ge eode.|
dyre dæd fruma swa dór sceadæð.
hwitan wylles| geat. ⁊**himbran ea**____
_brada brym stream. burga gife.|
ligere ceaster ⁊lincolne.
⁊snotinga hám. swylce| stanford eác
⁊deoraby.

In **ChronA[3]** *humbra* is nominative singular in apposition to *ea*, and serves – with *ea*, *hwitanwylles geat*, line 4a, *dor*, line 3b, and *brada brim|strēā*, line 5a – as the subject of *scadeþ*, line 3b.[392] **ChronB[1]** *humbran* (**ChronC[2]** *hunbran* **ChronD[2]** *himbran*), on the other hand, is an "appositive" or "identifying" genitive.[393] Although on the basis of an early genitive singular *humbrae*, Campbell classifies *humbra* as an *ō*-stem,[394] weak forms frequently occur: for example, *into humbran muðan* (**ChronC** and **ChronD** 1013/5) and *to humbran muðan* (**ChronE** 992/2-3).

[392]As Dobbie's punctuation of lines 1-8 of *Capture of the Five Boroughs* is impossible to construe (his second "sentence," *Burga fife... and Deoraby*, ll. 6b-8a doesn't have a verb), the following is suggested. The text (except for punctuation) is as in *ASPR* 6.

Her Eadmund cyning, Engla þeoden,
mæcgea mundbora, Myrce geeode,
dyre dædfruma, swa Dor scadeþ,
Hwitanwyllesgeat and Humbra ea,
brada brimstream, burga fife,
Ligoraceaster, and Lincylene
and Snotingaham, swylce Stanford eac
and Deoraby.

[393]Mitchell, *OES* §1290.

[394]Campbell, *OEG* §587, fn.1.

Metrically, the two readings are identical.

***Capt* (ChronA[3]), 8b**

ChronA[3]

dæne wæran **ær**
under| norðmannum nyde gebegde
ónhæþenra hæfteclōmū|
lange þraga oþ hie alysde eft
forhis weorþ scipe wig|gendra hleo
afera eadweardes eadmundcyning
ónfenganlafe||

ChronB[1]

denum wæron **æror**.
undernorð mannum.| nede gebǽded.
onhæþenum hæfte clammum.
lange þrage| oþ hiealysde eft.
forhis weorðscipe wiggendra hléo|
eafora eadweardes eadmund cining;|
H er eadmund cing...

ChronC[2]

dene wæron **æror**.
under norðmannū. nyde gebæded.
onhæ|þenra hæfte clommum.
lange þrage oþhialysde eft.
for| his weorð scype wiggendra hleo.
afora eadweardes. eadmund| cing.
Her
eadmundcing...

ChronD[2]

dæne wæron **æror**
under|| norð mannum nydegebæded
onhæðenra hæf|te. clommum
lange þrage. oþ hy alysde eft|
for his weorðscipe wigendra hleo
afora ead|weardes eadmundes cyning.|
Her anlaf abræc...

While both readings make good sense and syntax, **ChronA[3]** is metrically poor. In **ChronB[1]** **ChronC[2]** and **ChronD[2]**, line 9b is Type A-1; **ChronA[3]** can only be scanned (as Type E) only if *wæron* is assumed to carry a half-stress.

Substitution of Stressed Words and Elements (2 examples)

***Capt* (ChronA[3]), 2a**

ChronA[3]

Heread mund cyning engla þeoden
maga| mundbora myrce geeode
dyre dæd fruma| swa dor scadeþ
hwitanwylles geat. ꝯhumbra éa
brada brim|strēā burga fife
ligoraceaster ꝯlin cylene.
ꝯsnotingahā| swylce stanfordéac
deora by

ChronB[1]

H er eadmund cing engla þeoden.
mæcgea mund bora myrce| geeode.
dyredædfruma swa dor sceadeþ.
hwitanwylles| geat. ꝯhumbranéa.
brada brím stream burga fífe.
ligera|ceaster ꝯlind kylne.
snotingahám swylce stanford eac.|
ꝯdeoraby

ChronC[2]

Her eadmundcing englaþéoden
mecga mundbora myrce| ge eode.
dyredædfruma swádor sceadeþ.
hwitan wylles geat.| ꝯhunbranéa.
bradabrimstream burga fife.
ligeracester| ꝯlindcylne.
snotingaham. swilce stanford eac.
ꝯdeoraby|

ChronD[2]

Her eadmund cyning| engla þeoden
mægþa mund bora myrce ge eode.|
dyre dæd fruma swa dór sceadæð.
hwitan wylles| geat. ꝯhimbran ea____
_brada brym stream. burga gife.|
ligere ceaster ꝯlincolne.
ꝯsnotinga hám. swylce| stanford eác
ꝯdeoraby.

The three variants in these lines, **ChronA[3]** *maga* **ChronB[1]** *mæcgea* (**ChronC[2]** *mecga*) and **ChronD[2]** *mægþa* (genitive plural of *mǣgþ*, f. 'family group, tribe, clan') are all relatively appropriate to the poem's immediate context, although neither **ChronA[3]** *maga*| *mundbora* 'protector of kin' nor **ChronD[2]** *mægþa mund bora* 'protector of clans' is found elsewhere in a similar collocation (**ChronB[1]** *mæcgea mund bora* [**ChronC[2]** *mecga mundbora*], 'protector of men', also occurs in *Andreas*, line 772a).[395] O'Keeffe translates the **ChronD[2]** reading as "protector of maidens", adding that "the lurid reading in D,... while offering an unusual perspective on Edmund, provokes an interesting, if unanswerable, question about scribe 2's reading background."[396] *Mægþa* 'of maidens' and *mǣgþa*, 'of the clans' are metrically indistinguishable, however, and the **ChronD[2]** form can as easily be for the latter as the former form.

[395]O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 123.

[396]O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 123.

The three readings are metrically and syntactically equivalent. The **ChronB[1]-ChronC[2]** form is also mentioned briefly below on p. 191; that in **ChronD[2]** on p. 221.

***Capt* (ChronA[3]), 9b**

ChronA[3]

dæne wæran ær
under| norðmannum nyde **gebegde**
ónhæþenra hæfteclōmū|
lange þraga oþ hie alysde eft
forhis weorþ scipe wig|gendra hleo
afera eadweardes eadmundcyning
ónfenganlafe||

ChronC[2]

dene wæron æror.
under norðmannū. nyde **gebæded**.
onhæ|þenra hæfte clommum.
lange þrage oþhialysde eft.
for| his weorð scype wiggendra hleo.
afora eadweardes. eadmund| cing.
Her
eadmundcing...

ChronB[1]

denum wæron æror.
undernorð mannum.| nede **gebǽded**.
onhæþenum hæfte clammum.
lange þrage| oþ hiealysde eft.
forhis weorðscipe wiggendra hléo|
eafora eadweardes eadmund cining;|
H er eadmund cing...

ChronD[2]

dæne wæron æror
under|| norð mannum nyde**gebæded**
onhæðenra hæf|te. clommum
lange þrage. oþ hy alysde eft|
for his weorðscipe wigendra hleo
afora ead|weardes eadmundes cyning.|
Her anlaf abræc...

Both readings are possible and have parallels in other poems, although **ChronA[3]** is the more unusual. O'Keeffe points out that *nyde gebæded* (and accidental variants as in **ChronB[1] ChronC[2] ChronD[2]**) is relatively common in the corpus, with exact parallels in *Juliana* line 343b and *Husband's Message*, line 40b.[397] *Nyde gebegde* (as in **ChronA[3]**) is less common, although a second collocation is found in the Metrical Psalms, *nyde gebiged*, **PPs** 72:17.3b.[398]

While the two verbs are not synonyms, the variation does not affect the general tenor of the passage: **ChronA[3]** *nyde gebegde* 'bowed down by necessity', **ChronB[1] ChronC[2] ChronD[2]** *nydegebæded* (and variants) 'afflicted by necessity'. The two readings are metrically identical.

[397]O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 123.

[398]Bessinger and Smith. The example from the Paris Psalter is missed by O'Keeffe, who cites only the metrically analogous *nearwe gebeged* from *Christ and Satan* 444b (*Visible Song*, p. 123).

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

***Capt* (ChronA[3]), 8a**

ChronA[3]

Heread mund cyning engla þeoden
maga| mundbora myrce geeode
dyre dæd fruma| swa dor scadeþ
hwitanwylles geat. ⁊humbra éa
brada brim|strēā burga fife
ligoraceaster ⁊lin cylene.
⁊snotingahā| swylce stanfordéac
deora by

ChronB[1]

H er eadmund cing engla þeoden.
mæcgea mund bora myrce| geeode.
dyredædfruma swa dor sceadeþ.
hwitanwylles| geat. ⁊humbranéa.
brada brím stream burga fífe.
ligera|ceaster ⁊lind kylne.
snotingahám swylce stanford eac.|
⁊deoraby

ChronC[2]

Her eadmundcing englaþéoden
mecga mundbora myrce| ge eode.
dyredædfruma swádor sceadeþ.
hwitan wylles geat.| ⁊hunbranéa.
bradabrimstream burga fife.
ligeracester| ⁊lindcylne.
snotingaham. swilce stanford eac.
⁊deoraby|

ChronD[2]

Her eadmund cyning| engla þeoden
mægþa mund bora myrce ge eode.|
dyre dæd fruma swa dór sceadæð.
hwitan wylles| geat. ⁊himbran ea____
_brada brym stream. burga gife.|
ligere ceaster ⁊lincolne.
⁊snotinga hám. swylce| stanford eác
⁊deoraby.

The addition or omission of *⁊* in line 8a affects sense, metre and syntax. In **ChronB[1] ChronC[2] ChronD[2]** *⁊deoraby* is a Type B-1 line joined to the preceding list of place names by the conjunction *⁊*. For **ChronA[3]**, Lutz and O'Keeffe suggest that the scribe may have divided *swylce stanfordéac deora by* between *stanford* and *éac*, and understood *éac* as a conjunction 'eke, also, likewise, moreover, and': 'auch Stamford sowie Derby'[399]:

ChronA[3]

7 ⁊snotingahā| swylce stanford____
_éac deora by

While the resultant reading is metrically defensible,[400] the use of *eac* alone as a conjunction introducing the last item in a list appears to be without parallel. Mitchell reports that "*eac* is occasionally used *initially* [my emphasis] without *ond* in a cumulative or resumptive sense

[399]Lutz, *Die Version G*, p. 225; see also O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 124 fnn. 58-59.

[400]O'Keeffe cites two examples of an off-verse alliterating on *swylce* (*Visible Song*, p. 124 fn. 59): the textual defective Riddle 89, line 10: [....] *swæsendum swylce þrage*; and Christ 80b: *þæt ðu in sundurgiefe swylce befenge* (both texts from Krapp and Dobbie, *ASPR* 3). *Swylce* is not stressed and does not alliterate in any of her remaining examples: *Beowulf* 830a, *Christ and Satan* 321a, *Andreas* 1036, and *Fates of the Apostles* 16a.

'and, 'also, too'" but gives no examples of its appearance before the last item in the list.[401] Likewise, Bosworth and Toller give no examples of *eac* being used alone as a conjunction in a list without *and* or *ne*.[402] The fact that *stanford* and *éac* are run together in the manuscript, moreover, also suggests that the **ChronA^{3}** scribe did not divide the text in this fashion: his normal practice elsewhere in the *Capture of the Five Boroughs* is to mark the division between off- and on- verses with a generous space between words.

Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 173
Fifth Hand (ChronA^{5})

Coronation of Edgar

Difference of Inflection (1 example)

***CEdg* (ChronA^{5}), 2a**

ChronA^{5}

1 Her eadgarwæs englawaldend
corðre micel**re** tocyninge gehalgod.|
on ðære ealdan byrig acemannes ceastre.

ChronB^{1}

1 H er eadgarwæs englawaldend
corðremycc**lum** tokinge| gehalgod.
onþære ealdan byrig acemannes ceastre.‖

ChronC^{2}

1 H er eadgar wæs englawaldend
corþre mycc**lum** tokinge gehalgod.|
onþære ealdanbyrig acemannes ceastre.

In **ChronA^{5}**, the adjective *micelre* is ostensibly feminine dative singular. In **ChronB^{1}** **ChronC^{2}**, *mycclum* is strong neuter or masculine dative singular. As *corðor* "is found elsewhere only as a neuter,"[403] the **ChronA^{5}** reading is evidence either of the decay of grammatical gender (cf. the mistakes with gender made in the slightly later **ChronD^{2}**, discussed below, pp. 206-208), or the result of the unconscious influence of the final *-re* (misconstrued as a dative singular feminine ending) of the preceding word.[404]

The variation has no effect on metre.

---

[401]Mitchell, *OES*, §1740.

[402]B.-T. and B.-T.(S) s.v. *éac*.

[403]Dobbie, *ASPR* 6, p. 150.

Substitution of Stressed Words and Elements (1 example)

***CEdg* (ChronA[5]), 13b**

ChronA[5]

10 �既ðaagangenwæs
tynhundwintra ge teled| rimes.
frā gebyrd tide bremes cyninges
leohta hyrdes. buton| ðærtō lafe þa **agan**
wæs winter ge teles þæsðe gewritu secgað.|
15 seofon �striangle twentig.

ChronB[1]

10 ꝺþaagangenwæs.
tynhund wintra geteledrímes|
fram gebýrdtíde bremes cinges.
leohtahyrdes butan| ðærtoláfe þa**get**.
wæs wintergeteles þæs gewritu secgað.|
15 seofan ꝺ.XX.

ChronC[2]

10 ꝺ þá agangen wæs.
tynhund| wintra geteled rimes.
framgebýrdtíde bremes cinges.|
leohta hirdes butanþærtolafe ða**get**
wæs winter getæles| þæs ðegewritusecgað.
15 seofan ꝺXX.

ChronA[5] *agan* is presumably for *āgān*, 'to go by, pass' or the preterite present verb *āgan* 'to own, possess'. **ChronB[1] ChronC[2]** *get* is an adverb, 'yet'. The **ChronA[5]** reading is non-sensical and unmetrical.[405] In **ChronB[1] ChronC[2]** the off-verse is Type B-2; **ChronA[5]** resembles a Type-B verse with an unmetrical three syllables in the medial drop. As "*þa gen* is of far more frequent occurrence in poetry than *þa giet*," Bately suggests that **ChronA[5]** *þa agan wæs* from an "underlying 'þa gen wæs' (miscopied perhaps under the influence of 'þa agangen wæs' a few lines earlier)" may be closer to the original reading.[406]

[404]The "endings" are only graphically similar: the *-r-* in *corðre* is the final consonant of *corðor*.

[405]Cf. Dobbie, *ASPR* 6, p. 150.

[406]Bately, *MS. A*, p. xciii.

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

***CEdg* (ChronA[5]), 19b**

ChronA[5]

�

hī ead mundes eafora hæfde.
nigon ꝛ XX.| nið weorca heard.
wintra onworulde. þis gewordenwæs.
ꝛ þa onðā| XXX. wæs ðeoden gehalgod :7

ChronB[1]

ꝛhim eadmundes eaforahæfde
nigen ꝛ| .XX. niþweorcaheard
wintra onworlde **ða**þis gewordenwæs.|
O nþaonðam. þrittigæþanwæs þeoden gehalgod.

ChronC[2]

ꝛhimeadmundes| eafora hæfde
nigen ꝛXX. niðweorca heard
wintra on wu|rulde **þa**ðis gewordenwæs.
ꝛþaonþamþrittigeþan wæs| ðeoden gehalgod.

The omission of *þa* in **ChronA[5]** implies that lines 17-19a and 19b-20 are to be read as independent clauses: ‘And the son of Edmund, brave of war-works, had spent twenty-nine winters in the world. This happened and then in the thirtieth (year) he was consecrated King’. With the addition of *ða* in **ChronB[1] ChronC[2]**, lines 19b-20 are a much less strained adverbial clause modifying lines 17-19a: ‘And the son of Edmund, brave of war-works, had spent twenty-nine winters in the world *when* this happened; and then in the thirtieth (year) he was consecrated King’.[407]

Metrically, the addition or omission adds or removes an unstressed syllable to the beginning of a Type B-1 line.

[407] **ChronB[1]** *On* for expected *Ond* is an error. See below, p. 201.

Death of Edgar

Substitution of Unstressed Words and Elements (3 examples)

***DEdg* (ChronA[5]), 6a**

ChronA[5]

nemnað| leoda bearn
menon moldan. þæne monað gehwær
inðisse| eðeltyrf. þaþe ǽr wæran.
on rím cræfte. rihte ge togene.|
Iulius monoð. þ se geonga gewát
onþone eahteðan dæg. eadgarof| lífe.
beorna beahgyfa.

ChronB[1]

nemnað leoda bearn.
menn onmoldan þonemonaþ ge|hwær.
onþisse eþel tyrf þaþe ærwæron.
onrímcræfte| rihte getogene.
Iulius monð þær se geonga gewát.
onþone| eahtoðandæg eadgár oflífe.
beorna beahgifa.

ChronC[2]

nemnað leodabearn.
menn onmoldan þonemonað gehwær.|
onþysse eþeltyrf þaðe ǽr wæron.
onrímcræfte rihte||| getogene
Iulius monþ ðær segeonga gewát.
onþone eahtoþandæg| eadgar oflífe.
beorna beahgifa.

The variation has no effect on sense, metre, or syntax. *In* frequently appears in **ChronA** for *on* in the other manuscripts (although the substitution is most characteristic in the work of the first scribe in the manuscript, **ChronA[1]**).[408] Bately records only one example of **ChronA** *on* for *in* in the other witnesses.[409]

[408]Bately, *MS. A*, pp. cxvii-cxviii; her examples, including this occurrence, are found in the following annals: 35, 455, 457, 495, 527, 552, 568, 584, 601, 626, 635, 636, 661, 709 (twice), 855, 893 and 975. See also Bately, "Compilation," p. 114 and fn. 1 and p. 126, fn. 1.

[409]Bately, "Compilation," p. 126, fn. 1.

***DEdg* (ChronA[5]), 8b**

ChronA[5]

nemnað| leoda bearn
menon moldan. þæne monað gehwær
inðisse| eðeltyrf. þaþe ǽr wæran.
on rím cræfte. rihte ge togene.|
Iulius monoð. **þ** se geonga gewát
onþone eahteðan dæg. eadgarof| lífe.
beorna beahgyfa.

ChronB[1]

nemnað leoda bearn.
menn onmoldan þonemonaþ ge|hwær.
onþisse eþel tyrf þaþe ærwæron.
onrímcræfte| rihte getogene.
Iulius monð **þær** se geonga gewát.
onþone| eahtoðandæg eadgár oflífe.
beorna beahgifa.

ChronC[2]

nemnað leodabearn.
menn onmoldan þonemonað gehwær.|
onþysse eþeltyrf þaðe ǽr wæron.
onrímcræfte rihte||| getogene
Iulius monþ **ðær** segeonga gewát.
onþone eahtoþandæg| eadgar oflífe.
beorna beahgifa.

Both readings make acceptable sense and syntax. In **ChronA[5]**, *þ* serves as an uninflected relative[410]; in **ChronB[1] ChronC[2]**, *þær* introduces an adverbial clause of time.[411]

The two readings are metrically identical.

***DEdg* (ChronA[5]), 16a**

ChronA[5]

Ð a**wæs** on myrceon mine gefræge
wide ꝛwelhwær. walden|des lóf.
afylled onfoldan. felawearð tó dræfed.

ChronB[1]

Ð a**wearð** onmyrcum minegefræge.
wíde ꝛwelhræ wal|dendeslof.
afylled onfoldan feala weard todræfed.|||

ChronC[2]

Þ a**wearð** onmyrcum minegefræge.
wide ꝛwelhwær waldendes| lof.
afylled onfoldan feala wearð todræfed.

There may be a slight stylistic difference between the two readings. Otherwise there is no difference in syntax or metre. Similar variants can be found elsewhere in the *Chronicle*, and between **ChronA** and **ChronG**.[412]

---

[410]Mitchell, *OES* §2784. See also Bately, *MS. A*, p. cxxii, fn.356, who adds, however, that "confusion of *t* and *r* is a common error in Old English manuscripts" (implying that the **ChronB[1] ChronC[2]** reading may stem from an exemplar reading **þæt*). She gives no examples of this confusion and I have not come across any examples in my examination of the multiply attested poetry. The same variation (*þ*:*þær*) occurs once more: Exeter Riddle 30a/b line 6a. See Chapter 4, p. 250.

[411]Mitchell, *OES* §2460-2461. Cf. Bately, *MS. A*, p. cxxii, fn.356.

Substitution of Stressed Words and Elements (1 example)

***DEdg* (ChronA[5]), 33a**

ChronA[5]

ꝛþawearð| ætywed. uppe onroderum.
steorra onstaðole. þone| stið ferhþe.
hæleð hige gleawe. hatað wide.
cométa be|naman. cræft gleawe men.
wise **soðboran**. wæs geond| werðeode.

ChronB[1]

þawearð eac ætywed uppe onroderum.
steorraonstaðole| ðone stiþ ferhþe.
hæleþ higegleawe hatað wíde.
cométa| benaman. cræftgleawe menn.
wíse **woðboran** wæs geond| werþeode.

ChronC[2]

þawearð eac ætywed uppe onroderū|
steorra onstaþole þone stið ferhþe.
hæleð hige gleawe| hatað wíde.
cométa benaman. cræftgleawe menn.
wíse| **woð boran** wæs geond wer þeode.

Both readings are lexically, syntactically and metrically appropriate. **ChronB[1]** *woðboran* (**ChronC[2]** *woð boran*) 'orators, prophets' has parallels elsewhere in the poetic corpus[413]; **ChronA[5]** *soðboran* 'truth-bearers' is a *hapax legomenon*.[414] Given the graphic similarity of insular *w* and *s*, and the preponderance of lines with double alliteration in the on-verse in this passage, scribal error is a reasonable explanation for the **ChronA[5]** reading.

The variant affects alliteration: in **ChronB[1]** **ChronC[2]**, the on-verse alliterates on both lifts; in **ChronA[5]**, only the first lift alliterates. The two readings are otherwise metrically identical.

[412]See Bately, *MS. A*, p. cxix and Lutz, *Die Version G*, p. clxii. Bately gives five examples of the use of *wæs*/*wæron* against *wearð*/*wurdan*, twice as a main verb: the annals 592 (Scribe 1); 975 (Scribe 5), and three times as an auxiliary: annals 633 (Scribe 1), 882 (Scribe 1), *904 (Scribe 2[b]).

[413]All examples are from the Exeter Book: *sum woðbora*, *Christ*, l. 302b; *sum biþ woðbora*, *Gifts of Men*, l. 35b; *wisne woðboran*, *Order of the World*, l. 2a; *wisum woðboran*, Exeter Riddle, l. 31a; *oft ic woðboran*, Exeter Riddle 80, l. 9 (Bessinger and Smith).

[414]Bately, *MS. A*, pp. xciii, cxvii. Dobbie, *ASPR* 6, p. 150.

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

***DEdg* (ChronA[5]), 24a**

ChronA[5]

�

ꝥawearð eac ádræfed deormod hæleð.|
oslac of earde. ofer yða gewealc.
oferganotes bæð.| gamolfeax hæleð.
wís ꝝ word snotor ofer wætera ge|ðring
ofer hwæles eðel. hama bereafod.

ChronB[1]

Ðawearð eacadræfed| deormód hæleþ.
oslác ofearde ofer yþa gewalc.
ofer| ganotes bæð. gomolfeax hæleþ.
wís ꝝword snotor ofer| wætera geþring.
ofer hwæles eþel hama bereafod.|

ChronC[2]

Þáwearð eacadræfed deormodhæleþ.|
oslac of earde ofer yþa gewalc.
oferganotes bæð. gomolfeax| hæleþ.
wisꝝword snotor oferwæterageþring.
ofer hwæles| eþel hama bereafod.

In **ChronA[5]**, lines 24-28 follow syndetically from the preceding sentence. In **ChronB[1]** and **ChronC[2]**, the parataxis is asyndetic.

The addition of ꝝ to **ChronA[5]** adds a fifth unstressed syllable to the beginning of a Type A-3 line.

***DEdg* (ChronA[5]), 29a**

ChronA[5]

ꝥawearð| ætywed. uppe onroderum.
steorra onstaðole. þone| stið ferhþe.
hæleð hige gleawe. hatað wide.
cométa be|naman. cræft gleawe men.
wise soðboran. wæs geond| werðeode.

ChronB[1]

þawearð eac ætywed uppe onroderum.
steorraonstaðole| ðone stiþ ferhþe.
hæleþ higegleawe hatað wíde.
cométa| benaman. cræftgleawe menn.
wíse woðboran wæs geond| werþeode.

ChronC[2]

þawearð eac ætywed uppe onroderū|
steorra onstaþole þone stið ferhþe.
hæleð hige gleawe| hatað wíde.
cométa benaman. cræftgleawe menn.
wíse| woð boran wæs geond wer þeode.

In **ChronA[5]**, lines 29-33a follow syndetically from the preceding sentence. In **ChronB[1]** and **ChronC[2]**, the parataxis is asyndetic.

The addition of ꝝ to **ChronA** adds an additional unstressed syllable to the preliminary dip of a Type A-3 line.

***DEdg* (ChronA[5]), 29a**

ChronA[5]

ꝺþawearð| ætywed. uppe onroderum.
steorra onstaðole. þone| stið ferhþe.
hæleð hige gleawe. hatað wide.
cométa be|naman. cræft gleawe men.
wise soðboran. wæs geond| werðeode.

ChronB[1]

þawearð **eac** ætywed uppe onroderum.
steorraonstaðole| ðone stiþ ferhþe.
hæleþ higegleawe hatað wíde.
cométa| benaman. cræftgleawe menn.
wíse woðboran wæs geond| werþeode.

ChronC[2]

þawearð **eac** ætywed uppe onroderū|
steorra onstaþole þone stið ferhþe.
hæleð hige gleawe| hatað wíde.
cométa benaman. cræftgleawe menn.
wíse| woð boran wæs geond wer þeode.

The addition or omission of the sentence adverb *eac* has little effect on sense or syntax, and a slightly more significant effect on metre. Without *eac*, **ChronA[5]** is Type A-3. With *eac*, the equivalent line in **ChronB[1]** and **ChronC[2]** is best scanned as Type A-1 with double alliteration and a heavy anacrusis.[415]

[415]See Dobbie, *ASPR* 6, p. 150.

London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. vi,
First Hand (ChronB[1])
London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. i,
Second Hand (ChronC[2])

Recensional Variants

Battle of Brunanburh

Substitution of Unstressed Words and Elements (1 example)

Brun (ChronB[1]-ChronC[2]), 40b

ChronA[3]

swilce þær| eác sefroda. mid fleame cō.
onhis cyþþe norð. costontinus.|
hár hilde ring. hreman neþorfte.
mæcan gemanan. **he** wæs| his mæga sceard.
freonda gefylled. ónfolcstede.
beslagen| ætsæcce. ȝhis sunu forlet.
ónwæl stowe. wundun fer grunden.|
giungne ætguðe.

ChronC[2]

Swilce| þǽr eac sefroda midfleame cóm.
onhis cyððe norð. constan|tinus.
hár hilderinc. hreman neðorfte.
meca gemanan. **her**| wæs hismaga sceard.
freonda gefylled. onhis folcstede.
besle|gen ætsæcce. ȝhissunu forlet
onwælstowe. wundum forgrunden.|
geongne æt guþe.

ChronB[1]

S wylce þær eacsefróda mid fleamecóm.
onhiscyþþe| norð constantínus.
hárhilderinc hremanneþórfte|||
mecea gemanan **her** wæs his magasceard.
freonda| gefylled on folcstede.
forslegen ætsace ȝhissunu for|let.
onwælstowe wundum forgrunden.
geongne ætguþe|

ChronD[2]

swylce þæreác sefroda mid| fleame com
onhis cyððe norð constantinus|
hal hylde rínc hryman neþorfte.
inecga ge|manan **he**wæshis mæga. sceard
freonda ge|fylled onfolc stede
beslægen ætsȩcge. ȝhissunu| forlæt.
onwæl stowe wundum forgrunden.|
geongne ætguþe

ChronA[3] ChronD[2] *he* is the nominative singular of the third person singular personal pronoun. **ChronB[1] ChronC[2]** *her* is a sentence adverb, 'here, in this place, at this point in time'. The variation affects sense and syntax, but has no effect on metre. In **ChronA[3]** and **ChronD[2]**, *he* serves as the subject of the clause *he wæs his mæga sceard*, most commonly translated 'he was deprived of his kinsman...'.[416] In the equivalent lines of **ChronB[1] ChronC[2]**,

[416]Campbell, *Brunanburh*, p. 111. Campbell notes, however, that "the usual meaning of *sceard* is 'hacked', 'mutilated'. It is found only here in the sense 'deprived of'." See also Orton, "Constantine's Bereavement," p. 246. The following paragraphs are based largely on Orton.

the subject of *wæs* is presumably *maga*, which in this case must be the nominative singular of *māga*, 'son': 'here [i.e. at this point] was his son mutilated'.[417]

Both readings are problematic. In **ChronA**^{3} and **ChronD**^{2}, the use of the pronoun *he* requires a strained interpretation of *sceard*, line 40b, and *gefylled* (**ChronD**^{2} *ge|fylled*), line 41a, as 'deprived (of)'. As Campbell notes, neither word is found with this meaning elsewhere in the Old English corpus. For *sceard* the more usual translations are 'hacked', 'notched', 'mutilated'; for *gefyllan*, 'to cause to fall', 'to strike down', 'to cut down'.[418]

In **ChronB**^{1} **ChronC**^{2} on the other hand, the inclusion of the adverb *her* and the interpretation of *maga* as 'son' leaves the equally problematic readings *freonda*, line 41a, *forlet*, line 42b, and, in **ChronC**^{2} only, *besle|gen*, line 42a. While the substitution allows both *sceard* and *gefylled* to be understood in their usual senses, it leaves *freonda* without an obvious word to govern it[419] and renders **ChronC**^{2} *forlet* (**ChronB**^{1} *for|let*) and *beslagen* (the reading – with orthographic variants – of **ChronC**^{2}, **ChronA**^{3} and **ChronD**^{2}) meaningless. As Orton notes, "a corpse can scarcely be described simply as 'deprived' (*beslagen*), nor as having 'left' (*forlet*) anyone behind on the battlefield."[420] In **ChronB**^{1}, the first of these problems is solved by the substitution of prefixes, *forslegen* 'killed' for **ChronA**^{3} *beslagen* (**ChronC**^{2} *besle|gen* **ChronD**^{2} *beslægen*) 'deprived (of)'.[421]

---

[417]Orton, "Constantine's Bereavement," p. 249.

[418]Campbell, *Brunanburh*, p. 111. See also Orton, "Constantine's Bereavement," pp. 245-247; and the entries for *sceard* and *gefyllan* II in Clark-Hall, *sceard* and *gefyllan, -fylde* (B.-T.[S] *gefillan*) in B.-T.

[419]*Brunanburh*, line 40b is the only example of the use of the genitive with *gefyllan* (B.-T.[S] *gefillan*) in B.-T. and B.-T.(S). In a second occurrence in the poem, *ne wearð wæl mare / on þis eiglande æfer gieta / folces gefylled beforan þissum*, ll. 65b-67, *gefylled* is a predicate adjective agreeing with the neuter, nominative singular noun *wæl*. The genitive singular *folces* immediately preceding *gefylled* is governed by *wæl* (Campbell, *Brunanburh*, p. 120). As Campbell notes, "a gen. after *wæl* in this sense is fairly frequent" (p. 120).

[420]Orton, "Constantine's Bereavement," p. 247.

[421]Orton, "Constantine's Bereavement," p. 248. Cf. Campbell, pp. 111-112 (who interprets the **ChronB**^{1} form in the relatively minor sense 'worsted'); and see below, p. 195.

As it falls on the preliminary unstressed syllables of a Type B-line, the substitution **ChronA^{3} ChronD^{2}** *he* **ChronB^{1} ChronC^{2}** *her* has no metrical effect. Further discussion of the variation in these lines can be found on pp. 190 (**ChronB^{1} ChronC^{2}** *maga* for **ChronA^{3} ChronD^{2}** *mæga*, line 40b) and 195 (**ChronB^{1}** *forslegen* **ChronA^{3}** *beslagen* [**ChronC^{2}** *besle|gen* **ChronD^{2}** *beslægen*], line 42a), below.

Substitution of Stressed Words and Elements (2 examples)

***Brun* (ChronB^{1}-ChronC^{2}), 40a**

ChronA^{3}

swilce þær| eác sefroda. mid fleame cō.
onhis cyþþe norð. costontinus.|
hár hilde ring. hreman neþorfte.
40 **<u>mæcan</u>** gemanan.

ChronC^{2}

Swilce| þǽr eac sefroda midfleame cóm.
onhis cyðde norð. constan|tinus.
hár hilderinc. hreman neðorfte.
40 **<u>meca</u>** gemanan.

ChronB^{1}

S wylce þær eacsefróda mid fleamecóm.
onhiscyþþe| norð constantínus.
hárhilderinc hremanneþórfte|||
40 **<u>mecea</u>** gemanan

ChronD^{2}

swylce þæreác sefroda mid| fleame com
onhis cyðde norð constantinus|
hal hylde rínc hryman neþorfte.
40 **<u>inecga</u>** ge|manan

The variants in this passage are discussed above, pp. 163 ff. The reading of **ChronD^{2}** is also mentioned briefly below, p. 218.

Brun (ChronB[1]-ChronC[2]), 40b

ChronA[3]

swilce þær| eác sefroda. mid fleame cō.
onhis cyþþe norð. costontinus.|
hár hilde ring. hreman neþorfte.
40 mæcan gemanan. he wæs| his **mæga** sceard.
freonda gefylled. ónfolcstede.
beslagen| ætsæcce. ⁊his sunu forlet.
ónwæl stowe. wundun fer grunden.|
giungne ætguðe.

ChronC[2]

Swilce| þǽr eac sefroda midfleame cóm.
onhis cyððe norð. constan|tinus.
hár hilderinc. hreman neðorfte.
40 meca gemanan. her| wæs his**maga** sceard.
freonda gefylled. onhis folcstede.
besle|gen ætsæcce. ⁊hissunu forlet
onwælstowe. wundum forgrunden.|
geongne æt guþe.

ChronB[1]

S wylce þær eacsefróda mid fleamecóm.
onhiscyþþe| norð constantínus.
hárhilderinc hremanneþórfte|||
40 mecea gemanan her wæs his **maga**sceard.
freonda| gefylled on folcstede.
forslegen ætsace ⁊hissunu for|let.
onwælstowe wundum forgrunden.
geongne ætguþe|

ChronD[2]

fleame com
onhis cyððe norð constantinus|
hal hylde rínc hryman neþorfte.
40 inecga ge|manan hewæshis **mæga**. sceard
freonda ge|fylled onfolc stede
beslægen ætsȩcge. ⁊hissunu| forlæt.
onwæl stowe wundum forgrunden.|
geongne ætguþe

In **ChronA[3]** and **ChronD[2]**, *mæga* is the genitive plural of *mǣg*, 'kinsman'. The **ChronB[1]** **ChronC[2]** form is either for *mæga* (with West-Saxon *ā* for *ǣ* before *g* + back vowel)[422] or the nominative singular of *māga*, 'son'. The latter interpretation is the more likely on contextual grounds.[423] See above, pp. 187 ff.

The two readings are metrically equivalent.

[422]Campbell, *Brunanburh*, p. 8; *OEG* §162. For further examples of variation between *æ* and *a* in the context, see **ChronB[1]** *cneomagum*: **ChronA[3]** **ChronC[2]** **ChronD[2]** *cneomægum*, line 8a, and **ChronA[3]** *lægun* (**ChronG** *legun*): **ChronB[1]** **ChronC[2]** **ChronD[2]** *lagon*, line 28b.

[423]Orton, "Constantine's Bereavement," p. 247; O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, pp. 120-1.

Capture of the Five Boroughs

Substitution of Stressed Words and Elements (1 example)

***Capt* (ChronB[1]-ChronC[2]), 2a**

ChronA[3]

Heread mund cyning engla þeoden
maga| mundbora myrce geeode
dyre dæd fruma| swa dor scadeþ
hwitanwylles geat. ⁊humbra éa
brada brim|strēā burga fife
ligoraceaster ⁊lin cylene.
⁊snotingahā| swylce stanfordéac
deora by

ChronB[1]

H er eadmund cing engla þeoden.
mæcgea mund bora myrce| geeode.
dyredædfruma swa dor sceadeþ.
hwitanwylles| geat. ⁊humbranéa.
brada brím stream burga fífe.
ligera|ceaster ⁊lind kylne.
snotingahám swylce stanford eac.|
⁊deoraby

ChronC[2]

Her eadmundcing englaþéoden
mecga mundbora myrce| ge eode.
dyredædfruma swádor sceadeþ.
hwitan wylles geat.| ⁊hunbranéa.
bradabrimstream burga fife.
ligeracester| ⁊lindcylne.
snotingaham. swilce stanford eac.
⁊deoraby|

ChronD[2]

Her eadmund cyning| engla þeoden
mægþa mund bora myrce ge eode.|
dyre dæd fruma swa dór sceadæð.
hwitan wylles| geat. ⁊himbran ea____
_brada brym stream. burga gife.|
ligere ceaster ⁊lincolne.
⁊snotinga hám. swylce| stanford eác
⁊deoraby.

The three readings are metrically and syntactically identical and all relatively appropriate to the poem's immediate context. For a further discussion of all three forms, see above, p. 176. The **ChronD[2]** reading is also discussed briefly below, p. 221.

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

***Capt* (ChronB[1]-ChronC[2]), 7a**

ChronA[3]

Heread mund cyning engla þeoden
maga| mundbora myrce geeode
dyre dæd fruma| swa dor scadeþ
hwitanwylles geat. ꝯhumbra éa
brada brim|strēā burga fife
ligoraceaster ꝯlin cylene.
ꝯsnotingahā| swylce stanfordéac
deora by

ChronB[1]

H er eadmund cing engla þeoden.
mæcgea mund bora myrce| geeode.
dyredædfruma swa dor sceadeþ.
hwitanwylles| geat. ꝯhumbranéa.
brada brím stream burga fífe.
ligera|ceaster ꝯlind kylne.
snotingahám swylce stanford eac.|
ꝯdeoraby

ChronC[2]

Her eadmundcing englaþéoden
mecga mundbora myrce| ge eode.
dyredædfruma swádor sceadeþ.
hwitan wylles geat.| ꝯhunbranéa.
bradabrimstream burga fife.
ligeracester| ꝯlindcylne.
snotingaham. swilce stanford eac.
ꝯdeoraby|

ChronD[2]

Her eadmund cyning| engla þeoden
mægþa mund bora myrce ge eode.|
dyre dæd fruma swa dór sceadæð.
hwitan wylles| geat. ꝯhimbran ea____
_brada brym stream. burga gife.|
ligere ceaster ꝯlincolne.
ꝯsnotinga hám. swylce| stanford eác
ꝯdeoraby.

In **ChronB[1]** *snotingahám* (**ChronC[2]** *snotingaham*) is linked asyndetically to the list of towns freed by Eadmund (lines 5b-8a). In **ChronA[3] ChronD[2]**, *ꝯ* joins the town syndetically to the same list. Metrically, **ChronA[3] ChronD[2]** is a Type B-2; in **ChronB[1] ChronC[2]** the line is a Type E.

The variation has no semantic effect

Coronation of Edgar

The variants shared by **ChronB[1] ChronC[2]** in the *Coronation of Edgar* and the *Death of Edgar* have been discussed above, pp. 179-186.

Death of Edgar

The variants shared by **ChronB[1] ChronC[2]** in the *Coronation of Edgar* and the *Death of Edgar* have been discussed above, pp. 179-186.

London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. vi,
First Hand (ChronB[1])

Battle of Brunanburh

Differences of Inflection (1 example)

***Brun* (ChronB[1]), 70a**

ChronA[3]

65 newearð wæl mare.
ón þis| eiglande. æfer gieta.
folces gefylled. beforan þissū.
sweordes| écgum. þæs þeus segað béc
ealdeuðwitan. siþþan eastan hider.|
70 engle ꝛ**seaxe**. upbecoman.
ofer bradbrimu. brytene sohtan.
wlance wigsmiþas. weealles ofer coman.
eorlas arhwate. eard| begeatan.|

ChronB[1]

65 newearð| wælmáre.
onþyseglande æfregyta.
folces afylled befo|ran þyssum.
sweordes ecgum þæs þeus secggeaþ béc.
ealde|uþwitan syþþan eastan hider.
70 engle ꝛ**sexan** upp becoman.|
oferbrade brimu. brytenesohtan
wlance wigsmiþas.| wealas ofercoman
eorlas arhwate. eardbegeaton.|

ChronC[2]

65 newearð wælmare
onþys iglande æfregyta.|
folces gefylled beforan þyssum.
swurdes ecgum. þǽsðeús| segað béc.
ealde uþwitan. siððan eastanhider
70 engle ꝛ**sexe**.| uppbecomon.
oferbradebrimu bretene sohton.
wlance| wig smiðas. wealas ofercomon.
eorlas árhwáte eard be|geaton.

ChronD[2]

65 newearð wæl mare.
onþisneiglande æfregitá.|
folces gefylled beforan þyssum.
sweordes ecgum| þæs þeus segað béc.
ealde uðwitan siððan eastan|hider
70 engle ꝛ**seaxe** úpbecomon.
oferbrade bri|mu britene sohton
wlance wigsmiðas wealas| ofer comon.
eorlas arhwæte eard begeaton;|

The two readings are lexically, metrically and syntactically indistinguishable. Although "names of peoples are usually strong in all the *Chronicle*-texts," examples of both strong and weak endings are found.[424] Campbell suggests that the **ChronB[1]** reading may be the result of the influence of other *-an* endings in line 69-70.[425]

[424]Taylor, *MS. B*, p. xciv. Taylor cites An. 473 "where BC employ the more usual strong ending in *Engle*, with AE's weak *Englan*" (p. xciv, fn. 155); see also Campbell, *OEG* § 610.7 fn.1.

[425]Campbell, *Brunanburh*, p. 120.

Substitution of Unstressed Words and Elements (1 example)

***Brun* (ChronB[1]), 16b**

ChronA[3]

10 hord ȝhámas. het tend| crungun.
sceotta leoda. ȝscip flotan.
fæge feollan. feld dæn,ⁿede||
secgas hwate. sið þan sunne úp.
onmorgentíd. mære tun gol.
15 glad ofer| grundas. godes condel beorht.
eces drihtnes. **<u>oð</u>** sio æþele gesceaft.|
sahtosetle.

ChronC[2]

10 hord ȝhamas| hettend crungon.
scotta leode. ȝscypflotan.
fæge feollan| feld dennade.
secga swate. siððan sunne upp.
onmorgentid.| mære tungol.
15 gladofer grundas. godes candel beorht
eces| drihtnes **<u>oþ</u>**seo æþele gesceaft
sáhtósetle.

ChronB[1]

10 hórd ȝhámas hettend crungon
scotta leode| ȝscip flotan.
fægefeollan feld dennade.
secgaswate siþþan| sunne upp.
onmorgentíd mære tungol
15 glad ofergrun|das godes candel beorht.
ecesdrihtnes. **<u>þ</u>**seo æþele gesceaft|
sah tosetle.

ChronD[2]

10 hord. ȝhamas heted crungon|
scotta leode. ȝscipflotan.
fæge feollon feld dennode.|
secga swate siþþan sunne úp.
onmorgen tíd mære| tungol.
15 glad ofergrundas godes candel beorht.|
eces drihtnes. **<u>oð</u>** se æþele gesceaft.
sahtoseţtle

As written, **ChronB[1]** lines 13b-17a are non-sensical: '...after the sun, the glorious luminary, the bright candle of God, moved over the earth in the hours of morning *that* [so that? with the result that?] the noble creation bowed to rest'. The substitution of *þæt* for *oþ* (*þæt*) is a common feature of the **ChronB[1]** text, however.[426] The variation has no metrical effect.

[426]Taylor, *MS. B*, pp. lii and lvii. *þ* occurs for *oþ* or *oþ þ* 10 times between 755 and 937.

Substitution of Prefixes (2 examples)

***Brun* (ChronB[1]), 42a**

ChronA[3]

swilce þær| eác sefroda. mid fleame cō.
onhis cyþþe norð. costontinus.|
hár hilde ring. hreman neþorfte.
40 mæcan gemanan. he wæs| his mæga sceard.
freonda gefylled. ónfolcstede.
beslagen| ætsæcce. ꝯhis sunu forlet.
ónwæl stowe. wundun fer grunden.|
giungne ætguðe.

ChronC[2]

Swilce| þǽr eac sefroda midfleame cóm.
onhis cyððe norð. constan|tinus.
hár hilderinc. hreman neðorfte.
40 meca gemanan. her| wæs hismaga sceard.
freonda gefylled. onhis folcstede.
besle|gen ætsæcce. ꝯhissunu forlet
onwælstowe. wundum forgrunden.|
geongne æt guþe.

ChronB[1]

S wylce þær eacsefróda mid fleamecóm.
onhiscyþþe| norð constantínus.
hárhilderinc hremanneþórfte|||
40 mecea gemanan her wæs his magasceard.
freonda| gefylled on folcstede.
forslegen ætsace ꝯhissunu for|let.
onwælstowe wundum forgrunden.
geongne ætguþe|

ChronD[2]

swylce þæreác sefroda mid| fleame com
onhis cyððe norð constantinus|
hal hylde rínc hryman neþorfte.
40 inecga ge|manan hewæshis mæga. sceard
freonda ge|fylled onfolc stede
beslægen ætsȩcge. ꝯhissunu| forlæt.
onwæl stowe wundum forgrunden.|
geongne ætguþe

The substitution **ChronB[1]** *forslegen* **ChronA[3]** *beslagen* (**ChronC[2]** *besle|gen* **ChronD[2]** *beslægen*) has an important effect on sense and syntax, and is associated with the recensional substitution **ChronB[1]** **ChronC[2]** *her* **ChronA[3]** **ChronD[2]** *he* in line 40b (see above, pp. 187 and 190). At the same time, however, **ChronB[1]** shows a strong tendency towards innovation in verbal and nominal prefixes. Taylor cites fourteen examples of the addition, omission or substitution of prefixes in **ChronB[1]**: eight in which **ChronB[1]** has "a prefix different from that employed in the other texts", four in which "words... have a prefix only in B", and "two words which are without a prefix only in B."[427]

The variants are metrically identical.

[427]Taylor, *MS. B*, p. xcviii.

***Brun* (ChronB[1]), 67a**

ChronA[3]

newearð wæl mare.
ón þis| eiglande. æfer gieta.
folces **ge**fylled. beforan þissū.
sweordes| écgum. þæs þeus segað béc
ealdeuðwitan. siþþan eastan hider.|
engle ꝛseaxe. upbecoman.
ofer bradbrimu. brytene sohtan.
wlance wigsmiþas. weealles ofer coman.
eorlas arhwate. eard| begeatan.|

ChronB[1]

newearð| wælmáre.
onþyseglande æfregyta.
folces **a**fylled befo|ran þyssum.
sweordes ecgum þæs þeus secggeaþ béc.
ealde|uþwitan syþþan eastan hider.
engle ꝛsexan upp becoman.|
oferbrade brimu. brytenesohtan
wlance wigsmiþas.| wealas ofercoman
eorlas arhwate. eardbegeaton.|

ChronC[2]

newearð wælmare
onþys iglande æfregyta.|
folces **ge**fylled beforan þyssum.
swurdes ecgum. þǽsðeús| segað béc.
ealde uþwitan. siððan eastanhider
engle ꝛsexe.| uppbecomon.
oferbradebrimu bretene sohton.
wlance| wig smiðas. wealas ofercomon.
eorlas árhwáte eard be|geaton.

ChronD[2]

newearð wæl mare.
onþisneiglande æfregitá.|
folces **ge**fylled beforan þyssum.
sweordes ecgum| þæs þeus segað béc.
ealde uðwitan siððan eastan|hider
engle ꝛseaxe úpbecomon.
oferbrade bri|mu britene sohton
wlance wigsmiðas wealas| ofer comon.
eorlas arhwæte eard begeaton;|

The readings are metrically, syntactically, and semantically equivalent. O'Keeffe notes that *gefylled* and *afylled* both occur in formulaic systems with a preceding genitive, *gefylled* slightly more frequently.[428] The two forms are metrically identical, and, while perhaps not exact synonyms, nevertheless appear both to have meant 'destroy', 'cut down'.[429]

[428]O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 121.

[429]B.-T. *gefyllan, -fylde* (B.-T.[S] *gefillan*); B.-T. *afyllan* (B.-T.[S]) *áfyllan*. See also Campbell, *Brunanburh*, p. 120.

Substitution of Stressed Words and Elements (3 examples)

***Brun* (ChronB[1]), 4a**

ChronA[3]

Her æþel stancyning. eorladryhten.
beorna| bea hgifa. ꝯhisbroþor eác.
eadmund æþeling. ealdor langne tír.|
geslogon æt **sæcce**. sweorda écgum.
ymbe. brunanburh.

ChronC[2]

Heræþelstancing. eorladrihten.
beorna beahgyfa| ꝯhis broðor eac
eadmund æþeling. ealdor lagne tír.
geslogon| æt**sæcce**. swurda ecgum.
embebrun nanburh.

ChronB[1]

Her æþestan cing. eorladrihten.
beorna beaggifa ꝯhis| broþoreác
eadmund æþeling ealdorlangne tir.||
geslogan æt **sake** sweorda ecggum.
embe brunanb[ur]h|

ChronD[2]

Her æþelstan cyning| eorla drihten
beorna beah gifa. ꝯhis broþor eác|
ead mund æþeling ealdor langne tyr
geslogon æt| **secce** sweorda ecgum.
ymbe brunan burh

The substitution **ChronB[1]** *sake* **ChronA[3] ChronC[2]** *sæcce* (**ChronD[2]** *secce*) has no effect on sense or syntax. *Sake* (dative singular of *sacu*, f. 'conflict, strife') and *sæcce* (dative singular of the poetic *sæcc*, f. 'strife, contest') are homographs and approximate synonyms.[430]

The substitution does have a metrical effect. In **ChronA[3] ChronC[2] ChronD[2]**, *geslogon æt sæcce* (and variants) is a Type A-1 verse with anacrusis; in **ChronB[1]**, the line is Type B-2 with a resolved stress in the second lift.[431]

***Brun* (ChronB[1]), 18a**

ChronA[3]

þær læg secg mænig.
garū **ageted**. guma norþerna.|
ofer scild scoten. swilce scittisc eác.
werig wíges sæd.

ChronC[2]

þærlæg secgmonig.|
garum **ageted**. guman norðerne.
ofer scyldscoten swilce| scyttisc eac.
werig wig ges sæd.

ChronB[1]

þærlægsecg manig.
garum **forgrunden**.| guman norðerne.
oferscyldsceoten swylce scyttisceac.|
werig wiggessæd.

ChronD[2]

þær| læg secg monig.
garum **ageted** guman norþærne.|
ofer scyld sceoten swylce scyttisc eác.
werig wiges| ræd

Both readings make sense and good syntax and are metrically identical. **ChronB[1]** *garum forgrunden* belongs to a frequently attested formulaic system with a preceding dative

[430]See Taylor, *MS. B*, pp. xcvii-xcviii. Taylor describes the **ChronB[1]** reading as a "trivialisation."

[431]Campbell, *Brunanburh*, p. 24.

(*Xx forgrunden*).[432] *Agietan* (the verb of **ChronA^{3} ChronC^{2}** and **ChronD^{2}**) although relatively rare and not found in any consistent syntactical construction, is used almost exclusively of spears.[433]

***Brun* (ChronB^{1}), 42a**

ChronA^{3}

swilce þær| eác sefroda. mid fleame cō.
onhis cyþþe norð. costontinus.|
hár hilde ring. hreman neþorfte.
mæcan gemanan. he wæs| his mæga sceard.
freonda gefylled. ónfolcstede.
beslagen| æt**sæcce**. ꝯhis sunu forlet.
ónwæl stowe. wundun fer grunden.|
giungne ætguðe.

ChronC^{2}

Swilce| þǽr eac sefroda midfleame cóm.
onhis cyððe norð. constan|tinus.
hár hilderinc. hreman neðorfte.
meca gemanan. her| wæs hismaga sceard.
freonda gefylled. onhis folcstede.
besle|gen æt**sæcce**. ꝯhissunu forlet
onwælstowe. wundum forgrunden.|
geongne æt guþe.

ChronB^{1}

S wylce þær eacsefróda mid fleamecóm.
onhiscyþþe| norð constantínus.
hárhilderinc hremanneþórfte|||
mecea gemanan her wæs his magasceard.
freonda| gefylled on folcstede.
forslegen æt**sace** ꝯhissunu for|let.
onwælstowe wundum forgrunden.
geongne ætguþe|

ChronD^{2}

swylce þæreác sefroda mid| fleame com
onhis cyððe norð constantinus|
hal hylde rínc hryman neþorfte.
inecga ge|manan hewæshis mæga. sceard
freonda ge|fylled onfolc stede
beslægen æts**ȩcge**. ꝯhissunu| forlæt.
onwæl stowe wundum forgrunden.|
geongne ætguþe

As in line 4a (see above, p. 197), the variation **ChronB^{1}** *sace* **ChronA^{3} ChronC^{2}** *sæcce* (**ChronD^{2}** *sȩcge*) involves a substitution of homographic synonyms with no effect on sense or syntax. Metrically **ChronA^{3} ChronC^{2}** is a Type A-1 with anacrusis; **ChronB^{1}** is a Type B-2 with a resolved second stress. The **ChronD^{2}** form is discussed below, p. 214.

[432]O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, pp. 121-2.

[433]Campbell, *Brunanburh*, p. 103. DOE *ā-gītan*, 'to destroy, strike down (with a spear)'. The verb appears four times with *gar* (all in poetry). A fifth occurrence (without *gar*) in Riddle 86 is emended to *agnette*.

Capture of the Five Boroughs

Differences of Inflection (2 examples)

***Capt* (ChronB[1]), 8b**

ChronA[3]

dæn**e** wæran ær
under| norðmannum nyde gebegde
ónhæþenra hæfteclōmū|
lange þraga oþ hie alysde eft
forhis weorþ scipe wig|gendra hleo
afera eadweardes eadmundcyning
ónfenganlafe‖

ChronC[2]

den**e** wæron æror.
under norðmannū. nyde gebæded.
onhæ|þenra hæfte clommum.
lange þrage oþhialysde eft.
for| his weorð scype wiggendra hleo.
afora eadweardes. eadmund| cing.
Her
eadmundcing...

ChronB[1]

den**um** wæron æror.
undernorð mannum.| nede gebǽded.
onhæþenum hæfte clammum.
lange þrage| oþ hiealysde eft.
forhis weorðscipe wiggendra hléo|
eafora eadweardes eadmund cining;|
H er eadmund cing...

ChronD[2]

dæn**e** wæron æror
under‖ norð mannum nydegebæded
onhæðenra hæf|te. clommum
lange þrage. oþ hy alysde eft|
for his weorðscipe wigendra hleo
afora ead|weardes eadmundes cyning.|
Her anlaf abræc...

In **ChronB[1]**, *denum* is a dative of agent, functionally parallel to the prepositional phrase *undernorð mannum* in line 9a: '(They [i.e. the five towns])[434] were previously oppressed by hardship for a long time by the Danes, under the Northmen, in heathen bonds, until King Edmund, the son of Edward, the protector of warriors, freed them again, to his glory'. In the **ChronA[3] ChronC[2] ChronD[2]**, *dæne* (and variants) is nominative singular and the subject of *wæran* (**ChronC[2] ChronD[2]** *wæron*): 'The Danes were previously oppressed by hardship for a long time under the Northmen, in the bonds of the heathens, until King Edmund, the son of Edward, the protector of warriors, freed them again, to his glory'.

Of the two readings, that of **ChronA[3] ChronC[2]** and **ChronD[2]** is to be preferred on historical grounds. As Allen Mawer argues, the 'Danes' in this case are the inhabitants of the

[434]For examples of the non-expression of a subject which "has to be inferred from an oblique case in a preceding clause" see Mitchell, *OES* §§ 1509 and 1510. In this case the "unexpressed" subject of ll. 8bff. is to be inferred from *burga fife*, line 5b.

Danelaw, while the ‘northmen’ are likely to be the forces of the “Norse kings of Northumbria.”[435]

The variation in inflection has no effect on metre.

***Capt* (ChronB[1]), 10a**

ChronA[3]

dæne wæran ær
under| norðmannum nyde gebegde
ónhæþen**ra** hæfteclōmū|
lange þraga oþ hie alysde eft
forhis weorþ scipe wig|gendra hleo
afera eadweardes eadmundcyning
ónfenganlafe||

ChronC[2]

dene wæron æror.
under norðmannū. nyde gebæded.
onhæ|þen**ra** hæfte clommum.
lange þrage oþhialysde eft.
for| his weorð scype wiggendra hleo.
afora eadweardes. eadmund| cing.
Her eadmundcing...

ChronB[1]

denum wæron æror.
undernorð mannum.| nede gebǽded.
onhæþen**um** hæfte clammum.
lange þrage| oþ hiealysde eft.
forhis weorðscipe wiggendra hléo|
eafora eadweardes eadmund cining;|
H er eadmund cing...

ChronD[2]

dæne wæron æror
under|| norð mannum nydegebæded
onhæðen**ra** hæf|te. clommum
lange þrage. oþ hy alysde eft|
for his weorðscipe wigendra hleo
afora ead|weardes eadmundes cyning.|
Her anlaf abræc...

In **ChronA[3]** **ChronC[2]** and **ChronD[2]**, *hæþenra* (and orthographic variants) is a genitive plural substantive adjective depending on *hæfteclommum* ‘in the bonds of heathens’; in **ChronB[1]**, *hæþenum* (and orthographic variants) is a dative plural adjective modifying *hæfte clammum*, ‘in heathen bonds’.

The two readings make good sense and syntax and are metrically identical.

[435]Allen Mawer, “The Redemption of the Five Boroughs,” *ERH* 38 (1923): 551-557. See esp. 554-5.

Coronation of Edgar

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

***CEdg* (ChronB[1]), 14b**

ChronA[5]

10 ꝯðaagangenwæs
tynhundwintra ge teled| rimes.
frā gebyrd tide bremes cyninges
leohta hyrdes. buton| ðærtō lafe þa agan
wæs winter ge teles þæs**ðe** gewritu secgað.|
15 seofon ꝯ twentig.

ChronB[1]

10 ꝯþaagangenwæs.
tynhund wintra geteledrímes|
fram gebýrdtíde bremes cinges.
leohtahyrdes butan| ðærtoláfe þaget.
wæs wintergeteles þæs gewritu secgað.|
15 seofan ꝯ.XX.

ChronC[2]

10 ꝯ þá agangen wæs.
tynhund| wintra geteled rimes.
framgebýrdtíde bremes cinges.|
leohta hirdes butanþærtolafe ðaget
wæs winter getæles| þæs **ðe**gewritusecgað.
15 seofan ꝯXX.

The addition or omission of *ðe* occurs in the preliminary drop of a Type C-1 line and has no significant effect on metre, sense, or syntax. Demonstrative pronouns are found introducing relative clauses with and without *þe*.

***CEdg* (ChronB[1]), 20a**

ChronA[5]

ꝯ hī ead mundes eafora hæfde.
nigon ꝯ XX.| nið weorca heard.
wintra onworulde. þis gewordenwæs.
20 ꝯ **þa** onðā| XXX. wæs ðeoden gehalgod :7

ChronB[1]

ꝯhim eadmundes eaforahæfde
nigen ꝯ| .XX. niþweorcaheard
wintra onworlde ðaþis gewordenwæs.|
20 O nþaonðam. þrittigæþanwæs þeoden gehalgod.

ChronC[2]

ꝯhimeadmundes| eafora hæfde
nigen ꝯXX. niðweorca heard
wintra on wu|rulde þaðis gewordenwæs.
20 ꝯ**þa**onþamþrittigeþan wæs| ðeoden gehalgod.

ChronB[1] *On þa* is a graphic error for *Ond þa* (as in **ChronA[5]** **ChronC[2]**). The capitalisation and layout of the text in this manuscript suggest that the **ChronB[1]** scribe may not have understood his exemplar, especially as Miller's analysis of the distribution of *on* and

ond in manuscripts of the Old English translation of the *Historia* suggests that (non-Anglian) scribes would change *on* to *ond* where they recognised it as the conjunction.[436]

Taylor cites this variant as counter-evidence to his argument that **ChronC^{2}** had **ChronB^{1}** as its direct exemplar after 947.[437]

London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. i, Second Hand (ChronC^{2})

Battle of Brunanburh

Substitution of Stressed Words and Elements (2 examples)

***Brun* (ChronC^{2}), 25b**

ChronA^{3}

myrce| newyrndon.
25 he eardes hond plegan. hæleþa **<u>nanum</u>**
þæmid anlafe.| ofer æra gebland.
onlides bosme. land gesohtun.
fæge toge|feohte.

ChronC^{2}

myrce| newyrndon.
25 heardes handplegan hæleþa **<u>namū</u>**.
þaraðemid| anlafe. ofer ear gebland
onliþes bosme landgesohton.
fæge| togefeohte

ChronB^{1}

myrce| newyrndon.
25 heardes handplegan hæleþa**<u>nanum</u>**.
þara| ðemid anlafe ofereargebland.
onlides bosme landge|sohtan.
fægetogefeohte.

ChronD^{2}

myrce newyrndon.
25 heardes hand plegan hæleþa| **<u>nanum</u>**.
þæra þemid anlafe ofer eár gebland.|
onlides bosme land gesohton.
fage to feohte

The **ChronC^{2}** reading is the result of a minim error. It has been partially corrected in the manuscript.

[436]Miller, *The Old English Version*, v.1, p. xxviii.

[437]Taylor, *MS. B*, p. xlviii.

***Brun* (ChronC^2), 27a**

ChronA^3

myrce| newyrndon.
25 he eardes hond plegan. hæleþa nanum
þæmid anlafe.| ofer æra gebland.
on**lides** bosme. land gesohtun.
fæge toge|feohte.

ChronB^1

myrce| newyrndon.
25 heardes handplegan hæleþananum.
þara| ðemid anlafe ofereargebland.
on**lides** bosme landge|sohtan.
fægetogefeohte.

ChronC^2

myrce| newyrndon.
25 heardes handplegan hæleþa namū.
þaraðemid| anlafe. ofer ear gebland
on**liþes** bosme landgesohton.
fæge| togefeohte

ChronD^2

myrce newyrndon.
25 heardes hand plegan hæleþa| nanum.
þæra þemid anlafe ofer eár gebland.|
on**lides** bosme land gesohton.
fage to feohte

Both readings make reasonable sense, although Campbell suggests that the **ChronC^2** reading may be a simple graphic error:

> The scribe, conceivably, had O.N. *lið* in his mind, though it seldom means 'ship,' and is not recorded in English till 1052 (*Chron*., MSS. C, D, E; in the sense 'fleet' or 'band').[438]

As the scribe of **ChronC^2** is himself writing in the mid-eleventh century (he is "probably" responsible for the annals 491 to 1048 in his manuscript),[439] and as, as Campbell notes, he correctly writes *lides* in line 34a, the possibility of a (conscious or unconscious) substitution cannot be ruled out.

The variation has no effect on metre. The line is a Type C-1 line with a resolved first stress in all four manuscripts.

[438]Campbell, *Brunanburh*, p. 107.

[439]Ker, *Catalogue*, art. 191.

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

***Brun* (ChronC^2), 20b**

ChronA^3

wes seaxe fórð.|
ond long nedæg. eorod cistum :
onlast legdun. laþum þeo dum.
heowan| here fleman. hindan þearle.
mecum mylen scearpan.

ChronC^2

20 ⁊ wes sexe forð
andlangnedæg| eored cystum
onlast legdon laþum ðeodon.
heowon here|flymon hindan þearle
mecum mylenscearpum

ChronB^1

20 west sexeforð.
andlangnedæg eored| cystum.
onlast legdon laðumþeodum.
heowanherefly|man hindan þearle.
mecummylenscearpum

ChronD^2

20 wes seaxe forð.
⁊langne dæg eored cystum.|
onlast lægdon laþum ðeodum.
heowan heora|flyman hindan þearle.
mecum mycel scearpum|

The addition or omission of *⁊* has a minor effect on sense and syntax. In **ChronC^2** the sentence *⁊ wes sexe forð... mecum mylenscearpum* follows syndetically from the preceding clause. In **ChronA^3 ChronB^1** and **ChronD^2** the sentences are juxtaposed asyndetically. Both constructions are acceptable Old English.

With the addition of *⁊*, **ChronC^2** is a Type B-2 line. In **ChronA^3 ChronB^1 ChronD^2** the line is a Type E.

***Brun* (ChronC^2), 31b**

ChronA^3

fife lægun.
ónþam campstede. cyninges giunge.
30 sweordū| aswefede. swilce seofene eác.
eorlas anlafes. unrim heriges.|
flotan ꝯsceotta.

ChronC^2

fife lagon.
onþamcampstede cingas geonge.|
30 sweordum aswefde. swilce vii. eac
eorlas anlafes. ⁊únrím| herges.
flotan ꝯscotta

ChronB^1

fife lagon.
onðæm camp stede| ciningas geonge.
30 sweordum aswefede swilce seofone eac.|
eorlas anlafes. unrím herges.
flotan ꝯscotta

ChronD^2

fife| lagon
onþam campstede cyningas iunga
30 sweordū| aswefede swylce seofene eác.
eorlas anlafes unrím|| herges
flótan. ꝯscotta

See the preceding entry. In **ChronA^3 ChronB^1** and **ChronD^2** line 31b is Type A-2a. In **ChronC^2** it is Type A-2a with anacrusis.

***Brun* (ChronC^2), 41b**

ChronA^3

swilce þær| eác sefroda. mid fleame cō.
onhis cyþþe norð. costontinus.|
hár hilde ring. hreman neþorfte.
mæcan gemanan. he wæs| his mæga sceard.
freonda gefylled. ónfolcstede.
beslagen| ætsæcce. ꝯhis sunu forlet.
ónwæl stowe. wundun fer grunden.|
giungne ætguðe.

ChronB^1

S wylce þær eacsefróda mid fleamecóm.
onhiscyþþe| norð constantínus.
hárhilderinc hremanneþórfte|||
mecea gemanan her wæs his magasceard.
freonda| gefylled on folcstede.
forslegen ætsace ꝯhissunu for|let.
onwælstowe wundum forgrunden.
geongne ætguþe|

ChronC^2

Swilce| þǽr eac sefroda midfleame cóm.
onhis cyððe norð. constan|tinus.
hár hilderinc. hreman neðorfte.
meca gemanan. her| wæs hismaga sceard.
freonda gefylled. on**his** folcstede.
besle|gen ætsæcce. ꝯhissunu forlet
onwælstowe. wundum forgrunden.|
geongne æt guþe.

ChronD^2

swylce þæreác sefroda mid| fleame com
onhis cyððe norð constantinus|
hal hylde rínc hryman neþorfte.
inecga ge|manan hewæshis mæga. sceard
freonda ge|fylled onfolc stede
beslægen ætsȩcge. ꝯhissunu| forlæt.
onwæl stowe wundum forgrunden.|
geongne ætguþe

Campbell notes that "the insertion of *his* before *folcstede* by the scribe of C... suggests that he took the word here in the sense 'dwelling', 'home', and assumed the passage to imply that Constantine found himself with no kinsmen in his home."[440] In **ChronA^3 ChronB^1** and **ChronD^2** *on folcstede* (and variants) refers to the battlefield at Brunanburh.[441]

As it falls on the preliminary dip of a Type C-2 line, the variation has no effect on metre.

[440]Campbell, *Brunanburh*, p. 111. See also Orton, "Constantine's Bereavement," pp. 249-250.

[441]Campbell, *Brunanburh*, p. 111.

Addition/Omission of Prefixes (1 example)

***Brun* (ChronC^{2}), 57a**

ChronA^{3}
57 swilce þa**ge**broþer.||| begen æt samne.
cyning ȝæþeling. cyþþe sohton.
wes seaxena land.| wiges hrą̊mige.

ChronC^{2}
57 Swilce þábroðor begen ætsomne.
cing| ȝæþeling cyþþesohton.
wessexena land wiggeshremige.|

ChronB^{1}
57 Swylce þa**ge**bro|ðor begen ætsomne.
cing ȝæþeling cyþþe sohtan.
west|seaxenaland wiggeshremige.

ChronD^{2}
57 swylce þa**ge** broþor bege ætrunne
cyning ȝeaðe|ling cyðde sohton
west seaxna land wiges hremige|

ChronC^{2} substitutes the simple noun *broðor*, 'brother' for the collective *gebroðor* (and orthographic variants), 'fellowman' in **ChronA^{3} ChronB^{1}** and **ChronD^{2}**.[442]

The addition or omission of the prefix adds or subtracts a metrically insignificant unstressed syllable from the preliminary dip of a Type A-3 line.

London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. iv,
Second Hand (ChronD^{2})

Battle of Brunanburh

Differences of Inflection (3 examples)

***Brun* (ChronD^{2}), 16b**

ChronA^{3}
16 eces drihtnes. oð **sio** æþele gesceaft.|

ChronC^{2}
16 eces| drihtnes oþ**seo** æþele gesceaft

ChronB^{1}
16 ecesdrihtnes. þ**seo** æþele gesceaft|

ChronD^{2}
16 eces drihtnes. að **se** æþele gesceaft.

ChronD^{2} *se* is nominative singular masculine. **ChronA^{3}** *sio* (**ChronB^{1} ChronC^{2}** *seo*) is nominative singular feminine. *Gesceaft* is normally feminine or neuter in the singular, although "a masc. pl. *ge-seaftas* occurs."[443] Since *æþele* can be construed as either a strong *jó-* or (with the confusion of unstressed vowels) a weak-declension nominative masculine singular,[444] the **ChronD** reading is not necessarily a mistake.

---

[442]Campbell, *Brunanburh*, p. 117.

[443]B.-T.(S), *gesceaft*.

[444]Campbell, *OEG* §§645-7.

The substitution has no metrical effect. Similar variation in gender is found in lines 55a: **ChronD^{2}** *deopne* (for **ChronA^{3} ChronB^{1} ChronC^{2}** *deop*); and 66a: **ChronD^{2}** *þisne* (for **ChronA^{3}** *þis* **ChronB^{1} ChronC^{2}** *þys*).[445]

***Brun* (ChronD^{2}), 55a**

ChronA^{3}
55 oferdeop wæter. difel|in secan.

ChronC^{2}
55 oferdeopwæter dyflinsecan.

ChronB^{1}
55 oferdeopwæter| dyflensecean.

ChronD^{2}
55 ofe,ꝛdeopne| wæter dyflig secan.

In **ChronD^{2}**, *deopne* is a accusative singular masculine. In **ChronA^{3} ChronB^{1} ChronC^{2}**, *deop* is neuter. Bosworth and Toller cite one example of a masculine plural *wæteras* (Vercelli Homily XV. 55-6 *ȝ þonne æfter þan bioð ealle wæteras | ȝ ealle wyllas on blode*), although the ending in this case may also reflect the influence of the following noun *wyllas*.[446]

In **ChronA^{3} ChronB^{1}** and **ChronC^{2}**, line 55a is Type C-2; in **ChronD^{2}** it is Type B-1 with a resolved second stress. Campbell gives four examples of lines metrically similar to that in **ChronA^{3} ChronB^{1} ChronC^{2}** including three in the on-verse and one from the off-verse.[447] He also cites only one example from the poem of a Type B verse similar to that in **ChronD^{2}**, but notes that the form is quite common.[448]

For further examples of fluctuation in gender between **ChronD^{2}** and **ChronA^{3} ChronB^{1} ChronC^{2}**, see above, p. 206, below, p. 208.

[445]See below, pp. 207 and 208.

[446]Text: D. G. Scragg, *The Vercelli Homilies and Related Texts* EETS n.s. 300 (Oxford: EETS, 1992), p. 255.

[447]Campbell, *Battle of Brunanburh*, p. 26.

[448]Campbell, *Battle of Brunanburh*, p. 23.

***Brun* (ChronD[2]), 66a**

ChronA[3]
66 ón þis| eiglande. æfer gieta.

ChronC[2]
66 onþys iglande æfregyta.|

ChronB[1]
66 onþyseglande æfregyta.

ChronD[2]
66 onþis**ne**iglande æfregitá.|

In contrast to the preceding examples, in line 66a, the **ChronD[2]** reading is a clear mistake. In **ChronA[3] ChronB[1] ChronC[2]** the demonstrative adjective *þis*/*þys* is a neuter instrumental singular agreeing with (*e*)(*i*)*glande*, a neuter dative/instrumental singular noun; in **ChronD[2]**, the demonstrative adjective is masculine accusative singular.

As the variant falls on the preliminary dip of a Type C line, it has no effect on metre.

For further examples of fluctuation in gender between **ChronD[2]** and **ChronA[3] ChronB[1] ChronC[2]**, see the preceding two variants.

Substitution of Stressed Words and Elements (10 examples)

***Brun* (ChronD[2]), 5b**

ChronA[3]
5 **bord|weal** clufan.
heowan heaþolinde. hamora lafan.
afaran ead|weardes.

ChronC[2]
5 **bordweall**| clufon.
heowon heaþo linda. hamora lafum.
aforan ead|weardes.

ChronB[1]
5 **bordweall** clufon.
heowan heaðolina hamera lafum|
eaforan eadweardes

ChronD[2]
5 **heord|weal** clufan.
heowan heaðolinga hamera lafum.|
eaforan eadweardæs

O'Keeffe suggests that the **ChronD[2]** form is the result of "feature recognition" on the part of the **ChronD[2]** scribe:

> At 5b and 39a in the edited text, D transmits variants which are metrically acceptable, lexically defensible and, in terms of an 'authorial' version of the poem, probably wrong. These variants tell us something about the careful scribe of this portion of D, and I should argue that they also tell us something about the process of reading Old English verse which had developed by the mid-eleventh century. The first of these interesting variants is in 5 b, *bordweal clufon*. Both B and C read *bordweall*. A separates the free morphemes at the end of the line and reads *bord/ weal*. D also separates the free morphemes at the end of the line but reads *heord/ weal*. Now alliterative constraints argue that *bord-* is licit and *heord-* is not. But that does not necessarily mean that *heord* is simply the product of an unclear 'b' in the exemplar. More likely, the scribe scanned the morpheme **bord*, and by a process of

> feature recognition registered an ascender and an 'rd' combination. The more familiar form *heord*, 'care', 'custody' or 'guard', with various ecclesiastical overtones, then appeared.[449]

While not impossible, O'Keeffe's hypothesis of this variant's origin probably gives the **ChronD^{2}** scribe too much credit – *heord|weal* makes no sense in context and, as it removes the only alliterating letter in the off-verse, is unmetrical.

The more likely explanation involves a combination of the graphic confusion of insular *h* and *b* with a back-spelling of the late monophthongisation of Old English diphthongs. The same scribe confuses *h* and *b* once more in *Brunanburh*, producing the nonsensical **ChronD^{2}** *hly**bb**an* for **ChronA^{3}** *hle**hh**an* **ChronB^{1} ChronC^{2}** *hli**hh**an*, line 47b, and similar confusions of other graphically similar letters are common through his work. The spelling of the stressed vowel *o* as *eo* may be the result of a late back-spelling reflecting the monophthongisation of diphthongs in the eleventh century.[450] Similar use of digraphs for expected monophthongs in **ChronD^{2}** include: **ChronD^{2}** *here leafum* for **ChronA^{3}** *herelafū* (**ChronB^{1}** *herelafum* **ChronC^{2}** *here lafum*), line 47a and **ChronD^{2}** *eaðe|ling* for **ChronA^{3} ChronB^{1} ChronC^{2}** *æþeling*, line 58a.

Apart from its effect on the alliteration of the line, **ChronD^{2}** *heord|weal* is metrically identical to the **ChronA^{3} ChronB^{1} ChronC^{2}** reading.

[449]O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 117

[450]See Campbell, *OEG* §329.2.

***Brun* (ChronD^2), 20a**

ChronA^3

sahtosetle. þær læg secg mænig.
garū ageted. guma norþerna.|
ofer scild scoten. swilce scittisc eác.
20 werig wíges **sæd**.

ChronC^2

þærlæg secgmonig.|
garum ageted. guman norðerne.
ofer scyldscoten swilce| scyttisc eac.
20 werig wig ges **sæd**.

ChronB^1

þærlægsecg manig.
garum forgrunden.| guman norðerne.
oferscyldsceoten swylce scyttisceac.|
20 werig wigges**sæd**.

ChronD^2

þær| læg secg monig.
garum ageted guman norþærne.|
ofer scyld sceoten swylce scyttisc eác.
20 werig wiges| **ræd**

An example of the confusion of insular ſ (i.e. *s*) and *r* (i.e. *r*) by the scribe of **ChronD^2**. A second example is **ChronD^2** *æses* corrected from *æres*, line 63b.[451]

Although **ChronD^2** *ræd* is non-sensical in context, the substitution has no significant effect on metre: in all four manuscripts, the line is Type D*4.

***Brun* (ChronD^2), 23a**

ChronA^3

20 wes seaxe fórð.|
ond long nedæg. eorod cistum :
onlast legdun. laþum þeo dum.
heowan| **here** fleman. hindan þearle.
mecum mylen scearpan.

ChronC^2

20 ȝ wes sexe forð
andlangnedæg| eored cystum
onlast legdon laþum ðeodon.
heowon **here**|flymon hindan þearle
mecum mylenscearpum

ChronB^1

20 west sexeforð.
andlangnedæg eored| cystum.
onlast legdon laðumþeodum.
heowan**here**fly|man hindan þearle.
mecummylenscearpum

ChronD^2

20 wes seaxe forð.
ȝlangne dæg eored cystum.|
onlast lægdon laþum ðeodum.
heowan **heora**|flyman hindan þearle.
mecum mycel scearpum|

There are three possibilities for this variant: that **ChronD^2** *heora-* is intended for the poetic word *heoru-* 'sword-' (with *a* for *u* through the confusion of unstressed back-vowels); that it is intended for the third person plural possessive adjective 'their'; or that *-eo-* is a late back-spelling of *-e-*.

If it is for *heoru-* or a backspelling of *here*, the reading makes both sense and metre. Both *heoru* and *here* are used in compounds, and *heoruflȳma* is acceptable in context.

Metrically, the two forms are identical. If it is for *hira* 'their', the **ChronD**^{2} reading affects both sense and metre. *Heora flyman* 'the ones fleeing them'(?) is nonsensical, and the substitution of the unstressed pronoun for the stressed element *here* changes the Type D*1 line of **ChronA**^{3} **ChronB**^{1} **ChronC**^{2} to an A-1 (with alliteration on the inflected verb alone) in **ChronD**^{2}. As the **ChronD**^{2} scribe uses *hyra* for **ChronA**^{3} **ChronB**^{1} *heora* in line 47a (the only other occurrence of the plural third person possessive in the poem), the last possibility is the least likely.

***Brun* (ChronD^{2}), 24a**

ChronA^{3}

20 wes seaxe fórð.|
ond long nedæg. eorod cistum :
onlast legdun. laþum þeo dum.
heowan| here fleman. hindan þearle.
mecum **mylen** scearpan.

ChronC^{2}

20 ꝯ wes sexe forð
andlangnedæg| eored cystum
onlast legdon laþum ðeodon.
heowon here|flymon hindan þearle
mecum **mylen**scearpum

ChronB^{1}

20 west sexeforð.
andlangnedæg eored| cystum.
onlast legdon laðumþeodum.
heowanherefly|man hindan þearle.
mecum**mylen**scearpum

ChronD^{2}

20 wes seaxe forð.
ꝯlangne dæg eored cystum.|
onlast lægdon laþum ðeodum.
heowan heora|flyman hindan þearle.
mecum **mycel** scearpum|

The **ChronD**^{2} reading *mycel scearpum* 'great-sharp (?)' is presumably a scribal trivialisation of the nonce-compound **ChronA**^{3} *mylen scearp-* (**ChronB**^{1} **ChronC**^{2} *mylenscearp-*).[452]

[451]See O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 118, fn.29; Jabbour, diss, p. 61.

[452]For a discussion of the form in **ChronA**^{3} **ChronB**^{1} **ChronC**^{2}, see Campbell, *Brunanburh*, pp. 105-6. The variant is not discussed by O'Keeffe.

***Brun* (ChronD^2), 35a**

ChronA^3

35 cread cnearen **flot**.| cyning utgewat.
ónfealene flod. feorh generede.

ChronC^2

35 cread cnear||ón**flót** cining út géwat.
onfealoneflód feorh génerode.

ChronB^1

35 cread cnear on**flot**| cing ut gewát.
onfealone flód feorh generede.|

ChronD^2

35 creat cneár on**flod**| ----
---- feorh generode.

This "substitution" may be no more than the result of an eyeskip. **ChronD^2** is missing the next two half-lines.[453]

***Brun* (ChronD^2), 39a**

ChronA^3

swilce þær| eác sefroda. mid fleame cō.
onhis cyþþe norð. costontinus.|
hár hilde ring. hreman neþorfte.
40 mæcan gemanan.

ChronC^2

Swilce| þǽr eac sefroda midfleame cóm.
onhis cyððe norð. constan|tinus.
hár hilderinc. hreman neðorfte.
40 meca gemanan.

ChronB^1

S wylce þær eacsefróda mid fleamecóm.
onhiscyþþe| norð constantínus.
hárhilderinc hremanneþórfte|||
40 mecea gemanan

ChronD^2

swylce þæreác sefroda mid| fleame com
onhis cyððe norð constantinus|
hal hylde rínc hryman neþorfte.
40 inecga ge|manan

The substitution **ChronD^2** *hal* **ChronA^3 ChronB^1 ChronC^2** *hár* could be the result of the graphic confusion of insular *l* and *r* or a substitution of homographs. Both readings make sense: *hal* is found in similar contexts meaning to survive a physical threat and might even be considered ironic.[454] As O'Keeffe notes, however, the **ChronA^3 ChronB^1 ChronC^2** reading *har hilderinc* is a relatively common formula in Old English. It occurs perhaps four more times in the poetic corpus (*Beowulf*, 1307a, 3136a [*hilderince*, conjectured], *Maldon*, 169a; *An Exhortation to Christian Living*, 57a), and is "the only formula with *hilderinc* in the nominative singular."[455]

---

[453]See Campbell, *Brunanburh*, p. 109, note to line 35.

[454]See B.-T.(S), *hál*, II [2]; cf. *Beowulf* 1501-3a: *Grap þa togeanes, guðrinc gefeng / atolan clommum; no þy ær in gescod / halan lice*; and *Daniel* 270 *Hyssas hale hwurfon in þam hatan ofne*.

[455]O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 118. I do not understand the rest of O'Keeffe's comments on this substitution: "D reads *hal hylde rinc* with accent over *rinc*. D regularly separates free morphemes so the separation of *hylde* and *rinc* is probably not significant (nor is a regular pattern discernible in the use of accents in D).

The variation has no effect on metre.

***Brun* (ChronD[2]), 39b**

ChronA[3]

swilce þær| eác sefroda. mid fleame cō.
onhis cyþþe norð. costontinus.|
hár hilde ring. **hreman** neþorfte.
mæcan gemanan.

ChronB[1]

S wylce þær eacsefróda mid fleamecóm.
onhiscyþþe| norð constantínus.
hárhilderinc **hreman**neþórfte|||
mecea gemanan

ChronC[2]

Swilce| þǽr eac sefroda midfleame cóm.
onhis cyððe norð. constan|tinus.
hár hilderinc. **hreman** neðorfte.
meca gemanan.

ChronD[2]

swylce þæreác sefroda mid| fleame com
onhis cyððe norð constantinus|
hal hylde rínc **hryman** neþorfte.
inecga ge|manan

As Campbell notes, **ChronA[3] ChronB[1] ChronC[2]** *hreman* could be intended for either *hrēman* 'exult' (all dialects) or non-West-Saxon *hrēman*, 'lament'.[456] **ChronD[2]** *hryman*, however, can only be for *hrȳman* the late West-Saxon reflex of non-West-Saxon *hrēman* 'lament'.[457] Presumably the scribe of **ChronD[2]** or, perhaps more likely, that of a more southern antecedent,[458] misunderstood the sense of the passage and attempted to 'translate' a form he believed to be the non-West-Saxon *hrēman* 'lament' into its West-Saxon reflex.[459]

The variation has a great effect on sense. If **ChronD[2]** is intended for *hrȳman*, 'lament', then line 39b does not seem to make sense, unless it is intended ironically: 'he need not lament in the fellowship of kinsmen'. The two forms are metrically identical.

This spelling of **hilde* seems to have produced a compound whose meaning can only be inferred from the analogous *hyldemæg*, 'dear kinsman'" (*Visible Song*), p. 117. After *þ*/*ð*, variation between *y* and *i* is the most common among witnesses to the multiply attested poetry. It can hardly be considered significant. Whether it is spelled with an *i* or a *y*, the first part of the compounds *hylderinc* (*hilderinc*) and *hyldemæg* (*hildemæg*) should have been perceived as identical by readers of Old English.

[456]Campbell, *Brunanburh*, p. 110. *Hrēman* 'exult' is "connected etymologically with... O.S. *hrom*" (i.e. from Gmc. *ō*; Campbell, *Brunanburh*, p. 110). The i-umlaut of this is originally *ē* (from *ōe*) in Southern dialects, *ōe* in Anglian, but later *ē* in all dialects (Sievers-Brunner, §§101, 27). nWS *hrēman*/WS *hrīeman* (*hrȳman*) 'lament' shows the characteristic distinction in the i-umlaut of *ĕa* to nWS *ē* West-Saxon *īe*/*ȳ* (Campbell, OEG §261).

[457]See Campbell, *Brunanburh*, p. 110; also fn. 456, p. 213 above.

[458]On the composite nature of **ChronD[2]**, see Whitelock, *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, pp. xiv-xv.

[459]See Campbell, *Brunanburh*, p. 110.

***Brun* (ChronD^2), 42a**

ChronA^3

40 he wæs| his mæga sceard.
freonda gefylled. ónfolcstede.
beslagen| æt**sæcce**. ȝhis sunu forlet.
ónwæl stowe. wundun fer grunden.|
giungne ætguðe.

ChronC^2

40 her| wæs hismaga sceard.
freonda gefylled. onhis folcstede.
besle|gen æt**sæcce**. ȝhissunu forlet
onwælstowe. wundum forgrunden.|
geongne æt guþe.

ChronB^1

40 her wæs his magasceard.
freonda| gefylled on folcstede.
forslegen æt**sace** ȝhissunu for|let.
onwælstowe wundum forgrunden.
geongne ætguþe|

ChronD^2

40 hewæshis mæga. sceard
freonda ge|fylled onfolc stede
beslægen æt**sȩcge**. ȝhissunu| forlæt.
onwæl stowe wundum forgrunden.|
geongne ætguþe

The **ChronD^2** reading is a probable example of the back spelling of *c* for *cg* (compare **ChronD^2** *inecga* **ChronB ChronC** *mec*(*e*)*a* **ChronA** *mæcan*, line 40a). The other possibilities, that the form is for the first person present indicative singular of *secgan*,[460] the dative singular of *secg*, 'man', or the nominative singular of *secge* 'speech', do not make any sense in context.

***Brun* (ChronD^2), 55b**

ChronA^3

55 oferdeop wæter. **difel|in** secan.

ChronC^2

55 oferdeopwæter **dyflin**secan.

ChronB^1

55 oferdeopwæter| **dyflen**secean.

ChronD^2

55 ofe,ʳdeopne| wæter **dyflig** secan.

ChronD^2 *dyflig* is nonsensical. As the **ChronA^3 ChronB^1 ChronC^2** form *dyflin* (and orthographic variants) is a nonce word,[461] the **ChronD^2** spelling is presumably to be understood as a scribal attempt at making sense of an unknown word by "correcting" its final syllable to *-ig* to form an adjective.

[460]With *æ* [ȩ] for West-Saxon *e* as is common in Anglian texts (Campbell *OEG* §762).

[461]Campbell, *Brunanburh*, pp. 115-116.

***Brun* (ChronD[2]), 64a**

ChronA[3]

60 letan him behindan. hrᵂæbryttian.
salu wig|padan. þone sweartan hræfn.
hyrned nebban. ꝯþanehasewan|padan.
earn æftan hwit. æses brucan.
grædigne **guð hafóc**.| ꝯþæt græge deor.
65 wulf ónwealde.

ChronC[2]

60 leton hymbehindon hrá brittigan.
salowig padan þoneswear|tan hrefn.
hyrned nebban. ꝯþonehasu padan
earn æftan| hwit. ǽses brucan.
grædigne **guðhafoc** ꝯþgrægedeor.
65 wulf| onwealde.

ChronB[1]

60 letan himbehindan hraw| bryttigean.
salowig pádan þone sweartan hræfn.
hyrned| nebban ꝯþone hasopadan.
earn æftan hwit. æses brucan.|
grædigne **guþhafoc** ꝯþgrægedeor.
65 wulfonwealde.

ChronD[2]

60 læton him behindan hra bryttinga.
salowig padan| þone sweartan hræfn
hyrnet nebban. ꝯþone| hasu wadan
earn æftan hwit æres brucan.
græ|||digne **cuð heafóc**. ꝯþætgregedeor.
65 wulfonwealde|

Both readings are nonce compounds, metrically acceptable, and make some sense. *Cuð-* is relatively rare as the first half of a compound, and is not found at all in poetry.[462] Campbell cites *guðfugol* (Exeter Riddle 24,5) as a possible parallel to the **ChronA[3] ChronB[1] ChronC[2]** reading. With the exception of proper nouns (*gos-*, *mus-*, *spear-*, etc.) there are no examples of *hafoc* as the second element of a compound.[463]

As both *cūð* and *gūð* have long vowels the substitution has no effect on the stress pattern of the line. In **ChronD[2]**, line 64a has single alliteration in the on-verse. In **ChronA[3] ChronB[1] ChronC[2]**, the equivalent verse has double alliteration.

[462]Bessinger and Smith.

[463]Campbell, *Brunanburh*, pp. 119-120.

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

***Brun* (ChronD^{2}), 51b**

ChronA^{3}

midheora herelafū.| hlehhan neþorftun.
þ heo beaduweorca. beteran wurdun.
ón camp stede. cul bod ge hna des
garmit tinge. gumena ge|mo tes.
wæpen gewrixles. þæs hi ón wæl felda.
wiþead weardes.| afaran plegodan.

ChronB^{1}

midheora herelafum hlihhan| neþorftan.
þhie beado weorca beteran wurdan.
oncamp|stede cumbol gehnastes.
gármittinge gumena gemótes.|
wæpen gewrixles þæshie onwæl felda.
wiþeadweardes. eafo|ran plegodan.

ChronC^{2}

midhyra here lafum| hlihhan neðorftun.
þhi beadoweorca beteran wurdon.
oncamp|stede cumbol gehnastes.
gar mit tin ge gumena gemotes.
wæpen| gewrixles. þæs hionwælfelda
wið eadweardes aforan plegodon.|

ChronD^{2}

mid hyra here leafum hlybban neþorf|tan.
þæt hi beado weorca beteran wurdon.
on| campstede cumbol ge hnastes.
gár mittunge| gumena gemotes.
wæpen ge wrixles. þæs**þe**hi| on wæl felda
wiðeadweardes áfaran plegodon ;|

The addition or omission of *þe* occurs in the preliminary drop of a Type C-1 line and has no significant effect on metre, sense or syntax.

In both manuscripts, *þæs* (*þe*) can be understood as either a relative marker or a temporal conjunction. Although the verb, *plegodan*, l.52b, requires an accusative object, the possible antecedents for this object, *cumbolgehnastes*, *garmittinge*, *gumena gemotes*, *wæpengewrixles* (and orthographic variants) are all genitive singular. In **ChronD^{2}**, *þæsþe* is either an example of the use of the relative marker with a demonstrative pronoun in the case required by the principal clause (a *se'þe* clause)[464] or an example of *þæs þe* as "a conjunction 'when'... or 'because'."[465] In **ChronA^{3} ChronB^{1} ChronC^{2}**, *þæs* is an example either of a demonstrative adjective in the case required by the main clause being used to introduce an adjective clause with the "apparent absence of the relative marker"[466] or of the temporal conjunction.[467]

[464]Mitchell, *OES* §2159.

[465]Mitchell discusses this passage under the later of these two headings. See *OES* §§2302 and 2307.

[466]Mitchell, *OES* § 2307. See also Campbell, *Brunanburh*, p. 113.

[467]Mitchell, *OES* § 2680.

Addition/Omission of Prefixes (1 example)

***Brun* (ChronD^{2}), 28a**

ChronA^{3}

myrce| newyrndon.
25 he eardes hond plegan. hæleþa nanum
þæmid anlafe.| ofer æra gebland.
onlides bosme. land gesohtun.
fæge to**ge**|feohte.

ChronB^{1}

myrce| newyrndon.
25 heardes handplegan hæleþananum.
þara| ðemid anlafe ofereargebland.
onlides bosme landge|sohtan.
fægeto**ge**feohte.

ChronC^{2}

myrce| newyrndon.
25 heardes handplegan hæleþa namū.
þaraðemid| anlafe. ofer ear gebland
onliþes bosme landgesohton.
fæge| to**ge**feohte

ChronD^{2}

myrce newyrndon.
25 heardes hand plegan hæleþa| nanum.
þæra þemid anlafe ofer eár gebland.|
onlides bosme land gesohton.
fage to feohte

Both readings are metrically and semantically acceptable. As *gefeohte* is far more common in the poetry, however, the **ChronD^{2}** form may also be the result of eyeskip (*fa**ge** to **ge**feohte* > *fage to feohte*).

The pattern *X(x) to gefeohte* (as in **ChronA^{3} ChronB^{1} ChronC^{2}**) is found five other times in the poetic corpus: *feðan to gefeohte*, *Andreas*, line 1188a; *folc to gefeohte*, *Andreas*, line 1196a; *fysan to gefeohte*, *Judith*, line 202a; and *frean to gefeohte*, *Maldon*, line 12a.[468] *Feohte* is found twice, but never in the pattern *X(x) to feohte*: *wearð him seo feohte to grim*, *Vainglory*, line 66b; and *Þa wæs feohte neh*, Maldon, line 103b. [469]

As the variant falls on the medial dip of a Type A line it has no effect on metre.

[468]Bessinger and Smith.

[469]Bessinger and Smith.

Reinterpretation of Existing Text (4 examples)

Brun (ChronD^{2}), 40a

ChronA^{3}

swilce þær| eác sefroda. mid fleame cō.
onhis cyþþe norð. costontinus.|
hár hilde ring. hreman neþorfte.
40 **mæcan** gemanan. he wæs| his mæga sceard.
freonda gefylled. ónfolcstede.
beslagen| ætsæcce. ꝯhis sunu forlet.
ónwæl stowe. wundun fer grunden.|
giungne ætguðe.

ChronC^{2}

Swilce| þǽr eac sefroda midfleame cóm.
onhis cyððe norð. constan|tinus.
hár hilderinc. hreman neðorfte.
40 **meca** gemanan. her| wæs hismaga sceard.
freonda gefylled. onhis folcstede.
besle|gen ætsæcce. ꝯhissunu forlet
onwælstowe. wundum forgrunden.|
geongne æt guþe.

ChronB^{1}

S wylce þær eacsefróda mid fleamecóm.
onhiscyþþe| norð constantínus.
hárhilderinc hremanneþórfte|||
40 **mecea** gemanan her wæs his magasceard.
freonda| gefylled on folcstede.
forslegen ætsace ꝯhissunu for|let.
onwælstowe wundum forgrunden.
geongne ætguþe|

ChronD^{2}

swylce þæreác sefroda mid| fleame com
onhis cyððe norð constantinus|
hal hylde rínc hryman neþorfte.
40 **inecga** ge|manan hewæshis mæga. sceard
freonda ge|fylled onfolc stede
beslægen ætsȩcge. ꝯhissunu| forlæt.
onwæl stowe wundum forgrunden.|
geongne ætguþe

ChronD^{2} *inecga*[470] may be the result either of a minim error (for *mecga*) or a substitution and reinterpretation of an exemplar in *meca* (as in **ChronB^{1} ChronC^{2}**). The similarity of sense between the **ChronD^{2}** and **ChronB^{1} ChronC^{2}** forms provides a strong an argument in favour of an antecedent in *mæcga*. See above, pp. 163 and 189.

[470]In his notes and diplomatic transcription, Campbell gives the **ChronD^{2}** form as *mecga*, adding "the *m* might be read as *in*" (*Brunanburh*, p. 88, fn.1) There is a clear gap between the first and second minim in facsimile, however. See above fn. 365.

***Brun* (ChronD^{2}), 46a**

ChronA^{3}

gel panneþorfte.
45 beorn blandenfeax. bil|geslehtes.
ealdinwidda. ne anlafþyma.

ChronC^{2}

gylpanneþorfte.
45 beorn blandenfex. billge-|slihtes.
ealdinwitta. neánlaf þýma.

ChronB^{1}

gylpan neþorfte.
45 beorn blandenfex. bill geslyhtes.
eald|inwitta neanlaf þema.

ChronD^{2}

gylpan neþorfte.
45 beorn blan|denfeax bill geslihtes
eald inwuda ne anláf| þema.

ChronD^{2} *inwuda* for **ChronA^{3}** *inwidda* **ChronB^{1} ChronC^{2}** *inwitta* appears to reflect a reinterpretation of *inwidda* (*-witta*) 'adversary' as a prepositional phrase *inwuda* 'in the woods', perhaps through a minim error *-ud-* for *-itt-*.

Although it is nonsensical as written,[471] the **ChronD^{2}** form is metrical. With *inwitta*/*inwidda* the **ChronA^{3} ChronB^{1} ChronC^{2}** form is a Type D-1; with *inwuda*, the **ChronD^{2}** line is Type A-4 with a short second lift.

***Brun* (ChronD^{2}), 53b**

ChronA^{3}

gewitan him þa nor^{þ} men. nęgled cnearrū.|
dreorig daraðalaf. óndingesmere.
55 oferdeop wæter. difel|in secan.
ⁱeft hira land. æwiscmode.

ChronC^{2}

Gewiton hymþa norðmenn. negledcnearrum
dreoridare|þalaf ondinges mere.
55 oferdeopwæter dyflinsecan.
eft| yraland æwiscmode.

ChronB^{1}

Gewitan himþa norðmenn nægled cnear|rum
dreorig daroðaláf ondyngesmere.
55 oferdeopwæter| dyflensecean.
eft íraland æwiscmóde.

ChronD^{2}

G ewiton him þa norð men dæg gled ongarum|
dreorig dareða láf ondyniges mere
55 ofe,ʳdeopne| wæter dyflig secan.
eft yra land æwisc mode.|

As Campbell suggests, the variation **ChronD^{2}** *dæg gled ongarum* for **ChronA^{3}** *nęgled cnearrū* (**ChronB** *nægled cnear*|*rum* **ChronC** *negledcnearrum*) is almost certainly to be attributed to the **ChronD^{2}** scribe's failure to understand the "unfamiliar second element of the compound," *-cnearrum*.[472] Basing his emendation on the frame *-æ-gled-rum*, the scribe has produced forms which, while making some sense perhaps in relation to each other ('day flame

[471]See Campbell, *Brunanburh*, p. 112; also O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 30.

[*glēd,* f.] on spears' or 'shining [*gled* for *glæd,* adj.] day on spears'), are non-sensical and non-metrical in context.

In **ChronD^{2}**, the substitution destroys the alliteration and produces a line resembling a Type D with three full lifts. In **ChronA^{3} ChronB^{1} ChronC^{2}**, the line is Type A-1.

***Brun* (ChronD^{2}), 60b**

ChronA^{3}

60 letan him behindan. hræ͛w̄brytt**ian**.
salu wig|padan. þone sweartan hræfn.
hyrned nebban. ꝯþanehasewan|padan.
earn æftan hwit. æses brucan.
grædigne guð hafóc.| ꝯþæt græge deor.
65 wulf ónwealde.

ChronC^{2}

60 leton hymbehindon hrá britt**igan**.
salowig padan þoneswear|tan hrefn.
hyrned nebban. ꝯponehasu padan
earn æftan| hwit. æses brucan.
grædigne guðhafoc ꝯþgrægedeor.
65 wulf| onwealde.

ChronB^{1}

60 letan himbehindan hraw| brytt**igean**.
salowig pádan þone sweartan hræfn.
hyrned| nebban ꝯþone hasopadan.
earn æftan hwit. æses brucan.|
grædigne guþhafoc ꝯþgrægedeor.
65 wulfonwealde.

ChronD^{2}

60 læton him behindan hra brytt**inga**.
salowig padan| þone sweartan hræfn
hyrnet nebban. ꝯþone| hasu wadan
earn æftan hwit æres brucan.
græ|||digne cuð heafóc. ꝯþætgregedeor.
65 wulfonwealde|

The **ChronD^{2}** form – and oblique form of an abstract noun 'dispensing'[473] – makes no sense in context.

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

***Brun* (ChronD^{2}), 35a**

ChronA^{3}

35 cread cnearen **flot**.| cyning utgewat.
ónfealene **flod**. feorh generede.

ChronC^{2}

35 cread cnear||ón**flót** cining út géwat.
onfealone**flod** feorh génerode.

ChronB^{1}

35 cread cnear on**flot**| cing ut gewát.
onfealone **flód** feorh generede.|

ChronD^{2}

35 creat cneár on**flod**| ----
---- feorh generode.

The **ChronD^{2}** reading is the result of eyeskip ***flo****t* > ***flo****d*. See above, p. 212.

[472]Campbell, *Brunanburh*, p. 114.

[473]The declension of abstract nouns in *-ung* (*-ing*) is discussed in Campbell, *OEG*, § 589.8.

Capture of the Five Boroughs

Differences of Inflection (1 example)

***Capt* (ChronD[2]), 13b**

ChronA[3]

wæran ær
under| norðmannum nyde gebegde
ónhæþenra hæfteclōmū|
lange þraga oþ hie alysde eft
forhis weorþ scipe wig|gendra hleo
afera eadweardes eadmundcyning
ónfenganlafe||

ChronC[2]

dene wæron æror.
under norðmannū. nyde gebæded.
onhæ|þenra hæfte clommum.
lange þrage oþhialysde eft.
for| his weorð scype wiggendra hleo.
afora eadweardes. eadmund| cing.
Her eadmundcing...

ChronB[1]

denum wæron æror.
undernorð mannum.| nede gebǽded.
onhæþenum hæfte clammum.
lange þrage| oþ hiealysde eft.
forhis weorðscipe wiggendra hléo|
eafora eadweardes eadmund cining;|
H er eadmund cing...

ChronD[2]

dæne wæron æror
under|| norð mannum nydegebæded
onhæðenra hæf|te. clommum
lange þrage. oþ hy alysde eft|
for his weorðscipe wigendra hleo
afora ead|weardes eadmund**es** cyning.|
Her anlaf abræc...

In **ChronD[2]** *eadmundes* is genitive singular. In **ChronA[3] ChronB[1] ChronC[2]** *eadmund* is nominative singular. The context requires the nominative.

The variants also have a significant metrical effect. In **ChronA[3] ChronB[1] ChronC[2]** the line is Type A-4 with a short final stress. In **ChronD[2]** it is Type E with a resolved final stress.

Substitution of Stressed Words and Elements (2 examples)

***Capt* (ChronD[2]), 2a**

ChronA[3]

1 Heread mund cyning engla þeoden
maga| mundbora myrce geeode
dyre dæd fruma| swa dor scadeþ

ChronC[2]

1 Her eadmundcing englaþéoden
mecga mundbora myrce| ge eode.
dyredædfruma swádor sceadeþ.

ChronB[1]

1 H er eadmund cing engla þeoden.
mæcgea mund bora myrce| geeode.
dyredædfruma swa dor sceadeþ.

ChronD[2]

1 Her eadmund cyning| engla þeoden
mægþa mund bora myrce ge eode.|
dyre dæd fruma swa dór sceadæð.

The three readings are metrically and syntactically identical and all relatively appropriate to the poem's immediate context. For a further discussion of all three forms, see above, p. 176. The **ChronB[1] ChronC[2]** reading is also discussed briefly above, p. 191.

***Capt* (ChronD[2]), 5b**

ChronA[3]

Heread mund cyning engla þeoden
maga| mundbora myrce geeode
dyre dæd fruma| swa dor scadeþ
hwitanwylles geat. ꝯhumbra éa
brada brim|strēā burga **fife**
ligoraceaster ꝯlin cylene.
ꝯsnotingahā| swylce stanfordéac
deora by

ChronB[1]

H er eadmund cing engla þeoden.
mæcgea mund bora myrce| geeode.
dyredædfruma swa dor sceadeþ.
hwitanwylles| geat. ꝯhumbranéa.
brada brím stream burga **fífe**.
ligera|ceaster ꝯlind kylne.
snotingahám swylce stanford eac.|
ꝯdeoraby

ChronC[2]

Her eadmundcing englaþéoden
mecga mundbora myrce| ge eode.
dyredædfruma swádor sceadeþ.
hwitan wylles geat.| ꝯhunbranéa.
bradabrimstream burga **fife**.
ligeracester| ꝯlindcylne.
snotingaham. swilce stanford eac.
ꝯdeoraby|

ChronD[2]

Her eadmund cyning| engla þeoden
mægþa mund bora myrce ge eode.|
dyre dæd fruma swa dór sceadæð.
hwitan wylles| geat. ꝯhimbran ea____
_brada brym stream. burga **gife**.|
ligere ceaster ꝯlincolne.
ꝯsnotinga hám. swylce| stanford eác
ꝯdeoraby.

The scribe of **ChronD[2]** appears to have misunderstood his text. In **ChronA[3] ChronB[1] ChronC[2]**, *burga fife* (and orthographic variants) is an accusative phrase syntactically parallel to the subsequent town names.[474] In **ChronD**, the scribe seems to have read *gife* (for *gifu*) as a variant expression referring to the river and appositive to *humbra ea* and *brada brimstream*: 'gift of the towns'. The substitution has a metrical effect: in **ChronA[3] ChronB[1] ChronC[2]**, the line is a Type A-1 with a long vowel in the second lift; **ChronD[2]**, to the extent that it is metrical, is a Type A-4 (with a short second lift).

Conclusion

With the exception of a single late witness to the *eorðan*-recension of "Cædmon's Hymn," the seven poems discussed in this chapter survive exclusively as fixed constituents of larger prose framing texts. The Metrical Preface and Epilogue to the Old English translation of the *Pastoral Care* are always found at the same places in manuscripts of the *Pastoral Care*,

[474]For the punctuation of this passage, see p. 174, fn. 392, above. On the inflection of *-ceaster* in place names, see Campbell §589.4, fn.3.

copies of the *Chronicle*-poems are always found at the same places in manuscripts of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, and – with the exception of **To** – copies of the *eorðan*-recension of "Cædmon's Hymn" are always found at the same place in the Old English translation of Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica*.

Despite this common contextual position, however, these "Fixed Context" poems show no generically consistent amount or type of substantive variation. At their most conservative, the witnesses to the Fixed Context poems can vary as little as the least variable of the Glossing poems discussed in Chapter Two; at their most innovative, the scribes responsible for copying these poems show themselves to be perfectly willing to make quite significant changes in their received text – substituting stressed and unstressed words, adding or omitting prefixes, making minor changes in inflection, and, in cases where they appear to have found their text obscure, reinterpreting difficult or poetic vocabulary.

As we have seen in the course of this chapter, the first of these two facts helps explain the second. With one exception, the verse performance of the scribes responsible for copying the Fixed Context poetry has been directly comparable with that of their prose. The most innovative scribes of the Fixed Context poems have been also almost invariably the most innovative scribes of the vernacular prose frames with which these poems are copied; the most conservative scribes of the prose frames have been also responsible for the most conservative copies of their constituent verse. Moreover, the types of textual variation the more innovative of these scribes introduce is in all but one case approximately the same in both prose and verse. The scribe of the **B_1** version of "Cædmon's Hymn," for example, is as willing to change the vocabulary of his prose as his verse; the graphic errors and misinterpretations which characterise the **ChronD^2** copies of the *Battle of Brunanburh* and *Capture of the Five Boroughs* are equally characteristic of the surrounding prose.

This suggests two things about the way these poems were copied. In the first place, the fact that the majority of scribes responsible for copying these poems introduce similar types and amounts of variation into their prose and verse suggests that the variation itself is not necessarily "poetic" – let alone evidence of the survival of pre-literate methods of composing or understanding traditional poetry. In the second place, the fact that the most (or least) variable witnesses to the Fixed Context texts fail to fall into any single chronological period suggests that the urge to vary is less a function of a single technological or cultural process – be that "transitional literacy," "memorial transmission," or pure sloppiness – than the result of specific scribal intentions, habits, or abilities.

Chapter Four looks at the third group of Old English verse texts: the "Anthologised and Excerpted" poems. Like the Glossing, Translating, and Occasional poems discussed in Chapter two, these poems show a generically consistent pattern of substantive textual variation – albeit one that allows far more and far more significant variation than anything we have seen thus far. Like the Fixed Context poems, the specific types of innovation a given witness exhibits often can be linked to the demonstrable interests of the scribe responsible for first collecting, anthologising, or excerpting the text in the relevant context.

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."[475] 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

[475]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[476] – 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[477]:

T_1

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_1

1 Nu**we**herigan 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

[476]These variants are discussed above, Chapter 2, p. 66, and Chapter 3, p. 161.

[477]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,[478] 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.[479]

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

[478]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.

[479]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.[480] In others, it involves the adaptation of the text to its surrounding material or physical context.[481] 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])**

weþæs lifgende
worhton inwo|rulde eacþon wom dydon.
yldran usse inofer hygdū|
þinbibodu bræcon burg sit tende
had ofer hogedon| halgan lifes
wurdon weto wrecene geond widne grund|
heapum to[h]worfne hylda lease
wæs ure lif geond lon|da fela
fracuð ȝgefræge fold buendū
nuþu usic be|wræc**e** inþas wyrrestan
eorð cyning**es** æht gewealda
in| hæft heoro grimm**es** sceolon weþær hæþenra
þrea nyd || [strip of c. 4 ll. missing from MS]

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

weðæs lifgende.
worhton onworulde.| eac ðon wóm dyde.
user yldran. for ofer|hygdum.
bræcon bebodo. burhsittendū|
had ofer hogedon. halgan lifes.
siendonwe||| towrecene. geond widne grund.
heapum tohwor|fene. hylde lease.
is user lif . geond landafela.|
fracoð ȝgefræge. folca manegum.
baus éc| bewræc**on**. toþæs wyrrestan.
eorð cyninga.| æhta gewealde.
onhæft heoru grim**ra** ȝwe| nu hæðenra.
þeow ned þoliað.

[480]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.

[481]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 *bewræcon* (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' (*þeow 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' (*þrea 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*,[482] 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,"[483] 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."[484] 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.[485] *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.[486]

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

[482]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).

[483]Jabbour, diss., p. 51.

[484]Jabbour, diss., p. iv.

[485]Jabbour, diss., p. 12.

[486]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.[487]

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

[487]O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, pp. 35-36.

onhæbbe (for expected West-Saxon *onhebbe*) in the case of Riddle 30, line 7a,[488] and the nonsense words *dream* and *dry* (for expected *dreor*) in that of *Solomon and Saturn*, line 44a.[489] For the third, *Soul and Body* I and II, however, the evidence is more plentiful. As P. R. Orton and Douglas Moffat have argued,[490] 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[491]; an unusual example of an apparently unstressed *eft* before the alliterating syllable in line 62b (Exeter Book [**E**]) and 67b (Vercelli Book [**V**]): **E** *ȝeft sona fromðe* **V** *ȝeft sona fram þe*[492]; 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.[493]

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

---

[488]Roy Michael Liuzza, "The Texts of the OE Riddle 30," *JEGP* 87 (1984): 1-15, esp. p. 3.

[489]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."

[490]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.

[491]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.

[492]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_1**) witness to the West-Saxon *eorðan*-recension of "Cædmon's Hymn"[494] and the London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. vi (**ChronB**) versions of the *Battle of Brunanburh* and *Capture of the Five Boroughs*,[495] 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

---

[493]Moffat, "MS Transmission", pp. 300-301. As Moffat points out, **E** is later corrected to *a,ⁿcenda*.

[494]Jabbour tentatively includes the **B_1** 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_1** 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.

[495]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$_{aii}$**) 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**)[496]– there are no examples of these scribes taking any

[496]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[497] – 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.[498]

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,[499] 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

[497]See above, Chapter 3, pp. 112 ff.

[498]See above, Chapter 3, pp. 115 ff.

[499]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 loricas,[500] 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.[501]

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.[502] 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.[503] 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 loricas. The common text of *Daniel* and *Azarias* is found

[500]Raymond J. S. Grant, *Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 41: The Loricas 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.

[501]For a discussion of the "Legend of Solomon" in medieval literature, see Menner, *Solomon and Saturn*, pp. 21-70.

[502]See the discussions above, Chapter 2, pp. 32 ff., 48 ff. 53 ff., and 56 ff.

[503]See above, Chapter 2, pp. 72 ff.

as an integral part of two otherwise apparently unrelated biblical narratives.[504] 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.[505]

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 ($\mathbf{B_1}$). 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 $\mathbf{B_1}$ 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.[506]

---

[504]See below, pp. 359-362.

[505]Moffat, *Soul and Body*, pp. 41-44; Orton, "Disunity in the Vercelli Book *Soul and Body*," *Neoph* 63 (1979): 42-44.

[506]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$_1$** versions of "Cædmon's Hymn" exhibit ten significant substantive variants[507]:

M

Nu **scylun hergèn** hefaen ricaes uard
metudæs maecti end his modgidanc
uercuuldur **fadur**| sue he uundra**gihuaes**
eci dryctin **or**astelidæ
heaerist scop **aelda**barnū
heben **til** hrofe| haleg**scepen**.
thamiddungeard____moncynnæs uard
ecidryctin æfter tiadæ
firum fold**u**____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$_1$

Nu**weherigan sculon**| heofonrices weard
metodes mihte| ȝhismod geþanc
weorc wuldor **godes**| swahe wund ra **fela**
écedrihten **ord**| astealde
he ærest sceop **eorðan** bear|num
heofon **to**hrofe halig **scyp**|**pend**
þemiddan geard mann cynnes| weard
écedrihten æfter teode|
fyrum fold**an** 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[508]:

Leid

Mec seueta[..] uong uundrumfreorig
ob*his* innaðae| \aerist ce[*nd*]/|[509]
Uuat icmecbiuorth**æ** uull**an**fliusū
herū.ðerh hehcraeft hygið*on**c*[....]/|
Uundnae. menibiaðueflæ niic uar ph*a*fae__
_niðerih ðrea[.]**un**giðr*ae*.| **ðr&**me hlimmith.
Ne**m**ehrutend**o**___hrisil **scel*f*ath**____
_n*e* mec ou*an*a| **aam** **sceal** cnyssa
Uyrmas mec ni*aue*fun uyr*d***i**craeftum|
ðaði goelu *godu*eb___geatūfraetuath.|
Uil*me*chuc^{h}trae **suae**ðeh___uidæ ofaer eorðu_
_hatan **mith**| \hęliðum hyhtlicgiuæ/|[510]
Nian oegun icme aerig faerae **egsanbrogū**
ðehði ni|[...*n sip* **nȝiudlicae obcocrum**|||

E

M ec se wæta wong wundrum freorig
ofhis innaþe ær|ist cende
ne wat ic mec be worht**ne** wull**e** flysum
hæ|rum þurh heah cræft hyge þoncum min.
wundene me| ne beoð wefle neic wearp hafu
neþurh þreat**a** geþræ|cu **þræd** me**ne** hlimmeð
ne **æt** me hrutend**e** hrisil| **scriþeð**
nemec o hwonan **sceal amas** cnyssan
wyr|mas mecne á wæfan. wyrd**a** cræftum
þaþe geolo god|webb geatwum frætwað
wil**e** mec **mon** hwæþre **se**þeah| wide ofer eorþan
hatan **for**hæleþū hyht lic gewæde.|
saga soð cwidum **searo þoncum gleaw**
wordum wis||fæst **hwæt þis ge wædu sy** :7

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

[508]These variants are catalogued below, pp. 257-264.

[509]**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[511] 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†[512] 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$_1$** 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.[513]

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

---

[510]**Leid** *hęliðum hyhtlicgiuæ* is written above the line, after *geatūfraetuath*.

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

[512]The problem of agreement in **E** 8b is discussed below, p. 259.

[513]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'.[514]

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,[515] 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:

[514]See below, p. 262.

[515]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	V
2.1 [āhōf] ic riicnae kyniNc heafunæs h*l*afard hælda ic ni dorstæ. *B*ismæræ*d*u uNket men bā æt*g*ad[re] | ic [*wæs*] *mi*þ blōdæ [b]ist*ē*mi[*d*] *b*i[*got*e*n* of]	Rod wæs icaræred. ahof ic ricne cyning 45 heofona| hlaford. hyldan me nedorste. **<u>þurh drifan hime mid| deorcan næglū</u>**. **<u>on me syndon þa dolg ge siene opene inwid|hlemmas</u>**. **<u>ne dorste ic hira nænigū sceððan</u>** bysmeredon hie| unc butu ætgædere. eall ic wæs mid blode bestemed. begoten of| þæs guman sidan. siððan he hæfde his gast onsended.
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...]	I was reared up as a cross; I raised up a powerful King, Lord of the heavens. I dared not bend myself over. **<u>They pierced me with dark nails: the wounds are visible upon me, gaping malicious gashes. I did not dare harm any of them</u>**. 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.[516] 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:

[516]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*l*afard hælda ic ni dorstæ.
*B*ismæræd*u* uNket men bā ætgad[re] |
ic [*wæs*] *mi*þ blōdæ [b]ist*ē*mi[*d*]
*b*i[*g*ot*e*n of]

....

3.1 [+] krist wæs on rōdi
Hweþræ þēr fūsæ fearran kwōmu
æþþilæ til ānum ic þæt al bi*h*[eald]
S*ār*[*æ*] ic wæs mi[*þ*] so*r*g*u*m gi*dræ*[fi]d
h[*n*]a*g* [*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
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.
Feala| ic onþam beorge gebiden hæbbe
wraðra wyrda. ge seah ic weruda| god
þearle þenian þystro hæfdon
be wrigen mid wolcnum wealdendes hræw.
scirne sciman sceadu forð eode.
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
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."[517] In this version of the poem, Christ is referred to as a *geong hæleð* and described as *strang ȝstið 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 straight-forward description of him as 'almighty god':

R	**V**
1.1 [+ Ond]geredae hinae ɡod almehttig þa he walde on ɡalɡu gistiɡa [m]odig f[ore *allæ*] men [B]ūɡ[*a ic ni dorstæ*...]	Ongyrede hine **þa geong hæleð** **þæt wæs** god| ælmihtig 40 **strang ȝstið 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 icsceolde fæste| standan.
God almighty stripped himself, courageous before all men, when he wanted to climb upon the gallows; [I dared not] bow...	**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.[518] Given the limited space and different context of a standing stone cross, the differences

[517]Pope, *Seven Old English Poems*, p. 66.

[518]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.[519] 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 ȝ||| toswen$_g$de þurh swiðes meaht
liges leoman swa hyra lice ne**scod**.|
acwæs inþam ƀofne 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. ƿhyre líce ne**wæs**.
owiht| ge egled. **ácheon andan sloh**.
fyron feondas| **for fyren dǽdum**.
þawæs onþam ofne. þær| se engel becwóm.
windig ȝwynsum. wedere gelicost.
þōn hit onsumeres tíd. sended weor|ðeð.
dropena drearung. ondæges hwile.
wearm|lic wolcna scúr.

[519]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][520] 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

[520]Or, emending *ligges leoma* to *ligges leoma*n: '[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.[521] 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.[522] 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(*Rid*30*a*)** *leg bysig* **E(*Rid*30*b*)** *lig bysig*, line 1a; and **E(*Rid*30*a*)** *on hin gaþ* **E(*Rid*30*b*)** *on hnigað*, line 7b.[523] 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.[524]

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.

[521]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).

[522]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.

[523]The variation in the root syllable of *on hin gaþ / on hnigað* is discussed below, p. 252. Cf. Liuzza, who gives the **E(*Rid*30*a*)** reading in line 7b incorrectly as *on hin gað* ("Riddle 30," p. 3).

[524]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(*Rid*30*a*)**, 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(*Rid*30*b*)**, 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).[525] Indeed, the manuscript's layout at this

[525]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."[526]

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 *gemylted* in **E(*Rid*30*b*)** for **E(*Rid*30*a*)** *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(*Rid*30*b*)** is "rhetorically a decidedly more forceful poem"[527] – particularly in the second half of the riddle, where the b-text consistently shows the more compact reading: it eliminates the conjunction *ȝ* 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).

[526]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.

[527]Liuzza, "Riddle 30," p. 10.

Textual Variants

Inflectional Difference (1 example)

***Rid*30, 8a**

E(*Rid*30*a*)	**E(*Rid*30*b*)**
7 þōn ic| mec onhæbbe ȝhi on hin gaþ. tome	7 þōn| icmec onhæbbe hion hnigað tome
monige mid miltse| þæricmonnum sceal	modge miltsum| swaic mongum sceal
ycan up cyme eadig nesse :7	ycan up cyme eadignesse :7

E(*Rid*30*a*) *miltse* is a dative singular/instrumental prepositional object: 'with kindness' or 'with joy'; **E(*Rid*30*b*)** *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.[528] The addition or omission of the preposition *mid* is discussed below, p. 254.

Substitution Of Unstressed Words and Elements (2 examples)

***Rid*30, 6a**

E(Rid30a)	**E(*Rid*30*b*)**
5 ful oft mec ge siþas sendað| æfter hondum	5 ful oft mec gesiþas sendað| æfter hondū
þ mec weras ȝwif wlonce cyssað	**þær**mec weras ȝwif wlonce gecyssað
þōn ic| mec onhæbbe ȝhi on hin gaþ. tome	þōn| icmec onhæbbe hion hnigað tome
monige mid miltse| þæricmonnum sceal	modge miltsum| swaic mongum sceal
ycan up cyme eadig nesse :7	ycan up cyme eadignesse :7

The substitution **E(*Rid*30*a*)** *þ* **E(*Rid*30*b*)** *þær* affects sense and syntax. In **E(*Rid*30*a*)**, *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(*Rid*30*b*)**, *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(*Rid*30*b*)** text is "somewhat looser" than **E(*Rid*30*a*)**,[529] although it might as easily be argued that the temporal or local clause in **E(*Rid*30*b*)** is more appropriate than the

[528]Mitchell, *OES*, § 76; parallels cited by Mitchell include *Beowulf* 296 *arum* and *Beowulf* 2378 *mid are*.

[529]Liuzza, "Riddle 30," p. 7.

result clause of **E(*Rid*30*a*)**.[530] A similar substitution is found in the **ChronA**[5] version of the "Death of Edgar" line 8b (see p. 183 and footnote 410, above).

***Rid*30, 8b**

E(*Rid*30*a*)	**E(*Rid*30*b*)**
7 þōn ic| mec onhæbbe ꝛhi on hin gaþ. tome	7 þōn| icmec onhæbbe hion hnigað tome
monige mid miltse| **<u>bær</u>**icmonnum sceal	modge miltsum| **<u>swa</u>**ic mongum sceal
ycan up cyme eadig nesse :7	ycan up cyme eadignesse :7

The substitution **E(*Rid*30*a*)** *þær* **E(*Rid*30*b*)** *swa* affects sense and syntax, but not metre. In **E(*Rid*30*a*)** *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'.[531] In **E(*Rid*30*b*)**, *swa* is either a sentence adverb introducing lines 8b-9 as an independent clause ('Thus shall I increase the fount of blessedness among men'),[532] 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.'[533]

Substitution Of Stressed Words and Elements (4 examples)

***Rid*30, 3b**

E(*Rid*30*a*)	**E(*Rid*30*b*)**
1 I C eom leg bysig lace mid winde□	1 I ceom lig bysig lace mid winde
bewunden mid wuldre| wedre gesomnad	w[.....]|dre gesomnad
fus forð weges fyre **<u>gebysgad</u>**	fus forð weges fyre **<u>gemyl*ted*</u>**
bearu| blowende byrnende gled	*bear*[.]| blowende byrnende gled

The substitution **E(*Rid*30*a*)** *gebysgad* **E(*Rid*30*b*)** *gemyl*ted affects sense, but has no effect on syntax or metre. In **E(*Rid*30*a*)**, the speaker is 'troubled' by fire, in **E(*Rid*30*b*)**, 'melted'. As Liuzza notes, the "repetition of the word *gebysgad* in lines 1a and 3b" could be

[530]See also Jabbour, diss., p. 176, who suggests that "either reading is acceptable."

[531]Cf. Liuzza, "Riddle 30," p. 10, where *þær* is described as "an adverb with the generalized meaning 'then'."

[532]For this punctuation, see Liuzza, "Riddle 30," p. 10.

[533]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(*Rid*30*a*)** as a single sentence.

evidence of either a "sophisticated stylistic parallel" or dittography.[534] Of the two verbs, *gebysgad* is the more common in the Exeter Book with eight occurrences against two for *gemyl*ted.[535] In as much as it indicates that the object can be destroyed by fire, the **E(*Rid*30*b*)** reading may also reflect a desire for less ambiguity on the part of the person first responsible for the variant.

***Rid*30, 7b**

E(*Rid*30*a*)

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

E(*Rid*30*b*)

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

E(*Rid*30*a*) *on hin gaþ* is almost certainly a minim error for *onhnigaþ* (as in **E(*Rid*30*b*)**).[536] The **E(*Rid*30*a*)** form (from *hingan* 'to go hence'?) makes no sense in context as written.

***Rid*30, 8a**

E(*Rid*30*a*)

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

E(*Rid*30*b*)

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

Both **E(*Rid*30*a*)** *monige* 'multitudes' and **E(*Rid*30*b*)** *modge* 'proud (ones)' make good sense, metre, and syntax. In **E(*Rid*30*b*)**, 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'.[537] In **E(*Rid*30*a*)**, *monige* accomplishes the same thing by emphasising the breadth of the adoration: 'they bow to me, multitudes with kindnesses'. Metrically, **E(*Rid*30*a*)** is a Type A-1 line with a resolved first lift; in **E(*Rid*30*b*)**, the first lift is long by nature.

[534]Liuzza, "Riddle 30," p. 6.

[535]Liuzza, "Riddle 30," p. 10

[536]Liuzza, "Riddle 30," p. 8; Jabbour, diss., p. 176.

[537]Liuzza, "Riddle 30," p. 9.

***Rid*30, 8b**

E(*Rid*30*a*)

7 þōn ic| mec onhæbbe ꝛhi on hin gaþ. tome
monige mid miltse| þæric**monnum** sceal
ycan up cyme eadig nesse :7

E(*Rid*30*b*)

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

The substitution **E(*Rid*30*a*)** *monnum* **E(*Rid*30*b*)** *mongum* makes good sense, metre and syntax in both manuscripts. Liuzza suggests that the **E(*Rid*30*a*)** 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.[538] As *monige* is already the reading of the on-verse in this witness, however, the substitution may also be connected to the substitution **E(*Rid*30*a*)** *monige* **E(*Rid*30*b*)**, *mongum* discussed above.[539]

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

***Rid*30, 7b**

E(*Rid*30*a*)

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

E(*Rid*30*b*)

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

The addition or omission of ꝛ in line 7b has an important effect on the syntax of lines 7-8a. In **E(*Rid*30*b*)**, 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(*Rid*30*a*)**, 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 ꝛ occurs in the preliminary drop of a Type B-2 line and is metrically insignificant.

[538]Liuzza, "Riddle 30," p. 10.

[539]See also Jabbour, diss., p. 177.

***Rid*30, 8a**

E(*Rid*30*a*)

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

E(*Rid*30*b*)

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)

***Rid*30, 6b**

E(*Rid*30*a*)

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

E(*Rid*30*b*)

5 ful oft mec gesiþas sendað| æfter hondū
þærmec weras ꝯwif wlonce **ge**cyssað

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...."[540] 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)

***Rid*30, 2a**

E(*Rid*30*a*)

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

E(*Rid*30*b*)

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

Line 2 of **E(*Rid*30*b*)** is usually reconstructed *wuldre bewunden wedre gesomnad* on the basis of traces of the letters *uldr* after the surviving initial *w*.[541] Such rearrangement within the line is characteristic of the Anthologised and Excerpted texts (see above, p. 227).

[540]Liuzza, "Riddle 30," p. 8.

Regardless of the original reading, the variant almost certainly has an effect on metre: in **E(*Rid*30*a*)**, the first syllable of the on-verse is clearly anacrustic; in **E(*Rid*30*b*)**, 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**).[542] 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.[543] 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.[544] 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.[545] 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[546] or of a

---

[541]Liuzza, "Riddle 30," p. 5; Chambers *et al.*, *The Exeter Book*, p. 75.

[542]Ker, *Catalogue*, Appendix, art. 19.

[543]On the "remarkably consistent" orthography of the Exeter Scribe, see Megginson, diss., pp. 201-203.

[544]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.

[545]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," *ESts* 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).

[546]Gerritsen, "Leiden Revisited"; "Text of the Leiden Riddle"; and Dobbie, *ASPR* 6, p. cviii.

third scribe working in the tenth century.[547] The script is Carolingian in form but shows the influence of – and misunderstandings caused by – an insular exemplar.[548] 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.[549]

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

[547]Parkes, "Manuscript of the Leiden Riddle", pp. 215-217.

[548]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.[550]

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."[551] 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.[552]

Textual Variants

Inflectional Difference (8 examples)

*LeidR/Rid*35, 3a

Leid	**E(*Rid*35)**
3 Uuat icmecbiuorth**æ** uullanfliusū herū.ðerh hehcraeft hygið*on`c*[....]′|	3 ne wat ic mec be worht**ne** 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; **E*35*** *be worhtne* is masculine accusative singular strong. The two most

---

[549]See the references given above, fn. 545.

[550]Examples include Riddles 1, 2, 3, 8, 10, 12, 19 and 23.

[551]Jabbour, diss., p. 180.

[552]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."[553]

***LeidR/Rid*35, 3a**

Leid	**E(*Rid*35)**
3 Uuat icmecbiuorthæ uull**an**fliusū	3 ne wat ic mec be worhtne wull**e** flysum
herū.ðerh hehcraeft hygið*on*`*c*[....]′|	hæ|rum þurh heah cræft 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.[554]

***LeidR/Rid*35, 6a**

Leid	**E(*Rid*35)**
5 Uundnae. menibiaðueflæ niic uar ph*a*fae__	5 wundene me| ne beoð wefle neic wearp hafu
_niðerih ðrea[.]**un**giðr*ae*[.]| ðr&me hlimmith.	neþurh þreat**a** geþræ|cu þræd mene hlimmeð
Nemehrutendo___hrisil scel*f*ath____	ne æt me hrutende hrisil| scriþeð
_n*e* mec ou*an*a| aam sceal cnyssa	nemec o hwonan sceal amas cnyssan

As Dobbie notes, the **Leid** reading is hard to explain.[555] In **E*35***, *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."[556]

***LeidR/Rid*35, 6a**

Leid	**E(*Rid*35)**
5 Uundnae. menibiaðueflæ niic uar ph*a*fae__	5 wundene me| ne beoð wefle neic wearp hafu
_niðerih ðrea[.]ungiðr*ae*[.]| ðr&me hlimmith.	neþurh þreata geþræ|c**u** þræd mene hlimmeð
Nemehrutendo___hrisil scel*f*ath____	ne æt me hrutende hrisil| scriþeð
_n*e* mec ou*an*a| aam sceal cnyssa	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*."[557] If either of the usual

---

[553]Smith, *Three Northumbrian Poems*, p. 44.

[554]B.-T. *wull*.

[555]*ASPR* 6, p. 200.

[556]Smith, *Three Northumbrian Poems*, p. 36.

[557]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/Rid*35, 7a**

Leid	**E(*Rid*35)**
5 Uundnae. menibiaðueflæ niic uar ph*a*fae__	5 wundene me| ne beoð wefle neic wearp hafu
_niðerih ðrea[.]ungiðr*ae.*| ðr&me hlimmith.	neþurh þreata geþræ|cu þræd mene hlimmeð
Nemehrutend**o**___hrisil scel*f*ath____	ne æt me hrutend**e** hrisil| scriþeð
_n*e* mec ou*an*a| aam sceal cnyssa	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 **E*35***, and nominative plural in **Leid**.[558] For further discussion of the linked variants in this line, see pp. 261 and 263, below.

***LeidR/Rid*35, 8b**

Leid	**E(*Rid*35)**
5 Uundnae. menibiaðueflæ niic uar ph*a*fae__	5 wundene me| ne beoð wefle neic wearp hafu
_niðerih ðrea[.]ungiðr*ae.*| ðr&me hlimmith.	neþurh þreata geþræ|cu þræd mene hlimmeð
Nemehrutendo___hrisil scel*f*ath____	ne æt me hrutende hrisil| scriþeð
_n*e* mec ou*an*a| aam sceal cnyssa	nemec o hwonan sceal am**as** 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.

[558]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/Rid*35, 9a**

Leid	**E(*Rid*35)**
Uyrmas mec ni*aue*fun uyr*d***i**craeftum|	wyr|mas mecne á wæfan. wyrd**a** cræftum
10 ðaði goelu *godu*eb___geatūfraetuath.|	10 þaþe 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/Rid*35, 11a**

Leid	**E(*Rid*35)**
11 Uil*me*chuc^{h}trae suaeðeh___uidæ ofaer eorðu_ _hatan mith| \hęliðum hyhtlicgiuæ/|	11 wil**e** mec mon hwæþre seþeah| wide ofer eorþan hatan forhæleþū hyht lic gewæde.|

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

Assuming that *huc^{h}trae* is for *huethrae* (with *c* for *e* and ^{h}t for t^{h}), and that **huethrae*/*hwæþre* alliterates with *uidæ*/*wide*,[560] 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/Rid*35, 11a**

Leid	**E(*Rid*35)**
11 Uilme*c*huc^{h}trae **suae**ðeh____uidæ ofaer eorðu_ _hatan mith| \hęliðum hyhtlicgiuæ/|	11 wile mec mon hwæþre **se**þeah| wide ofer eorþan hatan forhæleþū 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*

[559]For examples, see Campbell, *OEG*, § 768; also Sievers-Brunner, § 428 Anm. 4.

[560]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.

þeah in *Soul and Body* **V**66a/**E** 61a).[561] The variants fall on the internal dip of a Type B-2 line and are metrically insignificant.[562]

***LeidR/Rid*35, 12a**

Leid	**E(*Rid*35)**
11 Uilm*e*chuc^{h}trae suaeðeh____uidæ ofaer eorðu_ _hatan **mith**| \hęliðum hyhtlicgiuæ/|	11 wile mec mon hwæþre seþeah| wide ofer eorþan hatan **for**hæleþū 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)

***LeidR/Rid*35, 7b**

Leid	**E(*Rid*35)**
5 Uundnae. menibiaðueflæ niic uar ph*a*fae__ _niðerih ðrea[.]ungiðr*ae*.| ðr&me hlimmith. Nemehrutendo___hrisil **scel*f*ath**____ _n*e* mec ou*an*a| aam sceal cnyssa	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

Leid *scelfath* 'shakes, reverberates' and **E** *scriþeð* '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'.[563]

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** *scriþeð* on the other hand is intransitive and singular. It is preceded by a prepositional phrase (*æt me*)

[561]See p. 318, below. *Swa þeah* 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 þean*). The spelling *seþeah* is not recorded in verse outside of the Exeter Book.

[562]See p. 260 and the references given in fn. 560 for a discussion of the alliteration in this line.

[563]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/Rid*35, 13a-14b**

Leid	**E(*Rid*35)**
13 **Nian oegun icme aerig faerae egsanbrogū**	13 **saga soð cwidum searo þoncum gleaw**
ðehði ni|[...*n siæ* n]iudlicae obcocrum|||	**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.[564]

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

***LeidR/Rid*35, 3a**

Leid	**E(*Rid*35)**
3 Uuat icmecbiuorthæ uullanfliusū	3 **ne** wat ic mec be worhtne wulle flysum
herū.ðerh hehcraeft hygið*on`c*[....]'|	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,* **E*35*** 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

[564]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*.[565]

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

***LeidR/Rid*35, 6b**

Leid	**E(*Rid*35)**
5 Uundnae. menibiaðueflæ niic uar ph*a*fae__	5 wundene me| ne beoð wefle neic wearp hafu
_niðerih ðrea[.]ungiðr*ae*.| ðr&me hlimmith.	neþurh þreata geþræ|cu þræd me**ne** hlimmeð
Nemehrutendo___hrisil scel*f*ath____	ne æt me hrutende hrisil| scriþeð
_n*e* mec ou*an*a| aam sceal cnyssa	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 **E*35*** is permissible but not necessary. The variant falls on the medial drop of a Type A-1 line and is metrically insignificant.

***LeidR/Rid*35, 7a**

Leid	**E(*Rid*35)**
5 Uundnae. menibiaðueflæ niic uar ph*a*fae__	5 wundene me| ne beoð wefle neic wearp hafu
_niðerih ðrea[.]ungiðr*ae*.| ðr&me hlimmith.	neþurh þreata geþræ|cu þræd mene hlimmeð
Nemehrutendo___hrisil scel*f*ath____	ne **æt** me hrutende hrisil| scriþeð
_n*e* mec ou*an*a| aam sceal cnyssa	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.

---

[565]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/Rid*35, 11a**

Leid	**E(*Rid*35)**
11 Uilme*e*chuc^{h}trae suaeðeh____uidæ ofaer eorðu_ _hatan mith| \hęliðum hyhtlicgiuæ/|	11 wile mec **<u>mon</u>** hwæþre seþeah| wide ofer eorþan hatan forhæleþū hyht lic gewæde.|

E *mon* falls on the preliminary dip of a Type B-2 line.[566] 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."[567]

Rearrangement Within Line (1 example)

***LeidR/Rid*35, 8b**

Leid	**E(*Rid*35)**
5 Uundnae. menibiaðueflæ niic uar ph*a*fae__ _niðerih ðrea[.]ungiðr*ae.*| ðr&me hlimmith. Nemehrutendo___hrisil scel*f*ath____ _n*e* mec ou*an*a| **<u>aam sceal</u>** cnyssa	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 **<u>sceal amas</u>** 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. **E*35*** is unmetrical.

***Solomon and Saturn* I**

Solomon and Saturn I is preserved in two manuscripts, Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 422 (**CC_{422}**), and, in fragmentary form, among the marginal texts of Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 41 (**B_1**). The main text of **B_1**, 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

[566]The alliteration in this line is discussed above, p. 260 and fn. 560.

[567]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.[568] 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**$_{422}$, *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*.[569] 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

---

[568]The best discussion of the marginal texts in **B**$_1$ is in Raymond J.S. Grant, *Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 41: The Loricas and the Missal*, Costerus: Essays in English and American Language and Literature, n.s. 17 (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1978), pp. 1-26, esp. p. 26.

[569]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$_1$** *læteð* 'sets free' (corrected to *filgið*) for **CC$_{422}$** *fylgeð* 'follow, pursue, persecute' in line 92b. As mentioned below (p. 280), the **B$_1$** 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$_1$** 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 instrusion of an unstressed syllable: *mód snot*|*terra* (see below, p. 350)

Textual Variants

Inflectional Difference (9 examples)

MSol, B_1 38b/CC_{422} 38b

B_1

Saturnus cwæð
36 Achwamæg| eaðusð eallra ge sceafta
ða haligan duru___heofna rices
torhte ontynan onge|tal**es** rime.

CC_{422}

Saturnus cwæð
36 achwa mæg eaðost ealra gesc[..]fta
ða| halgan duru heofona rices
torhte ontynan on *getæl*|rime

In **B_1**, *ge*|*tales* is a genitive singular noun used to qualify the dative prepositional object *rime*: 'in the count of numbers'. In **CC_{422}**, getæl|*rime* is a nonce compound 'number-count' (i.e. order, succession).[570] The variation has no significant effect on sense, syntax, or metre. The line is Type C-1 in both witness. In **B_1**, the first stress is resolved; in **CC_{422}** it is long by position.

MSol, B_1 45b/CC_{422} 45b

B_1

Swilceðumiht mid beorhtan gebede
blod onhætan
þæs deofles| dry þ him dropan| stigað
45 swatege|swiðed sefan| inting**an**
eges|fullicra____þane seo| ærene gripo
þōn| for twelf fýra ty|dernessum|
ofer glédagripe| gifrost weallað

CC_{422}

swylce ðu miht mid ðy be[.]rtan gebede
blod ón|*hætan*
ðæs deofles dream [..]*t* him dropan stigað
45 swate| *geswiðed* *seofan* inting**um**
e*ge*s fullicran ðōn seo ærene| *gripu*
ðōn heo for xi*i* [..]*yra* *tyde*rnessū
ofer gleda| grip*e* gi*frust* wealleð.

The variation **B_1** *intingan* **CC_{422}** *intingum* either is dialectal or reflects a difference in number. **CC_{422}** *intingum* is the expected dative plural form of the weak masculine noun *intinga* 'cause; occasion; sake.' **B_1** *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_1** *sefan*.

[570] Bessinger Smith.

Although, as Menner notes, the sense of the phrase is obscure in both witnesses, it seems unlikely that the difference in ending has a significant effect on the sense or syntax of the passage.[571] The two forms are metrically identical.

***MSol*, B_1 46a/CC_{422} 45b**

B_1

Swilceðumiht mid beorhtan gebede
blod onhætan
þæs deofles| dry þ him dropan| stigað
swatege|swiðed sefan| intingan
eges|fullicr**a**____þane seo| ærene gripo
þōn| for twelf fýra ty|dernessum|
ofer glédagripe| gifrost weallað

CC_{422}

swylce ðu miht mid ðy be[.]rtan gebede
blod ón|*hætan*
ðæs deofles *dream* [..]*t* him dropan stigað
swate| *geswiðed* *seofan* intingum
e*ge*s fullicr**an** ðōn seo ærene| *gripu*
ðōn heo for xi*i* [..]*yra* *tyde*rnessū
ofer gleda| gripe gi*frust* wealleð.

CC_{422} *ege*s *fullicran* is the nominative plural comparative form of the adjective *egesfullic*. It agrees with *dropan*, line 44b: 'drops rise up... more terrible than the brazen kettle'; **B_1** *eges*|*fullicra* is an example of the Northumbrian loss of *-n* from the nominative plural comparative,[572] a nominative singular comparative, or a genitive plural weak adjective. A nominative plural comparative is required by context.

***MSol*, B_1 52a/CC_{422} 52a**

B_1

forðan hafað| se cantic ofer| ealle cristes| bec
wid mærost| word hegewritu| læreð
stefnū| stereð ꝯhī stede| healdeð
heofon|rices heregea|towe wegeð|

CC_{422}

for ðon hafað se cantic ófer| *ealle cristes* bec
wid mærost word hege writū læreð|
stefnū steoreð ꝯh[..] *stede* healdeð
heofon**a** rices| *here*geatewa *wigeð*.

B_1 *heofon*|*rices* is the genitive singular of *heofonrīce* 'heaven-kingdom', a well-attested compound.[573] **CC_{422}** *heofona rices* 'of the kingdom of the heavens' is made up of the corresponding simplices. The variation has no significant effect on sense, but a great effect on metre. In **CC_{422}**, line 52a is a Type A-1 verse with a resolved first stress. The equivalent line

[571]Menner, *Solomon and Saturn*, pp. 109-110. See also *ASPR* 6, pp. 161-2. Menner translates the phrase as "possibly... 'because of the heart' or even 'by pressure on the heart'," p. 109; Dobbie translates: "in the affairs of his mind," p. 162.

[572]On the loss of final *-n* in Northumbrian, see Campbell, *OEG*, § 472; for a brief discussion of Anglian forms in the two witnesses, see Menner, *Solomon and Saturn*, p. 4.

[573]Bessinger-Smith record 56 occurrences.

in **B$_1$** is metrically deficient. As O'Keeffe notes, **B$_1$** *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."[574] As the **B$_1$** 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.[575]

***MSol*, B$_1$ 75b/CC$_{422}$ 74b**

B$_1$		**CC$_{422}$**	
75	he is mo|digra middan|geard**es**.	74	H*e* [.]s modigra middangear|d**e**
	staðole| he is strengra| þone ealle stána| gripe.		staðole strengra ðō̄n ealra stana gripe

Both readings make good sense, syntax, and metre.[576] In **CC$_{422}$** *middangear|de* is dative singular expressing place where: 'he is more powerful on earth';[577] in **B$_1$** *middan|geardes* is genitive singular, again expressing place where.[578] The two forms are metrically identical.

***MSol*, B$_1$ 76b/CC$_{422}$ 75b**

B$_1$		**CC$_{422}$**	
75	he is mo|digra middan|geardes.	74	H*e* [.]s modigra middangear|de
	staðole| he is strengra| þone eall**e** stána| gripe.		staðole strengra ðō̄n eal**ra** stana gripe

In **CC$_{422}$**, *ealra* is a genitive plural strong adjective agreeing with *stana*: 'than the grip of all stones'. In **B$_1$**, *ealle* is presumably to be understood as an adverb qualifying *strengra*:

[574]O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 62.

[575]Cf. **B$_1$** *heofna* (**CC$_{422}$** *heofona*), l. 37, **B$_1$** *heofnas* (**CC$_{422}$** *heofonas*), l. 40; **B$_1$** *heofnum* (**CC$_{422}$** *hefenum*), l. 60.

[576]See also, O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 62.

[577]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*** *unmære*. Mitchell notes that the dative alone for place where is rare, adding that "a preposition + the dative is usual even in the early texts."

[578]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'.[579] Metrically, the two forms are identical.

***MSol*, B_1 81b/CC_{422} 80b**

	B_1	CC_{422}
	Lamana| he is læce leoht| winci,[e]ndra	*lame*|na he islæce leoht wince[...]ra
	swil|ce he hisdeafra| duru deadra| tunge.	swilce he isdeafra| duru dumbra tunge
	scild ig|ra[580] scild scip|pendes seld	scyldigra scyld scyppendes| seld
80	flodes| feriend folces ne|riend	flodes ferigend folces nerigend
	yþayrfe| weard earm**a** fixa|	80 yða yrfe|weard earm**ra** fisca
	wyrma wlenco wil|deora holt	ꝛwyrma [.]*elm* wildeora holt|
	westenes| weard weorð myn|ta geard	ón westenne weard weorð myn[.]a geard

CC_{422} *earmra* is a strong genitive plural adjective modifying *fisca* 'of wretched fish'. B_1 *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_1 83a/CC_{422} 82b**

	B_1	CC_{422}
	Lamana| he is læce leoht| winci,[e]ndra	*lame*|na he islæce leoht wince[...]ra
	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| feriend folces ne|riend	flodes ferigend folces nerigend
	yþayrfe| weard earma fixa|	80 yða yrfe|weard earmra fisca
	wyrma wlenco wil|deora holt	ꝛwyrma [.]*elm* wildeora holt|
	westen**es**| weard weorð myn|ta geard	ón westen**ne** weard weorð myn[.]a geard

The inflectional variation B_1 *westenes* CC_{422} *westenne* is linked to addition or omission of the preceding preposition *on* (see below, p. 283). In B_1, *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_{422}, *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.

[579] Menner construes the B_1 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.

[580] B_1 *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$_{422}$** line 83a is Type B-2; in **B$_1$**, the equivalent verse is a Type E with a short syllable in the half-lift.[581]

***MSol*, B$_1$ 88b/CC$_{422}$ 87b**

B$_1$	**CC$_{422}$**
ȝseðe| wile georn̄lice þono godes cwide|	ȝseðe *wile*| georn̄lice ðone godes cwide
singan smealice| ȝhine symle lui|an	singan soðlice ȝhine| siemle wile
wile butan| leahtrū hemæg| þone laþan gesið|	lufian butan leahtrum he mæg ðone| laðan gæst
feohterne feond| fleonde gebringan|	feohtende feond fleonde gebrengan|
Gyf þu him ærest| ufan yorn gebri|ng**eð**.	gif ðu hī ærest ón ufan ierne gebreng**est**
ꝑlogo prim.| þam is .p. nama.|	pro|loga prima ðamis P P. nama

B$_1$ *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).[582] **CC$_{422}$** *gebrengest* is second person singular present indicative, as expected. The two endings are metrically identical.

Substitution Of Unstressed Words and Elements[583] (1 example)

***MSol*, B$_1$ 78a/CC$_{422}$ 77b**

B$_1$	**CC$_{422}$**
Lamana| he is læce leoht| winci,ᵉndra	*lame*|na he islæce leoht wince[...]ra
swil|ce he **his**deafra| duru deadra| tunge.	swilce he **is**deafra| duru dumbra tunge
scild ig|ra scild scip|pendes seld	scyldigra scyld scyppendes| seld
flodes| feriend folces ne|riend___	flodes ferigend folces nerigend
_yþayrfe| weard earma fixa|	yða yrfe|weard earmra fisca
wyrma wlenco wil|deora holt	ȝwyrma [.]*elm* wildeora holt|
westenes| weard weorð myn|ta geard	ón westenne weard weorð myn[.]a geard

The **B$_1$** form *his* is presumably to be explained as an example of the sporadic insertion of unetymological *h* before vowels.[584] The pronoun *his* makes no sense in context.

[581]For parallel examples, see Pope, *Seven Old English Poems*, p. 116; and O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 62, fn. 48.

[582]Sievers-Brunner, § 356 Anm. 2.

[583]*þane/þone* occurs twice in **B$_1$** for **CC$_{422}$** *þonne* (lines 46 and 76).

[584]Sievers-Brunner, § 217 Anm. 1.

Substitution Of Prefixes (2 examples)

***MSol*, B_1 59a/CC_{422} 59a**

B_1	**CC_{422}**
57b mec þæs| on worulde| full oft fyrwet frineð fús gewiteð mod **geond** mengeð	57b [.]ec ðæs on worolde full oft fyrwit fr*ineð* *fus gewiteð*| mod **ge** mengeð.

The substitution **B_1** *geond-* **CC_{422}** *ge-* in line 59a has no effect on syntax or metre,[585] and probably little effect on sense. As a nonce word, the sense of **B_1** *geond mengeð* can only be derived from its component parts. It is usually translated as 'confuses', though 'mixes up' is an equally appropriate calque.[586] **CC_{422}** *ge mengeð* '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_1 73a/CC_{422} 72a**

B_1	**CC_{422}**
73 Hu^{n}gor he**ge** he**ge**[587] hideð helle gestrudeð| wylm to worpeð| wuldor getym|breð.	72 hungor hé **a**hieðeð helle gestrudeð wylm toweor|peð wuldor getimbreð

B_1 *ge hideð* and **CC_{422}** *ahieðeð* are metrically and syntactically identical. Assuming **B_1** *-hideð* 'hides' is a graphic mistake for *-hiðeð* 'plunders' (see below, p. 277), the substitution has no significant effect on sense. The corrected dittography in **B_1** (see footnote 587) suggests that the exemplar to this witness may have read *he gehideð*.

[585]For the stress of *geond-* see Campbell, *OEG*, § 74.

[586]See B.-T. *geond-mengan*, 'to mingle, confuse'; Clark-Hall, *geondmengan*, 'to confuse, bewilder'.

[587]**B_1** *hege hege* with first *hege* underlined for deletion.

Substitution Of Stressed Words and Elements (18 examples)

***MSol*, B_1 32a/CC_{422} 32a**

B_1	CC_{422}
30 Þō̄n him bið leafre ðō̄n eall þeos leohte gesceaft|	30 [....]‖ leofre ðō̄n eall ðeos leohte gesceaft
gegoten fram ðamgrunde goldesȝsilofres	geg[.]ten frā̄ ðam| grunde goldes ȝseolfres
feðer s cette full fyrn gestreo|na	feðer sceatū̄ full feoh gestreona|
gif he æfre þæs organes ówiht cuðe.	gif he æfre ðæs órganes ówiht cuðe.

B_1 *feðer s cette* is a nominative singular feminine adjective agreeing with *gesceaft*, line 30b: 'all this bright creation, four cornered, full of ancient treasures.'[588] **CC_{422}** *feðer sceatū* is a masculine dative plural noun 'four quarters': 'all this bright creation in its four quarters full of treasures.'[589]

***MSol*, B_1 32b/CC_{422} 32b**

B_1	CC_{422}
30 Þō̄n him bið leafre ðō̄n eall þeos leohte gesceaft|	30 [....]‖ leofre ðō̄n eall ðeos leohte gesceaft
gegoten fram ðamgrunde goldesȝsilofres	geg[.]ten frā̄ ðam| grunde goldes ȝseolfres
feðer s cette full **fyrn** gestreo|na	feðer sceatū̄ full **feoh** gestreona|
gif he æfre þæs organes ówiht cuðe.	gif he æfre ðæs órganes ówiht cuðe.

The variants **B_1** *fyrn gestreo|na* 'ancient treasure' **CC_{422}***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_1** 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."[590]

[588]See B.-T. *feðer-scette*.

[589]See B.-T. *feðer-sceátas.*

[590]O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 65.

***MSol*, $\mathbf{B_1}$ 35a/$\mathbf{CC_{422}}$ 35a**

$\mathbf{B_1}$

Fracoð he bið þanne ꝛfremde||| frean ælmihtigum
englū **<u>unge sibb</u>** ána hwarfað.

$\mathbf{CC_{422}}$

fracoð he biððōn ꝛ| fremede frean ælmihtigū
englum **<u>ungelic</u>** ána hwearfað|

As O'Keeffe notes, **$\mathbf{B_1}$** *unge sibb* 'not related' and **$\mathbf{CC_{422}}$** *ungelic* 'unlike, different' are "semantically, metrically and syntactically acceptable" and attested elsewhere in Old English.[591]

***MSol*, $\mathbf{B_1}$ 41b/$\mathbf{CC_{422}}$ 41b**

$\mathbf{B_1}$

SALON̄ cwæð
þ̄ ge pa,ˡm twigude pater n̄r̄.
heofnas ontyneð ha|lie geblissað
metod gemiltsað morðor **<u>gefilleð</u>**
adwæsceð deofles fyr___dryħ|nes onæleð.

$\mathbf{CC_{422}}$

Salomon cwæð
ðæt ge palm twigede *paī noster*|
heofonas ontyneð halige geblissað
metod gemiltsað| morðor **<u>gesylleð</u>**
adwæsceð deofles fyr dryhtnes ón|æleð

$\mathbf{B_1}$ *gefilleð* 'strikes' **$\mathbf{CC_{422}}$** *gesylleð* 'gives, sells, betrays' are metrically, semantically, and syntactically appropriate without being synonyms. In **$\mathbf{B_1}$**, the *Pater noster* is said to 'strike down' murder; in **$\mathbf{CC_{422}}$**, it 'betrays' it.[592] Given the graphic similarity of *ſ* (i.e. *f*) and ſ (i.e. *s*) in insular script, it is likely that the substitution has its origins in a visual error.[593]

[591]O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 64.

[592]B.-T(S). *sellan* V (c).

[593]O'Keeffe lists this among her examples of the visual errors separating the two texts, *Visible Song*, p. 61, fn. 45.

***MSol*, B_1 44a/CC_{422} 44b**

B_1

Swilceðumiht mid beorhtan gebede
blod onhætan
þæs deofles| **dry** þ him dropan| stigað
swategе|swiðed sefan| intingan
eges fullicra___þane seo| ærene gripo
þōn| for twelf fýra ty|dernessum|
ofer glédagripe| gifrost weallað

CC_{422}

swylce ðu miht mid ðy be[.]rtan gebede
blod ón|*hætan*
ðæs deofles **dream** [..]*t* him dropan stigað
swate| *geswiðed* *seofan* intingum
e*ge*s fullicran ðōn seo ærene| *gripu*
ðōn heo for xi*i* [..]*yra tyde*rnessū
ofer gleda| grip*e* gi*frust* wealleð.

The substitution B_1 *dry* 'magician, sorcerer' CC_{422} *dream* 'joy, gladness' has a great effect on sense, although, as O'Keeffe and others have noted, neither version of the poem is particularly intelligible at this point.[594] It has no metrical or syntactic effect.

***MSol*, B_1 53a/CC_{422} 53a**

B_1

Saturnus cwæð|
ac hulic is se| **organan** inge|myndum
tobe| gangen ne þā| þe his gæst| wile
miltan| wið morðre| merian of sor|ge
Asceaden of| scyldū

CC_{422}

Saturnus cwæð
ac hulic ísse| **organ** *inge*myndū
tobe gonganne ðam ðe his gast| *wile*
melt*an* wið morðre mergan of*sorge*
asceadan| *of* scyldigū

As Menner suggests, the B_1 reading is "probably an error, perhaps the result of the scribe's acquaintance with *organa*, pl. *organan*, in the sense of 'organ'."[595] As the use of the nominative singular masculine form of the demonstrative article *se* presupposes a nominative masculine singular noun, the B_1 reading (which cannot be nominative singular) is syntactically problematic. The substitution also affects metre. In CC_{422}, line 53a is Type A-3; as written, B_1 is presumably to be scanned as a Type C-2.

Given the B_1 scribe's demonstrable problems with dittography elsewhere in his text (e.g. *hege hege hideð*, line 73a), it is possible that *organan* is a graphic mistake for *organ*.

[594]O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 64. See also Menner, *Solomon and Saturn*, pp. 3 and 109, and *ASPR* 6, p. 162.

[595]Menner, *Solomon and Saturn*, p. 110.

***MSol*, $\mathbf{B_1}$ 56a/$\mathbf{CC_{422}}$ 56a**

$\mathbf{B_1}$	$\mathbf{CC_{422}}$
Saturnus cwæð|	Saturnus cwæð
ac hulic is se| organan inge|myndum	ac hulic ísse| organ *inge*myndū
tobe| gangen ne þā| þe his gæst| wile	tobe gonganne ðam ðe his gast| *wile*
55 miltan| wið morðre| merian of sor|ge	55 melt*an* wið morðre mergan of*sorge*
Asceaden of| **scyldū**	*asceadan*| *of* **scyldigū**

$\mathbf{B_1}$ *scyldū* is the dative plural of the feminine or masculine noun *scyld* 'offence'; **$\mathbf{CC_{422}}$** *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 **$\mathbf{B_1}$** corresponds "to the other abstract nouns *morðre, sorge* (55)" in the surrounding lines,[596] while the adjective in **$\mathbf{CC_{422}}$** breaks the parallelism. Metrically, line 56a is Type A-1 with anacrusis in **$\mathbf{B_1}$**; Type D*2 (or A-1)[597] with anacrusis in **$\mathbf{CC_{422}}$**.

Suggesting that the **$\mathbf{CC_{422}}$** reading "can be argued to be a mechanical error," O'Keeffe excludes this variant from her count of "'formulaic' lexical variants".[598]

***MSol*, $\mathbf{B_1}$ 57a/$\mathbf{CC_{422}}$ 57a**

$\mathbf{B_1}$	$\mathbf{CC_{422}}$
56b huru hī| scep pend geaf|	56b huru him scippend geaf
wundor licne| wlite	**wuld*or licne*** *wlite*

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

[596]Menner, *Solomon and Saturn*, p. 110.

[597]Campbell reports the syncopation of *-ig-* after long syllables to be "the rule in Old English metre (often against the manuscript spelling)," *OEG*, § 358.

[598]O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 63.

***MSol*, B_1 60b/CC_{422} 60b**

B_1	CC_{422}
nænig monna| wat	*næ*[...] manna wat
60 hæleðaunder heofnum huminhige **dreogeð**	60 hæl*eða*|| under hefenum hu min hige **dreoseð**
bisiæfter bocum hwylū| me bryne stigeð	bysig æfter bocū| hwilum me bryne stigeð
hige heortan hearde wealleð.	hige heortan neah hædre wealleð.|

B_1 *dreogeð* **CC_{422}** *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_{422}**, Saturn reports that his spirit 'became weak' (*drēosan*, 'become weak, fail') in his studies; in **B_1**, 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_1 62b/CC_{422} 62b**

B_1	CC_{422}
nænig monna| wat	*næ*[...] manna wat
60 hæleðaunder heofnum huminhige dreogeð	60 hæl*eða*|| under hefenum hu min hige dreoseð
bisiæfter bocum hwylū| me bryne stigeð	bysig æfter bocū| hwilum me bryne stigeð
hige heortan **hearde** wealleð.	hige heortan neah **hædre** wealleð.|

B_1 *hearde* **CC_{422}** *hædre* are metrically and syntactically identical. Both readings make good, but different, sense in context: **B_1** 'welled furiously'; **CC_{422}** 'welled brightly'.[599]

***MSol*, B_1 73a/CC_{422} 72b**

B_1	CC_{422}
73 Hu^{n}gor hege he**ge hideð** helle gestrudeð|	72 hungor hé **ahieðeð** helle gestrudeð
wylm to worpeð| wuldor getym|breð.	wylm toweor|peð wuldor getimbreð

As written, **B_1** *ge hideð* 'hides' seems semantically inappropriate, though metrically and syntactically acceptable. As O'Keeffe, suggests, however, the form is most likely for *gehiðeð* (cf. **CC_{422}** *ahieðeð*), 'plunders, ravages'.[600] See also above, p. 272.

[599]The adverb in **CC_{422}** is usually taken (with a changing selection of examples from other poems) as evidence for the existence of a poetic adverb *hǣdre* 'oppressively' (cf. B.-T., CH, *hædre*; Menner, *Solomon and Saturn*, Glossary, p. 154). *Hǣdre*, 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.

[600]O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 64.

***MSol*, B_1 78b/CC_{422} 77b**

B_1

Lamana| he is læce leoht| winci,[e]ndra
swil|ce he hisdeafra| duru **deadra**| tunge.
scild ig|ra scild scip|pendes seld
flodes| feriend folces ne|riend_____
_yþayrfe| weard earma fixa|
wyrma wlenco wil|deora holt
westenes| weard weorð myn|ta geard

CC_{422}

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

Both readings make good sense and metre, although **CC_{422}** *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*."[601]

***MSol*, B_1 82a/CC_{422} 81a**

B_1

Lamana| he is læce leoht| winci,[e]ndra
swil|ce he hisdeafra| duru deadra| tunge.
scild ig|ra scild scip|pendes seld
flodes| feriend folces ne|riend____
_yþayrfe| weard earma fixa|
wyrma **wlenco** wil|deora holt
westenes| weard weorð myn|ta geard

CC_{422}

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

Both **B_1** *wlenco* 'pride, glory' and **CC_{422}** [.]*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."[602] The substitution is linked metrically to the addition or omission of ꝛ at the beginning of the line. In **B_1** (without ꝛ), the verse is Type A-1; in **CC_{422}** (with ꝛ), it is Type B-1. See also below, p. 282.

[601]Sisam, "Authority," p. 34.

[602]O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 64.

***MSol*, B_1 85a/CC_{422} 84a**

B_1

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

CC_{422}

ꝯseðe *wile*| geornlice ðone godes cwide
singan **soðlice** ꝯhine| siemle wile
85 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_1** *smealice* 'closely, thoroughly, accurately' is perhaps to be preferred to **CC_{422}** *soðlice* 'truly' as a description of the preferred manner of singing the *Pater noster*, "but... is otherwise unattested in verse."[603]

***MSol*, B_1 86b/CC_{422} 85b**

B_1

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

CC_{422}

ꝯseðe *wile*| geornlice ðone godes cwide
singan soðlice ꝯhine| siemle wile
85 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_1**, the *feond* is described as a hateful *gesið* 'companion', in **CC_{422}**, as a hateful *gæst* 'spirit'. Metrically, the half-line is Type B-2 in **B_1** and B-1 in **CC_{422}**. O'Keeffe cites parallels to the **CC_{422}** reading in *Soul and Body* II 110b and *Guðlac* 361b; she finds parallels to the **B_1** reading in *Daniel* 661b and *Juliana* 242.[604]

[603]O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 64.

[604]O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 64.

***MSol*, B_1 88b/CC_{422} 87b**

B_1	CC_{422}
ꝯseðe| wile geornlice þono godes cwide|	ꝯseðe *wile*| geornlice ðone godes cwide
85 singan smealice| ꝯhine symle lui|an	singan soðlice ꝯhine| siemle wile
wile butan| leahtrū hemæg| þone laþan gesið|	85 lufian butan leahtrum he mæg ðone| laðan gæst
feohterne feond| fleonde gebringan|	feohtende feond fleonde gebrengan|
Gyf þu him ærest| ufan **yorn** gebri|ngeð.	gif ðu hī ærest ón ufan **ierne** gebrengest
ꝑlogo prim.| þam is .p. nama.|	pro|loga prima ðamis Ꝑ P. nama

The B_1 reading is in error. For the confusion of *e* and *o* in the B_1 scribe's work, cf. B_1 *þono* CC_{422} *ðone*, line 84b/83b.

***MSol*, B_1 90a/CC_{422} 89a**

B_1	CC_{422}
90 hafað guð **maga** gyrde lange	hafað guð|**mæcga** gierde lange
gyldene gade ꝯþone grymman feond	90 gyldene gade ꝯa ðone g[...]man|| feond
swið|mod swapeð ꝯon swaðe ļæţęþ \filgið/	swið mod sweopað ꝯhim on swaðe fylgeð
A. ofer mægene ꝯhine eac ofslehð. T.|||	.A. á ofer|mægene ꝯhine eac óf slihð. Ꝯ 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_1 92b/CC_{422} 91b**

B_1	CC_{422}
90 hafað guð maga gyrde lange	hafað guð|mæcga gierde lange
gyldene gade ꝯþone grymman feond	90 gyldene gade ꝯa ðone g[...]man|| feond
swið|mod swapeð ꝯon swaðe **læţęþ \filgið/**	swið mod sweopað ꝯhim on swaðe **fylgeð**
A. ofer mægene ꝯhine eac ofslehð. T.|||	.A. á ofer|mægene ꝯhine eac óf slihð. Ꝯ t .

As mentioned above (p. 266), the uncorrected B_1 reading *læteð* 'set free' means exactly the opposite of CC_{422} *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_1 scribe's anticipation of his exemplar (as he immediately corrects his substitution, we know that his exemplar, like CC_{422}, 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_1 scribe *was* interested in the accurate reproduction of his text. The fact two examples of the omission of metrically,

syntactically and semantically necessary from the final lift of Type B and E verses also occur in **B_1** suggests further that the **B_1** version of the poem – as its marginal context in a collection of charms would suggest – is being copied to a standard of accuracy similar to that followed by the scribes of the translating and occasional texts discussed in Chapter Two. See also p. 266, above.

Addition/Omission Of Unstressed Words and Elements (8 examples)

***MSol*, B_1 43a/CC_{422} 43a**

B_1

Swilceðumiht mid beorhtan gebede
blod onhætan
þæs deofles| dry þ him dropan| stigað
45 swatege|swiðed sefan| intingan
eges fullicra____þane seo| ærene gripo
þōn| for twelf fýra ty|dernessum|
ofer glédagripe| gifrost weallað

CC_{422}

swylce ðu miht mid **<u>ðy</u>** be[.]rtan gebede
blod ón|*hætan*
ðæs deofles dream [..]*t* him dropan stigað
45 swate| *geswiðed* *seofan* intingum
e*ge*s fullicran ðōn seo ærene| *gripu*
ðōn heo for xi*i* [..]*yra* *tyde*rnessū
ofer gleda| gripe gi*frust* wealleð.

The addition or omission of *ðy* has no significant effect on sense, metre, or syntax. Metrically, the demonstrative pronoun falls in the preliminary drop of a Type B-2 line. While the use of a weak form of the adjective *beorhtan* in both witnesses would lead us to expect the demonstrative pronoun in a prose text, weak forms of the adjective appear without the demonstrative in verse.[605]

***MSol*, B_1 47a/CC_{422} 47a**

B_1

Swilceðumiht mid beorhtan gebede
blod onhætan
þæs deofles| dry þ him dropan| stigað
45 swatege|swiðed sefan| intingan
eges|fullicra____þane seo| ærene gripo
þōn| for twelf fýra ty|dernessum|
ofer glédagripe| gifrost weallað

CC_{422}

swylce ðu miht mid ðy be[.]rtan gebede
blod ón|*hætan*
ðæs deofles dream [..]*t* him dropan stigað
45 swate| *geswiðed* *seofan* intingum
e*ge*s fullicran ðōn seo ærene| *gripu*
ðōn **<u>heo</u>** for xi*i* [..]*yra* *tyde*rnessū
ofer gleda| gripe gi*frust* wealleð.

The addition or omission of *heo* has no significant effect on sense, metre, or syntax. In **CC_{422}**, *heo* is the subject of *wealleð* (line 48b), and refers back to the feminine noun *gripu*

[605]Mitchell, *OES*, § 3964.

('kettle, cauldron') in line 46b. In **B_1**, 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 *gripo*, line 46b). Both are acceptable Old English.[606]

***MSol*, B_1 76a/CC_{422} 75a**

B_1	**CC_{422}**
75 he is mo|digra middan|geardes.	74 H*e* [.]s modigra middangear|de
staðole| **he is** strengra| þone ealle stána| gripe.	staðole strengra ðn̄ 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_1**, this subject and verb are repeated before the predicate adjective *strengra*; in **CC_{422}**, they are not. Both readings are acceptable Old English syntax.[607] O'Keeffe's suggestion that the **B_1** 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"[608] rests on the assumption that *staðole* belongs to the same clause as **B_1** 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_1 82a/CC_{422} 81a**

B_1	**CC_{422}**
Lamana| he is læce leoht| winci,[e] ndra	*lame*|na he islæce leoht wince[...]ra
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| feriend folces ne|riend	flodes ferigend folces nerigend
yþayrfe| weard earma fixa|	80 yða yrfe|weard earmra fisca
wyrma wlenco wil|deora holt	⁊wyrma [.]*elm* wildeora holt|
westenes| weard weorð myn|ta geard	ón westenne weard weorð myn[.]a geard

The addition or omission of ⁊ in **B_1** 82a/**CC_{422}** 81a has an important effect on metre, but little significant effect on sense or syntax. In both manuscripts, the line forms part of a

[606]See Mitchell, *OES*, §§ 1512-1516.

[607]Mitchell, *OES*, §§ 1512-1516.

long list of epithets for the *Pater noster*. In **B_1**, the epithet is joined asyndetically to the preceding text; in **CC_{422}**, it is linked syndetically. Both versions are acceptable Old English syntax.

Metrically, the addition or omission of ⁊ is linked to the substitution of stressed words **B_1** *wlenco* **CC_{422}** [.]*elm* later in the same half-line (see above, p. 278). In **B_1** (with *wlenco* and without ⁊), line 82a is Type A-1; in **CC_{422}** (with [.]*elm* and ⁊), the same line is Type B-1.

***MSol*, B_1 83a/CC_{422} 82a**

B_1

Lamana| he is læce leoht| winci,[e] ndra
swil|ce he hisdeafra| duru deadra| tunge.
scild ig|ra scild scip|pendes seld
80 flodes| feriend folces ne|riend_____
_yþayrfe| weard earma fixa|
wyrma wlenco wil|deora holt
westenes| weard weorð myn|ta geard

CC_{422}

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
ꝯwyrma [.]*elm* wildeora holt|
<u>ón</u> westenne weard weorð myn[.]a geard

The addition or omission of *on* in **B_1** 83a/**CC_{422}** 82a has an important effect on the local syntax of the clause, but is of little metrical or semantic significance. In **CC_{422}**, *ón* introduces a prepositional adverbial phrase: '[he is] guardian in the wasteland'; in **B_1**, 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_{422}** the line is Type B-2; in **B_1** is it Type E.

[608]O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 62. *Staðole* is included in the clause of line 76a in the punctuation of Dobbie's and Menner's editions.

***MSol*, $\mathbf{B_1}$ 88a/$\mathbf{CC_{422}}$ 87a**

$\mathbf{B_1}$	$\mathbf{CC_{422}}$
ꝯseðe| wile geornlice þono godes cwide|	ꝯseðe *wile*| geornlice ðone godes cwide
85 singan smealice| ꝯhine symle lui|an	singan soðlice ꝯhine| siemle wile
wile butan| leahtrū hemæg| þone laþan gesið|	85 lufian butan leahtrum he mæg ðone| laðan gæst
feohterne feond| fleonde gebringan|	feohtende feond fleonde gebrengan|
Gyf þu him ærest| ufan yorn gebri|ngeð.	gif ðu hī ærest **<u>ón</u>** ufan ierne gebrengest
ꝑlogo prim.| þam is .p. nama.|	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 $\mathbf{B_1}$ 83a/$\mathbf{CC_{422}}$ 82a, p. 283.

***MSol*, $\mathbf{B_1}$ 91b/$\mathbf{CC_{422}}$ 90b**

$\mathbf{B_1}$	$\mathbf{CC_{422}}$
90 hafað guð maga gyrde lange	hafað guð|mæcga gierde lange
gyldene gade ꝯþone grymman feond	90 gyldene gade ꝯ**<u>a</u>** ðone g[...]man‖ feond
swið|mod swapeð ꝯon swaðe ļæţęð \filgið/	swið mod sweopað ꝯhim on swaðe fylgeð
A. ofer mægene ꝯhine eac ofslehð. T.‖‖	.A. á ofer|mægene ꝯhine eac óf slihð. T t .

The addition or omission of *a* 'ever' to $\mathbf{B_1}$ 91b/$\mathbf{CC_{422}}$ 90b has no significant effect on sense, metre, or syntax. The variant falls on the preliminary dip of a Type B-1 line.

***MSol*, $\mathbf{B_1}$ 92b/$\mathbf{CC_{422}}$ 91b**

$\mathbf{B_1}$	$\mathbf{CC_{422}}$
90 hafað guð maga gyrde lange	hafað guð|mæcga gierde lange
gyldene gade ꝯþone grymman feond	90 gyldene gade ꝯa ðone g[...]man‖ feond
swið|mod swapeð ꝯon swaðe ļæţęð \filgið/	swið mod sweopað ꝯ**<u>him</u>** on swaðe fylgeð
A. ofer mægene ꝯhine eac ofslehð. T.‖‖	.A. á ofer|mægene ꝯhine 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 $\mathbf{B_1}$ 92b/$\mathbf{CC_{422}}$ 91b (**$\mathbf{CC_{422}}$** *fylgeð*, $\mathbf{B_1}$ *læteð* corrected to *filgið*) is the same as that of the preceding clause (i.e. *þone grymman feond*, $\mathbf{B_1}$ 91b/$\mathbf{CC_{422}}$ 90b). In $\mathbf{B_1}$, the object of the first clause is not repeated in the second (the

normal pattern in Old English); in **CC$_{422}$**, it is replaced by the dative third person singular pronoun. Both are acceptable syntax.[609]

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

***MSol*, B$_1$ 62a/CC$_{422}$ 62a**

B$_1$	**CC$_{422}$**
nænig monna| wat	*næ*[...] manna wat
60 hæleðaunder heofnum huminhige dreogeð	60 hæl*eða*|| under hefenum hu min hige dreoseð
bisiæfter bocum hwylū| me bryne stigeð	bysig æfter bocū| hwilum me bryne stigeð
hige heortan hearde wealleð.	hige heortan **<u>neah</u>** hædre wealleð.|

The addition or omission of *neah* has an important effect on sense, metre, and syntax. In **CC$_{422}$**, *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$_1$**, *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$_1$** 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$_1$** ∅ **CC$_{422}$** *leaf*, line 64a (p. 286), the discussion of **B$_1$** *læteð* **CC$_{422}$** *fylgeð*, p. 280, and pp. 46, 70, 80 and 266.

[609]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$_1$** 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_1 64a/CC_{422} 64a**

B_1	CC_{422}
SALOÑ. c̄.	Salomon cwæð
63 gylden isse‖ godes cwide gym mum astæned.	63 gylden isse godes cwide gimmū [...]æned|
hafað seolofren	hafað sylfren **leaf**

CC_{422} *leaf* seems necessary for sense, metre and syntax. In **CC_{422}**, line 64a is Type B-1; **B_1** is unmetrical. See also **B_1** ∅**CC_{422}** *neah*, line 62a (p. 285), the discussion of **B_1** *læteð* **CC_{422}** *fylgeð*, p. 280.

Addition/Omission Of Metrical Units (1 example)

***MSol*, B_1 67**

B_1	CC_{422}
66 hebið sefan snytero �facwle hunig	66 he bið seofan snytro �facule hunig|
�facwodes meolc mærþa gesæl|gost.	

Lines 66 and (in **B_1**) 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_1 85b-86a/CC_{422} 84b-85a**

B_1	CC_{422}
�facwe| wile geornlice þono godes cwide|	�facwe *wile*| geornlice ðone godes cwide
85 singan smealice| ꝥhine symle **lui|an**	singan soðlice ꝥhine| siemle **wile**
wile butan| leahtrū hemæg| þone laþan gesið|	85 **lufian** butan leahtrum he mæg ðone| laðan gæst
feohterne feond| fleonde gebringan|	feohtende feond fleonde gebrengan|
Gyf þu him ærest| ufan yorn gebri|ngeð.	gif ðu hī ærest ón ufan ierne gebrengest
ꝑlogo prim.| þam is .p. nama.|	pro|loga prima ðamis P P. nama

The rearrangement affects the metre of the two lines. In **CC_{422}**, line 84b is Type B-1 with resolution of the second lift; line 85a is Type A-1. In **B_1**, *lui*|*an* (for *lufian*) adds a third (unmetrical) dip at the end of line 85b; line 86a is Type A-3.[610] In addition to the metrical problems in **B_1**, the double alliteration in **CC_{422}** line 85a suggests that it preserves the original reading.

[610]See also O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, pp. 62-63. Menner's arrangement of **B_1** lines 85b-86a with the line division between *symle* and *lui*|*an* does not solve the problem: *ꝥhine siemle* has only one lift.

Reinterpretation (1 example)

***MSol*, B_1 65b/CC_{422} 65b**

	B_1	**CC_{422}**
	SALOÑ. c̄.	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 **<u>god spellian</u>**	65 ðurh gastes‖ gife **<u>god spel secgan</u>**

B_1 *god spellian* is a compound verb 'evangelise'. **CC_{422}** *god spel secgan* consists of an accusative object and infinitive 'preach the gospel'. While O'Keeffe describes the **B_1** reading as being "the weaker version and only marginally acceptable,"[611] both readings appear to make good sense and metre. Metrically, **B_1** is Type D-2 and **CC_{422}** 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,[612] R.I. Page and Paul

[611]O'Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 62.

[612]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.pl.: 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.[613]

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.[614] 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

---

[613]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.

[614]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.[615]

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.[616]

[615]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.

[616]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.[617]

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.[618] 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).

---

[617] Ó Carragáin, "Vercelli Collector," p. 82.

[618] 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[619]

2.1 [āhōf] ic riicnae kyniNc
heafun**æs** h*l*afard hælda ic ni dorstæ.
*B*ismæræ*d*u uNket men bā æt*g*ad[re] |
ic [*wæs*] *mi*þ blōdæ [b]ist*ē*mi[*d*]
*b*i[*g*ote*n* of]

V(*Dream*)

Rod wæs icaræred. ahof icricne cyning
45 heofon**a**| 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.

[619]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*l*afard hælda **ic** ni dorstæ.
*B*ismæræ*d*u uNket men bā æt*g*ad[re] |
ic [*wæs*] *mi*þ blōdæ [b]ist*ē*mi[*d*]
*b*i[*g*ote*n* 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.

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 *hælda* 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, *hyldan* 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*l*afard hælda ic ni dorstæ.
*B*ismæræ*d*u uNket **men** bā æt*g*ad[re] |
ic [*wæs*] *mi*þ blōdæ [b]ist*ē*mi[*d*]
*b*i[*g*ote*n* 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.

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

events of the Crucifixion, and is in keeping with the nature of the **V** text as a dream-vision in which the Cross tells the dreamer of his historical experiences at Christ's Crucifixion. The use of *men* in **R**, on the other hand, eliminates the historical distance by emphasising the fact that the tormentors – like the reader of the inscription – were 'men'.[620] This is in keeping with the fragment's position on a monument to the Crucifixion, the purpose of which – among other things – is to remind Christians that Christ was killed by and for all mankind, and not simply the inhabitants of Classical Judea.

A further example of such historical distancing in the **V** text of the poem is found in line 63a, see below, p. 294.

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

R	**V(*Dream*)**
2.1 [āhōf] ic riicnae kyniNc	Rod wæs icaræred. ahof ic ricne cyning
heafunæs h*l*afard hælda ic ni dorstæ.	45 heofona| hlaford. hyldan me nedorste.
*B*ismæræ*d*u **<u>uNket</u>** men bā æt*g*ad[re] |	þurh drifan hime mid| deorcan næglū.
ic [*wæs*] *mi*þ blōdæ [b]ist*ē*mi[*d*]	on me syndon þa dolg ge siene
*b*i[*g*ot*e*n of]	opene inwid|hlemmas.
	ne dorste ic hira nænigū sceððan
	bysmeredon hie| **<u>unc</u>** butu ætgædere.
	eall ic wæs mid blode bestemed.
	begoten of| þæs guman sidan.
	siððan he hæfde his gast onsended.

V *unc* and **R** *uNket* are both forms of the first person dual personal pronoun (**R** *uNket*, is a form more commonly associated with late prose).[621] As both pronouns fall in the preliminary drop of a hypermetric Type-D line, the substitution has no effect on metre.

[620]*man* is used as an indefinite in the nominative singular only. See Mitchell, *OES*, § 363.

[621]Campbell, *OEG*, § 703; Swanton, *Dream of the Rood*, p. 117.

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

R	**V(*Dream*)**
4.1 *m*iþ s*tr*ē*l*um giwundad	62b eall ic wæs mid strælum for wundod.
ālegdun hiæ ***hinæ*** limwœ̄rignæ	Aledon hie| **ðær** lim werigne
gistōddu*n h*im [.....] *l*icæs [*h*ea]f[*du*]m	ge stodon him æt his lices heafdū
[*bi*]*h*ea[l]*d*u[*n*] *h*i[æ] þē[*r*.....]	be heoldon hie| ðær heofenes dryhten
	ꝛhe hine ðær hwile reste

The substitution of **V** *ðær* **R** h*inæ* has a significant effect on sense and syntax. In **R**, the accusative pronoun *hinæ* anticipates the immediately following noun *limwœ̄rignæ*: '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	**V(*Dream*)**
4.1 *m*iþ s*tr*ē*l*um **gi**wundad	62b eall ic wæs mid strælum **for** wundod.
ālegdun hiæ *h*inæ limœ̄rignæ	Aledon hie| ðær lim werigne
gistōddu*n h*im [.....] *l*icæs [*h*ea]f[*du*]m	ge stodon him æt his lices heafdū
[*bi*]*h*ea[l]*d*u[*n*] *h*i[æ] þē[*r*.....]	be heoldon hie| ðær heofenes dryhten
	ꝛhe 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*l*afard hælda ic ni dorstæ.
*B*ismæræ*d*u uNket men **bā** æt*g*ad[re] |
ic [*wæs*] *mi*þ blōdæ [b]ist*ē*mi[*d*]
*b*i[*g*ote*n* 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*l*afard hælda ic ni dorstæ.
*B*ismæræ*d*u uNket men bā æt*g*ad[re] |
ic [*wæs*] *mi*þ blōdæ [b]ist*ē*mi[*d*]
*b*i[*g*ote*n* 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	**V(*Dream*)**
2.1 [āhōf] ic riicnae kyniNc	Rod wæs icaræred. ahof ic ricne cyning
heafunæs h*l*afard hælda ic ni dorstæ.	45 heofona| hlaford. hyldan me nedorste.
*B*ismæræ*d*u uNket men bā æt*g*ad[re] |	**<u>þurh drifan hime mid| deorcan næglū</u>**.
ic [*wæs*] *mi*þ blōdæ [b]ist*ē*mi[*d*]	**<u>on me syndon þa dolg ge siene</u>**
*b*i[*g*ot*e*n of]	**<u>opene inwid|hlemmas</u>**.
	<u>ne dorste ic hira nænigū sceððan</u>
	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 h*l*afard hælda ic ni dorstæ.
*B*ismæræ*d*u uNket men bā ætg*a*d[re] |
ic [*wæs*] *mi*þ blōdæ [b]ist*ē*mi[*d*]
*b*i[*g*ote*n* of]

....

3.1 [+] krist wæs on rōdi
Hweþræ þēr fūsæ fearran kwōmu
æþþilæ til ānum ic þæt al bi*h*[eald]
S*ār*[*æ*] ic w*æ*s mi[*þ*] sor*g*u*m* gi*d*r*æ*[fi]d
h[*n*]a*g* [*ic*....]

V(*Dream*)

Rod wæs icaræred. ahof ic ricne cyning
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.
Feala| ic onþam beorge gebiden hæbbe
wraðra wyrda. ge seah ic weruda| god
þearle þenian þystro hæfdon
be wrigen mid wolcnum wealdendes hræw.
scirne sciman sceadu forð eode.
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
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[622] 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.

[622]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	**V(*Dream*)**
1.1 **[+ Ond]geredae hinae ᵹod almehttig**	**Ongyrede hine þa geong hæleð**
þā hē walde on ᵹalgu gistīᵹa	**þæt wæs god| ælmihtig**
[m]odig f[ore *allæ*] men	40 **strang ⁊stið mod**.
[B]ūᵹ[*a ic ni dorstæ*...]	**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 icsceolde 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 ⁊stið mod*, and combines the remaining text from the lines into a single hypermetric long line alliterating on *ᵹ*.[623]

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."[624] 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.

[623]Swanton prints **R** 1.1a and b as separate half-lines, and suggests that the equivalent of **V** line 40 (*þa he walde on ᵹalgu gistiᵹa*) 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).

[624]Pope, *Seven Old English Poems*, p. 66.

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

R	**V(*Dream*)**
1.1 [+ Ond]geredae hinae ɡod almehttig	Ongyrede hine þa geong hæleð
þā hē walde on ɡalɡu gistīɡa	þæt wæs god| ælmihtig
[m]o*d*ig f[ore *allæ*] men	40 strang ȝstið mod. ge stah he ongealgan heanne|
[B]ūɡ[*a ic ni dorstæ...*]	**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 icsceolde 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 *ūɡ* 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*]o*d*i*g f*[*ore* allæ] *men* [*B*]*ū*ɡ[a ic ni dorstæ...], does not alliterate, and, if correct, may represent an "unmetrical abridgement" as Pope suggests.[625]

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

R	**V(*Dream*)**
3.1 [+] krist wæs on rōdi	crist was onrode
Hweþræ þēr fūsæ fearran kwōmu	hwæðere þær fuse feorran cwoman
æþþilæ til ānum ic þæt al bi*h*[eald]	**to| þam æðelinge** icþæt eall be heold.
S*ār*[*æ*] ic wæs mi[*þ*] sor*ɡ*u*m* ge*dræ*[fi]d	Sare ic wæs mid gedrefed|
h[*n*]a*ɡ* [*ic*....]	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" *æþelu/æþeling*.[626] In **R,** *æþþilæ* (nominative plural of *æþele*, '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*)[627] 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...'

[625]Pope, *Seven Old English Poems*, p. 66.

[626]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.[628] 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*.[629]

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

---

[627]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

[628]Moffat, *Soul and Body*, pp. 41-44. See also Orton, "Disunity," *passim*.

[629]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).[630]

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.[631] These include: the non-alliterating form *acen*(*ne*)*da* in line **V** 51a/**E** 48a (p. 321, below)[632]; 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.[633] As Orton suggests of the corrupt formula in **V** 17a/**E** 17a,

---

[630]Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 78.

[631]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.

[632]The **E** form is subsequently corrected to *a*^{n}*cenda*.

[633]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.[634]

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 ꝛsawl**e**

E(*Soul* II)

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

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.[635] As *lic* and *sibbe* have the same form in the nominative and accusative, either reading is grammatically possible. If *sawl* is nominative, *lic ꝛsawl* 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).

---

[634]Orton, "A Further Examination," p. 178.

[635]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 licnes

E(*Soul* II)

17 hwæt drug**u**þu dreorga to hwon dreahtest| þu me
eorþan fylnes ealfor weornast
lames gelicnes|

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.[636] 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[637]; 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'.[638] 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 wær**e** þritig þusend wintra
toþinum deað dæge|

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

[636]The opinion of Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 67; Orton, "A Further Examination," p. 178, and Sisam, "Authority," p. 34.

[637]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.

[638]*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 hogod**est** her on life
syððan icðe on| worulde wunian sceolde
þæt ðu wære þurh flæsc| ȝþurh fyren lustas
strange ge stryned. 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 hogod**e** her onlife
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
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
strang**e** ge stryned. 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
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
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...'[639] 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| ꝯþurh fyren lustas
strange ge stryned. ꝯgestaðolod| þurh me.
ꝯIc wæs gast onðe fram gode sended
næfre| ðu me mid swa heard**ū** helle wit**um**
nege neredest| þurh þinra meda lust.

E(*Soul* II)

þærþu þō̆n hogode her onlife
þenden icþe inworul|de wunian sceolde
þæt þuwære þurh flæsc ꝯþurh fi|ren lustas
strong gestyred ꝯgestaþelad þurh mec.|
ꝯicwæs gæst onþe from gode sended
næfre þumec| swa heard**ra** helle wit**a**
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.[640] 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.

[639]Orton, "A Further Examination," p. 189; Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 72.

[640]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 sybb**an**. þonn,ᵉse| swearta hrefen
syððan ic ana ofðe utsiðode
þurh| þæs sylfes hand þe ic ær onsended wæs.

E(*Soul* II)

ne eart þu nuþon leofre nængū| lifgendra
menn toge mæccan nemedder nefæder
nenæn|gum gesibb**ra** 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'[641] **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 nán
ne þinre bryde beag. ne þin| gold wela.
ne nanþara goda þeðu iu ahtest.
Ac her| sceolon on bidan ban be reafod
be sliten synum. ꝛþe| þin sawl sceal
ꝛ minum unwillu oft gesecan
wemman| þe mid wordū swa ðu worhtest to me.

E(*Soul* II)

Nemag**on** þe nu heonan adon hyrste þa readan
negold|ne sylfor neþinra goda nán
ac her sculon abidan ban| bireafod
besliten seonwum ꝛþe 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*][642] *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'.[643] The use of the instrumental *þy* for expected *þa*, however, suggests instead that the **V** scribe could not

[641]On the substantive use of the weak adjective declension, see Mitchell, *OES*, §§ 133-4.

[642]*-e* for *-a* is common in unstressed syllables, see Campbell, *OEG*, § 379.

[643]Mitchell, *OES*, § 1524.

follow his exemplar at this point (see the following variant).[644] 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.
ne nanþara goda þeðu iu ahtest.
Ac her| sceolon on bidan ban be reafod
be sliten synum. ꝛþe| þin sawl sceal
ꝛ minum unwillu oft gesecan
wemman| þe mid wordū swa ðu worhtest to me.

E(*Soul* II)

Nemagon þe nu heonan adon hyrste **þa** readan
negold|ne sylfor neþinra goda nán
ac her sculon abidan ban| bireafod
besliten seonwum ꝛþe þin sawl sceal
minū ún|willan oft gesecan
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").[645] 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.
ne nanþara goda þeðu iu ahtest.
Ac her| sceolon on bidan ban be reafod
be sliten synum. ꝛþe| þin sawl sceal
ꝛ minum unwill**u** oft gesecan
wemman| þe mid wordū swa ðu worhtest to me.

E(*Soul* II)

Nemagon þe nu heonan adon hyrste þa readan
negold|ne sylfor neþinra goda nán
ac her sculon abidan ban| bireafod
besliten seonwum ꝛþe þin sawl sceal
minū ún|willan oft gesecan
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.

[644]Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 74.

[645]See Mitchell, *OES*, § 1524 and p. 306, above.

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

V(*Soul* I)

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

E(*Soul* II)

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

V *awihte* 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 *awihte*, **V** 74b is hypermetric Type D*1[646]; 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 frȳðe| fugel oðde fisc onsæ
oðde on eorðan neat ætes tilode|
feld gangende feoh butan snyttro
oðde onwestenne| wild deora
þæt wyrreste þær swa god wolde.
ge þeah| ðu wære wyrm cynna
þ grimmeste þær swa god wolde :7|
Þonne ðu æfre onmoldan mange wurde.
oðde 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 þuwurde| ætfrum sceafte fugel oþþe fisc onsæ.
oðde eorþan neat ætes tiolode
feld gongende feoh butan snyttro
ge on| westenne wild**ra** deora
þgrimmeste þærswa god wolde|
ge þeah þu wære wyrm cynna þæt wyrreste
þōn þu æfre|| onmoldan monge wurde
oþþe æfre fulwihte onfon sceo|lde

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.

[646]Moffat cites *ungedēfenlīce* (*Beowulf*, l. 2345b) as a possible parallel to *ne synt þīne æhta āwihte* (*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 *āwihte* see Campbell, *OEG*, § 393.

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

V(*Soul* I)

þonne ðu for unc **bæm**| and wyrdan scealt
onðam miclan dæge þonne mannū| beoð
wunda on wrigene þaðe onworulde ær
fyren ful|le men fyrnge worhton.
Ðōn wyle dryhten sylf dæda|ge hyran
hæleða gehwylces heofena scippend
æt ealra| manna gehwæs muðes reorde
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 ǽr.
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.[647] See also below, p. 310.

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

V(*Soul* I)

þonne ðu for unc bæm| and wyrdan scealt
onðam miclan dæge þonne mannū| beoð
wunda on wrigene þaðe onworulde ær
fyren ful|le men fyrnge worhton.
Ðōn wyle dryhten sylf dæda|ge hyran
hæleða gehwylces heofena scippend
æt ealra| manna gehwæ**s** muðes reorde
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 ǽr.
firen fulle menn fyrn geworhton.
ðōn wile| dryhten sylf dæda gehyran
æt ealra monna gehwa**m**| 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.

[647] Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 78.

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

V(*Soul* I)

þonne| nebið nan natoþæs lytel lið
onlime aweaxen.
þðu ne| scyle for anra ge hwylc**um** on sundrū
rihtagildan. ||| þōn reðe bið
dryhten æt þam dome

E(*Soul* II)

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).[648]

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 natoþæs lytel lið
onlime aweaxen.
þðu ne| scyle for anra ge hwylcum on sundr**ū**
rihtagildan. ||| þōn reðe bið
dryhten æt þam dome

E(*Soul* II)

þōn nebið nænig topæs lytel lið|
onlime geweaxen
þæt þune scyle for æghwylc anra on|sundr**an**
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."[649] The two endings are metrically identical.

[648]Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 78.

[649]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
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
wordum wrixlian wið þone werian gast.|

E(*Soul* II)

biþ þæt hea|fod tohliden honda tohleoþode
geaflas toginene goman| toslitene
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
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
sina beoð| ásocene swyra be cowen
fingras tohrorene
rib reaf|iað reðe wyrmas
beoð hira tung**an** totogenne ontyn| healfa
hungregū tofrofre
forþan hie ne magon| huxlicum
wordum wrixlian wið þone werian gast.|

E(*Soul* II)

biþ þæt hea|fod tohliden honda tohleoþode
geaflas toginene goman| toslitene
seonwe beoð asogene sweora bicowen
rib reafi|að reþe wyrmas
drincað hloþum hrá heolfres þurst|ge.
bið seo tung**e** totogen on tyn healfe
hungrum to| hroþor
forþon heone mæg horsclice
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)	**E(*Soul* II)**
bið þæt heafod tohliden handa to| liðode	biþ þæt hea|fod tohliden honda tohleoþode
geaglas toginene góman toslitene	geaflas toginene goman| toslitene
110 sina beoð| ásocene swyra be cowen	105 seonwe beoð asogene sweora bicowen
fingras tohrorene	rib reafi|að reþe wyrmas
rib reaf|iað reðe wyrmas	drincað hloþum hrá heolfres þurst|ge.
beoð hira tungan <u>totogen**ne**</u> ontyn| healfa	bið seo tunge <u>totogen</u> on tyn healfe
hungregū tofrofre	hungrum to| hroþor
forþan hie ne magon| huxlicum	forþon heone mæg horsclice
115 wordum wrixlian wið þone werian gast.|	110 wordū wrixlan| wið þone wergan gæst.

V *totogenne* is an inflected nominative plural feminine form of the preterite participal; **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
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
wordum wrixlian wið þone werian gast.|

E(*Soul* II)

biþ þæt hea|fod tohliden honda tohleoþode
geaflas toginene goman| toslitene
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 **heo**ne mæg horsclice
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
sina beoð| ásocene swyra be cowen
fingras tohrorene
rib reaf|iað reðe wyrmas
beoð hira tungan totogenne ontyn| healfa
hungregū tofrofre
forþan hie ne mag**on**| huxlicum
wordum wrixlian wið þone werian gast.|

E(*Soul* II)

biþ þæt hea|fod tohliden honda tohleoþode
geaflas toginene goman| toslitene
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
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 �facba **teð** þurh smyhð.
�facba eagan| þurh eteð ufan onþ heafod.
�facto ætwelan oðrum gerymeð.|
wyrmum 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. ꝑba **toþas** þurh smyhð
ꝑto| ætwelan oþrum gerymeð
ꝑba eaxan þurh| iteð ufon onþ| heafod
wyrmum 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** *toþas* is by analogy with the masculine *a*-declension.[650] 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 wyrm**a** gifel
on| eorþan þæt mæg æghwylcum
mento ge mynde modsnotra| gehwam :7|

E(*Soul* II)

bið þōn wyrm**es** giefl
æt| oneorþan þæt mæg æghwylcum
men toge myndū mód 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*.[651] **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
on| eorþan þæt mæg æghwylcum
mento ge mynd**e** modsnotra| gehwam :7|

E(*Soul* II)

bið þōn wyrmes giefl
æt| oneorþan þæt mæg æghwylcum
men toge myndū mód 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.

[650]Campbell, *OEG*, § 623.

[651]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
symble **<u>ymbe</u>** 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
sȳ|le **<u>ymb</u>** 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
<u>ne</u>meahte icðe||| of cuman
flæsce befangen ȝmefyren lustas
þine ge|þrungon

E(*Soul* II)

ic þe Ininnan **<u>no</u>**icþe of meahte
flæsce bifongen| ȝmefiren lustas
þinegeþrungon

V *ne* and **E** *no* are both negative adverbs. The substitution has no significant effect on sense, metre, or syntax.[652]

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

V(*Soul* I)

<u>á</u> ic uncres ge|dales onbád
earfoðlice nis nu huru se ende to góð.|

E(*Soul* II)

<u>hwæt</u> ic uncres 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.

[652]See Mitchell, *OES*, § 1128.

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

V(*Soul* I)	**E(*Soul* II)**
Forðan þu ne hogodest her on life	**þær**þu þōn hogode her onlife
syððan icðe on| worulde wunian sceolde	40 þenden icþe inworul|de wunian sceolde
þæt ðu wære þurh flæsc| ȝþurh fyren lustas	þæt þuwære þurh flæsc ȝþurh fi|ren lustas
45 strange ge stryned. ȝgestaðolod| þurh me.	strong gestyred ȝgestaþelad þurh mec.|
ȝIc wæs gast onðe fram gode sended	ȝicwæs gæst onþe from gode sended
næfre| ðu me mid swa heardū helle witum	næfre þumec| swa heardra helle wita
nege neredest| þurh þinra meda lust.	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 (*ȝofþyrsted wæs* / *godes lichoman gastes drynces*)[653]:

> ...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[654]:

> 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[655]:

---

[653]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
strange ge stryned. 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
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
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
strange ge stryned. 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
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
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.[656] The scribe of **E** frequently prefers accusative pronouns in *-ec*, although these

---

[654]See Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 70 (who does not accept this interpretation) and *ASPR* 3, pp. 55-6.

[655]This interpretation is preferred by Moffat, *Soul and Body*, pp. 70-71.

[656]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| ȝþurh fyren lustas
strange ge stryned. 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
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 þu**mec**| swa heardra helle wita
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)

eart ðu nu dumb|| ȝdeaf
ne**synt** þine dreamas awiht

E(*Soul* II)

eart þu dumb ȝdeaf
ne**sindan** þine dreamas| wiht.

V *synt* and **E** *sindon* 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**, *sindan* falls in the prliminary drop of a Type B-1 line; in **V**, *synt* is one of a metrically suspicious four anacrustic 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 ȝeft sona| fram þe
hweorfan onhancred þonne halige men
lifi|endum gode lof sang doð
secan þahamas þe ðu me| her scrife.
ȝþa arleasan eardung stowe.
ȝþe sculon| her mold wyrmas manige ceowan
slitan sarlice swear|te wihta
gifre ȝgrædige

E(*Soul* II)

sceal icþe nihtes **se**þeah nyde gesecan
synnum ge|sargad ȝeft sona fromðe
hweorfan onhoncred. þōnn| halege menn
gode lifgendum lof song doð
secan þa ha|mas þeþume ærscrife
ȝþa arleasan eardung stowe
ȝþe sculon mold wyrmas monige ceowan.
seonowum besli|tan swearte wihte
gifre ȝgrædge

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.|
þe ðu her on moldan mannū eowdest.

E(*Soul* II)

ne**sindon** þine geah|þe wiht
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 frȳðe| fugel oððe fisc onsæ
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
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 þuwurde| ætfrum sceafte fugel oþþe fisc onsæ.
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
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
dryhten æt þam dome

E(*Soul* II)

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
sina beoð| ásocene swyra be cowen
fingras tohrorene
rib reaf|iað reðe wyrmas
beoð **<u>hira</u>** tungan totogenne ontyn| healfa
hungregū tofrofre
forþan hie ne magon| huxlicum
wordum wrixlian wið þone werian gast.|

E(*Soul* II)

biþ þæt hea|fod tohliden honda tohleoþode
geaflas toginene goman| toslitene
seonwe beoð asogene sweora bicowen
rib reafi|að reþe wyrmas
drincað hloþum hrá heolfres þurst|ge.
bið **<u>seo</u>** tunge totogen on tyn healfe
hungrum to| hroþor
forþon heone mæg horsclice
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)

gifer hatte se wyrm **<u>þe</u>** þa eaglas beoð
nædle scearp|ran.

E(*Soul* II)

Gifer hatte sewyrm **<u>þam</u>**þa geaf|las||| beoð
nædle scearpran

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
onðam myclan dæge þonne eall| manna cynn
se **acenneda** ealle gesamnað.

E(*Soul* II)

scealt þunu hwæþre minra gescenta sco|me þrowian
onþam miclan dæge þōn monna cynn
se||| **a,ⁿcenda** ealle gegædrað.

The substitution **V** *acenneda* and **E**$^{\textbf{corr}}$ *a,ⁿcenda*[657] affects sense and metre. As Moffat and Orton point out, the common reading of **V** and **E**$^{\textbf{uncorr}}$ is unmetrical and semantically less appropriate than that of **E**$^{\textbf{corr}}$: 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'.[658]

***Soul* I/II, V 61a/E 56a**

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.
ne nanþara goda þeðu iu ahtest.
Ac her| sceolon **on** bidan ban be reafod
be sliten synum. ꝛþe| þin sawl sceal
ꝛ minum unwillu oft gesecan
wemman| þe mid wordū swa ðu worhtest to me.

E(*Soul* II)

Nemagon þe nu heonan adon hyrste þa readan
negold|ne sylfor neþinra goda nán
ac her sculon **a**bidan ban| bireafod
besliten seonwum ꝛþe 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.

[657] **E**$^{\textbf{corr}}$ means "the **E** reading after correction"; **E**$^{\textbf{uncorr}}$ means "the **E** reading before correction." For a discussion of the sigla used in this dissertation, see Appendix 2.

[658] Orton, "A Further Examination," p. 188. Moffat regards the common use of *acen*(*ne*)*da* in **V** and **E**$^{\textbf{uncorr}}$ 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 natoþæs lytel lið
onlime **a**weaxen.
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 **ge**weaxen
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 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 **æg**hwylc 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.[659] 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 ȝsawle

E(*Soul* II)

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

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

[659]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 eal**<u>for wisnad</u>**
lames ge licnes

E(*Soul* II)

17 hwæt druguþu dreorga to hwon dreahtest| þu me
eorþan fylnes eal**<u>for weornast</u>**
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.'[660]

***Soul* I/II, V 19b/E 19b**

V(*Soul* I)

lyt ðu **<u>ge mundest</u>**|
20 tohwan þinre sawle þing siðþan wurde
syððan oflic| homan læded wære :

E(*Soul* II)

lyt þu**<u>ge þohtes</u>**
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.

[660]See Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 67.

***Soul* I/II, V 20a/E 20a**

V(*Soul* I)

lyt ðu ge mundest|
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
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.
ȝþege bohte blode þy halgan.
ȝ| þu me mid þy heardan hungre gebunde
ȝge hæft nedest| helle witum.

E(*Soul* II)

lyt þuge þohtes
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
ȝþeþurh engel ufan ofroderum
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 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 *wyrmum to wiste*, i.e. to the situation of the body in the grave.”[661] 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.

[661]Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 68.

***Soul* I/II, V 22a/E 22a**

V(*Soul* I)

hwæt wite ðuðu me **<u>weriga</u>**
hwæt| ðu huru wyrma gyfl
lyt ge þohtest þa ðu lust gryrum| eallū
ful geodest huðu on eorðan scealt
wyrmum to| wiste.

E(*Soul* II)

22 hwæt wite þume| **<u>werga</u>**.
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**).[662] 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
strange **ge stryned**. 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 inworul|de wunian sceolde
þæt þuwære þurh flæsc ȝþurh fi|ren lustas
strong **<u>gestyred</u>** 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 *strīenan* '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').[663]

[662]Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 80.

[663]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| ꝛþurh fyren lustas
strange ge stryned. ꝛgestaðolod| þurh me.
ꝛIc wæs gast onðe fram gode sended
næfre| ðu me mid swa heardū helle witum
ne**ge neredest**| þurh þinra meda lust.

E(*Soul* II)

þærþu þōn hogode her onlife
þenden icþe inworul|de wunian sceolde
þæt þuwære þurh flæsc ꝛþurh fi|ren lustas
strong gestyred ꝛgestaþelad þurh mec.|
ꝛicwæs gæst onþe from gode sended
næfre þumec| swa heardra helle wita
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.[664] More recently, Orton and Moffat have suggested emending *gearwode* to *genearwode* (from *genearwian* ‘to force in, cramp, confine’).[665] As *genearwode* does not govern the genitive, this second option requires a further emendation in the preceding line. See also above, p. 305.

[664]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.

[665]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| ⁊þurh fyren lustas
strange ge stryned. ⁊gestaðolod| þurh me.
⁊Ic 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
þenden icþe inworul|de wunian sceolde
þæt þuwære þurh flæsc ⁊þurh fi|ren lustas
strong gestyred ⁊gestaþelad þurh mec.|
⁊icwæs gæst onþe from gode sended
næfre þumec| swa heardra helle wita
ne gearwode þurh þinra **neo|da** 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
onðam myclan dæge þonne eall| manna cynn
se acenneda ealle gesamnað.

E(*Soul* II)

scealt þunu hwæþre minra **gescenta**
sco|me þrowian
onþam miclan dæge þōn monna cynn
se||| a,ⁿcenda 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’.”[666] It also destroys the alliteration.[667]

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*

[666]Moffat, *Soul and Body*, pp. 72-3.

[667]Moffat, *Soul and Body*, pp. 72-3.

twitelgode gescentðe his "where it glosses the Latin *Confusio*."[668] 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
onðam myclan dæge þonne eall| manna cynn
se acenneda ealle **<u>gesamnað</u>**.

E(*Soul* II)

scealt þunu hwæþre minra gescenta
sco|me þrowian
onþam miclan dæge þōn monna cynn
se||| a,ⁿcenda ealle **<u>gegædrað</u>**.

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 ȝeft sona| fram þe
hweorfan onhancred þonne halige men
lifi|endum gode lof sang doð
secan þahamas þe ðu me| **<u>her</u>** scrife.
ȝþa arleasan eardung stowe.
ȝþe sculon| her mold wyrmas manige ceowan
slitan sarlice swear|te wihta
gifre ȝgrædige

E(*Soul* II)

sceal icþe nihtes seþeah nyde gesecan
synnum ge|sargad ȝeft sona fromðe
hweorfan onhoncred. þōnn| halege menn
gode lifgendum lof song doð
secan þa ha|mas þeþume **<u>ær</u>**scrife
ȝþa arleasan eardung stowe
ȝþe sculon mold wyrmas monige ceowan.
seonowum besli|tan swearte wihte
gifre ȝgrædge

V *her* is an adverb of place modifying *scrife* (from *scrīfan* '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.[669]

[668]Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 72 (Old English cited from Moffat).

[669]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 **<u>æhta</u>** awihte.|
þe ðu her on moldan mannū eowdest.

E(*Soul* II)

nesindon þine **<u>geah|þe</u>** wiht
þaþu her onmoldan monnum eawdest.

The substitution **V** *æhta* 'possessions' **E** *geah|þe* 'care, anxiety'[670] 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 ȝgrædige*. 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 **<u>frȳðe</u>**| fugel oððe fisc onsæ
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
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 þuwurde| æt**<u>frum sceafte</u>** fugel oþþe fisc onsæ.
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
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.[671] 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.[672]

[670]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 *geahð* 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.

[671]On the convoluted syntax of this passage, see Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 75 and Mitchell, *OES*, § 3415.

[672]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
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
wordum wrixlian wið þone werian gast.|

E(*Soul* II)

biþ þæt hea|fod tohliden honda tohleoþode
geaflas toginene goman| toslitene
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
wordū wrixlan| wið þone wergan gæst.

The two words are synonymous and metrically identical. Moffat notes that *geagl* appears else where only in prose.[673] 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
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
wordum wrixlian wið þone werian gast.|

E(*Soul* II)

biþ þæt hea|fod tohliden honda tohleoþode
geaflas toginene goman| toslitene
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
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."[674] 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.

[673]Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 17.

[674]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
sina beoð| ásocene swyra be cowen
fingras tohrorene
rib reaf|iað reðe wyrmas
beoð hira tungan totogenne ontyn| healfa
hungregū to**<u>frofre</u>**
forþan hie ne magon| huxlicum
wordum wrixlian wið þone werian gast.|

E(*Soul* II)

biþ þæt hea|fod tohliden honda tohleoþode
geaflas toginene goman| toslitene
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| **<u>hroþor</u>**
forþon heone mæg horsclice
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."[675] 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
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| **<u>huxlicum</u>**
wordum wrixlian wið þone werian gast.|

E(*Soul* II)

biþ þæt hea|fod tohliden honda tohleoþode
geaflas toginene goman| toslitene
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 **<u>horsclice</u>**
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*

[675]Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 79.

> 'squalid' and the latter was then exchanged for *huxlice* because of their similar meanings.[676]

When considered in light of the thoroughgoing change in number throughout lines **V** 113-115/**E** 108-110, however, the substitution seems less accidental. As mentioned above (p. 313), the subject of *mæg* in **E** 109b is *heo*, referring either to the body whose tongue is being shredded or the tongue of the body itself. In this version, the adverb *horsclice* qualifies the manner in which the body cannot exchange words with the soul: 'the tongue is torn into ten pieces as a solace for the hungry ones; therefore it cannot briskly trade words with the damned spirit'. This returns to a point made in both manuscripts immediately before the litany of punishments begins in line **V** 108/**E** 103, where the narrator describes how the body after death will be forced to listen to the soul without being able to answer back:

V(*Soul* I)	**E(*Soul* II)**
liget dust þær hit| wæs.	ligeð dust þærhit wæs|
nemæg him ȝsware ænige ge hatan	nemæg him ȝsware ænige secgan
geomrum gaste| geoce oððe frofre.	neþær edringe ænge| ge hatan
	gæste geomrum geoce oþþe frofre
The dust will remain where it was. Nor can he answer it [i.e. the soul], offer any help or consolation to the grieving ghost.	The dust will remain where it was. Nor can it give any answer to it [i.e. the soul], nor offer any shelter there, help, or consolation to the grieving ghost.

In **V**, however, the subject of the *magon* is *hie*, referring in this case to the worms (see above, p. 311). Here, *huxlicum* 'shameful, ignominious' is a dative plural adjective used adverbially[677] or with *wordum* to describe how the worms would speak were their tongues not torn: 'their [i.e. the worm's] tongues are torn into ten pieces, as a pleasure for the hungry ones: therefore they [i.e. the worms] cannot shamefully trade words [or: trade shameful words] with the weary soul.'

---

[676]Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 17

[677]See Mitchell, *OES*, §§ 1410-11.

***Soul* I/II, V 115a/E 110a**

V(*Soul* I)

bið þæt heafod tohliden handa to| liðode
geaglas toginene góman toslitene
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
wordum **wrixlian** wið þone werian gast.|

E(*Soul* II)

biþ þæt hea|fod tohliden honda tohleoþode
geaflas toginene goman| toslitene
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
wordū **wrixlan**| wið þone wergan gæst.

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.[678] Parallel stress patterns are found elsewhere with the preterite of weak II verbs,[679] 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 glitinian*, 2758a; *heah hlifian*, 2805a; *flod fæðmian*, 3133a.[680] 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)

gifer hatte se wyrm þe þa **eaglas** beoð
nædle scearp|ran.

E(*Soul* II)

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.[681] Moffat notes that **E** *geaf|las* "preserves a poetic usage while **V** introduces a more

[678]Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 23.

[679]For example, in the *Battle of Maldon*: *Byrhtnoþ maðelode* (Type D*2), lines 42a and 309a. See Pope, *Seven Old English Poems*, p. 114.

[680]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.

[681]Sievers-Brunner § 212 Anm. 2.

common form, one that... does not occur elsewhere in the extant verse"[682] (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)

Se**ge nydde** to me
ærest eallra onþam eorðscræfe|
þæthe þa tungan to tyhð ꝥþa teð þurh smyhð.
ꝥþa eagan| þurh eteð ufan onþ heafod.
ꝥto ætwelan oðrum gerymeð.|
wyrmum towiste þonne þæt werie
lic acolod bið. þæt| lange ær
werede mid wædum

E(*Soul* II)

se**ge neþeð** to
ærest ealra onþā eorð| scræfe
heþa tungan to tyhð. ꝥþa toþas þurh smyhð
ꝥto| ætwelan oþrum gerymeð
ꝥþa eaxan þurh| iteð ufon onþ| heafod
wyrmum 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 *genīedan* '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 ꝥþa teð þurh smyhð.
ꝥþa eagan| þurh eteð ufan onþ heafod.
ꝥto ætwelan oðrum gerymeð.|
wyrmum 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. ꝥþa toþas þurh smyhð
ꝥto| ætwelan oþrum gerymeð
ꝥþa eaxan þurh| iteð ufon onþ| heafod
wyrmum 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

[682]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)

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.
ꝛþege bohte blode þy halgan.
ꝛ| þu me mid þy heardan hungre gebunde
ꝛge hæft nedest| helle witum.

E(*Soul* II)

lyt geþohtes hu þis| is long hider
ꝛþeþurh engel ufan ofroderum
sawle on|sende þurh his sylfes hond
meotud ælmihtig of his| mægen þrymme
ꝛþeþa gebohte blode þyhalgan
ꝛþume| þy heardan hungre gebunde
ꝛge 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[683]]; 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.[684]

[683]Moffat uses a non-standard line-numbering in his edition.

[684]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|
lic ȝsawle

E(*Soul* II)

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

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)

Cleopað þōn swa cearful| cealdan reorde
spreceð grimlice **se** gast toþamduste.|

E(*Soul* II)

Cleopað þonne| swa cearful caldan reorde
spriceð 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|
tohwan þinre sawle þing siðþan wurde
syððan oflic| homan læded wære :

E(*Soul* II)

lyt þuge þohtes
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.[685]

***Soul* I/II, V 26b/E 23b**

V(*Soul* I)

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.
ꝛþege bohte blode þy halgan.
ꝛ| þu me mid þy heardan hungre gebunde
ꝛge hæft nedest| helle witum.

E(*Soul* II)

lyt geþohtes hu þis| is long hider
ꝛþeþurh engel ufan ofroderum
sawle on|sende þurh his sylfes hond
meotud ælmihtig of his| mægen þrymme
ꝛþeþa gebohte blode þyhalgan
ꝛþume| þy heardan hungre gebunde
ꝛge 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)

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.
ꝛþege bohte blode þy halgan.
ꝛ| þu me mid þy heardan hungre gebunde
ꝛge hæft nedest| helle witum.

E(*Soul* II)

lyt geþohtes hu þis| is long hider
ꝛþeþurh engel ufan ofroderum
sawle on|sende þurh his sylfes hond
meotud ælmihtig of his| mægen þrymme
ꝛþe**þa** gebohte blode þyhalgan
ꝛþume| þy heardan hungre gebunde
ꝛge 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.

[685]Mitchell, *OES*, §§ 1512 and 1513.

***Soul* I/II, V 31a/E 28a**

V(*Soul* I)

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.
ꝛþege bohte blode þy halgan.
ꝛ| þu me **mid** þy heardan hungre gebunde
ꝛge hæft nedest| helle witum.

E(*Soul* II)

lyt geþohtes hu þis| is long hider
ꝛþeþurh engel ufan ofroderum
sawle on|sende þurh his sylfes hond
meotud ælmihtig of his| mægen þrymme
ꝛþeþa gebohte blode þyhalgan
ꝛþume| þy heardan hungre gebunde
ꝛge 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)

eardode icþe oninnan
nemeahte icðe ||| of cuman
flæsce befangen ꝛmefyren lustas
þine ge|þrungon

E(*Soul* II)

ic þe Ininnan noicþe of meahte
flæsce bifongen| ꝛmefiren lustas
þinegeþrungon

V *eardode* '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)

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

E(*Soul* II)

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

Both forms are idiomatic.[686] The addition or omission of *hit* has no significant effect on sense, metre, or syntax.

[686]Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 69. See also Mitchell, *OES*, §§ 1487, 1507.

***Soul* I/II, V 38b/E 35b**

V(*Soul* I)	**E(*Soul* II)**
37 á ic uncres ge|dales onbád	hwæt ic uncres gedales bád.
earfoðlice nis nu **huru** se ende to góð.|	35 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)	**E(*Soul* II)**
Wære þu þe wiste wlanc. ꝯwines sæd.	36 wære þuþe wiste wlonc ꝯwines sæd
40 þrym ful þune|dest ꝯofþyrsted wæs	þrymful þu| nedest. ꝯ**ic** of þyrsted wæs.
godes lichoman gastes drynces :7|	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)	**E(*Soul* II)**
Forðan þu **ne** hogodest her on life	þærþu þōn hogode her onlife
syððan icðe on| worulde wunian sceolde	40 þenden icþe inworul|de wunian sceolde
þæt ðu wære þurh flæsc| ꝯþurh fyren lustas	þæt þuwære þurh flæsc ꝯþurh fi|ren lustas
45 strange ge stryned. ꝯgestaðolod| þurh me.	strong gestyred ꝯgestaþelad þurh mec.|
ꝯIc wæs gast onðe fram gode sended	ꝯicwæs gæst onþe from gode sended
næfre| ðu me mid swa heardū helle witum	næfre þumec| swa heardra helle wita
nege neredest| þurh þinra meda lust.	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
strange ge stryned. 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 **<u>þōn</u>** hogode her onlife
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
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
strange ge stryned. ȝgestaðolod| þurh me.
ȝIc wæs gast onðe fram gode sended
næfre| ðu me **<u>mid</u>** swa heardū helle witum
nege neredest| þurh þinra meda lust.

E(*Soul* II)

þærþu þōn hogode her onlife
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
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’.[687] 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 þu**nu** hwæþre minra gescenta
sco|me þrowian
onþam miclan dæge þōn monna cynn
se||| a,ncenda 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 **hwæþre** minra gescenta
sco|me þrowian
onþam miclan dæge þōn monna cynn
se||| a,ncenda ealle gegædrað.

Like **E** *nu*, lines 46a and 51a, and **E** *þōn*, line 39a, **E** *hwæþre* emphasises the contrast between the body’s previous behaviour and its current and future punishment. It is not

[687]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,[e] se| swearta hrefen
syððan ic ana ofðe utsiðode
þurh| þæs sylfes hand þe ic ær onsended wæs.

E(*Soul* II)

ne eart þu **<u>nu</u>**þon leofre nængū| lifgendra
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.|

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.
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
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.

The addition or omission of *ȝ* 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**, *ȝ* 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.
ne nanþara goda þeðu iu ahtest.
Ac her| sceolon on bidan ban be reafod
be sliten synum. ꝥe| þin sawl sceal
ꝥ minum unwillu oft gesecan
wemman| **þe** mid wordū swa ðu worhtest to me.

E(*Soul* II)

Nemagon þe nu heonan adon hyrste þa readan
negold|ne sylfor neþinra goda nán
ac her sculon abidan ban| bireafod
besliten seonwum ꝥþe þin sawl sceal
minū ún|willan oft gesecan
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 *gesecan* and is not expressed. Both are acceptable syntax.[688] 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)

eart ðu **nu** dumb|| ꝥdeaf
nesynt þine dreamas awiht

E(*Soul* II)

eart þu dumb ꝥdeaf
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 gesecan
synnum ge sargod ꝥeft sona| fram þe
hweorfan onhancred þonne halige men
lifi|endum gode lof sang doð
secan þahamas þe ðu me| her scrife.
ꝥþa arleasan eardung stowe.
ꝥþe sculon| **her** mold wyrmas manige ceowan
slitan sarlice swear|te wihta
gifre ꝥgrædige

E(*Soul* II)

sceal icþe nihtes seþeah nyde gesecan
synnum ge|sargad ꝥeft sona fromðe
hweorfan onhoncred. þōnn| halege menn
gode lifgendum lof song doð
secan þa ha|mas þeþume ærscrife
ꝥþa arleasan eardung stowe
ꝥþe sculon mold wyrmas monige ceowan.
seonowum besli|tan swearte wihte
gifre ꝥgrædge

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.

[688]See Mitchell, *OES*, §§ 1575-6.

***Soul* I/II, V 96a/E 89a**

V(*Soul* I)

95 Ac| hwæt wylt ðu þær.
onþā 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**toþæs lytel lið
onlime aweaxen.
ƀðu 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 natoþæs lytel lið
onlime aweaxen.
ƀðu 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)

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
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|
þæthe þa tungan to tyhð ꝥa teð þurh smyhð.
ꝥa eagan| þurh eteð ufan onþ heafod.
ꝥto ætwelan oðrum gerymeð.|
wyrmum towiste

E(*Soul* II)

sege neþeð to
ærest ealra onþā eorð| scræfe
heþa tungan to tyhð. ꝥa toþas þurh smyhð
ꝥto| ætwelan oþrum gerymeð
ꝥa eaxan þurh| iteð ufon onþ| heafod
wyrmum towiste

The addition of *þæt* to **V** suggests that lines **V**119-121a 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.
ȝþa eagan| þurh eteð ufan onþ heafod.
ȝto ætwelan oðrum gerymeð.|
wyrmum 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. ȝþa toþas þurh smyhð
ȝto| ætwelan oþrum gerymeð
ȝþa eaxan þurh| iteð ufon onþ| heafod
wyrmum towiste þōn biþ þæt werge.
lic acolad þæt| **he** longe ær
werede mid wædum

The addition or omission of *he* in **V**123b/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).[689] 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.[690] 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.[691] The addition or omission is metrically insignificant and falls on the preliminary drop of a Type B-1 line.

[689]B.-T. s.v. *werian.*

[690]See Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 81.

[691]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)	**E(*Soul* II)**
á ic uncres ge|dales **on**bád	hwæt ic uncres gedales bád.
earfoðlice nis nu huru se ende to góð.|	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)	**E(*Soul* II)**
eart ðu nu dumb|| ȝdeaf	eart þu dumb ȝdeaf
nesynt þine dreamas **a**wiht	nesindan þine dreamas| wiht.

The (normally stressed)[692] 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)	**E(*Soul* II)**
ne synt þine æhta **a**wihte.|	nesindon þine geah|þe wiht
þe ðu her on moldan mannū eowdest.	þaþu her onmoldan monnum eawdest.

Together with the difference in case, the addition of the prefix *a-* creates metrical problems in **V**.[693] 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.

[692]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*.

[693]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 **<u>cuman</u>**
flæsce befangen ⁊mefyren lustas
35 þine ge|þrungon

E(*Soul* II)

30 ic þe Ininnan noicþe of meahte
flæsce bifongen| ⁊mefiren 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 is Old English.[694] 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 **<u>eall</u>**| manna cynn
se acenneda ealle gesamnað.

E(*Soul* II)

46 scealt þunu hwæþre minra gescenta
sco|me þrowian
onþam miclan dæge þō̄n monna cynn
se||| a,ⁿcenda 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.

[694]Mitchell, *OES*, § 1007.

***Soul* I/II, V 89b/E 83b**

V(*Soul* I)

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

E(*Soul* II)

þōn þu for unc bú ondwyrdan scealt
onþam miclan| dæge þōn **<u>eallum</u>** monnū beoð
wunde onwrigene þaþe in| worulde ǽr.
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."[695] 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 **<u>me</u>**
ærest eallra onþam eorðscræfe|
þæthe þa tungan to tyhð ꝛþa teð þurh smyhð.
ꝛþa eagan| þurh eteð ufan onþ heafod.
ꝛto ætwelan oðrum gerymeð.|
wyrmum 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. ꝛþa toþas þurh smyhð
ꝛto| ætwelan oþrum gerymeð
ꝛþa eaxan þurh| iteð ufon onþ| heafod
wyrmum 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."[696] 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.

[695]Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 77.

***Soul* I/II, V 125a/E 120a**

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 mód snot|terra :7|

E *æt*| *oneorþan* is syntactically parallel to *wyrmes giefl*, **E** 119b and part of the predicate of *bið*: 'then he is a worm's food, dinner in the earth...'. In **V**, *on*| *eorþan* is an adverbial prepositional phrase of place used to explain where the body is: 'then he is worms' food in the earth...'. In **E**, *æt* is the first lift of a Type A-1 line with double alliteration. The equivalent line in **V** is unmetrical.

***Soul* I/II, V 126b/E 121b**

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 mód snot|terra :7|

The addition or omission of **V** *gehwam* has a significant effect on the syntax of the passage. In **E** *mód snot*|*terra* is genitive plural, dependent on *men*, line 121a: 'then he [the body] is a worm's food, dinner in the earth, which may be a reminder to each man of the prudent ones'. In **V**, *modsnotra*| *gehwam* is a dative of interest parallel to *æghwylcum men*: 'then it is worms' food in the earth, which may be a reminder to each man, to each of the prudent ones'.

Metrically, **E** line 121b is Type D-1. **V** is Type E.

[696]*ASPR* 2, p. 128.

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
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.
ꝥþege bohte blode þy halgan.
ꝥ| þu me mid þy heardan hungre gebunde
ꝥge hæft nedest| helle witum.

E(*Soul* II)

hwæt wite þume| werga.
hwæt þu huru wyrma gifl.
lyt geþohtes hu þis| is long hider
ꝥþeþurh engel ufan ofroderum
sawle on|sende þurh his sylfes hond
meotud ælmihtig of his| mægen þrymme
ꝥþeþa gebohte blode þyhalgan
ꝥþume| þy heardan hungre gebunde
ꝥge 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).[697] **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 bryde beag. **ne þin| gold wela**.
ne nanþara goda þeðu iu ahtest.
Ac her| sceolon on bidan ban be reafod
be sliten synum. ꝥþe| þin sawl sceal
ꝥ minum unwillu oft gesecan
wemman| þe mid wordū swa ðu worhtest to me.

E(*Soul* II)

Nemagon þe nu heonan adon hyrste þa readan
negold|ne sylfor neþinra goda nán
ac her sculon abidan ban| bireafod
besliten seonwum ꝥþe 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).[698] Neither of the lines omitted from **E** alliterate in **V**, a fact which leads Jones-Gyger, Orton, and Moffat to suspect interpolation on

[697]Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 68; see also Orton, "A Further Examination," p. 181-2.

[698]Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 74.

the part of the **V** scribe (or predecessor).[699] 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)	**E(*Soul* II)**
þonne ðu for unc bæm| and wyrdan scealt	þōn þu for unc bú ondwyrdan scealt
onðam miclan dæge þonne mannū| beoð	onþam miclan| dæge þōn eallum monnū beoð
90 wunda on wrigene þaðe onworulde ær	wunde onwrigene þaþe in| worulde ǽr.
fyren ful|le men fyrnge worhton.	85 firen fulle menn fyrn geworhton.
Ðōn wyle dryhten sylf dæda|ge hyran	ðōn wile| dryhten sylf dæda gehyran
<u>hæleða gehwylces</u> **<u>heofena scippend</u>**	æt ealra monna gehwam| muþes reorde
æt ealra| manna gehwæs muðes reorde	wunde wiþer lean
95 wunde wiðer 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)	**E(*Soul* II)**
100 ac hwæt do wyt unc.|	achwæt dowit unc
sculon wit þōn eft æt somne siððan brucan	**<u>þōn he unc hafað geedbyrded</u>|** **<u>oþre siþe</u>**
swylcra yrm|ða swaðu unc her ær scrife.	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.

[699]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 ꝯsware ænige ge hatan
geomrum gaste| geoce oððe frofre.

E(*Soul* II)

ligeð dust þærhit wæs|
100 nemæg him ꝯsware **ænige secgan**
neþær 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 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 hea|fod tohliden honda tohleoþode
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."[700] Interpolation in **V** seems at least as likely given the line's metrical difficulties.

[700]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
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
wordum wrixlian wið þone werian gast.|

E(*Soul* II)

biþ þæt hea|fod tohliden honda tohleoþode
geaflas toginene goman| toslitene
seonwe beoð asogene sweora bicowen
rib reafi|að reþe wyrmas
<u>drincað hloþum hrá heolfres þurst|ge</u>.
bið seo tunge totogen on tyn healfe
hungrum to| hroþor
forþon heone mæg horsclice
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.[701] 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
<u>nemeahte icðe||| of</u> cuman
flæsce befangen ȝmefyren lustas
þine ge|þrungon

E(*Soul* II)

ic þe Ininnan **<u>noicþe of meahte</u>**
flæsce bifongen| ȝmefiren lustas
þinegeþrungon

The rearrangement within line **V** 33b/**E**30b 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.

[701]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 ȝeft sona| fram þe
hweorfan onhancred þonne halige men
lifi|endum gode lof sang doð
secan þahamas þe ðu me| her scrife.
ȝþa arleasan eardung stowe.
ȝþe sculon| her mold wyrmas manige ceowan
slitan sarlice swear|te wihta
gifre ȝgrædige

E(*Soul* II)

sceal icþe nihtes seþeah nyde gesecan
synnum ge|sargad ȝeft sona fromðe
hweorfan onhoncred. þōnn| halege menn
gode lifgendum lof song doð
secan þa ha|mas þeþume ærscrife
ȝþa arleasan eardung stowe
ȝþe sculon mold wyrmas monige ceowan.
seonowum besli|tan swearte wihte
gifre ȝgrædge

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."[702]

Soul I/II, V 107a/E 102a

V(*Soul* I)

liget dust þær hit| wæs.
nemæg him ȝsware ænige ge hatan
geomrum gaste| geoce oððe frofre.

E(*Soul* II)

ligeð dust þærhit wæs|
nemæg him ȝsware 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 natoþæs lytel lið
onlime aweaxen.
þðu ne| scyle for **anra ge hwylcum** on sundrū
rihtagildan. ||| þōn reðe bið
dryhten æt þam dome

E(*Soul* II)

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.

[702] *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 ȝþa teð þurh smyhð.
ȝþa eagan| þurh eteð ufan onþ heafod.
ȝto ætwelan oðrum gerymeð.|
wyrmum 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. ȝþa toþas þurh smyhð
ȝto| ætwelan oþrum gerymeð
ȝþa eaxan þurh| iteð ufon onþ| heafod
wyrmum 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.[703] 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.[704]

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 frȳðe| fugel oðde fisc onsæ
oðde on eorðan neat ætes tilode|
feld gangende feoh butan snyttro
oðde onwestenne| wild deora
þæt wyrreste þær swa god wolde.
ge þeah| ðu wære wyrm cynna
þ grimmeste þær swa god wolde :7|
Þonne ðu æfre onmoldan mange wurde.
oðde 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 þuwurde| ætfrum sceafte fugel oþþe fisc onsæ.
oðde 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
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

[703]See above, p. 334.

[704]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*** *wyrr**este***), which was subsequently caught and reworked to avoid correction.[705]

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 ⁊þa teð þurh smyhð.
⁊þa eagan| þurh eteð ufan onþ heafod.
⁊to ætwelan oðrum gerymeð.|
wyrmum 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. ⁊þa toþas þurh smyhð
⁊to| ætwelan oþrum gerymeð
⁊þa eaxan þurh| iteð ufon onþ| heafod
wyrmum 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
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
sȳ|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.

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 *wyrcan* 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).

[705]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."[706]

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.[707] 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 icðe nihtes| swa þeah nede gesecan
synnum ge sargod ȝeft sona| fram þe
hweorfan onhancred þonne halige men
lifi|endum gode lof sang doð
secan þahamas þe ðu me| her scrife.
ȝþa arleasan eardung stowe.
ȝþe sculon| her mold wyrmas manige ceowan
slitan sarlice swear|te wihta
gifre ȝgrædige

E(*Soul* II)

sceal icþe nihtes seþeah nyde gesecan
synnum ge|sargad ȝeft sona fromðe
hweorfan onhoncred. þōnn| halege menn
gode lifgendum lof song doð
secan þa ha|mas þeþume ærscrife
ȝþa arleasan eardung stowe
ȝþe sculon mold wyrmas monige ceowan.
seonowum besli|tan swearte wihte
gifre ȝgrædge

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.

[706]Orton, "A Further Examination," p. 186.

[707]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',[708] 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**.[709]

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.[710]

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,

---

[708]*Beslitan* is found only in *Soul and Body* (Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 75). See also **V** 62a/**E** 57a.

[709]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*.[711] 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,"[712] 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.[713] 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."[714]

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."[715]

---

[710]Ker, *Catalogue*, art. 334. For an opposing view, see Farrell, *Daniel and Azarias*, pp. 5-6.

[711]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 (11972): 1-8.

[712]Pope, "Paleography and Poetry," pp. 35-36.

[713]Ker, rev. of *The Exeter Book*, p. 227.

[714]Pope, "Paleography and Poetry," p. 41.

[715]See Krapp, *ASPR* 1, pp. xxxii-xxxiii. Jabbour, 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 deutero-canonical section of the Vulgate *Daniel* (3:24-3:90) added by Jerome to his translation of the Hebrew Bible,[716] parts of which were used as canticles in a number of contemporary liturgies.[717] 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.[718] 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 **ꝑ**)"[719] – 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.

[716]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.

[717]Farrell, *Daniel and Azarias*, pp. 24-5; "The Unity of the Old English *Daniel*," *RES* 18 (1967): 117-35, at p. 133.

[718]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.

[719]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*)	**J(*Dan*)**
1 Himþa azarias ingeþoncum	ða| azarias inge þancum.
hleoþrede halig þurh| hatne lig	280 hleoðrade halig.| þurh hatne líg.
dreag dæd**um** georn dryhten herede	dæd**a** georn. drihten herede.|
wis| inweorcum ꝥas word acwæð	wer womma leas. ꝥa 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.[720] 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.

[720]Mitchell, *OES*, § 219, p. 92.

***Az/Dan*, E 12a/J 291a**

E(*Az*)	**J(*Dan*)**
ro|dera waldend	290 rodora waldend.
geoca **<u>us</u>** georne gæsta scyppend	geo ca**<u>user</u>** georne.| nu gasta scyppend.
ȝ| þurh hyldo help halig dryhten	ȝþurh help halig drih|ten.
nuwe þec forþear|fum ȝfor þrea nydum	nu^we^,þec for þreaum. ȝfor ðeo nydum.|
15 ȝfore eað medum arena| biddaþ	ȝfor eaðmedum. arna biddað.
lege bilegde	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.[721]

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*)	**J(*Dan*)**
weþæs lifgende	295 weðæs lifgende.
worhton inwo|rulde eacþon wom dydon.	worhton onworulde.| eac ðon wóm dyde.
yldran usse inofer hygdū|	user yldran. for ofer|hygdum.
þinbibodu bræcon <u>burg sit tend**e**</u>	bræcon bebodo. <u>burhsittendū</u>|
20 had ofer hogedon| halgan lifes	had ofer hogedon. halgan lifes.

E *burg sit tende* is nominative plural, parallel to *yldran*, line 18a, and subject of *brœcon*, 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'.[722] The two forms are metrically identical.

[721]Mitchell, *OES*, § 1092.

[722]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 23a/J 302a**

E(*Az*)	**J(*Dan*)**
wurdon weto wrecene geond widne grund|	300 siendonwe||| towrecene. geond widne grund.
heapum to^{h}worfne hylda lease	heapum tohwor|fene. hylde lease.
<u>wæs</u> ure lif geond lon|da fela	**<u>is</u>** user lif . geond landafela.|
fracuð ꝛgefræge fold buendū	fracoð ꝛgefræge. folca manegum.
25 nuþu usic be|wræce inþas wyrrestan	þaus éc| bewræcon. toþæs wyrrestan.
eorð cyninges æht gewealda	305 eorð cyninga.| æhta gewealde.
in| hæft heoro grimmes	onhæft heoru grimra ꝛwe| nu hæðenra.
sceolon weþær hæþenra	þeow ned þoliað.
þrea nyd || [strip of c. 4 ll. missing from MS]	

E *wæs* is the third person preterite indicative of *bēon*; **J** *is* is the third person present indicative. The variation occurs as part of a series of linked changes in tense and number throughout **E** 21-28/**J** 300-307a. As argued above (pp. 228 ff.), **E** 21-28 have as their primary focus the current predicament of Azarias and the Children in Nebuchadnezzar's furnace. The linked preterite verbs in 21a and 23a indicate that in this version of the prayer, the Babylonian captivity of the Jewish people as a whole is seen primarily as a historical background to Azarias's request for aid. In **J**, on the other hand, Azarias is speaking as a representative of his people. His use of the present tense for the verbs of lines 300a and 302a indicate that he sees the captivity of the Jews as a current problem in its own right. The effect of these changes on the passage as a whole are discussed above, pp. 228 ff. For the variation in the verb of **E** 21a/**J** 300a, see below, p. 376.

***Az/Dan*, E 25a/J 304a**

E(*Az*)	**J(*Dan*)**
wurdon weto wrecene geond widne grund|	300 siendonwe||| towrecene. geond widne grund.
heapum to^{h}worfne hylda lease	heapum tohwor|fene. hylde lease.
wæs ure lif geond lon|da fela	is user lif . geond landafela.|
fracuð ꝛgefræge fold buendū	fracoð ꝛgefræge. folca manegum.
25 nuþu usic <u>be|wræc**e**</u> inþas wyrrestan	þaus éc| <u>bewræc**on**</u>. toþæs wyrrestan.
eorð cyninges æht gewealda	305 eorð cyninga.| æhta gewealde.
in| hæft heoro grimmes	onhæft heoru grimra ꝛwe| nu hæðenra.
sceolon weþær hæþenra	þeow ned þoliað.
þrea nyd || [strip of c. 4 ll. missing from MS]	

E *be\|wræce* is second person singular preterite indicative of *bewrecan* 'drive; drive away, banish'; its subject is the pronoun *þu*, referring to God. **J** *bewræcon* is the plural

preterite indicative; the subject in this version is *þa*, a plural demonstrative pronoun with *folca manegum* as antecedent. The variation is one of a linked series of changes in number and tense in **E** 21-28/**J** 300-307a . A full discussion of the effect of these variants on the passage as a whole is given above, pp. 228 ff.. The variation has no effect on metre.

***Az/Dan*, E 26a/J 305a**

E(*Az*)

wurdon weto wrecene geond widne grund|
heapum to^{h}worfne hylda lease
wæs ure lif geond lon|da fela
fracuð ȝgefræge fold buendū
nuþu usic be|wræce inþas wyrrestan
eorð cyning**es** æht gewealda
in| hæft heoro grimmes
sceolon weþær hæþenra
þrea nyd || [strip of c. 4 ll. missing from MS]

J(*Dan*)

siendonwe||| towrecene. geond widne grund.
heapum tohwor|fene. hylde lease.
is user lif . geond landafela.|
fracoð ȝgefræge. folca manegum.
þaus éc| bewræcon. toþæs wyrrestan.
eorð cyninga.| æhta gewealde.
onhæft heoru grimra ȝwe| nu hæðenra.
þeow ned þoliað.

E *eorð cyninges* is possessive genitive singular. It qualifies *æht gewealda* ‘power’ and is modified by the genitive singular superlative adjective *wyrrestan* ‘most terrible’: ‘into the power of this most terrible earth-king.’ **J** *eorð cyninga* is a partitive genitive plural. It modifies *wyrrestan*, a possessive genitive singular superlative adjective, in this case used substantively to qualify *gewealde*: ‘into the power of this most terrible of earth-kings’. The two forms are metrically equivalent.

Despite their similarity to other linked changes in number and tense throughout **E** 21-28/**J** 300-307a, these variants are not an integral part of the interpretative differences in the passage: in both cases, a single king is being referred to.

***Az/Dan*, E 26b/J 305b**

E(*Az*)

wurdon weto wrecene geond widne grund|
heapum to^{h}worfne hylda lease
wæs ure lif geond lon|da fela
fracuð ꝛgefræge 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.|
fracoð ꝛgefræge. folca manegum.
þaus éc| bewræcon. toþæs wyrrestan.
305 eorð cyninga.| æht**a** gewealde.
onhæft heoru grimra ꝛwe| 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'[723] 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^{h}worfne hylda lease
wæs ure lif geond lon|da fela
fracuð ꝛgefræge fold buendū
25 nuþu usic be|wræce inþas wyrrestan
eorð cyninges æht gewealda
in| hæft heoro grimm**es**
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.|
fracoð ꝛgefræge. folca manegum.
þaus éc| bewræcon. toþæs wyrrestan.
305 eorð cyninga.| æhta gewealde.
onhæft heoru grim**ra** ꝛwe| 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,

[723]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 cwid**as**
þæt þu hyra from|cynn onfyrn dagum
ycan wolde þhit æfter him
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
yþe geond ear|grund þæt swa unrime
ymb wintra hwearft weorðan sceol|de

J(*Dan*)

315 þu him þgehéte. þurh| hleoðor cwyd**e**.
þ þu hyra frum cyn. infyrn| dagum.
ícan wolde. þte æfter him.
oncneo|rissum. cenned wurde.
ꝛseo mænigeo mǽre| wære.
320 hat to hebbanne. swa heofon steor|ran.
bebugað bradne hwyrft . oð þ brim|faro. þæs
sæ faroða sand. geond sealtne| wǽg.
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.[724] 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
oncyne|ryce cenned wurde
yced oneorþan þæt swa unrime
had to| hebb**an** swa heofon steorran
bugað bradne hwearft oðbrim|flodas.
swa waroþa sond ymb sealt wæter
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.
ꝛseo mænigeo mǽre| wære.
320 hat to hebban**ne**. swa heofon steor|ran.
bebugað bradne hwyrft . oð þ brim|faro. þæs
sæ faroða sand. geond sealtne| wǽg.
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

[724]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*."[725] In **E**, *had to*| *hebban* is Type A-1; **J** *hat to hebbanne* is D*1.

***Az/Dan*, E 39b/J 322b**

E(*Az*)

þuhimge hete þurh hleoþor cwidas
þæt þu hyra from|cynn onfyrn dagum
ycan wolde þhit æfter him
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
yþe geond ear|grund þæt swa unrime
ymb wintra hwearft weorðan sceol|de

J(*Dan*)

þu him þgehéte. þurh| hleoðor cwyde.
þ þu hyra frum cyn. infyrn| dagum.
ícan wolde. þte æfter him.
oncneo|rissum. cenned wurde.
ꝯseo mænigeo mǽre| wære.
hat to hebbanne. swa heofon steor|ran.
bebugað bradne hwyrft . oð þ brim|faro. þæs
sæ faroða sand. geond sealt**ne**| wǽg.
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 *wǽg*. 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.

[725]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*)

þuhimge hete þurh hleoþor cwidas
þæt þu hyra from|cynn onfyrn dagum
ycan wolde þhit æfter him
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
yþe geond ear|grund þæt swa unrim**e**
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.
ꝛseo mænigeo mǽre| wære.
320 hat to hebbanne. swa heofon steor|ran.
bebugað bradne hwyrft . oð þ brim|faro. þæs
sæ faroða sand. geond sealtne| wǽg.
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 *únrime* is indicated by the preceding genitive pronoun *his*[726]; 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'.[727]

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.[728]

[726]On the use of pronouns in a partitive sense, see Mitchell, *OES*, § 1268.

[727]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.

[728]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*)	**J(*Dan*)**
gecyð cræft ꝯmeaht nu| þec caldeas	gecyð cræft ꝯ| miht. þþcaldeas.
45 ꝯeac fela folca gefregen **habban**	ꝯfolca fela. gefrigen **hab|bað**.
þæt þu ana| eart ece dryhten	ðaþe under heofenum. hæðene lifigeað.|
sige rof set tend ꝯsoð meo tod	330 ꝯþþu ána eart. éce drihten.
wuldres| waldend ꝯworuld sceafta	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."[729] 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 ꝯ\| miht*. See below, p. 382.

***Az/Dan*, E 52a/J 336a**

E(*Az*)	**J(*Dan*)**
ða ofroderum wearð	335b ðaof roderum wæs.
engel ælbeorht**a** ufon onsended|	engel ælbeorht.| ufan onsended.
wlite scyne wer inhis wuldor homan.	wlite scyne wer. onhiswul|dorhaman.
Cwomhimþa toare| ꝯto ealdor nere	sehim cwóm tofrofre. ꝯto| feorh nere.
55 þurh lufan ꝯþurh lisse	mid lufan ꝯmid 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.

[729]Mitchell, *OES*, § 3105. He describes the second example, Blickling Homilies 163.3, as "probably corrupt".

***Az/Dan*, E 59b/J 341b**

E(*Az*)

Tosweop ꝛ||| toswen$_g$de þurh swið**es** meaht
liges leoman swa hyra lice nescod.|
acwæs inþam ḥofne þase engel cwom
windig ꝛwynsum wede|re onlicust
þōn onsumeres tid sended weorþeð
dropena| dreorung mid dæges hwile.

J(*Dan*)

tosweop hine ꝛtoswende. þurh þa swið|**an** miht.
ligges leoma. ƿhyre líce newæs.
owiht| ge egled. ácheon andan sloh.
fyron feondas| for fyren dǽdum.
þawæs onþam ofne. þær| se engel becwóm.
windig ꝛwynsum. wedere gelicost.
þōn hit onsumeres tíd. sended weor|ðeð.
dropena drearung. ondæges 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*)

seþone lig tosceaf|
halig ꝛheofonbeorht hatan fyres
ƿse bittra bryne beor|gan sceolde
forþæs engles ége æfæstum þrim.
Tosweop ꝛ||| toswen$_g$de þurh swiðes meaht
liges leom**an** swa hyra lice nescod.|
acwæs inþam ḥofne þase engel cwom
windig ꝛwynsum wede|re onlicust
þōn onsumeres tid sended weorþeð
dropena| dreorung mid dæges hwile.

J(*Dan*)

seðone| lig tosceaf.
halig ꝛheofon beorht. hatan||| fyres.
tosweop hine ꝛtoswende. þurh þa swið|an miht.
ligges leom**a**. ƿhyre líce newæs.
owiht| ge egled. ácheon andan sloh.
fyron feondas| for fyren dǽdum.
þawæs onþam ofne. þær| se engel becwóm.
windig ꝛwynsum. wedere gelicost.
þōn hit onsumeres tíd. sended weor|ðeð.
dropena drearung. ondæges hwile.
wearm|lic wolcna scúr.

E *leoman* is accusative singular, object of *Tosweop* and *toswen$_g$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*.[730]

[730]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, ʒē* 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.[731] See also below, p. 411.

***Az/Dan*, E 70a/J 359a**

E(*Az*)	**J(*Dan*)**
bædon bletsunge bearn Inworulde	bǽdon bletsian. bearn| israela.
70 eall**e** gesceaf|te ecne dryhten	eall land gesceaft. écne drihten.|
þeoda waldend	360 ðeoda waldend.

E *ealle* is an instrumental singular adjective 'agreeing' with the neuter dative *gesceaf|te*: 'for all creation'.[732] **J** *eall* is an accusative singular neuter adjective agreeing with *land gesceaft*, the direct object of *bǽdon*: '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.

[731]Fred C. Robinson, personal communication.

[732]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^2) reads *bodigaþ godspel elce gesceafte* for Lindisfarne (Li) *alle ł eghuelcum sceafte*" (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*)	**J(*Dan*)**
bædon bletsunge bearn Inworulde	bǽdon bletsian. bearn| israela.
70 ealle gesceaf|t**e** ecne dryhten	eall láṅd gesceaft. écne drihten.|
þeoda waldend	360 ðeoda waldend.

E *gesceaf\|te* is dative singular, modified by the instrumental adjective *ealle*.[733] In **J** *láṅd 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*)	**J(*Dan*)**
1 Himþa azarias ingeþoncum	ða| azarias inge þancum.
hleoþrede halig þurh| hatne lig	280 hleoðrade halig.| þurh hatne líg.
dreag dædum georn dryhten herede	dæda georn. drihten herede.|
wis| inweorcum ꝯ**þas** word acwæð	wer womma leas. ꝯ**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[734] and are metrically indistinguishable.

[733]See above, fn. 732.

[734]Jabbour, diss., p. 120.

***Az/Dan*, E 8b/J 286b**

E(*Az*)	**J(*Dan*)**
sindon þine domas| **on**dæda gehwam	siendon þine dó|mas. **in**daga gehwam.
soðe geswiðde ȝgesige fæste.	soðe ȝgeswiðde. ȝge|sige fæste.
10 eac| þinne willan inworuld spedum	swa þu eac sylfa eart.
ryhte mid ræde	syndon| þine willan. onworuld spedum.
	290 rihte ȝge|rume.

The substitution has no significant effect on sense, metre, or syntax.

***Az/Dan*, E 10a/J 289a**

E(*Az*)	**J(*Dan*)**
sindon þine domas| ondæda gehwam	siendon þine dó|mas. indaga gehwam.
soðe geswiðde ȝgesige fæste.	soðe ȝgeswiðde. ȝge|sige fæste.
10 **eac**| þinne willan inworuld spedum	swa þu eac sylfa eart.
ryhte mid ræde	**syndon**| þine willan. onworuld spedum.
	290 rihte ȝge|rume.

In **J**, *syndon* is the main verb of the clause *syndon*\| *þine willan…rihte ȝge*\|*rume*: 'your wishes are just and generous in the abundance of the world'. In **E**, *eac* is best interpreted as a conjunction, 'and, also'.[735] In this case, the main verb of the resulting clause *eac*\| *þinne willan… ryhte mid ræde* (lines10b-11a) is same as that of the preceding clause (*sindon*, line 8a) and is not expressed[736]; *þinne willan* is to be understood as a nominative plural with graphic doubling of the medial *n* in *þinne*[737]: '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.

[735]Mitchell, *OES*, § 1740

[736]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.

[737]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*)

sindon þine domas| ondæda gehwam
soðe geswiðde ȝgesige fæste.
eac| þinne willan **in**woruld spedum
ryhte mid ræde

J(*Dan*)

siendon þine dó|mas. indaga gehwam.
soðe ȝgeswiðde. ȝge|sige fæste.
swa þu eac sylfa eart.
syndon| þine willan. **on**woruld spedum.
rihte ȝge|rume.

The substitution has no significant metrical, semantic, or syntactic effect.

***Az/Dan*, E 11a/J 290a**

E(*Az*)

sindon þine domas| ondæda gehwam
soðe geswiðde ȝgesige fæste.
eac| þinne willan inworuld spedum
ryhte **mid** ræde

J(*Dan*)

siendon þine dó|mas. indaga gehwam.
soðe ȝgeswiðde. ȝge|sige fæste.
swa þu eac sylfa eart.
syndon| þine willan. onworuld spedum.
rihte ȝge|rume.

J *ȝ* 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
ȝ| þurh hyldo help halig dryhten
nuwe þec forþear|fum ȝfor þrea nydum
ȝfore eað medum arena| biddaþ
lege bilegde

J(*Dan*)

rodora waldend.
geo causer georne.| nu gasta scyppend.
ȝþurh help halig drih|ten.
nu^we^,þec for þreaum. ȝfor ðeo nydum.|
ȝfor eaðmedum. arna biddað.
líge beleg|de.

***Az/Dan*, E 17a/J 296a**

E(*Az*)

weþæs lifgende
worhton **in**wo|rulde eacþon wom dydon.
yldran usse inofer hygdū|
þinbibodu bræcon burg sit tende
had ofer hogedon| halgan lifes

J(*Dan*)

295 weðæs lifgende.
worhton **on**worulde.| eac ðon wóm dyde.
user yldran. 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.
yldran usse **in**ofer hygdū|
þinbibodu bræcon burg sit tende
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 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[h]worfne hylda lease
wæs ure lif geond lon|da fela
fracuð ȝgefræge fold buendū
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 **siendon**we||| towrecene. geond widne grund.
heapum tohwor|fene. hylde lease.
is user lif . geond landafela.|
fracoð ȝgefræge. folca manegum.
þaus éc| bewræcon. toþæs wyrrestan.
305 eorð cyninga.| æhta 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^{h}worfne hylda lease
wæs **ure** lif geond lon|da fela
fracuð ȝgefræge fold buendū
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*)

siendonwe||| towrecene. geond widne grund.
heapum tohwor|fene. hylde lease.
is **user** lif . geond landafela.|
fracoð ȝgefræge. folca manegum.
þaus éc| bewræcon. toþæs wyrrestan.
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^{h}worfne hylda lease
wæs ure lif geond lon|da fela
fracuð ȝgefræge fold buendū
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*)

siendonwe||| towrecene. geond widne grund.
heapum tohwor|fene. hylde lease.
is user lif . geond landafela.|
fracoð ȝgefræge. folca manegum.
þaus éc| bewræcon. toþæs wyrrestan.
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*)	**J(*Dan*)**
wurdon weto wrecene geond widne grund|	300 siendonwe||| towrecene. geond widne grund.
heapum to^{h}worfne hylda lease	heapum tohwor|fene. hylde lease.
wæs ure lif geond lon|da fela	is user lif . geond landafela.|
fracuð ȝgefræge fold buendū	fracoð ȝgefræge. folca manegum.
25 nuþu usic be|wræce **in**þas wyrrestan	þaus éc| bewræcon. **to**þæs wyrrestan.
eorð cyninges æht gewealda	305 eorð cyninga.| æhta gewealde.
in| hæft heoro grimmes	onhæft heoru grimra ȝwe| nu hæðenra.
sceolon weþær hæþenra	þeow ned þoliað.
þrea nyd || [strip of c. 4 ll. missing from MS]	

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*)	**J(*Dan*)**
wurdon weto wrecene geond widne grund|	300 siendonwe||| towrecene. geond widne grund.
heapum to^{h}worfne hylda lease	heapum tohwor|fene. hylde lease.
wæs ure lif geond lon|da fela	is user lif . geond landafela.|
fracuð ȝgefræge fold buendū	fracoð ȝgefræge. folca manegum.
25 nuþu usic be|wræce inþas wyrrestan	þaus éc| bewræcon. toþæs wyrrestan.
eorð cyninges æht gewealda	305 eorð cyninga.| æhta gewealde.
in| hæft heoro grimmes	**on**hæft heoru grimra ȝwe| nu hæðenra.
sceolon weþær hæþenra	þeow ned þoliað.
þrea nyd || [strip of c. 4 ll. missing from MS]	

The substitution has no effect on sense, syntax, or metre.

***Az/Dan*, E 27b/J 306b**

E(*Az*)

wurdon weto wrecene geond widne grund|
heapum to^{h}worfne hylda lease
wæs ure lif geond lon|da fela
fracuð ȝgefræge fold buendū
nuþu usic be|wræce inþas wyrrestan
eorð cyninges æht gewealda
in| hæft heoro grimmes
sceolon we**<u>þær</u>** hæþenra
þrea nyd || [strip of c. 4 ll. missing from MS]

J(*Dan*)

siendonwe||| towrecene. geond widne grund.
heapum tohwor|fene. hylde lease.
is user lif . geond landafela.|
fracoð ȝgefræge. folca manegum.
þaus éc| bewræcon. toþæs wyrrestan.
eorð cyninga.| æhta gewealde.
onhæft heoru grimra ȝwe| **<u>nu</u>** hæðenra.
þeow ned þoliað.

E *þær* is a locative adverb; **J** *nu* a temporal. The substitution affects sense, but is not obviously related to the more thoroughgoing differences in tense and number throughout the passage. The substitution falls on the preliminary dip of a Type C-1 line and has no significant metrical effect.

***Az/Dan*, E 34b/J 317b**

E(*Az*)

þuhimge hete þurh hleoþor cwidas
þæt þu hyra from|cynn onfyrn dagum
ycan wolde **<u>þ</u>**hit æfter him
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
yþe geond ear|grund þæt swa unrime
ymb wintra hwearft weorðan sceol|de

J(*Dan*)

þu him þgehéte. þurh| hleoðor cwyde.
þ þu hyra frum cyn. infyrn| dagum.
ícan wolde. **<u>þte</u>** æfter him.
oncneo|rissum. cenned wurde.
ȝseo mænigeo mære| wære.
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 *þ* **J** *þte* are syntactically equivalent conjunctions introducing the subordinate clause **E** 34b-36/**J** 316b-319. As Mitchell points out, this can be a noun clause governed by *gehete*, an adjective clause modifying **E** *from*|*cynn* **J** *frum cyn*, "a final clause (God's purpose), or a consecutive clause (an undoubted happening in the future)."[738] See also p. 407, below.

[738]Mitchell, *OES*, § 2808.

***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
oncyne|ryce cenned wurde
yced oneorþan þæt swa unrime
had to| hebban swa heofon steorran
bugað bradne hwearft **<u>oð</u>**brim|flodas.
swa waroþa sond ymb sealt wæter
yþe geond ear|grund þæt swa unrime
ymb wintra hwearft weorðan sceol|de

J(*Dan*)

þu him þgehéte. þurh| hleoðor cwyde.
þ þu hyra frum cyn. infyrn| dagum.
ícan wolde. þte æfter him.
oncneo|rissum. cenned wurde.
ꝛseo mænigeo mære| wære.
hat to hebbanne. swa heofon steor|ran.
bebugað bradne hwyrft . **<u>oð þ</u>** 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...'[739] In **J**, *oð þ*, a temporal conjunction meaning 'until', is usually taken as an error for *oðþe* 'or'[740] – a not unreasonable assumption given the evident difficulty the **J** scribe has with 315-324. *Oþ þ* is not impossible to construe, however. Assuming that **J** *brim|faro. þæs* is an error for *brimfaroþes*, 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.

[739]See Farrell, *Daniel and Azarias*, p. 91. Also, Krapp and Dobbie, *ASPR* 3, p. 270.

[740]See Mitchell, *OES*, § 1930; Farrell, p. 67; Krapp, *ASPR* 3, p. xxii.

***Az/Dan*, E 39b/J 322b**

E(*Az*)

þuhimge hete þurh hleoþor cwidas
þæt þu hyra from|cynn onfyrn dagum
ycan wolde þhit æfter him
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
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.
ȝseo mænigeo mǽre| wære.
320 hat to hebbanne. swa heofon steor|ran.
bebugað bradne hwyrft . oð þ brim|faro. þæs
sæ faroða sand. **geond** sealtne| wǽg.
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*)

þuhimge hete þurh hleoþor cwidas
þæt þu hyra from|cynn onfyrn dagum
ycan wolde þhit æfter him
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
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.
ȝseo mænigeo mǽre| wære.
320 hat to hebbanne. swa heofon steor|ran.
bebugað bradne hwyrft . oð þ brim|faro. þæs
sæ faroða sand. geond sealtne| wǽg.
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*)

þuhimge hete þurh hleoþor cwidas
þæt þu hyra from|cynn onfyrn dagum
ycan wolde þhit æfter him
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
yþe geond ear|grund þæt swa unrime
ymb wintra hwearft weorðan sceol|de

J(*Dan*)

þu him þgehéte. þurh| hleoðor cwyde.
þ þu hyra frum cyn. infyrn| dagum.
ícan wolde. þte æfter him.
oncneo|rissum. cenned wurde.
ꝛseo mænigeo mǽre| wære.
hat to hebbanne. swa heofon steor|ran.
bebugað bradne hwyrft . oð þ brim|faro. þæs
sæ faroða sand. geond sealtne| wǽg.
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*)

fyl nuþa frum spræce þeahþe **user** fea lifgen
wlitega| þine word cwidas ꝛðinwuldor us.

J(*Dan*)

fyl nu frum spræce.| ðeah **heora** féa lifigen.
wlitiga þinne word| cwyde. ꝛþín 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 ꝯmeaht **nu**| þec caldeas
ꝯeac fela folca gefregen habban
þæt þu ana| eart ece dryhten
sige rof set tend ꝯsoð meo tod
wuldres| waldend ꝯworuld sceafta

J(*Dan*)

gecyð cræft ꝯ| miht. **þþ**caldeas.
ꝯfolca fela. gefrigen hab|bað.
ðaþe under heofenum. hæðene lifigeað.|
ꝯþþu 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†[741] 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*.[742]

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| ꝯto ealdor nere
þurh lufan ꝯþurh lisse

J(*Dan*)

335b ðaof roderum wæs.
engel ælbeorht.| ufan onsended.
wlite scyne wer. **on**hiswul|dorhaman.
sehim cwóm tofrofre. ꝯto| feorh nere.
mid lufan ꝯmid lisse.

The substitution **E** *in* **J** *on* has no significant effect on sense, metre, or syntax.

[741]The use of the subjunctive *habban* (i.e. *habben*) is unusual in this context. For details, see above, p. 370.

[742]See Farrell, p. 67; Krapp, *ASPR* 3, p. xxii; and Mitchell, *OES*, § 1930.

***Az/Dan*, E 55a/J 339a**

E(*Az*)

ða ofroderum wearð
engel ælbeorhta ufon onsended|
wlite scyne wer inhis wuldor homan.
Cwomhimþa toare| ꝯto ealdor nere
55 **þurh** lufan ꝯþurh lisse

J(*Dan*)

335b ðaof roderum wæs.
engel ælbeorht.| ufan onsended.
wlite scyne wer. onhiswul|dorhaman.
sehim cwóm tofrofre. ꝯto| feorh nere.
mid lufan ꝯmid 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*)

ða ofroderum wearð
engel ælbeorhta ufon onsended|
wlite scyne wer inhis wuldor homan.
Cwomhimþa toare| ꝯto ealdor nere
55 þurh lufan ꝯ**þurh** lisse

J(*Dan*)

335b ðaof roderum wæs.
engel ælbeorht.| ufan onsended.
wlite scyne wer. onhiswul|dorhaman.
sehim cwóm tofrofre. ꝯto| feorh nere.
mid lufan ꝯ**mid** lisse.

See the preceding entry.

***Az/Dan*, E 60b/J 342b**

E(*Az*)

Tosweop ꝯ||| tosweng de þurh swiðes meaht
60 liges leoman **swa** hyra lice nescod.|
acwæs inþam ẖofne þase engel cwom
windig ꝯwynsum wede|re onlicust
þō̄n onsumeres tid sended weorþeð
dropena| dreorung mid dæges hwile.

J(*Dan*)

tosweop hine ꝯtoswende. þurh þa swið|an miht.
ligges leoma. **þ**hyre líce newæs.
owiht| ge egled. ácheon andan sloh.
fyron feondas| for fyren dǽdum.
345 þawæs onþam ofne. þær| se engel becwóm.
windig ꝯwynsum. wedere gelicost.
þō̄n hit onsumeres tíd. 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'.[743] In **J**, *þ* introduces a result clause: '[he][744] swept it back and brushed [it] aside by his great might so that not a whit was harmed on their body...'.

Metrically, the two forms are identical.

***Az/Dan*, E 61a/J 345a**

E(*Az*)

Tosweop ⁊||| toswen$_g$de þurh swiðes meaht
liges leoman swa hyra lice nescod.|
acwæs inþam ḥofne þase engel cwom
windig ⁊wynsum wede|re onlicust
þō̄n onsumeres tid sended weorþeð
dropena| dreorung mid dæges hwile.

J(*Dan*)

tosweop hine ⁊toswende. þurh þa swið|an miht.
ligges leoma. þhyre líce newæs.
owiht| ge egled. ácheon andan sloh.
fyron feondas| for fyren dǽdum.
þawæs onþam ofne. þær| se engel becwóm.
windig ⁊wynsum. wedere gelicost.
þō̄n hit onsumeres tíd. 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 ⁊||| toswen$_g$de þurh swiðes meaht
liges leoman swa hyra lice nescod.|
acwæs **in**þam ḥofne þase engel cwom
windig ⁊wynsum wede|re onlicust
þō̄n onsumeres tid sended weorþeð
dropena| dreorung mid dæges hwile.

J(*Dan*)

tosweop hine ⁊toswende. þurh þa swið|an miht.
ligges leoma. þhyre líce newæs.
owiht| ge egled. ácheon andan sloh.
fyron feondas| for fyren dǽdum.
þawæs **on**þam ofne. þær| se engel becwóm.
windig ⁊wynsum. wedere gelicost.
þō̄n hit onsumeres tíd. 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.

[743]This use of *swa* is mentioned in Mitchell, *OES*, § 1862.

[744]This translation ignores the problem of **J** *ligges leoma*. For a discussion, see above, p. 371.

***Az/Dan*, E 61b/J 345b**

E(*Az*)	**J(*Dan*)**
Tosweop ȝ||| toswen$_g$de þurh swiðes meaht	tosweop hine ȝtoswende. þurh þa swið|an miht.
liges leoman swa hyra lice nescod.|	ligges leoma. þhyre líce newæs.
acwæs inþam ḥofne **þa**se engel cwom	owiht| ge egled. ácheon andan sloh.
windig ȝwynsum wede|re onlicust	fyron feondas| for fyren dǽdum.
þōn onsumeres tid sended weorþeð	þawæs onþam ofne. **þær**| se engel becwóm.
dropena| dreorung mid dæges hwile.	windig ȝwynsum. wedere gelicost.
	þōn hit onsumeres tíd. 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[745]: '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*)	**J(*Dan*)**
Tosweop ȝ||| toswen$_g$de þurh swiðes meaht	tosweop hine ȝtoswende. þurh þa swið|an miht.
liges leoman swa hyra lice nescod.|	ligges leoma. þhyre líce newæs.
acwæs inþam ḥofne þase engel cwom	owiht| ge egled. ácheon andan sloh.
windig ȝwynsum wede|re onlicust	fyron feondas| for fyren dǽdum.
þōn onsumeres tid sended weorþeð	þawæs onþam ofne. þær| se engel becwóm.
dropena| dreorung **mid** dæges hwile.	windig ȝwynsum. wedere gelicost.
	þōn hit onsumeres tíd. sended weor|ðeð.
	dropena drearung. **on**dæges 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*)	**J(*Dan*)**
sewæs inþam fire forfrean| meahtum	swylc bið wedera cyst.
halgum tohelpe	**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

[745]See Mitchell, *OES*, § 2460-2462.

one was in the furnace through the powers of the Lord as an aid to the holy men.' In **J**, *swylc* line 350a is an indefinite pronoun correlative to *swylce* in line 349b.[746] In this version, lines 350-351a refer not to the Angel but to the nature of the weather within the furnace: 'As is the finest weather, such was it in that fire through the powers of the Lord as an aid to the holy men.' Metrically, the two words are identical. The linked addition of line **J** 349b is discussed below, p. 420.

***Az/Dan*, E 68a/J 357a**

E(*Az*)

66b wearð sehata lig
to drifen ꝯ| todwæsced þærþa dæd hwatan
þry **mid**geþoncum þeoden| heredon

J(*Dan*)

351b wearð se háta líg.
todrifen ꝯto|dwæsced. þær þa dæd| hwatan.
geond þone| ofen eodon. ꝯse engel míd.
féorh nerigende.| seðær feorða wæs.
355 annanias ꝯazarías.
ꝯ| misael. þærþamód hwatan.
þry **on**geðanc|um ðeoden here don.

The substitution **E** *mid* **J** *on* has no significant effect on sense, metre, or syntax. A similar substitution occurs in line **E** 64b/**J** 348b. See p. 386, above.

Substitution Of Prefixes (1 example)

***Az/Dan*, E 62b/J 346b**

E(*Az*)

Tosweop ꝯ||| tosweⁿgde þurh swiðes meaht
60 liges leoman swa hyra lice nescod.|
acwæs inþam ḥofne þase engel cwom
windig ꝯwynsum wede|re **on**licust
þō̄n onsumeres tid sended weorþeð
dropena| dreorung mid dæges hwile.

J(*Dan*)

tosweop hine ꝯtoswende. þurh þa swið|an miht.
ligges leoma. þhyre líce newæs.
owiht| ge egled. ácheon andan sloh.
fyron feondas| for fyren dǽdum.
345 þawæs onþam ofne. þær| se engel becwóm.
windig ꝯwynsum. wedere **ge**licost.
þō̄n hit onsumeres tíd. sended weor|ðeð.
dropena drearung. ondæges hwile.
wearm|lic wolcna scúr.

The substitution has no significant effect on sense, syntax, or metre. **J** *gelicost* and **E** *onlicust* both can be translated 'most like' and the two words are metrically and syntactically identical.

[746]Mitchell, *OES*, § 2375.

Substitution Of Stressed Words and Elements (22 examples)

***Az/Dan*, E 8b/J 286b**

E(*Az*)	**J(*Dan*)**
sindon þine domas| on**dæda** gehwam	siendon þine dó|mas. in**daga** gehwam.
soðe geswiðde ȝgesige fæste.	soðe ȝgeswiðde. ȝge|sige fæste.
eac| þinne willan inworuld spedum	swa þu eac sylfa eart.
ryhte mid ræde	syndon| þine willan. onworuld spedum.
	rihte ȝge|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.[747]

[747]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 *gehwam*, the two words are syntactically equivalent. Metrically, **E** 8b is Type B-2; in **J**, the equivalent line in Type B-1 with a resolved first lift.

***Az/Dan*, E 11a/J 290a**

E(*Az*)	**J(*Dan*)**
sindon þine domas| ondæda gehwam	siendon þine dó|mas. indaga gehwam.
soðe geswiðde ȝgesige fæste.	soðe ȝgeswiðde. ȝge|sige fæste.
10 eac| þinne willan inworuld spedum	swa þu eac sylfa eart.
ryhte mid **ræde**	syndon| þine willan. onworuld spedum.
	290 rihte ȝ**ge|rume**.

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** *ȝ*, see above, p. 375.

***Az/Dan*, E 14a/J 293a**

E(*Az*)	**J(*Dan*)**
ro|dera waldend	290 rodora waldend.
geoca us georne gæsta scyppend	geo causer georne.| nu gasta scyppend.
ȝ| þurh hyldo help halig dryhten	ȝþurh help halig drih|ten.
nuwe þec for**þear|fum** ȝfor þrea nydum	nu[we],þec for **þreaum**. ȝfor ðeo nydum.|
15 ȝfore eað medum arena| biddaþ	ȝfor eaðmedum. arna biddað.
lege bilegde	295 líge beleg|de.

The substitution **E** *þear|fum* **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.[748]

***Az/Dan*, E 14b/J 293b**

E(*Az*)	**J(*Dan*)**
ro|dera waldend	290 rodora waldend.
geoca us georne gæsta scyppend	geo causer georne.| nu gasta scyppend.
ȝ| þurh hyldo help halig dryhten	ȝþurh help halig drih|ten.
nuwe þec forþear|fum ȝfor **þrea nydum**	nu[we],þec for þreaum. ȝfor **ðeo nydum**.|
15 ȝfore eað medum arena| biddaþ	ȝfor eaðmedum. arna biddað.
lege bilegde	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.

[748]Jabbour, diss., p. 125.

***Az/Dan*, E 18a/J 297a**

E(*Az*)	**J(*Dan*)**
weþæs lifgende	weðæs lifgende.
worhton inwo|rulde eacþon wom dydon.	worhton onworulde.| eac ðon wóm dyde.
yldran **usse** inofer hygdū|	**user** yldran. for ofer|hygdum.
þinbibodu bræcon burg sit tende	bræcon bebodo. burhsittendū|
had ofer hogedon| halgan lifes	had ofer hogedon. halgan lifes.

E *usse* is the nominative plural of the poetic possessive adjective **user*[749]; **J** *user* is the genitive of second person plural personal pronoun.[750] 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*)	**J(*Dan*)**
wurdon weto wrecene geond widne grund|	siendonwe||| towrecene. geond widne grund.
heapum to^{h}worfne hylda lease	heapum tohwor|fene. hylde lease.
wæs ure lif geond lon|da fela	is user lif . geond landafela.|
fracuð ȝgefræge fold buendū	fracoð ȝgefræge. folca manegum.
nuþu usic be|wræce inþas wyrrestan	þaus éc| bewræcon. toþæs wyrrestan.
eorð cyninges æht gewealda	eorð cyninga.| æhta gewealde.
in| hæft heoro grimmes	onhæft heoru grimra ȝwe| nu hæðenra.
sceolon weþær hæþenra	**þeow ned** þoliað.
þrea nyd || [strip of c. 4 ll. missing from MS]	

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.

[749]Campbell, *OEG*, § 706; Sievers-Brunner § 335.

[750]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
on**cyne|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
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.
on**cneo|rissum**. cenned wurde.
ȝseo mænigeo mǽre| wære.
320 hat to hebbanne. swa heofon steor|ran.
bebugað bradne hwyrft . oð þ brim|faro. þæs
sæ faroða sand. geond sealtne| wǽg.
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
oncyne|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
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.
ȝseo mænigeo mǽre| wære.
320 hat to hebbanne. swa heofon steor|ran.
bebugað bradne hwyrft . oð þ **brim|faro. þæs**
sæ faroða sand. geond sealtne| wǽg.
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 þ* is not a mistake (see above, p. 380), then **J** *brim|faro. þæs* (for *brimfaroþas*) is most likely to be construed as the nominative plural masculine subject of *gryndeð*.[751]

As Jabbour suggests, the **J** reading may be an anticipation of *sæ faroða* in the following line.[752]

***Az/Dan*, E 39b/J 322b**

E(*Az*)

þuhimge hete þurh hleoþor cwidas
þæt þu hyra from|cynn onfyrn dagum
ycan wolde þhit æfter him
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 **<u>wæter</u>**
yþe geond ear|grund þæt swa unrime
ymb wintra hwearft weorðan sceol|de

J(*Dan*)

þu him þgehéte. þurh| hleoðor cwyde.
þ þu hyra frum cyn. infyrn| dagum.
ícan wolde. þte æfter him.
oncneo|rissum. cenned wurde.
ꝛseo mænigeo mǽre| wære.
hat to hebbanne. swa heofon steor|ran.
bebugað bradne hwyrft . oð þ brim|faro. þæs
sæ faroða sand. geond sealtne| **<u>wǽg</u>**.
me áre gryndeð. þ his únrima.
inwintra| worn. wurðan sceolde.

E *wæter* 'water' and **J** *wǽg* '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.[753] 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.

[751]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.

[752]Jabbour, diss., p. 132.

[753]See Bessinger-Smith, *sealt-*.

***Az/Dan*, E 41a/J 324a**

E(*Az*)

þuhimge hete þurh hleoþor cwidas
þæt þu hyra from|cynn onfyrn dagum
ycan wolde þhit æfter him
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
yþe geond ear|grund þæt swa unrime
ymb wintra **<u>hwearft</u>** weorðan sceol|de

J(*Dan*)

þu him þgehéte. þurh| hleoðor cwyde.
þ þu hyra frum cyn. infyrn| dagum.
ícan wolde. þte æfter him.
oncneo|rissum. cenned wurde.
ꝛseo mænigeo mære| wære.
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| **<u>worn</u>**. 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 ꝛmeaht nu| þec caldeas
ꝛeac fela folca gefregen habban
þæt þu ana| eart ece dryhten
<u>sige rof</u> set tend ꝛsoð meo tod
wuldres| waldend ꝛworuld sceafta

J(*Dan*)

gecyð cræft ꝛ| miht. þþcaldeas.
ꝛfolca fela. gefrigen hab|bað.
ðaþe under heofenum. hæðene lifigeað.|
ꝛþþu ána eart. éce drihten.
weroda waldend.| woruld gesceafta.
<u>sigora</u> settend. soð fæst| metod.

E *sige rof* 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.[754] Metrically, **E** is Type A-2ab; in **J**, the line is a Type A-2b.

[754]Both epithets are nonce occurrences.

***Az/Dan*, E 47b/J 332b**

E(*Az*)	**J(*Dan*)**
gecyð cræft ꝯmeaht nu| þec caldeas	gecyð cræft ꝯ| miht. þþcaldeas.
45 ꝯeac fela folca gefregen habban	ꝯfolca fela. gefrigen hab|bað.
þæt þu ana| eart ece dryhten	ðaþe under heofenum. hæðene lifigeað.|
sige rof set tend ꝯsoð meo tod	330 ꝯþþu ána eart. éce drihten.
wuldres| waldend ꝯworuld sceafta	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 ꝯ in the preliminary dip (see p. 414).[755]

***Az/Dan*, E 48a/J 331a**

E(*Az*)	**J(*Dan*)**
gecyð cræft ꝯmeaht nu| þec caldeas	gecyð cræft ꝯ| miht. þþcaldeas.
45 ꝯeac fela folca gefregen habban	ꝯfolca fela. gefrigen hab|bað.
þæt þu ana| eart ece dryhten	ðaþe under heofenum. hæðene lifigeað.|
sige rof set tend ꝯsoð meo tod	330 ꝯþþu ána eart. éce drihten.
wuldres| waldend ꝯworuld sceafta	**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.[756] 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.

[755]See also Jabbour, diss., p. 139.

[756]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*)	**J(*Dan*)**
swase halga wer hergende wæs|	swa se halgawer. hergende wæs.
50 meotudes miltse ȝhis **<u>mod sefan</u>**	me|todes miltse. ȝhis **<u>mihta sped</u>**.
rehte þurh reorde|	335 rehte þ*urh*| 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.[757]

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*)	**J(*Dan*)**
ða ofroderum **<u>wearð</u>**	335b ðaof roderum **<u>wæs</u>**.
engel ælbeorhta ufon onsended|	engel ælbeorht.| ufan onsended.
wlite scyne wer inhis wuldor homan.	wlite scyne wer. onhiswul|dorhaman.
Cwomhimþa toare| ȝto ealdor nere	sehim cwóm tofrofre. ȝto| feorh nere.
55 þurh lufan ȝþurh lisse	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*)	**J(*Dan*)**
ða ofroderum wearð	335b ðaof roderum wæs.
engel ælbeorhta ufon onsended|	engel ælbeorht.| ufan onsended.
wlite scyne wer inhis wuldor homan.	wlite scyne wer. onhiswul|dorhaman.
Cwomhimþa to**<u>are</u>**| ȝto ealdor nere	sehim cwóm to**<u>frofre</u>**. ȝto| feorh nere.
55 þurh lufan ȝþurh lisse	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**, *frofre*, 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*.

[757] 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*)	**J(*Dan*)**
ða ofroderum wearð	335b ðaof roderum wæs.
engel ælbeorhta ufon onsended|	engel ælbeorht.| ufan onsended.
wlite scyne wer inhis wuldor homan.	wlite scyne wer. onhiswul|dorhaman.
Cwomhimþa toare| ꝯto **ealdor** nere	sehim cwóm tofrofre. ꝯto| **feorh** nere.
55 þurh lufan ꝯþurh lisse	mid lufan ꝯmid 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.[758] 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*)	**J(*Dan*)**
Tosweop ꝯ||| toswen$_g$de þurh swiðes meaht	tosweop hine ꝯtoswende. þurh þa swið|an miht.
60 liges leoman swa hyra lice ne**scod**.|	ligges leoma. þhyre líce ne**wæs**.
acwæs inþam ḥofne þase engel cwom	owiht| ge egled. ácheon andan sloh.
windig ꝯwynsum wede|re onlicust	fyron feondas| for fyren dǽdum.
þō̄n onsumeres tid sended weorþeð	345 þawæs onþam ofne. þær| se engel becwóm.
dropena| dreorung mid dæges hwile.	windig ꝯwynsum. wedere gelicost.
	þō̄n hit onsumeres tíd. sended weor|ðeð.
	dropena drearung. ondæges 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][759] 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*)	**J(*Dan*)**
bædon **bletsunge** bearn Inworulde	bǽdon **bletsian**. bearn| israela.
70 ealle gesceaf|te ecne dryhten	eall láand gesceaft. écne drihten.|
þeoda waldend	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 gesceaf\|te* is a dative phrase[760] 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 láand 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,[761] both versions of the text make good sense in context.

[758]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

[759]This translation ignores the problem of **J** *ligges leoma*. For a discussion, see above, p. 371.

[760]*Ealle* is instrumental, *gesceaf\|te* dative. For a discussion of the forms, see above, p. 372, fn. 732.

[761]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*)	**J(*Dan*)**
bædon bletsunge bearn **<u>Inworulde</u>**	bǽdon bletsian. bearn| **<u>israela</u>**.
70 ealle gesceaf|te ecne dryhten	eall láND gesceaft. écne drihten.|
þeoda waldend	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*),[762] suggests that *in worulde* may be an "all-purpose half-verse tag" used without thought by the **E** scribe.[763]

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*)	**J(*Dan*)**
B Letsige þec bilwit fæder	362 ÐE Gebletsige. bylywit fæder.
<u>woruld</u> **sceafta** wuldor| ȝweorca gehwylc	<u>woruld</u>|**cræfta** wlite. ȝweorca gehwilc.
75 heofonas ȝenglas ȝhluttor| wæter	heofo|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*)	**J(*Dan*)**
B Letsige þec bilwit fæder	362 ÐE Gebletsige. bylywit fæder.
woruld sceafta **<u>wuldor</u>** | ȝweorca gehwylc	woruld|cræfta **<u>wlite</u>**. ȝweorca gehwilc.
75 heofonas ȝenglas ȝhluttor| wæter	heofo|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

[762] **J** has a different half-line here; see below, p. 401.

[763] 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*)	**J(*Dan*)**
1 Himþa azarias ingeþoncum	ða| azarias inge þancum.
hleoþrede halig þurh| hatne lig	280 hleoðrade halig.| þurh hatne líg.
dreag dædum georn dryhten herede	dæda georn. drihten herede.|
wis| inweorcum ȝþas word acwæð	**wer womma leas**. ȝþa 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).[764] 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,"[765] 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.

[764]Jabbour, diss., p. 120.

[765]Jabbour, diss., p. 120.

***Az/Dan*, E 24b/J 303b**

E(*Az*)

wurdon weto wrecene geond widne grund|
heapum to^{h}worfne hylda lease
wæs ure lif geond lon|da fela
fracuð ȝgefræge **<u>fold buendū</u>**
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*)

siendonwe||| towrecene. geond widne grund.
heapum tohwor|fene. hylde lease.
is user lif . geond landafela.|
fracoð ȝgefræge. **<u>folca manegum</u>**.
þaus éc| bewræcon. toþæs wyrrestan.
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*)

þuhimge hete þurh hleoþor cwidas
þæt þu hyra from|cynn onfyrn dagum
ycan wolde þhit æfter him
oncyne|ryce cenned wurde
<u>yced oneorþan þæt swa unrime</u>
had to| hebban swa heofon steorran
bugað bradne hwearft oðbrim|flodas.
swa waroþa sond ymb sealt wæter
yþe geond ear|grund þæt swa unrime
ymb wintra hwearft weorðan sceol|de

J(*Dan*)

þu him þgehéte. þurh| hleoðor cwyde.
þ þu hyra frum cyn. infyrn| dagum.
ícan wolde. þte æfter him.
oncneo|rissum. cenned wurde.
<u>ȝseo mænigeo mǽre| wære.</u>
hat to hebbanne. swa heofon steor|ran.
bebugað bradne hwyrft . oð þ brim|faro. þæs
sæ faroða sand. geond sealtne| wǽg.
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*)	**J(*Dan*)**
1 **Him**þa azarias ingeþoncum	ða| azarias inge þancum.
hleoþrede halig þurh| hatne lig	280 hleoðrade halig.| þurh hatne líg.
dreag dædum georn dryhten herede	dæda georn. drihten herede.|
wis| inweorcum ȝþas word acwæð	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.[766]

Az/Dan, E 3a/J 281a

E(*Az*)	**J(*Dan*)**
1 Himþa azarias ingeþoncum	ða| azarias inge þancum.
hleoþrede halig þurh| hatne lig	280 hleoðrade halig.| þurh hatne líg.
dreag dædum georn dryhten herede	**dæda** georn. drihten herede.|
wis| inweorcum ȝþas word acwæð	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,[767] 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'.

---

[766]For **E**, cf. **J** *oðer azarías*, line 91b; for **J**, cf. **J** *ȝazarías*, line 355b; **E** *ȝazarias*, line 153b.

[767]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."[768] It is also possible, however, that an exemplar to **J** had *georn*a, the masculine singular weak form of the adjective.[769] 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*)	**J(*Dan*)**
5 meotud allwihta þueart| meahtum swið niþas tonerganne	283 metod al|wihta. **<u>hwæt</u>** 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.[770]

[768]Jabbour, diss., pp. 89-90, 119-120.

[769]I am grateful to Fred C. Robinson for this suggestion.

[770]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 ⁊gesige fæste.
eac| þinne willan inworuld spedum
ryhte mid ræde

J(*Dan*)

siendon þine dó|mas. indaga gehwam.
soðe ⁊geswiðde. ⁊ge|sige fæste.
swa þu eac sylfa eart.
syndon| þine willan. onworuld spedum.
rihte ⁊ge|rume.

The addition or omission of ⁊ affects our interpretation of the precedig word in both witnesses, *soðe*. In **J**, *soðe* is a nominative plural adjective agreeing with *dó|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 ⁊, **E** *soðe* would be more likely interpreted as an adverb qualifying *geswiðde*: 'your decrees are truly established, and secured of their triumph.'

As ⁊ 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.
yldran usse inofer hygdū|
þinbibodu bræcon burg sit tende
had ofer hogedon| halgan lifes

J(*Dan*)

weðæs lifgende.
worhton onworulde.| eac ðon wóm dyde.
user yldran. 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 and 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 27b/J 306b**

E(*Az*)

wurdon weto wrecene geond widne grund|
heapum to^{h}worfne hylda lease
wæs ure lif geond lon|da fela
fracuð ȝgefræge fold buendū
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*)

siendonwe||| towrecene. geond widne grund.
heapum tohwor|fene. hylde lease.
is user lif . geond landafela.|
fracoð ȝgefræge. folca manegum.
þaus éc| bewræcon. toþæs wyrrestan.
eorð cyninga.| æhta gewealde.
onhæft heoru grimra ȝwe| nu hæðenra.
þeow ned þoliað.

J lines 306b-307a are an independent clause joined syndetically (by *ȝ*) to the preceding material: 'and we now endure slavery of heathens'. In **E**, the equivalent lines are a locative clause: 'where we must... oppression of heathens'. The conjunction alls in the preliminary drop of a Type C-1 line and has no effect on metre.

***Az/Dan*, E 27b/J 306b**

E(*Az*)

wurdon weto wrecene geond widne grund|
heapum to^{h}worfne hylda lease
wæs ure lif geond lon|da fela
fracuð ȝgefræge fold buendū
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*)

siendonwe||| towrecene. geond widne grund.
heapum tohwor|fene. hylde lease.
is user lif . geond landafela.|
fracoð ȝgefræge. folca manegum.
þaus éc| bewræcon. toþæs wyrrestan.
eorð cyninga.| æhta gewealde.
onhæft heoru grimra ȝwe| nu hæðenra.
þeow ned þoliað.

Sceolon is the main verb of **E** 27b-28a; an infinitive was presumably amongst material removed from the manuscript after *þrea nyd*. This is quite different syntax from **J**, where *þoliað* is the sole verb in the clause.

***Az/Dan*, E 31a/J 314a**

E(*Az*)

[text missing from **E**]

hæfdes.
to abra hame. ⁊to isace.
⁊iacobe. gæsta scyp|pend.

J(*Dan*)

þæs þe þanc| sie
wereda wuldor cyning. þþuus þas wra|ce teodest: ||
Nefor let þu usic ana . éce drihten.
forðam| miltsum. ðe ðec men hligað.
⁊forðam treowū. þe þu tirum fæst.
niða nergend. genumen| hæfdest.
to abrahame. ⁊to isaace.
⁊**to**iaco|be gasta scyppend.

J *toiaco|be* 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**.[771] 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.[772]

***Az/Dan*, E 32a/J 315a**

E(*Az*)

þuhimge hete þurh hleoþor cwidas
þæt þu hyra from|cynn onfyrn dagum
ycan wolde þhit æfter him
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
yþe geond ear|grund þæt swa unrime
ymb wintra hwearft weorðan sceol|de

J(*Dan*)

þu him þgehéte. þurh| hleoðor cwyde.
þ þu hyra frum cyn. infyrn| dagum.
ícan wolde. þte æfter him.
oncneo|rissum. cenned wurde.
⁊seo mænigeo mǽre| wære.
hat to hebbanne. swa heofon steor|ran.
bebugað bradne hwyrft . oð þ brim|faro. þæs
sæ faroða sand. geond sealtne| wǽg.
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.

---

[771]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.

[772]B.T(S). *geniman*, senses XVII and XVIIa.

***Az/Dan*, E 34b/J 317b**

E(*Az*)	**J(*Dan*)**
þuhimge hete þurh hleoþor cwidas	315 þu him þgehéte. þurh| hleoðor cwyde.
þæt þu hyra from|cynn onfyrn dagum	þ þu hyra frum cyn. infyrn| dagum.
ycan wolde þ**hit** æfter him	ícan wolde. þte æfter him.
35 oncyne|ryce cenned wurde	oncneo|rissum. cenned wurde.
yced oneorþan þæt swa unrime	ȝseo mænigeo mǽre| wære.
had to| hebban swa heofon steorran	320 hat to hebbanne. swa heofon steor|ran.
bugað bradne hwearft oðbrim|flodas.	bebugað bradne hwyrft . oð þ brim|faro. þæs
swa waroþa sond ymb sealt wæter	sæ faroða sand. geond sealtne| wǽg.
40 yþe geond ear|grund þæt swa unrime	me áre gryndeð. þ his únrima.
ymb wintra hwearft weorðan sceol|de	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.[773] It has no significant effect on metre.

***Az/Dan*, E 42a/J 325a**

E(*Az*)	**J(*Dan*)**
42 fyl nu**þa** frum spræce þeahþe user fea lifgen	325 fyl nu frum spræce.| ðeah heora féa lifigen.
wlitega| þine word cwidas ȝðinwuldor us.	wlitiga þinne word| cwyde. ȝþín 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*)	**J(*Dan*)**
42 fyl nuþa frum spræce þeah**þe** user fea lifgen	325 fyl nu frum spræce.| ðeah heora féa lifigen.
wlitega| þine word cwidas ȝðinwuldor us.	wlitiga þinne word| cwyde. ȝþín 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.

[773]See Farrell, *Daniel and Azarias*, p. 22.

***Az/Dan*, E 43b/J 326b**

E(*Az*)	**J(*Dan*)**
42 fyl nuþa frum spræce þeahþe user fea lifgen	325 fyl nu frum spræce.| ðeah heora féa lifigen.
wlitega| þine word cwidas ꝯðinwuldor us.	wlitiga þinne word| cwyde. ꝯþín 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*)	**J(*Dan*)**
gecyð cræft ꝯmeaht nu| **þec** caldeas	gecyð cræft ꝯ| miht. þþcaldeas.
45 ꝯeac fela folca gefregen habban	ꝯfolca fela. gefrigen hab|bað.
þæt þu ana| eart ece dryhten	ðaþe under heofenum. hæðene lifigeað.|
sige rof set tend ꝯsoð meo tod	330 ꝯþþu ána eart. éce drihten.
wuldres| waldend ꝯworuld sceafta	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*)	**J(*Dan*)**
gecyð cræft ꝯmeaht nu| þec caldeas	gecyð cræft ꝯ| miht. þþcaldeas.
45 ꝯ**eac** fela folca gefregen habban	ꝯfolca fela. gefrigen hab|bað.
þæt þu ana| eart ece dryhten	ðaþe under heofenum. hæðene lifigeað.|
sige rof set tend ꝯsoð meo tod	330 ꝯþþu ána eart. éce drihten.
wuldres| waldend ꝯworuld sceafta	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 �journeaht nu| þec caldeas
�journeac fela folca gefregen habban
þæt þu ana| eart ece dryhten
sige rof set tend �journsoð meo tod
wuldres| waldend �jworuld sceafta

J(*Dan*)

gecyð cræft ꝅ| miht. þþcaldeas.
ꝅfolca fela. gefrigen hab|bað.
ðaþe under heofenum. hæðene lifigeað.|
ꝅþþu ána eart. éce drihten.
weroda waldend.| woruld gesceafta.
sigora settend. soð fæst| metod.

The addition or omission of *ꝟ* 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 ꝟ meaht* in **E** 44a/**J** 327a. With *ꝟ* 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 ꝟmeaht nu| þec caldeas
ꝟeac fela folca gefregen habban
þæt þu ana| eart ece dryhten
sige rof set tend ꝟsoð meo tod
wuldres| waldend ꝟworuld sceafta

J(*Dan*)

gecyð cræft ꝅ| miht. þþcaldeas.
ꝅfolca fela. gefrigen hab|bað.
ðaþe under heofenum. hæðene lifigeað.|
ꝅþþu ána eart. éce drihten.
weroda waldend.| woruld gesceafta.
sigora settend. soð fæst| metod.

The addition or omission of *ꝟ* 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**, *ꝟ* joins the epithet *soð meo tod* ‘true Creator’ syndetically to the preceding epithets. With the omission of *ꝟ* 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 ⁊ is linked to the substitution **E** *soð* **J** *soð fæst* discussed above, p. 395. In **E** ⁊ 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 ⁊meaht nu| þec caldeas
⁊eac fela folca gefregen habban
þæt þu ana| eart ece dryhten
sige rof set tend ⁊soð meo tod
wuldres| waldend ⁊woruld sceafta

J(*Dan*)

gecyð cræft ⁊| miht. þþcaldeas.
⁊folca fela. gefrigen hab|bað.
ðaþe under heofenum. hæðene lifigeað.|
⁊þþu ána eart. éce drihten.
weroda waldend.| woruld gesceafta.
sigora settend. soð fæst| metod.

As in the preceding variant, the addition or omission of ⁊ 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 ⁊ has an important effect on metre. In **E**, *⁊woruld 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| ⁊to ealdor nere
þurh lufan ⁊þurh lisse

J(*Dan*)

335b ðaof roderum wæs.
engel ælbeorht.| ufan onsended.
wlite scyne wer. onhiswul|dorhaman.
sehim cwóm tofrofre. ⁊to| feorh nere.
mid lufan ⁊mid 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.[774] 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*)	**J(*Dan*)**
ða ofroderum wearð	335b ðaof roderum wæs.
engel ælbeorhta ufon onsended|	engel ælbeorht.| ufan onsended.
wlite scyne wer inhis wuldor homan.	wlite scyne wer. onhiswul|dorhaman.
Cwomhim**þa** toare| �facto ealdor nere	sehim cwóm tofrofre. �facto| feorh nere.
55 þurh lufan �facþurh lisse	mid lufan �facmid 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*)	**J(*Dan*)**
Tosweop ꝃ||| toswen$_g$de þurh swiðes meaht	tosweop **hine** ꝃtoswende. þurh þa swið|an miht.
60 liges leoman swa hyra lice nescod.|	ligges leoma. þhyre líce newæs.
acwæs inþam ḥofne þase engel cwom	owiht| ge egled. ácheon andan sloh.
windig ꝃwynsum wede|re onlicust	fyron feondas| for fyren dǽdum.
þo̅n onsumeres tid sended weorþeð	345 þawæs onþam ofne. þær| se engel becwóm.
dropena| dreorung mid dæges hwile.	windig ꝃwynsum. wedere gelicost.
	þo̅n hit onsumeres tíd. sended weor|ðeð.
	dropena drearung. ondæges hwile.
	wearm|lic wolcna scúr.

In **E**, the object of *Tosweop* and *toswen$_g$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][775] swept it back and brushed [it] aside by his great might...' As **J** *leoma*, line

[774]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*.

[775]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 ⁊||| toswen$_g$de þurh swiðes meaht
liges leoman swa hyra lice nescod.|
acwæs inþam ḥofne þase engel cwom
windig ⁊wynsum wede|re onlicust
þō̄n onsumeres tid sended weorþeð
dropena| dreorung mid dæges hwile.

J(*Dan*)

tosweop hine ⁊toswende. þurh **<u>þa</u>** swið|an miht.
ligges leoma. ƿhyre líce newæs.
owiht| ge egled. ácheon andan sloh.
fyron feondas| for fyren dǽdum.
þawæs onþam ofne. þær| se engel becwóm.
windig ⁊wynsum. wedere gelicost.
þō̄n hit onsumeres tíd. sended weor|ðeð.
dropena drearung. ondæges 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 *swīð*: ‘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*)	**J(*Dan*)**
Tosweop ȝ||| toswen$_g$de þurh swiðes meaht	tosweop hine ȝtoswende. þurh þa swið|an miht.
liges leoman swa hyra lice nescod.|	ligges leoma. þhyre líce newæs.
acwæs inþam ḥofne þase engel cwom	owiht| ge egled. ácheon andan sloh.
windig ȝwynsum wede|re onlicust	fyron feondas| for fyren dǽdum.
þōn onsumeres tid sended weorþeð	þawæs onþam ofne. þær| se engel becwóm.
dropena| dreorung mid dæges hwile.	windig ȝwynsum. wedere gelicost.
	þōn **hit** onsumeres tíd. sended 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 *sended 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*)	**J(*Dan*)**
sewæs inþam fire **for**frean| meahtum	swylc bið wedera cyst.
halgum tohelpe	swylc| wæs on þam fyre. fréan mihtum.
	halgum| to helpe.

In **E**, *forfrean| 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,[776] but does affect metre. In **J**, *fréan* must be scanned disyllabically and the line is Type A-1. In **E**, *frean* 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."[777]

[776]See also, Jabbour, diss., p. 144.

[777]Farrell, *Daniel and Azarias*, p. 20.

Addition/Omission Of Prefixes (4 examples)

***Az/Dan*, E 38a/J 321a**

E(*Az*)

þuhimge hete þurh hleoþor cwidas
þæt þu hyra from|cynn onfyrn dagum
ycan wolde þhit æfter him
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
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.
ꝛseo mænigeo mǽre| wære.
320 hat to hebbanne. swa heofon steor|ran.
bebugað bradne hwyrft . oð þ brim|faro. þæs
sæ faroða sand. geond sealtne| wǽg.
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'.[778] 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'.[779]

---

[778]*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.

[779]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 ꝯmeaht nu| þec caldeas
ꝯeac fela folca gefregen habban
þæt þu ana| eart ece dryhten
sige rof set tend ꝯsoð meo tod
wuldres| waldend ꝯworuld sceafta

J(*Dan*)

gecyð cræft ꝯ| miht. þþcaldeas.
ꝯfolca fela. gefrigen hab|bað.
ðaþe under heofenum. hæðene lifigeað.|
ꝯþþu ána eart. éce drihten.
weroda waldend.| woruld **ge**sceafta.
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.[780] 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 ⁊ 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 ⁊ to the preliminary drop), **E** is a Type C-1.

***Az/Dan*, E 61b/J 345b**

E(*Az*)

Tosweop ꝯ||| toswen$_{g}$de þurh swiðes meaht
liges leoman swa hyra lice nescod.|
acwæs inþam ḥofne þase engel cwom
windig ꝯwynsum wede|re onlicust
þōn onsumeres tid sended weorþeð
dropena| dreorung mid dæges hwile.

J(*Dan*)

tosweop hine ꝯtoswende. þurh þa swið|an miht.
ligges leoma. þhyre líce newæs.
owiht| ge egled. ácheon andan sloh.
fyron feondas| for fyren dǽdum.
þawæs onþam ofne. þær| se engel **be**cwóm.
windig ꝯwynsum. wedere gelicost.
þōn hit onsumeres tíd. sended weor|ðeð.
dropena drearung. ondæges 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*)	**J(*Dan*)**
B Letsige þec bilwit fæder	362 ÐE **Ge**bletsige. bylywit fæder.
woruld sceafta wuldor| ꝯweorca gehwylc	woruld|cræfta wlite. ꝯweorca gehwilc.
75 heofonas ꝯenglas ꝯhluttor| wæter	heofo|nas ꝯenglas. ꝯhluttor 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*)	**J(*Dan*)**
ro|dera waldend	290 rodora waldend.
geoca us georne gæsta scyppend	geo causer georne.| **nu** gasta scyppend.
ꝯ| þurh hyldo help halig dryhten	ꝯþurh help halig drih|ten.
nuwe þec forþear|fum ꝯfor þrea nydum	nu^{we},þec for þreaum. ꝯfor ðeo nydum.|
15 ꝯfore eað medum arena| biddaþ	ꝯfor eaðmedum. arna biddað.
lege bilegde weþæs lifgende	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.[781] A sentence adverb, *nu* has little significant effect on sense or syntax.

[780]Jabbour, diss., p. 139. See Bessinger-Smith *woruldgesceaft*, *woruldgesceafta*, *woruldgesceafte*.

[781]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*)	**J(*Dan*)**
ro|dera waldend	290 rodora waldend.
geoca us georne gæsta scyppend	geo causer georne.| nu gasta scyppend.
ȝ| þurh **<u>hyldo</u>** help halig dryhten	ȝþurh help halig drih|ten.
nuwe þec forþear|fum ȝfor þrea nydum	nu[we],þec for þreaum. ȝfor ðeo nydum.|
15 ȝfore eað medum arena| biddaþ	ȝfor eaðmedum. arna biddað.
lege bilegde	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*.[782]

***Az/Dan*, E 40b/J 323b**

E(*Az*)	**J(*Dan*)**
þuhimge hete þurh hleoþor cwidas	315 þu him þgehéte. þurh| hleoðor cwyde.
þæt þu hyra from|cynn onfyrn dagum	þ þu hyra frum cyn. infyrn| dagum.
ycan wolde þhit æfter him	ícan wolde. þte æfter him.
35 oncyne|ryce cenned wurde	oncneo|rissum. cenned wurde.
yced oneorþan þæt swa unrime	ȝseo mænigeo mǽre| wære.
had to| hebban swa heofon steorran	320 hat to hebbanne. swa heofon steor|ran.
bugað bradne hwearft oðbrim|flodas.	bebugað bradne hwyrft . oð þ brim|faro. þæs
swa waroþa sond ymb sealt wæter	sæ faroða sand. geond sealtne| wǽg.
40 yþe geond ear|grund þæt swa unrime	me áre gryndeð. þ his únrim<u>**a**</u>.
ymb wintra hwearft weorðan sceol|de	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** *unrime* **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.

[782]Jabbour, diss., p. 124.

***Az/Dan*, E 70a/J 359a**

E(*Az*)	**J(*Dan*)**
bædon bletsunge bearn Inworulde	bǽdon bletsian. bearn| israela.
70 ealle gesceaf|te ecne dryhten	eall **<u>láND</u>** gesceaft. écne drihten.|
þeoda waldend	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. E*alle gesceafte* is a common tag in Old English poetry; **J** contains the only occurrence of *eall landgesceaft.*[783]

Addition/Omission Of Metrical Units (5 examples)

***Dan*, J 288**

E(*Az*)	**J(*Dan*)**
6b isþin noma mære|	isþin nama mære.
wlitig ȝwuldor fæst ofer wer þeode	285 wlitig ȝwul|dor fæst. ofer wer ðeode.
sindon þine domas| ondæda gehwam	siendon þine dó|mas. indaga gehwam.
soðe geswiðde ȝgesige fæste.	soðe ȝgeswiðde. ȝge|sige fæste.
10 eac| þinne willan inworuld spedum	**<u>swa þu eac sylfa eart</u>**.
ryhte mid ræde	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

[783]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*.[784]

***Az*, E 57-58**

E(*Az*)	**J(*Dan*)**
55b seþone lig tosceaf|	seðone| lig tosceaf.
halig ȝheofonbeorht hatan fyres	340 halig ȝheofon beorht. hatan||| fyres.
þse bittra bryne beor|gan sceolde	
forþæs engles ége æfæstum þrim.	

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'.[785] 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).[786] While they are more than "essentially an elaboration of a foregoing idea,"[787] the lines are not necessary to the over all sense of the poem.

[784]Farrell, *Daniel and Azarias*, p. 20.

[785]Jabbour, diss., p. 142.

[786]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 *ǣ*, "the concept of a law common to all men," in the author's original text of *Daniel*.

[787]Jabbour, diss., p. 142.

***Dan*, J 343-344**

E(*Az*)

Tosweop ȝ||| toswen$_g$de þurh swiðes meaht
liges leoman swa hyra lice nescod.|
acwæs inþam ḥofne þase engel cwom
windig ȝwynsum wede|re onlicust
þō̄n onsumeres tid sended weorþeð
dropena| dreorung mid dæges hwile.

J(*Dan*)

tosweop hine ȝtoswende. þurh þa swið|an miht.
ligges leoma. ƿhyre líce newæs.
owiht| ge egled. **ácheon andan sloh**.
fyron feondas| **for fyren dǽdum**.
þawæs onþam ofne. þær| se engel becwóm.
windig ȝwynsum. wedere gelicost.
þō̄n hit onsumeres tíd. sended 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][788] 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||| toswen$_g$de þurh swiðes meaht
liges leoman swa hyra lice nescod.|
acwæs inþam ḥofne þase engel cwom
windig ȝwynsum wede|re onlicust
þō̄n onsumeres tid sended weorþeð
dropena| dreorung mid dæges hwile.
sewæs inþam fire forfrean| meahtum
halgum tohelpe

J(*Dan*)

tosweop hine ȝtoswende. þurh þa swið|an miht.
ligges leoma. ƿhyre líce newæs.
owiht| ge egled. ácheon andan sloh.
fyron feondas| for fyren dǽdum.
þawæs onþam ofne. þær| se engel becwóm.
windig ȝwynsum. wedere gelicost.
þō̄n hit onsumeres tíd. sended weor|ðeð.
dropena drearung. ondæges hwile.
wearm|lic wolcna scúr. **swylc bið wedera cyst**.
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*)	**J(*Dan*)**
66b wearð sehata lig	351b wearð se háta líg.
to drifen ꝛ| todwæsced þærþa dæd hwatan	todrifen ꝛto|dwæsced. þær þa dæd| hwatan.
þry midgeþoncum þeoden| heredon	**geond þone| ofen eodon**. **ꝛse engel míd**.
	féorh nerigende.| **seðær feorða wæs**.
	355 **annanias ꝛazarías**.
	ꝛ| 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[789]: ' 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

---

[788]This translation ignores the problem of **J** *ligges leoma*. For a discussion, see above, p. 371.

[789]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."[790] 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."[791]

Reinterpretation of Existing Text (1 example)

***Az/Dan*, E 39a/J 322a**

E(*Az*)

þuhimge hete þurh hleoþor cwidas
þæt þu hyra from|cynn onfyrn dagum
ycan wolde þhit æfter him
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
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.
ꝯseo mænigeo mǽre| wære.
320 hat to hebbanne. swa heofon steor|ran.
bebugað bradne hwyrft . oð þ brim|faro. þæs
sæ faroða sand. geond sealtne| wǽg.
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'.[792]

[790]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.

[791]Jabbour, diss., p. 145.

[792]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*)	**J(*Dan*)**
weþæs lifgende	295 weðæs lifgende.
worhton inwo|rulde eacþon wom dydon.	worhton onworulde.| eac ðon wóm dyde.
yldran usse inofer hygdū|	**user yldran**. for ofer|hygdum.
þinbibodu bræcon burg sit tende	bræcon bebodo. burhsittendū|
20 had ofer hogedon| halgan lifes	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*)	**J(*Dan*)**
weþæs lifgende	295 weðæs lifgende.
worhton inwo|rulde eacþon wom dydon.	worhton onworulde.| eac ðon wóm dyde.
yldran usse inofer hygdū|	user yldran. for ofer|hygdum.
þin**bibodu bræcon** burg sit tende	**bræcon bebodo**. burhsittendū|
20 had ofer hogedon| halgan lifes	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*)	**J(*Dan*)**
gecyð cræft ꝯmeaht nu| þec caldeas	gecyð cræft ꝯ| miht. þþcaldeas.
45 ꝯeac **fela folca** gefregen habban	ꝯ**folca fela**. gefrigen hab|bað.
þæt þu ana| eart ece dryhten	ðaþe under heofenum. hæðene lifigeað.|
sige rof set tend ꝯsoð meo tod	330 ꝯþþu ána eart. éce drihten.
wuldres| waldend ꝯworuld sceafta	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**, *ꝯeac fela folca* is a Type C-1 line with principal lifts on *fela* (resolved) and *folca*[793]; in **J**, the equivalent line is Type B-1.

***Az/Dan*, E 54a/J 338a**

E(*Az*)	**J(*Dan*)**
ða ofroderum wearð	335b ðaof roderum wæs.
engel ælbeorhta ufon onsended|	engel ælbeorht.| ufan onsended.
wlite scyne wer inhis wuldor homan.	wlite scyne wer. onhiswul|dorhaman.
Cwomhimþa toare| ꝯto ealdor nere	se**him cwóm** tofrofre. ꝯto| feorh nere.
55 þurh lufan ꝯþurh lisse	mid lufan ꝯmid 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*)	**J(*Dan*)**
B Letsige **þec** bilwit fæder	362 **ÐE** Gebletsige. bylywit fæder.
woruld sceafta wuldor| ꝯweorca gehwylc	woruld|cræfta wlite. ꝯweorca gehwilc.
75 heofonas ꝯenglas ꝯhluttor| wæter	heofo|nas ꝯenglas. ꝯhluttor 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.

[793]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*)	**J(*Dan*)**
gecyð cræft ꝛmeaht nu| þec caldeas	gecyð cræft ꝛ| miht. þþcaldeas.
45 ꝛeac fela folca gefregen habban	ꝛfolca fela. gefrigen hab|bað.
þæt þu ana| eart ece dryhten	ðaþe under heofenum. hæðene lifigeað.|
sige rof set tend ꝛsoð meo tod	330 ꝛþþu ána eart. éce drihten.
wuldres| waldend ꝛworuld sceafta	**weroda waldend**.| **woruld gesceafta**.
	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."[794]

Recomposition (1 example)

***Az/Dan*, E 40a/J 323a**

E(*Az*)	**J(*Dan*)**
þuhimge hete þurh hleoþor cwidas	315 þu him þgehéte. þurh| hleoðor cwyde.
þæt þu hyra from|cynn onfyrn dagum	þ þu hyra frum cyn. infyrn| dagum.
ycan wolde þhit æfter him	ícan wolde. þte æfter him.
35 oncyne|ryce cenned wurde	oncneo|rissum. cenned wurde.
yced oneorþan þæt swa unrime	ꝛseo mænigeo mǽre| wære.
had to| hebban swa heofon steorran	320 hat to hebbanne. swa heofon steor|ran.
bugað bradne hwearft oðbrim|flodas.	bebugað bradne hwyrft . oð þ brim|faro. þæs
swa waroþa sond ymb sealt wæter	sæ faroða sand. geond sealtne| wǽg.
40 **yþe geond ear|grund** þæt swa unrime	**me áre gryndeð**. þ his únrima.
ymb wintra hwearft weorðan sceol|de	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*[795] *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**.

[794]Jabbour, diss., p. 138.

[795]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 occured, 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 rearrangment 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.

Chapter 5
Conclusion

This study has argued that Anglo-Saxon scribes copied Old English verse to different standards of accuracy depending on the nature of the context in which they were working. Taking as its sample all metrically regular Old English poems known to have survived in more than one twelfth-century or earlier witness, it divides this corpus into three main contextual groups, each of which exhibits a characteristic pattern of substantive textual variation.

Chapter Two examines "Glossing, Translating, and Occasional" poems. These texts are generally short, are found in primarily non-poetic contexts, and appear to have been transmitted independently of their surrounding context. They also all show a high level of substantive textual accuracy. At their most accurate, the scribes responsible for copying the surviving witnesses to these poems show themselves to have been able to reproduce their common texts with little or no variation in vocabulary, word order, or syntax – and preserve this accuracy even in the face of a corrupt common exemplar or thoroughgoing dialectal translation. The substantive variants the witnesses to these texts do show tend either to be obvious mistakes or to have a relatively insignificant effect on sense, syntax, and metre. Apparently significant inflectional differences more often than not can be attributed to graphic error, orthographic difference, or phonological change. Verbal substitutions are rare and almost invariably involve words which look alike and have similar meanings. Examples of the addition or omission of words and elements either destroy the sense of the passage in which they occur, or involve unstressed and syntactically unimportant sentence particles.

Chapter Three looks at the poems preserved in "Fixed Contexts" – as constituents of larger vernacular prose framing texts such as the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, the Old English translation of the *Pastoral Care*, and the Old English translation of Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica*. With the exception of a single, late witness to the Old English *Historia*, these poems are found in exactly the same contextual position in each surviving witness. The *Battle of Brunanburh* is always found in manuscripts of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*; the Metrical Preface to the Old English *Pastoral Care* survives only in manuscripts of Alfred's translation. In contrast to the Glossing, Translating, and Occasional poems discussed in Chapter Two, the Fixed Context poems differ greatly in the amount and types of textual variation they exhibit. At their most conservative, the scribes of the surviving witnesses to these texts produce copies as accurate as the least variable Glossing, Translating, and Occasional poems; the scribes of other witnesses, however, show themselves to be far more willing to introduce substantive changes of vocabulary and inflection. In either case the amount and nature of the variation introduced is directly comparable to the substantive textual variation found in the surrounding prose. Scribes who show themselves to have been innovative copyists of the prose texts in which these poems are found, also invariably produce innovative copies of the poems themselves; scribes who produce conservative copies of the poetic texts, on the other hand, are responsible for the most conservative texts of the surrounding frame.

The third standard of accuracy is exhibited by the "Anthologised and Excerpted" poems discussed in Chapter Four. These poems differ from the Glossing, Translating, and Occasional poems of Chapter Two and the Fixed Context poems of Chapter Three in both the nature of the contexts in which they are found and the amount and significance of the substantive variation they exhibit. Unlike the texts discussed in the preceding chapters, the Anthologised and Excerpted poems show evidence of the intelligent involvement of the

persons first responsible for collecting or excerpting them in their surviving witnesses. Like the greater part of the corpus of Old English poetry as a whole – but unlike the poems discussed in Chapters Two and Three – these texts all survive with at least one witness in a compilation or anthology. In four out of the six cases, their common text shows signs of having been excerpted from, inserted into, or joined with other prose or verse texts in one or another witness. Where the variation exhibited by the poems discussed in Chapters Two and Three was to be explained only on the grounds of the personal interests, abilities, or difficulties of the scribes responsible for the tradition leading up to each of the surviving witnesses, that exhibited by the witnesses to the Anthologised and Excerpted poems frequently can be explained on contextual grounds – and often involves the introduction of metrically, lexically or syntactically coordinated variants at different places in the common text.

This argument has some important implications for our understanding of the transmission of Old English poetry. In the first place, it suggests that there was no single style of Old English poetic transmission. Since Sisam first asked "Was the poetry accurately transmitted?" scholars examining variation in the transmission of Old English verse texts have tended to assume they were investigating a single phenomenon – that is to say, have assumed that, a few late, early, or otherwise exceptional examples aside, all Old English poems showed pretty much the same kinds of textual variation, whether this variation be the result of "error," or the application of "oral" or "formulaic" ways of thinking. The evidence presented here, however, suggests that the scribes themselves worked far less deterministically. Rather than copying "the poetry" to any single standard of substantive accuracy, the scribes seem instead to have adjusted their standards to suit the demands of the context in which the specific poem they were copying was to appear. When the wording of their text was important – as it was when the poem was being copied as a gloss or translation – the scribes reproduced their

exemplars more or less word-for-word. When the relationship between their text and its surrounding context was paramount – as it appears to have been in the case of the Anthologised and Excerpted poems – the evidence of the surviving witnesses suggests that the persons responsible for transmitting these texts were more willing to adjust sense, syntax, and metre. When other factors appear to have played a role – incompetence in the case of the scribe of the London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. i (**ChronD**) version of the *Chronicle* poems, editorial adventurousness in that of the Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 41 ($\mathbf{B_1}$) version of the Old English Bede – the similarity between the verse and prose variation these manuscripts exhibit suggests the scribes did not take any specifically "poetic" approach to the constituent verse.

In the second place, the evidence presented here that scribes copied to a different standard of accuracy depending on the nature of the context in which they were working suggests that the scribes themselves recognised the existence of different types of manuscript collections. The fact that the scribes responsible for copying the (marginal) West-Saxon *ylda*- and the (fixed, main-text) West-Saxon *eorðan*-recensions of "Cædmon's Hymn" worked to such different standards of accuracy, for example, tells us that they collectively recognised a functional difference between the margins of a Latin manuscript and the main text of a vernacular prose history. Just as significantly, the fact that the Anthologised and Excerpted poems differ so greatly from the "minor poems" discussed in Chapters Two and Three in both context and variation suggests that these poems and collections were also regarded as a different class of text or manuscript – in this case, perhaps, a more "literary" class, suitable for collection, recomposition, or excerption as the need arose.

This is not an insignificant observation. In contrast to our knowledge of the poetry of most other periods of English literature, our knowledge of Old English vernacular verse is almost

entirely deductive. Most Old English poems are undateable, anonymous, and of uncertain origins. The Anglo-Saxons themselves left no accounts of the metrical basis of their verse, the manner in which they composed the texts, the generic classifications (if any) they recognised. In this light, the distinctions maintained by the scribes of the multiply attested poems between different poems and contexts can be seen as an implicit source of contemporary literary criticism, providing us with an opportunity to establish how Anglo-Saxon readers saw their poetry both as an art-form in its own right and as part of the wider cultural and literary environment in Anglo-Saxon England.

For practical and historical reasons, this study has concentrated on the substantive variation found among the witnesses to *poetic* texts. Practical in the sense that the number of multiply-attested poetic texts is relatively small, and that the preservation of metre provides a valuable means of distinguishing between otherwise syntactically and lexically acceptable readings. Historical in the sense that the "authority" of Anglo-Saxon manuscripts always has been seen as a primarily poetic problem. For it is only in the poetry that the relative lack of multiply attested texts presents critics with such important questions about the reliability of the scribes responsible for the preservation of the surviving witnesses. The most important prose works of the period generally survive in enough copies to allow for the relatively easy isolation of what Dorothy Horgan has called the "Scribal Contribution." As a result, research into prose variation has tended to concentrate on explicating the motives and techniques of individual scribes or revisers, rather than examining the basic reliability of their profession as a whole. Thus, in the same volume of collected essays in which Sisam uses the variation between the surviving manuscripts of poetic texts to question the reliability of the scribes responsible for copying Old English verse, appears an essay in which the variation between surviving manuscripts of Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies* is used in part to reconstruct Ælfric's habits as a

reviser of his own work.[796] Likewise, the "thousands of (mostly) minor modifications"[797] in the text of Wærferð's translation of Gregory's *Dialogues* in Oxford Bodleian Hatton 76, ff. 1-54 has led to the frequent discussion of the syntactic and lexical differences between the original and revision – but not of the competency of the scribe(s) responsible for the revised text.[798]

Future work will need to look at the prose. Perhaps because the reliability of the scribes of prose texts has not been an important issue in the study of Old English literature, there are to my knowledge no comparative studies of Anglo-Saxon prose transmission. While current work with multiply attested prose works often gives us a very good idea of the type of variation introduced by the scribes of different manuscripts within a single tradition or text, I know of no study which examines whether certain types of prose texts or whether prose texts preserved in certain types of manuscript contexts are more liable to textual revision and innovation than others. This is of obvious importance in the case of the anthologies containing both prose and verse. If I am right in suggesting that the anthologies formed a special class of manuscripts in which collectors were more willing to intervene in the verse texts they transmit, then similar amounts and types of variation ought also to appear in their prose as well.[799] But

[796]Kenneth Sisam, "MSS. Bodley 340 and 342: Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies*," *Studies in the History of Old English Literature* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1953), 148-198.

[797]Roberta Frank, "General Editor's Preface," in: David Yerkes, *The Two Versions of Wærferth's Translation of Gregory's Dialogues: An Old English Thesaurus*, Toronto Old English Series 4 (Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1979), p. vii.

[798]See in particular the series of studies by David Yerkes: *The Two Versions of Wærferth's Translation of Gregory's Dialogues*; *Syntax and Style in Old English: A Comparison of the Two Versions of Wærferth's Translation of Gregory's Dialogues*, Medieval and Renaissance Texts & Studies 5 (Binghamton, NY: Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies, SUNY Binghamton, 1982); "The Differences of Inflection between the two versions of the Old English Translation of Gregory's *Dialogues*," *NM* 83 (1982): 260-66; "The Translation of Gregory's Dialogues and Its Revision: Textual History, Provenance, Authorship," *Studies in Earlier Old English Prose*, ed. Paul E. Szarmach (Albany: SUNY, 1986) 335-44.

[799]That the multiply attested homilies of the Vercelli Book contain many unique readings has been reported by Donald Scragg – although he suggests that these "can often be shown by comparison with the [Latin] sources to be original" (*The Vercelli Homilies and Related Texts*, EETS o.s. 300 [Oxford: EETS, 1992], p. xx).

a similar approach may also yield fruit in other, uniquely prosaic, contexts. For example, are homilies more or less accurately transmitted when they are copied as fixed constituents of homiliaries, or as individual texts assembled in collections like the Vercelli Book? Do different prose genres – historical writing, *vitae*, homilies – provoke different scribal responses towards the substantive details of their texts? Regardless of the results of this research, the approach – in which scribal performance is seen as a practical response to the demands of the text or context in which the scribe is working rather than as a result of a culturally determined reflex – seems certain to offer us a more reasonable, and it may be hoped, a more living, view of Anglo-Saxon literary life.

Appendix 1
The Multiply Attested Poems

"Bede's Death Song"*[800]

35 manuscripts, mostly post twelfth-century or continental.[801]

"Cædmon's Hymn"

Northumbrian eordu-recension*

Br	Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale, 8245-57
Di	Dijon, Bibliothèque Municipale, 574
P_1	Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Lat. 5237

Northumbrian *aeldu*-recension

L	St. Petersburg, M.E. Saltykov-Schedrin Public Library, Lat. Q. I. 18 (Leningrad Bede)
M	Cambridge, University Library, Kk. 5. 16 (Moore Bede)

West-Saxon *eorðan*-recension

B_1	Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 41
C	†London, British Library, Cotton Otho B. xi (=N)
Ca	Cambridge, University Library, Kk. 3. 18
O	Oxford, Corpus Christi College, 279
T_1	Oxford, Bodleian Library, Tanner 10
To	†Tournai, Bibliothèque Municipale, 134
(**N**	London, British Library, Additional 43703)

West-Saxon *eorðan*-recension (Hr - Ld_1 - CArms sub-group)*

CArms	London, College of Arms, M. 6
Hr	Hereford, Cathedral Library, P. 5. i
Ld	Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud Misc. 243

West-Saxon *ylda*-recension

Bd	Oxford, Bodleian Library, 163
H	Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 43
Ln	Oxford, Lincoln College, Lat. 31
Mg	Oxford, Magdalen College, Lat. 105
SanM	San Marino, CA. Huntington Library HM 35300
Tr_1	Cambridge, Trinity College, R. 5. 22
W	Winchester, Cathedral I

[800]Poems marked with an asterisk are omitted from this study (for an explanation, see Chapter 1, p. 13, fn. 30). Manuscripts and sigla in parentheses are modern transcriptions. An explanation of the other symbols on this page can be found in Appendix 2, "Manuscripts and Sigla."

[801]A list of the known witnesses can be found (with facsimiles) in Fred C. Robinson and E. G. Stanley, eds., *Old English Verse Texts from Many Sources: A Comprehensive Collection*, EEMF 23 (Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1991).

Charm 5/10*

Charm 5

Har_{585} London, British Library, Harley 585

Charm 10

B_1 Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 41

Daniel*/*Azarias

***Daniel*, ll. 279-364**

J Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 11 (Junius Manuscript)

***Azarias*, ll. 1-75**

E Exeter, Cathedral 3501, ff. 8-130 (Exeter Book)

"Durham"

CUL_{Ffi27} Cambridge, University Library, Ff. i. 27

Vit_{Dxx} †London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius D. xx (=Hickes)

(**Hickes** George Hickes, *Linguarum Veterum. Septentrionalium Thesaurus Grammatico-Criticus et Archæologicus*. Oxford, 1705).

Exeter Riddle 30 a/b

E Exeter, Cathedral 3501, ff. 8-130 (Exeter Book)

Exeter Riddle 35/Leiden Riddle

E Exeter, Cathedral 3501, ff. 8-130 (Exeter Book)

Leid Leiden, Rijksbibliotheek, Vossianus Lat. Quarto 106

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

R Ruthwell Cross, Ruthwell Parish, Dumfriesshire

V Vercelli, Biblioteca Capitolare CXVII (Vercelli Book)

"Gloria I"

CC_{201} Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 201

Jn_{121} Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 121

Latin-English Proverbs*

$Faust_{Ax}$ London, British Library, Cotton Faustina A. x

RPs London, British Library, Royal 2B. v (Regius Psalter)

Metrical Preface and Epilogue to Alfred's Translation of the *Pastoral Care*

Preface

CC_{12} Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 12

CUL_{Ii24} Cambridge, University Library, Ii. 2. 4

Hat_{20} Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 20

Tib_{Bxi} †London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. xi (=Jn_{53})

Tr_1 Cambridge, Trinity College, R. 5. 22

(**Jn_{53}** Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 53)

Epilogue

CC_{12} Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 12

Hat_{20} Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 20

Metrical Translation of the Psalms

Psalm 90:16.1-95:2.1

EPs Cambridge, Trinity College, R. 17. 1 (Eadwine's Psalter; Canterbury Psalter)

PPs Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Lat. 8824 (Paris Psalter)

Psalm 142

EPs Cambridge, Trinity College, R. 17. 1 (Eadwine's Psalter; Canterbury Psalter)
PPs Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Lat. 8824 (Paris Psalter)

Psalm 117:22/"Menologium," ll. 60-3

ChronC London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. i ("Menologium," ll. 60-3)
PPs Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Lat. 8824 (Paris Psalter)

"Fragments of Psalms"

Jn_{121} Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 121
PPs Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Lat. 8824 (Paris Psalter)

Poems of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*

***Battle of Brunanburh* (937)**

ChronA Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 173
ChronB London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. vi
ChronC London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. i
ChronD London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. iv
ChronG†London, British Library, Cotton Otho B. xi

***Capture of the Five Boroughs* (942)**

ChronA Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 173
ChronB London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. vi
ChronC London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. i
ChronD London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. iv
ChronG†London, British Library, Cotton Otho B. xi

***Coronation of Edgar* (973)**

ChronA Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 173
ChronB London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. vi
ChronC London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. i
ChronG†London, British Library, Cotton Otho B. xi

***Death of Edgar* (975)**

ChronA Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 173
ChronB London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. vi
ChronC London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. i
ChronG†London, British Library, Cotton Otho B. xi

Death of Alfred* (1036)

ChronC London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. i
ChronD London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. iv

Death of Edward* (1065)

ChronC London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. i
ChronD London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. iv

"Prayer"

Jul_{Aii} London, British Library, Cotton Julius A. ii, ff.136-144
LPs London, Lambeth Palace 427, ff. 1-209 (Lambeth Psalter)

***Solomon and Saturn* I**

B_1 Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 41
CC_{422} Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 422

***Soul and Body* I/II**

***Soul and Body* I**

V Vercelli, Biblioteca Capitolare CXVII (Vercelli Book)

***Soul and Body* II**

E Exeter, Cathedral 3501, ff. 8-130 (Exeter Book)

Appendix 2
Manuscripts and Sigla

In citing manuscripts in this study, the following conventions have been followed:

1. The sigla used by Dobbie in *The Manuscripts of Cædmon's Hymn* have been retained.[802]
2. For the Chronicle Manuscripts, I have used the standard sigla with the prefix **Chron**. Thus the siglum for Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 173 (the A Chronicle) is **ChronA**; London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. vi (the B Chronicle) is **ChronB** and so on.
3. For the remaining manuscripts, I have either based my siglum on the popular name for the manuscript (when this exists), or on an abbreviated form of the Library, name and/or shelf-number. Hence Paris, Bibliothéque Nationale Fonds Lat. 8824 ("The Paris Psalter") is **PPs**; Cambridge, Trinity College, R.17.1 ("The Eadwine Psalter") is **EPs**; but Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 201 is **CC_{201}**.
4. Shelf numbers are given as a subscript; superscript is used for information about the scribe. Thus **$ChronA^{3}$** is used for the third hand in **ChronA**; **$ChronA^{5}$** is used for the fifth. Likewise **O^{corr}** is used for the post-correction text of **O**; **O^{uncorr}** is used for the uncorrected version of the text when this differs from the corrected version. At times when confusion might otherwise arise, poem short-titles are given in brackets after the siglum. Thus **E(*Rid*30a)** is used for Exeter Riddle 30a; **E(*Rid*30b)** for Exeter Riddle 30b.
5. The symbol † is used before manuscripts in which the multiply attested poem no longer survives.

[802]See particularly Dobbie, *Manuscripts*, pp. 8-9.

Sigla Index

B_1	Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 41
Bd	Oxford, Bodleian Library, 163
Br	Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale, 8245-57
C	†London, British Library, Cotton Otho B. xi (transcribed in **N**)
Ca	Cambridge, University Library, Kk. 3. 18
CArms	London, College of Arms, M. 6
CC_{12}	Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 12
CC_{201}	Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 201
CC_{422}	Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 422
ChronA	Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 173
ChronB	London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. vi
ChronC	London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. i
ChronD	London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. iv
ChronE	London, British Library, Laud Misc. 636 (Peterborough Chronicle)
ChronG	†London, British Library, Cotton Otho B. xi (various transcripts survive)
CUL_{Ffi27}	Cambridge, University Library, Ff. i. 27
CUL_{Ii24}	Cambridge, University Library, Ii. 2. 4
Di	Dijon, Bibliothèque Municipale, 574
E	Exeter, Cathedral 3501, ff. 8-130 (Exeter Book)
EPs	Cambridge, Trinity College, R. 17. 1 (Eadwine's Psalter; Canterbury Psalter)
$Faust_{Ax}$	London, British Library, Cotton Faustina A. x
H	Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 43
Har_{585}	London, British Library, Harley 585
Hat_{20}	Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 20
Hickes	George Hickes, *Linguarum Veterum. Septentrionalium Thesaurus Grammatico-Criticus et Archæologicus*, two vols. (Oxford, 1705).
Hr	Hereford, Cathedral Library, P. 5. i
J	Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 11 (Junius Manuscript)
Jn_{121}	Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 121
Jn_{53}	Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 53 (transcript of **Tib_{Bxi}**; **$Otho_{Bii}$** [partial])
Jul_{Aii}	London, British Library, Cotton Julius A. ii, ff.136-144
L	St. Petersburg, M.E. Saltykov-Schedrin Public Library, Lat. Q. I. 18 (Leningrad Bede)
Ld	Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud Misc. 243
Leid	Leiden, Rijksbibliotheek, Vossianus Lat. Quarto 106
Ln	Oxford, Lincoln College, Lat. 31
LPs	London, Lambeth Palace 427, ff. 1-209 (Lambeth Psalter)
M	Cambridge, University Library, Kk. 5. 16 (Moore Bede)
Mg	Oxford, Magdalen College, Lat. 105
N	London, British Library, Additional 43703 (transcript of **C** and **ChronG**)
O	Oxford, Corpus Christi College, 279
$Otho_{Bii}$	†London, British Library, Cotton Otho B. ii (partial transcript in **Jn_{53}**)
P_1	Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Lat. 5237
PPs	Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Lat. 8824 (Paris Psalter)
R	Ruthwell Cross, Ruthwell Parish, Dumfriesshire

RPs London, British Library, Royal 2B. v (Regius Psalter)
SanM San Marino, CA. Huntington Library, HM 35300
T_1 Oxford, Bodleian Library, Tanner 10
Tib_{Bxi} †London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. xi (transcript in **Jn_{53}**)
To †Tournai, Bibliothèque Municipale 134 (survives in facsimile only)
Tr_1 Cambridge, Trinity College, R. 5. 22
V Vercelli, Biblioteca Capitolare CXVII (Vercelli Book)
Vit_{Dxx} †London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius D. xx (transcript in **Hickes**)
W Winchester, Cathedral I

Manuscript Index

Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale, 8245-57 **Br**
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 12 **CC_{12}**
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 173 **ChronA**
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 201 **CC_{201}**
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 41 **B_1**
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 422 **CC_{422}**
Cambridge, Trinity College, R. 5. 22 **Tr_1**
Cambridge, Trinity College, R. 17. 1 (Eadwine's Psalter; Canterbury Psalter) **EPs**
Cambridge, University Library, Ff. i. 27 **CUL_{Ffi27}**
Cambridge, University Library, Ii. 2. 4 **CUL_{Ii24}**
Cambridge, University Library, Kk. 3. 18 **Ca**
Cambridge, University Library, Kk. 5. 16 (Moore Bede) **M**
Dijon, Bibliothèque Municipale 574 **Di**
Exeter, Cathedral 3501, ff. 8-130 (Exeter Book) **E**
Hereford, Cathedral Library, P. 5. i **Hr**
Hickes, George. *Linguarum Veterum. Septentrionalium Thesaurus Grammatico-Criticus et Archæologicus*. 2 vols (Oxford, 1705). **Hickes**
Leiden, Rijksbibliotheek, Vossianus Lat. Quarto 106 **Leid**
London, British Library, Additional 43703 (transcript of C and ChronG) **N**
London, British Library, Cotton Faustina A. x **$Faust_{Ax}$**
London, British Library, Cotton Julius A. ii, ff.136-144 **Jul_{Aii}**
London, British Library, Cotton Otho B. ii **$Otho_{Bii}$**
†London, British Library, Cotton Otho B. xi **C**, **ChronG**
London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. vi **ChronB**
London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. i **ChronC**
London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. iv **ChronD**
†London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. xi **Tib_{Bxi}**
†London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius D. xx **Vit_{Dxx}**
London, British Library, Harley 585 **Har_{585}**
London, British Library, Laud Misc. 636 (Peterborough Chronicle) **ChronE**
London, British Library, Royal 2B. v (Regius Psalter) **RPs**
London, College of Arms, M. 6 **CArms**
London, Lambeth Palace 427, ff. 1-209 (Lambeth Psalter) **LPs**
Oxford, Bodleian Library, 163 **Bd**

Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 20 **Hat_{20}**
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 43 **H**
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 11 (Junius Manuscript) **J**
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 121 **Jn_{121}**
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 53 (transcript of Tib_{Bxi}; $Otho_{Bii}$ [partial]) **Jn_{53}**
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud Misc. 243 **Ld**
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Tanner 10 **T_1**
Oxford, Corpus Christi College, 279 **O**
Oxford, Lincoln College, Lat. 31 **Ln**
Oxford, Magdalen College, Lat. 105 **Mg**
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Lat. 5237 **P_1**
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Lat. 8824 (Paris Psalter) **PPs**
Ruthwell Cross, Ruthwell Parish, Dumfriesshire **R**
San Marino, CA. Huntington Library, HM 35300 **SanM**
St. Petersburg, M.E. Saltykov-Schedrin Public Library,
Lat. Q. I. 18 (Leningrad Bede) **L**
†Tournai, Bibliothèque Municipale 134 **To**
Vercelli, Biblioteca Capitolare CXVII (Vercelli Book) **V**
Winchester, Cathedral I **W**

Bibliography

Baker, Peter S. “A Little Known Variant Text of the Old English Metrical Psalter.” *Speculum* 59 (1984): 263-81.

Bately, Janet M. *MS A: A Semi-Diplomatic Edition with Introduction and Indices.* The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, a Collaborative Edition 3. Cambridge: Brewer, 1986.

———. “The Compilation of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, Once More,” *LSE* n.s. 16 (1985): 7-26.

———. “The Compilation of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* 60 B.C. to A.D. 890: Vocabulary as Evidence.” *Proceedings of the British Academy* 64 (1978), 93-129.

Bessinger, J.B., and P.H. Smith, eds. *A Concordance to the Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell, 1978.

Bethel, Patricia. “Anacrusis in the Psalms of the Paris Psalter.” *NM* 89 (1988): 33-43.

Blackburn, F. A. “Husband’s Message and the Accompanying Riddles of the Exeter Book.” *JEGP* 3 (1901): 1-11.

Bliss, A.J. *The Metre of Beowulf*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1958.

Bosworth, Joseph, and T. Northcote Toller, eds. *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary Based on the Manuscript Collections of the Late Joseph Bosworth.* Oxford: OUP - Clarendon, 1898.

Bradley, S. A. J., comp. and trans. *Anglo-Saxon Poetry: An Anthology of Old English Poems in Prose Translations with Introduction and Headnotes.* London: Dent - Everyman’s Library, 1982.

Brunner, Karl. *Altenglische Grammatik nach der Angelsächsischen Grammatik von Eduard Sievers.* Dritte Auflage. Sammlung kurzer Grammatiken germanischer Dialekte 3 (Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1965).

Callaway, Morgan Jr. *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon*. Publications of the Carnegie Institute 169. Washington: Carnegie Institute, 1913.

Cameron, Angus, Ashley Crandell Amos, Antonette diPaolo Healey *et al*., eds. *Dictionary of Old English*. Toronto: Pontifical Institute for Mediaeval Studies, 1986- .

Campbell, A. *Old English Grammar.* 1959. Oxford: OUP - Clarendon, 1991.

———, ed. *The Battle of Brunanburh*. London: Heinemann, 1938.

Carlson, Ingvar, ed.. *The Pastoral Care: Edited from British Museum Cotton Otho B.ii*. Completed by Lars- G. Hallander, Mattias Löfvenberg, and Alarik Rynell. 2 vols. Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis: Stockholm Studies in English, 34 and 48. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell International, 1975, 1978.

Chambers, R.W., 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.

Colgrave, Bertram, and R. A. B. Mynors, eds. *Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People.* Oxford Medieval Texts. Oxford: OUP - Clarendon, 1969.

Colgrave, B., general editor. *The Paris Psalter* (*MS. Bibliothèque Nationale Fonds Latin 8824*). Preface by various contributors. Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile 8. Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1958.

Conner, Patrick W. *Anglo-Saxon Exeter: A Tenth Century Cultural History.* Studies in Anglo-Saxon History. Edited by David Dumville, vol. 4. Woodbridge: Boydell, 1993.

Cox, R.S. "The Old English Distichs of Cato." *Anglia* 90 (1972): 1-29.

Cramp, Rosemary. "The Anglican Sculpted Crosses of Dumfriesshire." *Dumfriesshire and Galloway Natural History and Antiquitarian Society, Transactions and Journal of Proceedings* Ser. 3, vol. 38 (1965): 9-20.

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

Dam, J. van. *The Causal Clause and Causal Prepositions in Early Old English Prose*. Groningen and Djakarta, 1957.

Dobbie, Elliott Van Kirk, ed. *The Anglo-Saxon Minor Poems.* The Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records 6. New York: Columbia UP, 1942.

———. *The Manuscripts of Cædmon's Hymn and Bede's Death Song: With a Critical Text of the Epistola Cuthberti de obitu Bedæ*. New York: Columbia UP, 1937.

Duggan, Hoyt N. "The Evidential Basis for Old English Metrics." *SP* 85 (1988): 145-63.

Dumville, David N. "The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and the Origins of English Square Minuscule Script," *Wessex and England: Six Essays on Political, Cultural, and Ecclesiastical Revival*. Woodbridge: Boydell, 1992. 55-139

Farrell, R. T., ed. *Daniel and Azarias.* London: Methuen, 1974.

———. "The Unity of the Old English *Daniel*." *RES* n.s. 18 (1967): 117-35.

Förster, Max. "Die altenglischen Beigaben des Lambeth Psalters." *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen* 132 (1914): 328-335.

———. "Zu Adrian und Ritheus," *ESt* 23 (1897): 433-4.

Frank, Roberta. "Late Old English *Þrymnys* 'Trinity': Scribal Nod or Word Waiting to be Born." In: Joan Hall, *et al*. eds. *Old English and New*. pp. 97-110.

———. "General Editor's Preface." In: David Yerkes, *The Two Versions of Wærferth's Translation of Gregory's Dialogues: An Old English Thesaurus*.

Frantzen, Allen J. "The Body in *Soul and Body I*." *ChR* 17 (1982): 76-88.

Fry, Donald K. "A Newly Discovered Version of the Old English Poem 'Durham'." In: Joan Hall, *et al*. eds. *Old English and New*. pp. 97-110.

Gerritsen, J. "Leiden Revisited: Further Thoughts on the Leiden Riddle." In: *Medieval Studies Conference, Aachen, 1983.* Edited by W.-D. Bald and H. Weinstock. Frankfurt-am-Main; New York: Lang, 1984. 51-59.

———. "The Text of the Leiden Riddle." *ESts* 6 (1969): 529-544.

Gibson, Margaret, T. A. Heslop, and Richard W. Pfaff, eds. *The Eadwine Psalter*: *Text, Image and Monastic Culture in Twelfth-Century Canterbury*. Publications of the Modern Humanities Research Association 14. London: Modern Humanities Research Association, 1992.

Gollancz, Sir Israel, ed. *The Cædmon Manuscript of Anglo-Saxon Biblical Poetry. Junius XI in the Bodleian Library*. Oxford: Humphrey Milford for the British Academy, 1927.

Gordon, R.K. *Anglo-Saxon Poetry*. Everyman's Library 794. London: Dent, 1959.

Grant, Raymond J. S. *The B-Text of the Old English Bede*: *A Linguistic Commentary*. Costerus n.s. 73. Amsterdam: Rodophi, 1989.

———. *Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 41: The Loricas and the Missal*. Costerus: Essays in English and American Language and Literature, n.s. 17. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 1978.

———. "Lawrence Nowell's Transcript of BM Cotton Otho B.xi." *ASE* 3 (1974): 111-124.

Griffith, M. S. "Poetic Language and the Paris Psalter: The Decay of the Old English Tradition." *ASE* 20 (1991): 167-86.

Gyger, Alison (*née* Jones). See: Jones-Gyger, Alison.

Hall, J.R. ed. *A Concise Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*. Fourth edition with a supplement by Herbert D. Merritt. Medieval Academy Reprints for Teaching 14. 1960. Toronto: UTP, 1991.

Hall, Joan H., Nick Doane, and Dick Ringler, eds.. *Old English and New: Studies in Language and Linguistics in Honour of Frederic G. Cassidy*. New York: Garland, 1992.

Hardwick, Charles, and H. Luard, eds. *A Catalogue of Manuscripts Preserved in the Library of the University of Cambridge.* 1857. München: Kraus, 1980.

Harris, Joseph. "'Brunanburh' 12b-13a and Some Skaldic Passages." *Magister Regis: Studies in Honor of Robert Earl Kaske*. Eds. Robert Groos with Emerson Brown Jr., Thomas D. Hill, Giuseppe Mazzotta and Joseph S. Wittig (New York: Fordham, 1986), 61-68.

Hickes, George. *Linguarum Veterum. Septentrionalium Thesaurus Grammatico-Criticus et Archæologicus*. Two vols. Oxford, 1705.

Holthausen, Ferdinand. Review of the *Exeter Book*: Part II. Edited by W.S. Mackie. *Bleiblatt zur Anglia* 46 (1935): 5-10.

———. "Zur Textkritik altenglisher Dichtungen." *ESt* 37 (1907): 198-211.

———. Review of *Bibliothek der angelsächsichen Poesie*. Edited by Christian W. M. Grein, *Anglia Beiblatt* 8 (1894): 192-198, 224-234.

Horgan, Dorothy M. "The Old English Pastoral Care: the Scribal Contribution." *Studies in Earlier English Prose*. Edited by Paul E. Szarmach. Albany: SUNY, 1986. 109-28

———. "The Lexical and Syntactic Variants Shared by Two of the Later MSS of Alfred's Translation of Gregory's Cura Pastoralis." *ASE* 9 (1981): 213-21.

———. "The Relationship Between the O.E. MSS. of King Alfred's Translation of Gregory's Pastoral Care." *Anglia* 91 (1973): 153-69.

Humphreys, K. W., and Alan S. C. Ross. "Further Manuscripts of Bede's 'Historia Ecclesiastica', of the 'Epistola Cuthberti De Obitu Bedae', and Further Anglo-Saxon Texts of 'Cædmon's Hymn' and 'Bede's Death Song'." *N&Q* 220 (1975): 50-55.

Jabbour, Alan Albert. “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.

James, M. R. *The Canterbury Psalter*. London, 1935.

[Jones-]Gyger, Alison. “The Old English *Soul and Body* as an Example of Oral Transmission.” *MÆ* 38 (1969): 239-44.

Jones[-Gyger], Alison. “*Daniel* and *Azarias* as Evidence for the Oral-Formulaic Character of Old English Poetry.” *MÆ* 35 (1966): 95-102.

Jost, Karl. “Zu den Handschriften der *Cura Pastoralis*.” *Anglia* 37 (1913): 63-68.

Ker, N. R. *A Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon* (*Reissued With Supplement*). 1957. Oxford: OUP - Clarendon, 1990.

———, ed. *The Pastoral Care*. Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile 6. Copenhagen: Rosenkilde & Bagger, 1956.

———. “The Hague MS of the *Epistola Cuthberti De Obitu Bedae* With Bede’s Death Song.” *MÆ* 8 (1939): 40-44.

———. Review of *the Exeter Book of Old English Poetry*, by R. W. Chambers, Max Förster, and Robin Flower. *MAE* 2 (1933): 224-31.

Klaeber, Fr. *Beowulf and the Fight at Finnsburg*. Third edition with first and second supplements. Lexington MA: Heath, 1950.

Kiernan, Kevin S. Beowulf *and the* Beowulf *Manuscript.* New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers UP, 1981.

Liuzza, Roy Michael. “The Texts of the OE Riddle 30.” *JEGP* 87 (1984): 1-15.

Luick, Karl. *Historische Grammatik der englischen Sprache.* 1914. Oxford: Clarendon – OUP, 1964.

Lutz, Angelika, ed. *Die Version G der angelsächsischen Chronik: Rekonstruktion und Edition*. Münchener Universitäts-Schriften, Philosophische Fakultät 11. München: Wilhelm Fink, 1981.

Mawer, Allen. “Redemption of the Five Boroughs.” *ERH* 38 (1923): 551-557.

Megginson, David. “The Written Language of Old English Poetry.” Diss., Centre for Medieval Studies, University of Toronto, 1993.

Menner, Robert J., ed. *The Poetical Dialogues of Solomon and Saturn.* Monograph Series, vol. 13. New York: MLA, 1941.

Meyvaert, Paul. “An Apocalypse Panel on the Ruthwell Cross.” *Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 9 (1982): 3-32.

Miller, Thomas, ed. *The Old English Version of Bede’s Ecclesiastical History of the English People*. EETS os 95, 110. London: EETS, 1890-1898.

Mitchell, Bruce. *Old English Syntax.* 2 Vols. Oxford: OUP - Clarendon, 1985.

———. “Cædmon’s Hymn, Line 1: What is the Subject of *Scylun* or its Variants.” *LSE* 16 (1985): 190-97.

———. “Some Problems Involving Old English Periphrasis with *Beon*/*Wesan* and the Present Participle.” *NM* 77 (1976): 482-3.

———. “Linguistic Fact and the Interpretation of Old English Poetry.” *ASE* 4 (1975): 11-28.

———. “Five Notes on Old English Syntax.” *NM* 70 (1969): 82-3.

Moffat, Douglas. “Anglo-Saxon Scribes and Old English Verse.” *Speculum* 67 (1992): 805-27.

———, ed. and trans. *The Old English* Soul and Body. Wolfeboro NH: D.S. Brewer - Boydell & Brewer, 1990.

———. “A Case of Scribal Revision in the OE Soul and Body.” *JEGP* 86 (1987): 1-8

———. “The MS Transmission of the OE Soul and Body.” *MÆ* 52 (1983): 300-302.

Muir, Bernard J, ed. *The Exeter Anthology of Old English Poetry: An Edition of Exeter Dean and Chapter MS 3501*. Exeter: U Exeter P, 1995.

Nelson, Marie. “King Solomon’s Magic: the Power of a Written Text.” *Oral Tradition* 5 (1990): 20-36.

Ó Carragáin, Éamonn. “How Did the Vercelli Collector Interpret the *Dream of the Rood*?” In: *Studies in English Language and Early Literature in Honour of Paul Christopherson.* Edited by P. M. Tilling. Occasional Papers in Linguistics and Language Learning 8. Belfast, 1981. 62-104.

———. “Liturgical Innovations Associated with Pope Sergius and the Iconography of the Ruthwell and Bewcastle Crosses.” In: *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*. Edited by Robert T. Farrell. British Archaeological Reports 46. N.Pl., 1978. 131-47.

O’Donnell, Daniel P. “A Northumbrian Version of ‘Cædmon’s Hymn’ (*eordu*-recension) in Brussels Bibliothèque Royale manuscript 8245-57 ff.62r^{2}-v^{1}: Identification, Edition and Filiation.” Forthcoming in: *New Essays on the Venerable Bede* (provisional title). Edited by A.A. MacDonald and L. Houwen. Groningen, 1995.

———. “The Collective Sense of Concrete Singular Nouns In Beowulf: Emendations of Sense.” *NM* 92 (1991): 433-440.

O’Keeffe, Katherine O’ Brien. *Visible Song: Transitional Literacy In Old English Verse.* Cambridge Studies In Anglo-Saxon England 4. Cambridge: CUP, 1990.

O’Neill, Patrick P. “The English Version.” In: Gibson *et al.*, *The Eadwine Psalter*, pp. 121-138.

———. “Another Fragment of the Metrical Psalms in the Eadwine Psalter.” *N&Q* 233 (1988), 434-36.

Orton, P.R. “‘The Battle of Brunanburh’, 40b-44a: Constantine’s Bereavement.” *Peritia* 4 (1985): 243-50.

———. “Disunity in the Vercelli Book Soul and Body,” *Neoph* 63 (1979): 42-44.

———. “The Old English *Soul and Body*: A Further Examination.” *MÆ* 48 (1979): 173-97.

Page, R. I. *An Introduction to English Runes.* London: Methuen, 1973.

Parkes, M. B. “The Manuscript of the Leiden Riddle.” *ASE* 1 (1972): 207-17.

Pitman, James Hall, trans. *The Riddles of Aldhelm.* Yale Studies in English 67. 1925. New Haven, CT: Archon Books, 1970.

Plummer, Charles. *Two of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicles Parallel*: *A Revised Text*. 2 vols. Oxford: OUP - Clarendon, 1899.

Pope, John C. “Paleography and Poetry: Some Solved and Unsolved Problems of the Exeter Book.” In: *Medieval Scribes, Manuscripts and Libraries, Essays Presented to N.R. Ker*. Edited by M.B. Parkes, and Andrew G. Watson. London: Scolar, 1978. 25-65.

———. *Seven Old English Poems*. Corrected Edition. New York: Bobs-Merrill; Norton, 1981.

———. *The Rhythm of Beowulf: An Interpretation of the Normal and Hypermetric Verse-Forms in Old English Poetry*. New Haven: Yale, 1942.

Pulsiano, Philip. “The Scribes and Old English Gloss of Eadwine’s Canterbury Psalter.” *Proceedings of the PMR Conference: Annual Publication of the International Patristic, Mediaeval and Renaissance Conference* 14 (1989): 223-60.

Rissanen, Matti. “Two Notes on Old English Poetic Texts: ‘Beowulf’ 2461; ‘Ruthwell Cross’ III 3.” *NM* 68 (1967): 276-88.

Robinson, Fred C., and E. G. Stanley, eds. *Old English Verse Texts from Many Sources: A Comprehensive Collection.* Early English Manuscripts In Facsimile 23. Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1991.

———. “‘Bede’s’ Envoi to the Old English *History*: an Experiment in Editing.” *SP* 78 (1981): 4-19.

———. “Lexicography and Literary Criticism: A Caveat.” *Philological Essays in Old and Middle English Language and Literature in Honour of Herbert Dean Meritt*. edited by James Rosier. The Hague and Paris: Mouton, 1970. 99-110.

Russom, Geoffrey. *Old English Metre and Linguistic Theory*. Cambridge: CUP, 1987.

Schipper, Jacob, ed. *König Alfreds Übersetzung von Bedas Kirchengeschichte*. 2 vols. Bibliothek der angelsächsichen Prosa 4. Leipzig: Georg H. Wigand, 1898-1899.

Schücking, Levin L. “Altengl. scepen und die sogen. idg. Vokative-reste im Altengl.” *ESt* 44 (1912): 155-57.

Scragg, D. G. *The Vercelli Homilies and Related Texts.* EETS o.s. 300. Oxford: EETS, 1992.

———. “Initial *h* in OE.” *Anglia* 88 (1970): 165-96

Sievers, Eduard. “AGS. scepen,” *ESt* 44 (1912): 295-96.

———. *Altgermanische Metrik*, Sammlung kurzer Grammatiken germanischer Dialeckte (Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1893).

———. “Zur Rhythmik des Germanischen Alliterationsverses I & II.” *PBB* 10 (1885): 209-314, 415-545.

Sisam, Celia, ed. *The Vercelli Book: A Late Tenth Century Manuscript Containing Prose and Verse. Vercelli Biblioteca Capitolare CXVII.* Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile 19. Copenhagen : Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1976.

———. Review of the *Finnsburh Fragment and Episode* and *Daniel and Azarias*. *RES* n.s. 27 (1976): 324-26.

Sisam, Kenneth and Celia Sisam. “The Psalm Texts.” In: B. Colgrave, ed. *The Paris Psalter*. pp. 15-17.

Sisam, Kenneth. *Studies in the History of Old English Literature*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1953.

———. “The Authority of Old English Poetical Manuscripts.” In: *Studies in the History of Old English Literature*. 29-44.

———. “The Exeter Book.” In: *Studies in the History of Old English Literature*. 97-108.

———. “MSS. Bodley 340 and 342: Ælfric’s *Catholic Homilies*.” In: *Studies in the History of Old English Literature*. 148-198.

———. “The Publication of Alfred’s Pastoral Care.” In: *Studies in the History of Old English Literature*. 140-47.

Smetena, Cyril. “Second Thoughts on *Soul and Body I*.” *MS* 29 (1967): 193-205.

Smith, A. H., 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. Edited by M. J. Swanton and Marion Glasscoe. Exeter: University of Exeter, 1978.

Swanton, Michael, ed. *The Dream of the Rood.* Manchester: Manchester UP, 1970.

Sweet, Henry, ed.. *King Alfred’s West-Saxon Version of the Pastoral Care*. EETS o.s. 45 and 50. London: Kegan Paul, 1871-72.

Taylor, Simon, ed. *MS B.* The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A Collaborative Edition 4. Cambridge: Brewer, 1983.

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

Toller, T. Northcote, ed. *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary Based on the Manuscript Collections of the Late Joseph Bosworth*: *Supplement.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1921.

Ure, James M. *The Benedictine Office: An Old English Text.* Edinburgh University Publications Language and Literature, vol. 11. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1957.

———. “The *Benedictine Office* and the Metrical Paraphrase of the Lord’s Prayer in MS C.C.C.C. 201.” *RES* n.s. 4 (1953): 354-6.

Webber, Teresa. “Codicology and Paleography: 2. The Script.” In: Gibson *et al.*, *The Eadwine Psalter*, pp. 13-24.

Whitelock, Dorothy. “The Old English Bede.” *Proc. Brit. Acad.* 48 (1962): 57-90.

———. ed. *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*: *A Revised Translation* with David C. Douglas and Susie I. Tucker. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1961.

———. ed. *English Historical Documents: c.500-1042*. London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1955.

———. *The Peterborough Chronicle*. With an appendix by Cecily Clark. Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile 4. Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1954.

Wildhagen, Karl. *Der Psalter des Eadwine von Canterbury: Die Sprache der altenglischen Glosse ein frühchristliches Psalterium die Grundlage*. Studien zur englischen Philolologie 13 (Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1905).

Williamson, Craig, ed. *The Old English Riddles of the Exeter Book.* Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1977.

Wuest, P. “Zwei neue Handschriften von Caedmons Hymnus,” *ZfdA* 48 (1906): 205-26.

Wülker, Richard. *Die Verceller Handschrift*: *die Handschrift des Cambridger Corpus Christi Collegs CCI, die Gedichte der sogen. Cædmonhandschrift, Judith, der Hymnus Cædmons, Heiligenkalendar nebst kleineren geistlichen Dichtungen*. Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Poesie v. 2.1. Kassel: Georg H. Wigand, 1888.

Yerkes, David. "The Translation of Gregory's Dialogues and its Revision: Textual History, Provenance, Authorship." In: *Studies in Earlier Old English Prose. Edited by* Paul E. Szarmach. Albany: SUNY, 1986. 335-44.

———. *Syntax and Style in Old English: A Comparison of the Two Versions of Wærferth's Translation of Gregory's Dialogues.* Medieval and Renaissance Texts & Studies, vol. 5. Binghamton, NY: Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies, SUNY Binghamton, 1982.

———. "The Differences of Inflection Between the Two Versions of the Old English Translation of Gregory's *Dialogues*." *NM* 83 (1982): 260-66.

———. *The Two Versions of Wærferth's Translation of Gregory's Dialogues: An Old English Thesaurus*, Toronto Old English Series 4. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1979.

Zupitza, Julius ed., *Beowulf Reproduced in Facsimile from the Unique Manuscript British Museum Ms. Cotton Vitellius A. xv*. Second Edition containing a new reproduction of the manuscript with an introductory note by Norman Davis. EETS no. 245. London: OUP, 1959.