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.” 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* – show seven variants which O’Keeffe considers to be metrically, syntactically, and semantically appropriate. On the other hand, there are the five surviving eleventh and twelfth-century copies of the West-Saxon ylda-recension. 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

42 The sixth, a marginal recension in the s.xii/siii Tournai, Bibliothèque Municipale 134 (To), is not discussed by O’Keeffe. See below, Chapter 3, pp. 112 ff. and 135 ff.
43 By my own count there are fifteen substantive variants in this recension of the poem. See Chapter 3, pp. 108-136.
44 Two witnesses to the ylda-text, San Marino CA, Huntington Library, HM 35300 (SanM) and Cambridge, Trinity College R.5.22 (Tr1), date from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Neither is of any textual value. In addition to numerous nonsense forms, there is one potentially significant variant, SanM æ, line 2h, for *and* in all other witnesses. This is almost certainly the result of the scribal misunderstanding of the abbreviation, æ. For an example of the opposite mistake – the misunderstanding of æ as ġ, cf. CUL 4227
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 eordan-recension shows a variability which she suggests is evidence of its “earlier, purely oral condition.”

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 eordan-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.”

The fact that two groups of roughly

\[ \text{ðelwold} \quad \text{Hickes Æðelwold, in “Durham,” l. 14b (discussed below, p. 81). The odd form Tr₁ euca, l. 9b for freu in all other manuscripts is presumably to be explained graphically.} \]

\[ ^{45}\text{O’Keeffe, Visible Song, p. 40.} \]

\[ ^{46}\text{O’Keeffe, Visible Song, p. 41.} \]
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 *eordan*-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 *eordan-
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)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Witness</th>
<th>caelesti</th>
<th>creatoris</th>
<th>illius</th>
<th>gloriae</th>
<th>deus</th>
<th>extitit</th>
<th>tect</th>
<th>creavit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tib_ii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tib_Aiv</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr_1275</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy_13CV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ld</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ln</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr_1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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).  

Twelve of the fourteen known English manuscripts of the *Historia* divide the paraphrase into three main clauses, *nunc... gloriae, quomodo... extitit, and qui... creavit*. 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*,

---

48 O’Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 42.
49 The description of the punctuation of Bede’s paraphrase of “Cædmon’s Hymn” and of the *eordan*- 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.
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.\textsuperscript{51}

Table 2: Pointing In “Cædmon’s Hymn,” West-Saxon eordan-recension (adapted from O’Keeffe,
Visible Song, figure 3)\textsuperscript{52}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Witness</th>
<th>1a</th>
<th>1b</th>
<th>2a</th>
<th>2b</th>
<th>3a</th>
<th>3b</th>
<th>4a</th>
<th>4b</th>
<th>5a</th>
<th>5b</th>
<th>6a</th>
<th>6b</th>
<th>7a</th>
<th>7b</th>
<th>8a</th>
<th>8b</th>
<th>9a</th>
<th>9b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T\textsubscript{1}</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B\textsubscript{1}</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ca</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In contrast, only one witness to a vernacular text of “Cædmon’s Hymn” employs a
similarly consistent grammatical system of punctuation (Table 2).\textsuperscript{53} This manuscript, a tenth-
century copy of the Old English translation of the Historia and eordan-recension of the Hymn
in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Tanner 10 (T\textsubscript{1}),\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{55} Of these points, only the last, that marking the end of the poem at line 9b, is

\textsuperscript{51}O’Keeffe, Visible Song, p. 44.

\textsuperscript{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 eordan-recension and are not considered in this study. A second manuscript
from the eordan-group not included in O’Keeffe’s table is To. This is discussed below, Chapter 3, pp. 135 ff.

\textsuperscript{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 ylde- and eordan-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.

\textsuperscript{54}For a complete list of the manuscripts and sigla used in this dissertation, see Appendix 2 “Manuscripts and
Sigla.”

\textsuperscript{55}O’Keeffe, Visible Song, p. 44.
found in the three other surviving twelfth-century or earlier manuscripts of the *eordan-* recension.\textsuperscript{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\textsubscript{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 *eordan-* recension, Cambridge, University Library, Kk. 3. 18 (Ca), uses four points, at the ends of lines 3a, 4a, 6b and 9b. Like T\textsubscript{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 gehwaes / ece drihten*, in lines 3b-4a.\textsuperscript{57}

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{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\textsubscript{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* (1.1b), *metodes mihte* (1.2a), *mod ge pan* (1.2b) and *werp| wuldor fæder* (1.3a). 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*. 
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 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. 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*.  
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 *γ* 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*, 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*.  

---

Table 3: Pointing In “Cædmon’s Hymn,” West-Saxon *ylda*-recension (adapted from O’Keeffe, Visible Song, figure 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Witness</th>
<th>1a</th>
<th>1b</th>
<th>2a</th>
<th>2b</th>
<th>3a</th>
<th>3b</th>
<th>4a</th>
<th>4b</th>
<th>5a</th>
<th>5b</th>
<th>6a</th>
<th>6b</th>
<th>7a</th>
<th>7b</th>
<th>8a</th>
<th>8b</th>
<th>9a</th>
<th>9b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>H</em></td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Mg</em></td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ln</em></td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Placement of points by clause (expressed in half-lines)
ylde 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. The point at the end of line 2a divides the direct objects of herian in two, separating heofonrices we|ard and meto̊ 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 meto̊ des mihte (his works

62A 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 f 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 – suggests that the points which do appear serve primarily as a means of clarifying aspects of the text the individual found difficult to understand.

That this was necessary brings us to a third difference between the ylda- and eordan-recensions. Not only is the ylda-recension transmitted to a higher standard of substantive accuracy and more heavily punctuated than the eordan-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 eordan-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 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). For purposes of comparison, I have reproduced the texts of H and M:

### ylda-recension (H)

```
Nu we sculon herian heofon ricesweard.
metudes myhte.  his mod ge þanc.
wurc wuldor fæder.  swa he wundra ge hwile
hee drihten ord ealstelde.
5 He ærest sceop ylda barnū
heofon to hrofe.  halig scyppend
middan geard man cynnes weard
hee drihten.  Æfter tida
firum on foldum frea áelmyhtig
```

### aeldu-recension (M)

```
Nuscylun hergan hefaemicaes uard
metudaes maecti end his modgigand
uerc uulurfadar| sue he uundragihtuaes
ecidryctin orastelida
5 heaerist sceop aelda barnū
behtinlrofe| halegscepen
thamiddun geard moncynnæsuard
ecidryctin æfter tiadæ
firum foldu freaallmectig
```

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line No.</th>
<th>West-Saxon ylda-recension</th>
<th>Northumbrian aeldu-recension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>we</td>
<td>∅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>gehwilc</td>
<td>gihtuaes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td>ord</td>
<td>or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a</td>
<td>gesceop</td>
<td>scop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a</td>
<td>middangearde</td>
<td>tha middungeard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8b</td>
<td>tida</td>
<td>tiadæ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9a</td>
<td>on foldum</td>
<td>foldu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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. 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 eordan-recension (Ca B1 To and the corrected from of O Ocorr); ord for or, l.4b, is found in all witnesses to the eordan text except T1 N (both of which read or) and To (ar). O has oor corrected to Ocorr oor gesceop (and orthographic variants) is also the reading of the eordan-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 1.3, *gehwilc* is quite ungrammatical since a genitive (*gehwæs* in the other texts of the Hymn) is required here after *ord*, 1.4. In 1.7, *middangearde*, as a dative-instrumental, has no conceivable relation to its context; and the phrase *on foldum*, 1.9, 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 1.8, 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 *tiada*, 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 ærest 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

---

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Majority Reading</th>
<th>Variant Reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td><em>H Mg W</em> sculon</td>
<td><em>Ln</em> sculun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>H Ln Mg</em> herian</td>
<td><em>W herian</em> [heri]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td><em>H Ln Mg</em> metudes</td>
<td><em>W metoðdes</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Mg W</em> mihte</td>
<td><em>Bd</em> <em>H myhte; Ln</em> michte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td><em>Bd H Mg</em> wurc</td>
<td><em>Ln W</em> weorc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Ln Mg W</em> wuldorfæder</td>
<td><em>H wuldorfæder (with o corrected from u)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td><em>H Mg W</em> gehwilc</td>
<td><em>Ln gehwylc; Bd [gehw]ylc (with y corrected from i)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td><em>H Mg W</em> ece</td>
<td><em>Ln eche</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a</td>
<td><em>H Mg ærest</em></td>
<td><em>Ln æræst; W [æ]ræst</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Ln Mg W</em> gescop</td>
<td><em>H gescop</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a</td>
<td><em>H Ln Mg</em> heofon</td>
<td><em>W heofon</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>H Ln</em> hrofe</td>
<td><em>Mg W</em> rofe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b</td>
<td><em>H Ln Mg</em> scyppend</td>
<td><em>W scyppend</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a</td>
<td><em>H Ln Mg</em> middangearde</td>
<td><em>W middangearde; Bd [mid]angearde</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b</td>
<td><em>H Bd Mg</em> mancynnes</td>
<td><em>Ln mancynnes; W mancynnes</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>H Mg W</em> weard</td>
<td><em>Ln weard (with e erased after d)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8a</td>
<td><em>H Mg W</em> ece</td>
<td><em>Ln eche</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9b</td>
<td><em>Bd Ln Mg</em> frea ælmihtig</td>
<td><em>H frea ælmihtig; W frea ealmhiti (with erasure [o?] between frea and ealmhiti)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 \(i\) 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, \textit{OEG}, §§315-318.

\(^{70}\)See Campbell, \textit{OEG}, §§49 and 377.

\(^{71}\)Campbell, \textit{OEG}, §321.

\(^{72}\)Campbell, \textit{OEG}, §181.

\(^{73}\)See Campbell, \textit{OEG}, §267.

\(^{74}\)Cf. Campbell, \textit{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.” 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. 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. The metrical Old English portion of the interlinear gloss has been copied in a hand different from those responsible for both the

---

75Campbell, *OEG*, §66.

76A 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.

77Descriptions 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).

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

Although the parallel text of Psalms 90:16.1-95:2.1 is like the ylดา-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 naere (EPs nere) for expected ware (Lat. est) in Psalm 93:16.2b, and at least one probable error, PPs EPs he for expected he in Psalm 94:7.3a. 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: æ is used throughout the text as the most common spelling for West-Saxon stressed and unstressed ð: EPs oncnæwen (PPs oncnawan), Psalm 93:8.3b; EPs demæ (PPs dema), Psalm 93:15.1b; for the second element of the diphthong æa: EPs þearfe (PPs þearfe), Psalm 93:8.3b: onworuld aworuld (PPs woruld aworuld EPs woruld aworuld) 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” Jn111 onworuld aworuld CC201 on worlda world, line 41a.

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 woruldæ woruld (PPs worulda worulda EPs worulda aworulda) 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” Jn111 onworuld aworuld CC201 on worlda world, line 41a.

81 For a detailed discussion of the forms and dialectical implications of the spellings of the lexical glosses in the Eadwine Psalter, see Karl Wildhagen, Der Psalter des Eadwine von Canterbury: Die Sprache der allenglischen 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; and for unstressed e and o in inflectional endings, prepositions, and pronouns: **EPs On[finden** (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 &: **EPs er (PPs ær)**, Psalm 94:11.2a; **EPs cweð (PPs cwæð)**, Psalm 94:10.3a; **EPs syndæn (PPs syndon)**, Psalm 93:8.2b.

82 West-Saxon æ is also preserved, for example, in Psalm 93:9.1-7 where has **EPs ægana (PPs eaegena)**, as well as **EPs ealdum, earan, eallu, sealle, gesceawian, healdað, eallum, and ðrea** (for **PPs ealdum, earan, eallum, sealle, gesceawian, healdað, eallum, and ðrea**).

83 West-Saxon æ is also preserved: **EPs aghwer PPsaegher (for aeghwer)**, Psalm 91:9.3b; **EPs æt PPsaet**, Psalm 93:15.2b.


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 æ in **PPs gehwyrfeþ: EPs gewerfeþ (corrected from geferfeþ)**, Psalm 93:13.1b.

Other differences separating the two recensions include: the sporadic omission of final vowels in **EPs oðð þe (PPs oððe þe)**, Psalm 91:3.3a; **EPs Ahefðe** (for **PPs Næfre**), Psalm 93:2.1a; **EPs gefultumed (PPs gefultumed)**, Psalm 93:15.2a; minim errors and other graphic mistakes in the use of consonants: **EPs þoonne** (for expected þonne as in **PPs**), Psalm 91:6.1a; **EPs þeð** (for ðet, **PPs þæt**), Psalm 93:8.1a; **EPs Hefre** (for nefre, **PPs Næfre**), Psalm 93:12.1a; reverse spellings, assimilations and the spurious addition of consonants: **PPs geon** (for **EPs geond**), Psalm 90:16.2b; **EPs cneowrisse** (for **PPs cneorisse**), Psalm 94:9.4a; **EPs sin**
ningrae (for PPs synnigra), Psalm 91:6.2a; EPs urriht (for PPs unriht), Psalm 93:13.2a; EPs onworul aworl (for on worulde woruld, PPs onworuld aworuld), Psalm 91:6.6a; EPs meæh| (for meæht, PPs miht), Psalm 93:1.1b; PPs foweor|hað (for forweor|hað, EPs for weor|hað), Psalm 91:8.2b; EPs eælre, corrected from eælle (for PPs eælra), Psalm 93:8.2b; EPs æghylcne (for PPs æghwylcne), Psalm 93:1.2b; PPs æghær (for æghæræ, EPs æghærer), Psalm 91:9.3b; EPs gewerfæ corrected from geferfæ (for gehwerfæ, PPs gehwyr|fæd), Psalm 93:13.1b; dittography and eye-skip: PPs heæhste (for heæhsta, EPs heæhste), Psalm 91:7.2a; EPs Forðon is se| micla god kining.| ofer eall| manne| goodu (for: Forðon is se micla god mihtig drihten ŋ se micla kining ofer eall manne godu; cf. PPs Forðon isse micla| god mihtig drihten| ō 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. 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.

The two lists are not mutually exclusive. The twenty-one variants discussed below include some – like the omission of mihtig drihten ŋ 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

   æweorðæð to wrecene wide eælle [a[æ]l] unrihtes æror worhtan;

EPs

1 hinu ðinre feond facene drihten on eorðwege] eælle for weorðæð.
   ðæ æunriht es] eror worhtan]

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

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

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

MPs (PPs/EPs), 93:2.1a

PPs

1 A hefe þe onellen. eorðæn demæ. gild ofer hidugum swa hi ær[græme] worhton;

EPs

1 Ahefeðe onhellen eorðæn demæ.] gild ofer hidegum[ swæ hi ær[græme] 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. 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 (ahefe ðe > 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 gefultumeðe (Psalm 93:15.2a, p. 38 below). The addition or omission of the

87Sievers-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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPs</th>
<th>EPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Onfindað þet -ongeo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intelligite nunc qui insipientes estis in populo et stulti aliquando sapite

PPs *Onfindað* is a plural imperative; EPs *Onfindæn* 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). 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...

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

---

88The 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 *onceæwan*), 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.

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.  

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>PPs</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th><strong>EPs</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Nymðe me drihten</td>
<td>dema usser</td>
<td>1 Nimðe me drihten</td>
<td>demæ usser.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gefultumede</td>
<td>fegereæ</td>
<td>þearfe</td>
<td>gefultumed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weninga</td>
<td>minsawl</td>
<td>sothehelle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Nisi quia dominus adiuvasset me paulominus habitaverat in inferno anima mea*

**EPs gefultumed (for **PPs** gefultumedede)** 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 this loss of this letter are similarly graphic, eyeskip being the most likely explanation in each case (**EPs** oðð pe : **PPs** oððe pe, Psalm 91:3.3a, p. 34, above, and **EPs** Ahefðe **PPs** A hefe pe, 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** gefultumedede 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.  

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. *Gefultumedede* is also used as a half-line in both witnesses to Psalm 93:16.4a.
MPs (PPs/EPs), 93:16.1a

PPs  
1  G if ic heas sægde.  þmin sylfes fot.  ful sarlicæ  asliden nære  þæmæ mildheortnes mihtihan drihtnes gefultumede  þicfeorh ahte. |

EPs  
1  Gif ic det segde.  þmin silifes fot.  ful sarlices.  asliden nere.  þæ me mildheortnes mihtigan drihtnes gefultumede  þic feorh ahte. |

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

EPs det PPs heas 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  þiniðine feond  facne drihten  on eorðwege  ealle foweorðað.  þæ weorðað to wrecene  wide ealle  þæpæl unrihtes  æror worðían; |

EPs  
1  hinuðiniðre feond  facne|drihten  on eorðwege|  eælle for weorðæð.  þæ 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 þinið 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.

92The 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  secggenede wæs l atðra spella. On the variation between the Paris and Eadwine Psalters, see also Baker, “Variant Text,” p. 281.

93This 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 *pi* occurs in a similar sense on two other occasions in the metrical Psalms (Psalm 58:3.1 *pi* *nu mine sawle*, Lat. *quia*; and Psalm 72:10.1 *pi* *fyren fulle fol[dan æhta*, Lat. *ecce*). Baker suggests that the variation between *h* and *p* can be explained graphically.  

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

**PPs**

| 5  | *gese| ege healdeð | eallum| þeodum.  
|-----|-----------------|----------|----------| 5  | *gese| ege healdeð | eallum| þeodum.  
|     | *hiss|rea| nesio | *heor* for awiht|  
|     | *se þe men læreð| micelne wisdom.|  

**EPs**

| 5  | *gese| ege healdeð | eallum| þeodum.  
|-----|-----------------|----------|----------| 5  | *gese| ege healdeð | eallum| þeodum.  
|     | *hiss|rea| nesio | *heor* |  
|     | *se þe men læreð| micelne wisdom.|

*Qui corripit gentes non arguet qui docet hominem scientiam*

**EPs** *heor* is presumably for the unstressed adverb *ha* ‘then’. **PPs** *heor* 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**

| 2  | *we|run| wehis fælefolc| *giss| fægere sceap| 2  | *werum| we his fele folc| *giss| fægere sceæp.|

**EPs**

| 2  | *werum| we his fele folc| *giss| fægere sceæp.|

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

**EPs** *werum* is ostensibly the dative plural of *wer* ‘man’. **PPs** *wer|run* is the plural preterite indicative of *bəon* ‘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.

---


96 Baker reads *ha*, but the form is ambiguous in facsimile. The descender of the letter looks more like that used by the scribe for *a* than that used for an *a*. The upper right bow of the *a* (assuming it is an *a*) 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPs</th>
<th>EPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 H ioftust sprecað</td>
<td>1 hi oftust sprecaþ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unnyt sæcgað</td>
<td>unnyt sæcgað</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>| woh meldiað wyrcað wyrceæþ un riht</td>
<td>| woh meldiað | wrecæþ wyrceæþ unriht</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPs</th>
<th>EPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 N eæt fyligeð</td>
<td>1 Ne et fligeð</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>þé ahwær facen ne unriht</td>
<td>be æhwe r facen ne unriht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>du ge fæstnæst facen</td>
<td>sares.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 fligeð for etfiligeð or etfilgeð (PPs et 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 ðyssum
   wintra rijmes wonade neah.
   áá. þymble cwæð eac swa onceow
   þætic ær on yrre æðe be nemde
gifhionmi læ reste  ricene  eodon]

**EPs**
1 Nu ic feow ertig folce ðysu
   wintra rimes. wunede| neah
   áá þymble cwæð[ eac swa onceow[  
   þet hi on heo rтан  hige disegan]

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 -fwegas mine wihte| neonceowan
   ǰet|[ic] er on yrre æðe| nemde
gifhionmi98| rest] ricene| eodon[  

**EPs**
1 hi wegas mine wihte| neon cnewan.
   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 mean

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

---

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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPs</th>
<th>EPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 I chine generie</td>
<td>1 Ic hine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>gelwuldrige</em></td>
<td><em>gewul drige</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>geond eælle weordæoda</em>.</td>
<td><em>gerond eælle weordæoda</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_hilmilf</td>
<td>dasag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>langesylle</em>____</td>
<td>_længe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_swylce him minehælu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_Eripiam eum et glorificabo eum longitudinem dierum adimplebo eum et oftendam illi salutare meum._

As Baker suggests, the addition of EPs 7 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, 7 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, 7 separates the verb *sille* ‘give’ from its predicate, *lif|daæges*. 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.

---


\(^99\) Mitchell “Five Notes,” pp. 82-3.

MPs (PPs/Eps), 91:1.1b

PPs
1  G ódis|etmandriht|e geara andette
   |neodlice his naman| asinge.
   þone heahes|tan heleða cynnes :

EPs
1  is| det| mæn drihtne| ȝ geææ ændette
   |neodlice his næmæn æsinge.
   þone heæhestæn heleðæ cynnes

Bonum est confiteri domino et psallere nomini tuo altissime

As in Psalms 90:16.3b and 94:10.3b, EPs ȝ is written directly above Latin et and is probably to be attributed to the graphic influence of the Latin text. 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 ȝ 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
1  W utun his| ansyne| ærest seceæn
   þwe|andettæn ure fyre|rne.
   þwe sealmas| singan mid wynne.

EPs
1  wutun ansine aрест seceæn
   þwe an detten ure fyrene
   þwe 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.

---

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

Addition/Omission of Prefixes (1 example)

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EPs</th>
<th>PPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 H wylc þonne gen a gehwyrfed byð.</td>
<td>1 hwilc ðonne gena gewerfeþ bið</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>þet he on urriht eft ne cyrran.</td>
<td>þ he on urriht eft ne on cyrran.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ọððe hwylc nymeðne me</td>
<td>þic mán fleo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ọmid riht heortu redes</td>
<td>þence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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 urrihtum oncyrron* ‘they turned from their injustice’ (Blickling Homilies 109.20), 104 and *hi geeacniað heora wita, gif hi ær ende ne cyrrað* ‘They
will increase their punishments, if they do not reform first at the end’ (Homl.S.13). 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPs</th>
<th>EPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ß</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Testimonia tua domine credibilia facta sunt nimir.

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. The word is written above and slightly to the left of Latin *domine*. For the addition or 7 to EPs under similar circumstances, see above, pp. 43, 44, and 45.

**MPs (PPs/Eps), 93:18.2a**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPs</th>
<th>EPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ð</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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. 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

---

105Cited in B.-T(S). *cirran* II 3).
108When 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPs</th>
<th>EPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  Forðon isse micla</td>
<td>god</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quoniam deus magnus dominus et rex magnus super omnes deos

The omission of an equivalent for mihtig drihten ṣe 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 mannegodu 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPs</th>
<th>EPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  S ægdan cwædan    þæt</td>
<td>negesawe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1  segdæn</td>
<td>γ cwæ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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)səon. EPs ge ne| sæwe consists ostensibly of the second person plural personal pronoun, a negative particle, and the plural preterite subjunctive of səon.109 While

---

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

gesawelsæwe 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). Although these poems are obviously ultimately related to those
discussed above, their witnesses are, with the exception of the PPps 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. 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 eordan-recension (the Northumbrian eordan-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 (D1), Paris Bibliothèque Nationale, 5237 (P1), and Brussels, Bibliothèque
Royale, 8245-57 (Br). The identification of Br and a discussion of the relationships between these
witnesses can be found in my article, “A Northumbrian Version of ‘Cædmon’s Hymn’ (eordan-recension) in
Brussels Bibliothèque Royale Manuscript 8245-57, ff. 62r²-v¹: Identification, Edition and Filiation,”
forthcoming in New Essays on the Venerable Bede, ed. A.A. MacDonald and L. Houwen.

The second recension of “Cædmon’s Hymn” omitted from discussion here is related to the eordan-
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.\footnote{See below, p. 53.}

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.\footnote{Ker, *Catalogue*, arts. 25 and 122, dates the Moore Manuscript to “s.viii” 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).}

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.\footnote{Ker, *Catalogue*, art. 122.} 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.\footnote{Ker, *Catalogue*, art. 25.} In this manuscript, the Hymn is followed by a Latin note, *primo cantauit*
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.\footnote{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}

Table 4: Pointing In “Cædmon’s Hymn,” Northumbrian aeldu-recension (adapted from O’Keeffe, Visible Song, figure 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Placement of points by clause (expressed in half-lines)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Witness 1a 1b 2a 2b 3a 3b 4a 4b 5a 5b 6a 6b 7a 7b 8a 8b 9a 9b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L ×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M ×</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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
decoding, is a powerful indication of the still strongly oral component in the *Hymn’s* transmission and reception.\footnote{O’Keeffe, *Visible Song*, pp. 45-46.}

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.\footnote{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.} 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.”\footnote{O’Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 21.} 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\footnote{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.} 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.
Textual Variants

Substitution of Unstressed Words (1 example)

*Cæd(aeldu), 6a*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 he ærist scop aeldubarnum&lt;sup&gt;121&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5 heaerist scop aelda barnū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hefen to hrofe halig sceppend</td>
<td>hebent[hrofe] halegscepen.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>he ærist scop aeldubarnum&lt;sup&gt;122&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>heaerist scop aelda barnū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hefen to hrofe halig <em>sceppend</em></td>
<td>hebent[hrofe] halegscepen.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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*,<sup>123</sup> or the sole example in Old English of a cognate for OHG *scaffin, sceffin* ‘judge’, Fris *skeppena* ‘juryman’, from WGmc *skapinaz*. 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

---

<sup>121</sup>Dobbie, *Manuscripts*, has *ælđa 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.

<sup>122</sup>See above, fn. 121.


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

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. As the most commonly cited cognates for OE *scepen* have connotations of judge or jury rather than creator, 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. 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.


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

supplements rather than replaces the interlinear lexical gloss to the Roman psalter in which the metrical translation of Psalms 90:16-95:2.1 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.\textsuperscript{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: \textbf{EPs} glewe for \textbf{PPs} glewe in Psalm142:9.2b; \textbf{EPs} saule for \textbf{PPs} sawle in Psalm142:9.4a; and, in a scribal reversal of letters, \textbf{EPs} drihtnes for \textbf{PPs} drihtnes in Psalm142:9.3a.\textsuperscript{132}

\textbf{Translating and Occasional Poems}

\textit{“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 \textit{Historia} and the Psalter also were used for collections of verse and miscellaneous texts unrelated to their main texts,\textsuperscript{133}

\textsuperscript{131}For a discussion of the placement of this text, see O’Neill, “Another Fragment,” p. 435.

\textsuperscript{132}O’Neill, “Another Fragment,” p. 435.

\textsuperscript{133}B1, a manuscript of the Old English translation of the \textit{Historia}, for example, also contains copies of two multiply-attested poems in its margins in addition to a version of the \textit{eordan}-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 **EPIs**, 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; 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

---

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

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 (Jn121). 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 PPṣ. Probably coincidentally, Jn121 has no fragments in common with the glosses in EPṣ.
There are no marked dialectal or orthographic differences between these two witnesses to the Psalms, although Jn\textsubscript{121} shows a slight preference for the loss of medial vowels after long and short syllables in comparison to PP\textsubscript{s}: Jn\textsubscript{121} hal\textsubscript{gan}: PP\textsubscript{s} hal[\textsubscript{i}]\textsubscript{gan}, Psalm 53:1.1a; and four examples involving oblique cases of \textit{ma}\textsubscript{gen}: Jn\textsubscript{121} mæ\textsubscript{gen}: PP\textsubscript{s} mæ\textsubscript{gen}\textsubscript{e}, Psalm 70.7.1b; Jn\textsubscript{121} mæ\textsubscript{gen}: PP\textsubscript{s} mæ\textsubscript{gen}\textsubscript{e}, Psalm 79.18.1a; Jn\textsubscript{121} mæ\textsubscript{gen}: PP\textsubscript{s} mæ\textsubscript{gen}\textsubscript{e}, Psalm 87.13.2b; Jn\textsubscript{121} mæ\textsubscript{gen}: PP\textsubscript{s} mæ\textsubscript{gen}\textsubscript{e}, Psalm 121:7.1a.\textsuperscript{135} In keeping with its nature as a collection of excerpts from the Psalter suitable for an office, the Jn\textsubscript{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)**

\textit{MP\textsubscript{s}} (Jn\textsubscript{121}/PP\textsubscript{s}), 58:1.3b

\textbf{Jn\textsubscript{121}}

\texttt{3 alysme fram| laðum | ðeme \textit{lugeon}}
\texttt{risanwil|lað. nym|pɛ| ðume ræd gife.}

\textbf{PP\textsubscript{s}}

\texttt{3 alysme| fram laðum. ðeme| \textit{lunge| on}}
\texttt{risan wil|lað. nymðe| þu me ræ|d | geofe|}\
\textit{et ab insurgentibus in me libera me}

\textbf{Jn\textsubscript{121}} \textit{lugeon} (PP\textsubscript{s} \textit{lunge| on}) appears to be the result of the scribal misapprehension of the poetic adverb \textit{lunge|} ‘immediately’ and the sentence adverb \textit{on}, perhaps as the preterite

\textsuperscript{135}On the other hand, PP\textsubscript{s} has saw\textsubscript{i} for J saw\textsubscript{u} in Ps 118.175.1a.
plural of the strong 2 verb ļoğan ‘deceive, belie, betray’. This makes acceptable sense in context but is unmetrical. In PPs, Psalm 58:1.3b is a Type B-1 line with the lungre and on taking stress.

**MPs (Jn121/PPs), 89:18.3b**

Jn121  
1 G eseoh| þine scealcas   swæsum eagum.  
     þon|in| agenweorc   écedrihten.  
     þearabearn| geréce   bliðum móde.  

PPs  
1 B eseohon þinesceal|cas   swæs|eagú  
     þon| þinagen weorc   ece| dihrten.  
     þeora bé|ngerece   bliðe mode.|  

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

Jn121 bliðum is dative singular; PPs bliðe is instrumental singular. This is a common variation in Old English and has no appreciable effect on sense, metre, or syntax. For a further example, see “Prayer,” line 10b, p. 74, below.

**MPs (Jn121/PPs), 102:5.4b**

Jn121  
1 Heðe gesige fæste. soðre mildse  
     þe mild|||heorte   mode getrymede.  
     eart ðu edniwe|    éarne gelicost.  
     ongeoguðe. nu.   gleaw geworden.]  

PPs  
1 H epegesige fæste soðre|| miltse  
     þemildhe|orte.   mode getry|mede  
     eart þu edneo|we   earne gelicast|  
     ongeogoðe nu   gleaw|e  ge worden.  

*Qui coronat te in miseratione et misericordia; et renouabitur sicut aquile iuventus tua.*

In Jn121, gleaw is an adjective ‘keen’ serving as the complement of geworden, parallel to gelicost in line 3; in PPs, the complement of ge worden is gelicast and gleawe is either an adverb ‘keenly’ or the weak form of the nominative singular masculine adjective (with e for

136u is the normal vowel of the preterite plural of ļoğan. 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 sæcgead (for expected sæcgað), Ps. 93:4.1; PPs ecean (for expected ecgan), Ps. 102:1.2b; ChronB mecea (for expected meca), Battle of Brunanburh, line 40a; ChronB mæcgea (for expected mæcga) Capture of the Five Boroughs, line 2a; ChronB cegead (ChronC cegeaf; 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-.

137Mitchell, 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

1  S e alysde þin lif. leof offorwyrde____
   _fylde| þinne willan. fægere mid góde.

**PPs**

1  H e alysde þin lif leol] of of forwyrde.
   _fylde| þinne willan fæge|re mid gode.

*Qui redemí de interitu uitam tuam, qui sanat in bonis desiderium tuam.*

In *Jn*121, the subject of the sentence is the nominative singular demonstrative adjective *Se*. In *PPs*, it is the nominative singular third person masculine form of the personal pronoun, *He*. 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* *Onfindaeñ* 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. 45v/4), 28.9 (f. 47v/7).
Substitution of Prefixes (1 example)

*MPs* (Jn₁₂₁/PPs), 89:18.1a

**Jn₁₂₁**

1. **G** eseoh [bīne scealcas swæsum eagram.  
   þo[þin] agenweorc écedrihten.  
   þheorabear[n] geréce bliðum móde.]

**PPs**

1. **B** eseoh [þinesceal[ca]s__swæs[jeag]u  
   þheora be[arn]gerece bliðe mode.]

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

The variation has no significant effect on the sense of the line and none on the metre or syntax (for a discussion of the addition or omission of PPs on in this Psalm, see p. 62, below).

Both words can be used to translate *respice*, although *besēon* is more common.¹⁴₀

Substitution of Stressed Words and Elements (1 example)

*MPs* (Jn₁₂₁/PPs), 89:15.2b

**Jn₁₂₁**

1. **G** ehweorfus hwæthwygu. halig drihten.  
   wes[þin] u[n] scealcum wel eað bene.

**PPs**

1. **G** ehweorfus hw[u]lga halig drihten[|]  
   wes[þin] u[n] scealcu[|] wel eað bede.|  

**Convuertere 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 beðe* ‘easily entreated’, is synonymous with *EPs* form *eað bene*.¹⁴₁ As the point under the *d* of the PPs form suggests, however, the scribe appears to have intended to go further and correct his original form to *eað bene*, but stopped – either because he forgot to complete his correction by adding the *n* or because he recognised that his half-corrected form was synonymous with the reading of his exemplar. The variation does have a slight effect on the metre. **Jn₁₂₁** and the uncorrected PPs reading both produce Type D-1 lines; in its corrected form, the PPs line is a Type D-2.

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

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

**MPs (Jn121/PPs), 60:6.3a**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jn121</th>
<th>PPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2 S waicnamanþinum. néode singe.  
[ðmin] gehat  her agylde.  
ofdæge ondæg. swa| hit gedéfe wese.|||
| 1 H wylc seceð þæt  þe| soð fæst byð.  
swal ic naman ðinum.  neode singe.  
þæt| ic min gehát.  hér| agylde.  
ofdæge| on dæg.  swahit ge|defe wese.|

**Jn121** Sic psalmum dicam nomini tuo, deus, in seculam seculi,  
ut reddam uota mea dedie in diem.

**PPs** Misericordiam et veritatem quis requiret eorum; sic psallam nomini tuo,  
deus, in seculam [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: ‘...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 **Jn121**, as Mitchell suggests that “clauses with unexpressed personal pronoun subjects and objects” seem “more common in poetry than in prose.” 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 **Jn121** 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*).

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.
144 For a similar use of *þæt* as a general relative marker in the Psalms, see Psalm 121:2,
MPs (Jn121/PPs), 89:18.1a

Jn121
1 G eseoh| þine scealcas swæsum eagum.  
  þonhin| agenweorc écedrihten.  
  þheorabearn| geréce bliðum mód.  

PPs
1 B eseobon þinesceal|cas swæsegú  
  þon| þinagen weorc ece| drihten.  
  þheora 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). As it occurs on the internal dip of a Type A-1 line the addition has no significant effect on metre.

Rearrangement of Elements within the Line (1 example)

MPs (Jn121/PPs), 69:1.2a

Jn121 (f.43v)
1 W es drihtengod. deore fultum  
  beheald| drihten me| me hraðe syððan  
  gefultuma æt feorh |hearfe.|  

PPs
1 W es drihten god. de|ore fultum.  
  be he|ald drihten me  
  ge fultuma æ|t feorh |hearfe;  

Jn121 (f.51r)
1 W es drihtengod deore| fultum.  
  beheald medrihten  
  gefultuma æt feorh |hearfe.|  

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

The variation in the order of *drihten* and *me* between *Jn121* (f.43v) and *PPs*, and *Jn121* (f.51r) has an important effect on metre but none on sense or syntax. To the extent that the line is metrical at all, the reading of *PPs* and *Jn121* f.43v is a particularly heavy Type D-4 with anacrusis, *beheald, drihten*, and *me* all taking a full stress. *Jn121* f.51r, however, is a slightly more regular Type A-1 with anacrusis. A distinctive feature of all three versions is the use of the inflected verb *beheald* for alliteration in preference to the stressed noun *drihten*.  

---

145Cited in B.-T(S). *beséon* I (b).

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

A translation of the greater doxology, “Gloria I” is found in two witnesses: Jn121 and Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 201 (CC201), an eleventh-century collection of homilies, laws and miscellaneous religious texts. In Jn121, 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. In CC201, “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”), and, separated by fifty-five pages of miscellaneous laws, prayers and other texts, a copy of the prose parts of the Jn121 “office” – a translation of the second book of the De officiis et orationibus canonnicarum horarum by Hrabanus Maurus, De clericorum institutione.

The witnesses to “Gloria I” exhibit very few marked orthographic or dialectal differences. CC201 has a tendency towards the devoicing of final stops not found in Jn121: CC201 cynice for Jn121 cyning (3 times: lines 11b, 42a, and 52b); and CC201 pinc for Jn121 ping (line 19b). This tendency is also responsible for a correction, CC201 wealdent corrected to wealdend, line 9b. For its part, Jn121 tends to restore medial vowels lost after long and short syllables: Jn121 woruld(-) for CC201 world(-), (5 times: lines 5a, 15a, 34a, and twice in line 41a); Jn121 sawule for CC201 sawle, line 55b; Jn121 geopenod for CC201 ge opnod, line 1b; and Jn121 orud for CC201 ord, line 55b.

The two manuscripts each contain an example of the sporadic voicing of medial consonants, CC201 mildse for expected miltse (as in Jn121), line 46b, and Jn121 pan gung for

---

147 The Jn121 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.

expected *puncung* (as in CC$_{201}$), line 45b. CC$_{201}$ has one obvious uncorrected error not in Jn$_{121}$. CC$_{201}$ *heriad* *heriad* by ditography 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, *haligne 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jn121</th>
<th>CC201</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sy þe wuldor ȝlof.</td>
<td>Sy þe wuldor ȝlof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wide</td>
<td>geopenod.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geond ealleþeoda.</td>
<td>geond ealleþeoda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>þanc ȝylla</td>
<td>þanc ȝylla.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mægen ȝmildse.</td>
<td>mægen ȝmildse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ȝealles modes lufu</td>
<td>ȝealles modeslufu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soð</td>
<td>fastra sib.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>þynes sylfes dom.</td>
<td>þynes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 worulde</td>
<td>gewlitegod.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swaðu wealdan miht.</td>
<td>swaðu wealdan miht.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eall eorðan</td>
<td>mægen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-ulpyne.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wind</td>
<td>ȝwolcnæ.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

**Glor I, 7b**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jn121</th>
<th>CC201</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 wealdest</td>
<td>eall onriht.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 eall</td>
<td>onriht.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Jn121 eall** is the object of **wealdan**: “You wield all [things] for the best.”

**CC201 ealle** is used adverbially with an absolute form of the verb: “You rule entirely for the best.” The addition or omission of the ending has little effect on the metre. It falls in the second dip of a Type E* line in both manuscripts and metrical parallels for both lines can be found elsewhere in the corpus, e.g. (for **Jn121**) **e·can lifes blād, Seafarer** line 79b; (for **CC201**) **hrūsan heolstre bewrāk, Wanderer**, line 23a.

---

151 For the use of **eall** as an independent “Pronoun Adjective,” see Mitchell, *OES*, §454.

152 Cf. Chron. 1036: ᵃᵈᵃ ᶐᵈᵉ micel weoldan on ᶐᵈⁱˢᵘᵐ lᵃⁿᵈᵉ, quoted in B.-T., wealdan V (d); also III (e), where the following glosses are given: wylt:presidet; wealdendum:imperantibus.
This is the only variant in the poems discussed in this chapter in which syntactically coordinated and necessary (“linked”) changes are made to more than one element in the text.

In CC201, halige gastes is nominative plural and subject of wunað and rixað, line 41b, parallel to cyninc, line 42a, ge corenan, line 42b, wlitige englas, line 44a, wuldorgyfe, line 44b, sibbe, line 45a, þáncung, line 45b, and mildse, line 46a. In Jn121, haliges gastes is (possessive) genitive singular modifying héahþrymnesse, line 43a. The variation has no effect on metre.

The substitution Jn121 héahþrymnesse CC201 heah þrymnesse in line 43a is discussed below, p. 67.

The variation Jn121 halig|domas CC201 halig domes is the result either of a difference in the interpretation of the syntax of the passage as a whole or of the falling together of a and e in unstressed syllables. If the Jn121 spelling is not the result of the confusion of unstressed e and a, then Jn121 halig|domas is nominative plural, and is to be read in syntactic apposition to mæste lufu, line 46b; if the variation is not intentional, however, the compound is genitive singular and functions as the object of fulle, line 48b. As Holthausen notes, the CC201 reading
shows a marked similarity to the *te deum: pleni sunt coeli et terra majestatis gloriae tuae*, and *haligdomes* is almost certainly to be preferred.  

**Glor I, 55b**

*Jn121*  
55 ṣawul  
sealdest word  
wiwaldorfgye.  
moðes milste.  

*CC201*  
55 sawle  
sealdest word -  
ways ciest  
moðes milste.  

*Jn121* *sawul* (adopted by all editors except Ure) is either the nominative singular or an example of an Anglian endingless accusative singular.  

If intended for a nominative singular, it destroys the syntax of the sentence as an accusative is required by the context. *CC201* *sawle* is accusative singular.

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

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

**Substitution of Stressed Words and Elements (1 example)**

**Glor I, 43a**

*Jn121*  
45 sóðesibbe. sawla þan gunga.  
moðes milste.  

*CC201*  
45 sóðe sibbe. sawla þuncung.  
moðes milste.  

The origin of this variant probably lies in the superficially liturgical appearance of the immediate context, compounded by the etymological confusion of *þrymness* and *þrynnes* in late Old English.  

At a purely lexical level, *Jn121* *héahþrynnesse* ‘Holy Trinity’ is an

---


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

155 For a discussion of the development of *þrymnys* in the sense ‘Trinity’ and its subsequent confusion with *þrynnes*, see Roberta Frank, “Late Old English *þrymnys* ‘Trinity’: Scribal Nod or Word Waiting to be
appropriate choice for lines 41-46a. The remaining words and tags in these lines (all cited in their Jn121 form), haliges gastes, onworuld aworuld, cyning innan wuldre, gecorenan and wlitige englas, are all perfectly suited to a discussion of God and the Holy Trinity. As Roberta Frank has argued recently, moreover, þrymnys ‘mightiness’ (CUL Ffi27 heah þrymnesse) had become increasingly associated with þrymnys ‘trinity’ in late Old English.

The sense and syntax of the passage make clear, however, that lines 41-46a are concerned not with the makeup and nature of the Holy Trinity, but more generally with the inhabitants and perquisites of heaven. The words the Jn121 scribe appears to have associated with the Holy Trinity refer instead to the hosts of angels and souls in heaven. While Jn121 héahþrymnesse can be construed as an example of the analogical extension of -e to the nominative singular of feminine nouns (examples are reported by Campbell from all dialects except Kentish),156 or, more regularly, as an oblique singular (CUL Ffi27 heah þrymnesse is dative or genitive singular), neither construction makes much sense in the local context of Jn121. As a nominative plural, héahþrymnesse “High Trinities,” would be too much of a good thing. But it makes just as little sense to speak in the dative or genitive singular of the “High Trinity of the Holy Spirit,” Jn121 héahþrymnesse haliges gastes.

A better reading is to follow CC201 and take the nouns in lines 42-46a as roughly appositive to each other, serving together as the subjects of the plural verbs wunað þrixad 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

---

156Campbell, OEG, §592.f.
cyninc innan wuldre, jwuldorgife, sodē 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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jn121</th>
<th>CC201 20-23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 þusetest on foldan. swyðe feala cynna. þugewrohtest éce gód.</td>
<td>20 þu settest on foldan. swiðe fela cynna. þuge worhtest. écegod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>onsx dagum. jonpone seofodon þugerestest.</td>
<td>onsixdagã. seofodon þuge restest.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The variation Jn121 jonpone seofodon : CC201 seofodon involves two independent additions or omissions, both of which affect metre and syntax.

The first is the addition or omission of the conjunction ond. In Jn121 the clause jonpone seofodon þugerestest is related to the preceding clause þugewrohtest... onsx dagum syndetically. In CC201, the relationship of the equivalent clauses þuge worhtest... onsixdagã and seofodon þuge restest is asyndetic. While the CC201 reading more “abrupt” as Ure has suggested, both forms of parataxis are common.158

The second addition or omission involves the preposition and definite article, Jn121 onpone CC201 Ø. In Jn121 an attempt appears to have been made to distinguish between duration of time and point in time through use of contrasting dative and accusative prepositional objects: Jn121 onsx dagum (dative, duration of time), line 23a, Jn121 onpone seofodon (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

157Dobbie and Ure read heahbrynnmes haliges gastes “with the high might of the Holy Ghost” for l. 43b, mixing the Jn121 and CC201 readings.

158Ure, 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, and the scribe of Jn121 or an exemplar may have found it sufficient simply to establish a grammatical distinction between the two phrases. The omission of on þone from CC201 is an example of the non-repetition of elements which can supplied from a coordinate clause, in this case, the preposition, demonstrative article and (as in Jn121) noun dæge.  

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

**Glor I, 31a**

Jn121 | CC201
---|---
31 | puþ wýmble. þinesōðan weorc. Jn121 | Andnusymle þine soðan weorc.
 | þîn mîcèle mîht manegül swytelað. swaþin[| creftas hêo. cyðaþ wide. ofer éalle wóruld.] ece stándeþ.

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

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

**Glor I, 48a**

Jn121 | CC201
---|---
50 | swutolec gesyne þ du hysyl[worhtest. swasynd þine mihta ofer middan eard.

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

---


161 Dobbie, *ASPR* 6, p. 75; Ure, *Benedictine Office*, pp. 83 and 122. Holthausen for his part assumes the loss of material after gerestest and rearranges Jn121 as a Type B-1 line followed by a defective verse (*Zur Textkritik altenglischer Dichtungen*, *ES* 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 exe, p. 46 above); and “Durham,” line 6a (Hickes ∅ CULFf27 is, p. 80 below).

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

**Glor I, 13b**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jn121</th>
<th>CC201</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ðueart frofra fæder.</td>
<td>ðueart frofra fæder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ðeorth hyrde.</td>
<td>ðeorth hyrda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lifes latteow.</td>
<td>lifes laððeow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leohtes wealdend.</td>
<td>leohtes[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 asãndrod</td>
<td>framsynnum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swaðinsunumære.</td>
<td>swaþinsunu mære.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>þurh</td>
<td>clene gecynd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cyning oferealle.</td>
<td>cyninc ofer ealle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beald]</td>
<td>gebletsod.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bóca lâreow.</td>
<td>boca lareow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heah hige frof</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Glor I, 13b**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jn121</th>
<th>CC201</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ðueart frofra fæder.</td>
<td>ðueart frofra fæder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ðeorth hyrde.</td>
<td>ðeorth hyrda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lifes latteow.</td>
<td>lifes laððeow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leohtes wealdend.</td>
<td>leohtes[</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 asãndrod</td>
<td>framsynnum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swaðinsunumære.</td>
<td>swaþinsunu mære.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>þurh</td>
<td>clene gecynd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cyning oferealle.</td>
<td>cyninc ofer ealle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beald]</td>
<td>gebletsod.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bóca lâreow.</td>
<td>boca lareow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heah hige frof</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lines 8-13 consists of a series of epithets for God the Father, God the Son (and, in Jn121, God the Holy Spirit), arranged around the second person singular substantive verb eart, line 8a. The omission of æh alig gast by the scribe of CC201 is presumably the result of simple oversight, perhaps through anticipation of the Latin verse immediately following the line in both manuscripts. The omission corresponds to a metrical unit.

**Reinterpretation of Existing Text (1 example)**

**Glor I, 26a**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jn121</th>
<th>CC201</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ðawæs gefordæd</td>
<td>ðawæs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>þin</td>
<td>fægere wéorc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 þhusunnan dég;</td>
<td>25 þhusunnan dég;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sylf halgoldest.</td>
<td>sylf halgodest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ðgemærsode</td>
<td>hine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mánegum tohélpe</td>
<td>manegum tohélpe.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The origin of this variant seems to be the reinterpretation of the verbal prefix ge- by the scribe of CC201 as an ‘incorrect’ nominative plural form of the second person pronoun ge. The subject the same as that of line 25, but not repeated.162 In CC201, the verb is mærsian, and the subject, þu, is repeated in both lines. This is less usual syntax, but still acceptable: Mitchell

```
Jn121 23-*24a  on syx dagum and on þone seofoða 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 (JulAii). 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

---

165Ker, *Catalogue*, art. 280.
166Ker, *Catalogue*, art. 280.
167Ker, *Catalogue*, art. 280.
foliation does not suggest any missing pages at this point, 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.

JulAii 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. 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), notes on a variety of subjects (f.140v), translations of the distichs of Cato and miscellaneous apophthegms (ff.141-4v).

In their fifteen common lines, the two witnesses to “Prayer” share two apparent errors, both involving faulty alliteration (lines 2 and 7). JulAii also has one obvious error not in LPs, JulAii peo on for LPs peon, 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.
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,” ESi 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 Jn121), by R.S. Cox, “The Old English Distichs of Cato,” Anglia 90 (1972): 1-29.
Textual Variants

Inflectional Difference (1 example)

*Pr*, 10b

LPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pr 10b</th>
<th>JulAit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Æala frea briht</td>
<td>Æala frea beorhta. folkes scippend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gemilda þin mod me togode.</td>
<td>Gemilsa þyn mod. me to gode.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syle ðine are þinum earminge</td>
<td>sile þyne are. þyne earminge.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pr 9a</th>
<th>JulAit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Æala frea briht</td>
<td>Æala frea beorhta. folkes scippend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gemilda þin mod me togode.</td>
<td>Gemilsa þyn mod. me to gode.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syle ðine are þinum earminge</td>
<td>sile þyne are. þyne earminge.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pr 14a</th>
<th>JulAit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sebið earminge þeon eorðan her deges ðihtes deofl cumpað hys willan wyrceð wa him þære myrigðe. bonne hand lean hafað sceawað</td>
<td>Se byð earming. þeo on eorðan her. déiges ðihtes. deoflon campað. þys willan wyrceð. wa him þære mirigðe. bonne heða handlean. hafað þ sceawað.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>butan he þæs yfles ærge swice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 \( \partial a \), has little or no effect on sense, metre or syntax.

As the material added to L\( P_s \) or omitted from J\( u_{1i} \) 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 J\( 1 \)) contains many of the same errors found in his transcript of an early edition of CUL\( Ffi27 \) (Fry’s J\( 2 \)), and since the principal differences between J\( 1 \) and the known texts of CUL\( Ffi27 \) and Vit\( Dxx \) (i.e. Hickes) involve readings in which J\( 2 \) exhibits a nonsense reading, the most likely explanation is that J\( 1 \) is an emended transcription of J\( 2 \), 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 J\( C \)) appears to be a direct transcription of CUL\( Ffi27 \). I am preparing an article discussing the relationship of J\( 1 \) to CUL\( Ffi27 \) at greater length.


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\textit{Ff27} \textit{f}\textit{ola} (for Hickes \textit{feola}), line 5a.

Textual Variants

Inflectional Difference (5 examples)

\textit{Dur, 4a}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hickes 6-10 \textsuperscript{179}</th>
<th>CUL\textit{Ff27}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>\textit{Weor ym\textsuperscript{b} eornað.}</td>
<td>\textit{weor. ymbeor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{Ean yðum \textbf{strong}.}</td>
<td>\textit{eayðum. \textbf{stronge}.}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{And ðerinne wunað.}</td>
<td>\textit{\textbf{j} ðer inne wu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{Fisca \textit{feola} kinn.}</td>
<td>\textit{On floda gemong.}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{5 \textit{f}\textit{ola} fisca. \textit{kyn.} onfloda ge mon</td>
<td>ge.}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hickes \textit{strong} is an endingless nominative plural feminine adjective agreeing with \textit{eän},\textsuperscript{180} while CUL\textit{Ff27} \textit{stronge} is either an adverb or a nominative plural strong adjective in \textit{e}, agreeing with \textit{ea} (for a discussion of the variation Hickes \textit{eän yðum} CUL\textit{Ff27} \textit{eayðum}, see the following entry). In Hickes, the line is a heavy Type E with \textit{eän}, \textit{yðum} and \textit{strong} all taking a full stress; CUL\textit{Ff27} is a Type \textit{A\textsuperscript{*}}, in which \textit{yðum} takes a half-stress as the second element in a compound.

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{180}On the use of endingless forms in all cases of Northumbrian adjectives, see Campbell, \textit{OEG}, §638. Campbell reports that endingless forms are more common in the singular than plural, however.
Dur, 4a

Hickes 6-10

Weor ymb eornað.]
Ean yðum strong.]
Fisca feola kinn.]

CUL-Ffl27

weor. ymbeor|nad. 
eyðum. stronge. 
5 fjola fisca. kyn. 

Hickes ean is an inflected nominative plural parallel to the singular Weor and modified by strong, ‘streams strong in waves.’ In CUL-Ffl27, ea is the first part of a dative plural compound eyðum, ‘(in) river-waves’, and stronge an adverb modifying ymbeor|nad:

‘the Weir goes about strongly with river waves’. As a compound, eyðum 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, ean, eyðum, and strong all take a full stress.

Dur, 5b

Hickes 6-10

Weor ymb eornað.]
Ean yðum strong.]
Fisca feola kinn.]

CUL-Ffl27

weor. ymbeor|nad. 
eyðum. stronge. 
5 fjola fisca. kyn. 

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 sceadena gemong, Judith 193b; the only parallel to the CUL-Ffl27 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.  

If the CUL\textsuperscript{Ff27} form is not an example of the spurious addition of *-e*, the variant does have an effect on the metre: *on fōda gemonge* (Hickes) is a Type B-2 line, *on fōda gemonge* (CUL\textsuperscript{Ff27}) a Type A-1 with anacrusis.

**Dur, 6a**

**Hickes 1-12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is ðeos burch breome</th>
<th>Geond breoten rice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steopa gestaðolad</td>
<td>Stanas ymb utan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wundrum gewæxen</td>
<td>Wear ymb eornal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ean yðum strong</td>
<td>And ðerinne wuna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisca feola kinn</td>
<td>On floda gemong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And ðere gewexen</td>
<td>Wuda festern mycel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CUL\textsuperscript{Ff27}**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is ðeos burch breome</th>
<th>Geond breoten rice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>steppa ge staðolad</td>
<td>stanas ymbulstan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wundrū ge waxen</td>
<td>weor ymbearnad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eayðum stronge</td>
<td>ðer inne wuŋnað</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 fjola fisca kyn</td>
<td>onfloda ge monge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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. 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eardiað æt ðem eadige</th>
<th>In inðem mynstre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unarimeda reliquia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ðær monige wundrum gewurða</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De writa seggeð</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid ðene drihtnes</td>
<td>werdomes bideð</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CUL\textsuperscript{Ff27}**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eardiedæ ætðem eaidige</th>
<th>In inðem minstre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>un arimedæ</td>
<td>reliquia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 ðe monia wund rumge</td>
<td>wurða</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ðes ðe writ</td>
<td>seggeð</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>midd ðene drihnes</td>
<td>werdomes. bideð</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The variation Hickes writa CUL\textsuperscript{Ff27} writ is between the singular and plural of the neuter strong noun *writ* (with Hickes -a for -u), ‘writings’ vs ‘writ’. As Hickes CUL\textsuperscript{Ff27} seggeð can be singular or plural (with ðeð for expected að), both readings make acceptable

---

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

\textsuperscript{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 the is long by position.

**Substitution of Unstressed Words and Elements (1 example)**

**Dur, 20a**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hickes 32-37</th>
<th>CUL-Ff127</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eardiæð æt ðem eadige.</td>
<td>Eardiæð. ætðem eadige in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In ðiðem mynstre.</td>
<td>un arimed. reliquia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unarimesa reliquia.</td>
<td>De writa seggeð.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ðer monige wundrum gewurðað.] 20</td>
<td>Ðer monia wund rumge. wurðað.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ðe writa seggeð.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid ðene drihtnes</td>
<td>werdomes bideð.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two readings are syntactically and metrically equivalent. *De* and *ðær* are used “interchangeably” in Old English to introduce “adjective clauses of place.”

**Substitution of Stressed Words and Elements (1 example)**

**Dur, 17b**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hickes 25-31</th>
<th>CUL-Ff127</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is ðerinne mid heom.</td>
<td>IS ðer inne midd heom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Æelwold bisceop.</td>
<td>Æelwold , bisco.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And breoma bocera Beda.</td>
<td>And Boisil abbot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ðe clæne Cuðberchte.</td>
<td>On gecheðe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lerde lustum.</td>
<td>And he his lara wel genom.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Hickes his* is the third person possessive pronoun. For alliterative reasons, the CUL-Ff127 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-Ff127 *wis lara* adds a non-alliterating lift to the beginning of the off-verse. In *Hickes*, *his* is unaccented. Neither version is metrically orthodox.

---

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

**Dur, 20b**

**Hickes 32-37**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hickes 32-37</th>
<th>CUL_{Ffi27}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eardiað æt ðem eadige.</td>
<td>Eardiað ætðem eadige in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unarimeda reliquia.</td>
<td>un arimeda. reliquia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ðær monige wundrum gewurðað.</td>
<td>20 ðe monia wund runge. wurðað.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid ðene drihtnes werdomes bideð.</td>
<td>midd ðene drihnes. werdomes. bideð.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

**Dur, 6a**

**Hickes 11-12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hickes 11-12</th>
<th>CUL_{Ffi27}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>And ðere gewexen.</td>
<td>Wuda festern mycel.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**Dur, 14b**

**Hickes 25&26**

\[\text{Is ðerinne mid heom.} \quad \text{Ædelwold bisceop.}\]

**CUL-Ff.27**

\[\text{14 ðer inne midd heom.} \quad \text{þelwold, bisco.}\]

The CUL-Ff.27 reading is by the misapprehension of æ as j. For an example of the opposite mistake in a late manuscript, cf. SanM æ Bd H Ln Mg Tr W j, “Cædmon’s Hymn” (ylda-recension), line 2b.184

Rearrangement within the Line (1 example)

**Dur, 5a**

**Hickes 6-10**

\[\text{Weor ymb eornað.} \quad \text{Ean yðum strong.} \quad \text{Fisca feola kinn.}\]

**CUL-Ff.27**

\[\text{Weor, ymbeor[nað.} \quad \text{eadým. stronge.} \quad \text{5 feola fisca, kyn.}\]

Both manuscripts make equally good sense (with the exception of the erroneous correction f\textit{ola} in CUL-Ff.27). In CUL-Ff.27, 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 ChronC¹)

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 (ChronC¹) 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 ChronC¹ 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 word¹⁸⁷: PPs ead befe (corrected from eadmede) EPs ead bene, Psalm 89:15.2b and

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

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

¹⁸⁷As mentioned above, pp. 55-55, the majority of substitutions of stressed words in the “Glossing, Translating and Occasional” poems involve graphic error or the influence of the surrounding Latin.
one somewhat similar example of the addition or omission of prefixes: PPs *cyrre* EPs on *cyrre*, Psalm 93:13.2b.

Similar amounts and types of textual variation are found among the more innovative witnesses to the “Fixed Context” poems discussed in Chapter Three. This might suggest that the ChronC text of the “Menologium” should be classified with the work of such innovative “Fixed Context” scribes as that of the Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 41 (B₁) version of “Cædmon’s Hymn” or the London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. vi (ChronB) version of the *Battle of Brunanburh*\(^\text{188}\) – were it not that the ChronC\(^1\) 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\(^1\) scribe’s verse performance directly).\(^\text{189}\) As none of the variants between PPs and ChronC\(^1\) have a particularly significant effect on sense, syntax, or metre, and as the most significant variant –involving the substitution of stressed elements ChronC\(^1\) *warum* PPs *tudrum* – involves the use of a more common word in ChronC\(^1\) for a nonce form in PPs, it is perhaps just as likely that the ChronC\(^1\) 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”),\(^\text{190}\) “money is the root of all evil” (for

\(^{188}\) These poems, scribes, and manuscripts are discussed in greater detail in Chapter 3.


\(^{190}\) First statement as Prime Minister, May 13, 1940.
the King James translation, “the love of money is the root of all evil”), and “gilding the lily” (for Shakespeare’s “to gild refinèd gold, to paint the lily”).

### Textual Variants

#### Substitution of Unstressed Words (1 example)

**MPs** (PPs/ChronC¹ [Men]), 117:22.1b/60b  
**ChronC¹**  
| ðæn dream gerist: | PPs  
| well| wide gehwar| swa se witiga sang.  
| 60 | ðis is se dæg: | ðone| drihten ús.  
| wisfæst worhte: | wera cneorissi.  
| eall| eorðwarum: | eadig| tôblisse.  
| PPs  
| l ð is ys se dæg | ðehine| drihten us.  
| wisfæst| ge worhte | wera cneorissum  
| eall| um| eorðtudrum| eadgum tôblisse;  

The substitution **ChronC¹** ðæn (i.e. ðone) **PPs** ðehine has no significant effect on sense, syntax, or metre. Both forms are found introducing adjective clauses in Old English. 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/ChronC¹ [Men]), 117:22.3a/62a  
**ChronC¹**  
| ðæn dream gerist: | PPs  
| well| wide gehwar| swa se witiga sang.  
| 60 | ðis is se dæg: | ðone| drihten ús.  
| wisfæst worhte: | wera cneorissi.  
| eall| eorðwarum: | eadig| tôblisse.  
| PPs  
| l ð is ys se dæg | ðehine| drihten us.  
| wisfæst| ge worhte | wera cneorissum  
| eall| um| eorðtudrum| eadgum tôblisse;  

The substitution **ChronC¹** -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 **ChronC¹**, 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 Tim 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.

Addition/omission of Prefixes (1 example)

*MPs* (PPs/ChronC¹ [Men]), 117:22.2a/61a

**ChronC¹**

\[\text{þæn dreaem gerist;}\]
\[\text{wel| wid gehwær;} \text{ swa se witega sang.}\]

60 \[\text{þis is se dæg;} \text{ þæn| drihten ús.}\]
\[\text{wisfæst worhte;} \text{ wera cneorissū.}\]
\[\text{eallú| eorðwarum;} \text{ eadigū tölisse.}\]

**PPs**

\[\text{þis is se dæg} \text{ þehine| drihten ús.}\]
\[\text{wisfæst ge worhte} \text{ wera cneorissum}\]
\[\text{eallum eorðudrum} \text{ eadgum toblisse;}\]

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