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

| Manuscript line division
|| Manuscript line division at the end of a recto page
||| Manuscript line division at the end of a verso page
___ Between words and half-lines, this symbol is used to indicate that the manuscript shows no space between the words joined by the line.

**Bold** Bold and underlined letter(s) represent the variant being discussed.

HWæt A space after a capital indicates a marginal or illuminated letter in manuscript.

\hwæt/ Word has been copied above the preceding text.

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

**B**

Lamana| he is læce  leocht| winci,“ndra
swil|ce he hisdeafra| duru deadra| tunge.
schild igra scild  scip|pendes seld
80 flodes| feriend  folces ne|r|end
_ȳpayrfe| weard  earma fixa]|wyrmal|lenco  wil|deora holt
westenes| weard  weorð myn|ta geard

With manuscript line division and word spacing, the same text would appear as follows:
Lamana
he is læce leoht
pinci,ændra spil
ce he hisdeafra
duru deadra
tunge. scild ig
ra scild scip
pentes seld flodes
feriend folces ne
riendyþayrfe
pearde earma fixa
pyrma plenko pîl
deora holt pestenes
pearde peorð myn
ta geard
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Chapter 1
Introduction

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

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

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

²For a critique of this evidence as it pertains to our knowledge of Old English metre, see Hoyt N. Duggan, “The Evidential Basis for Old English Metrics,” *SP* 85 (1988): 145-63.
copy the same piece of poetry, the multiply attested poems provide us with what seems to be an ideal opportunity for determining how these scribes worked – the extent to which they preserved the text of their exemplars, or, if they were more willing to intervene, the nature and extent of the variants they introduced.

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

In the past, studies of the multiply attested poems have concentrated on describing and determining the origins of individual types of variants or the variation within individual poems or groups of poems. Variants or poems which do not fit the theory being expounded have been seen primarily as “exceptions” or have been used to set the (chronological or other) boundaries of the theory being proposed.
In this, the work of Alan Albert Jabbour is atypical only in the comprehensiveness of the sample examined. The only scholar to deal explicitly with the variation in the entire corpus of multiply attested poems – he omits only Psalm 142:9, the second witness to which was discovered twenty years after his dissertation was completed – Jabbour divides these texts into two main groups: a “control group” consisting of poems which “can be said with certainty to be scribally transmitted” and which show a relatively low degree of substantive textual variation, and a “memorial group,” the variants of which have a more significant effect on the passages in which they occur.

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

---


5 Jabbour, diss., p. 51.

6 Jabbour, diss., p. 206.
otherwise “strikingly different to the eye.” Moreover, differences among its various members are for the most part ignored. While Jabbour acknowledges the existence of differences in the amount and nature of the textual variation exhibited by the poems of both groups – differences which in the case of his “control group” will later provide Katherine O’Brien O’Keeffe with the bulk of her examples of “transitional literacy” – he nevertheless makes little attempt to account for these differences systematically, and indeed, leaves them out of the final summary of his method entirely:

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

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

---

7 Jabbour, diss., pp. 67-70.
8 See below, p. 5
9 Jabbour, diss., p. 206.
“Bede’s Death Song.” Forty years later, Kevin Kiernan dismisses all of Sisam’s principal examples as being themselves either too late or too different from each other to allow any meaningful comparison,\(^\text{11}\) and argues instead that “Cædmon’s Hymn” and “Bede’s Death Song” are the “only poems whose transmissions can be studied at all.”\(^\text{12}\)

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


\(^{14}\) O’Keeffe, *Visible Song*, pp. 39-40 and 46.
than the earlier ones is cited as evidence that this “literacy” “was more likely in the period before the end of the tenth century than later.”

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

In some cases, the extrapolation is made by critics of the approach taken by a given scholar. In a recent article examining the validity of O’Keeffe’s notions of the role of “transitional literacy” in the transmission of Old English poetry, for example, Douglas Moffat tests O’Keeffe’s approach by applying it to two poems not among her principal examples: _Soul and Body_ I and II, and the common text of _Daniel_ and _Azarias_. Analysing the variants in these two texts, Moffat finds numerous examples which do not fit O’Keeffe’s definition of formulaic variation – that is to say, variants which, “conditioned by formulaic conventions,... are metrically, syntactically and semantically appropriate.”

---

15 O’Keeffe, _Visible Song_, p. 136.


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

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

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

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

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

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

²⁰Kiernan, Beowulf Manuscript, p. 174.
²²Although O’Keeffe never discusses the variation in Soul and Body I and II, the common text of Daniel and Azarias, or Exeter Riddle 30a/b directly, she mentions them repeatedly as further examples of the type of variation she finds in her principal examples, see (for Soul and Body I and II and Riddle 30a/b): pp. 65, 76,
The danger inherent in this use of a limited number of examples from the corpus of the multiply attested texts as the basis for more general conclusions about the nature of Anglo-Saxon scribal practice can be most easily appreciated if one considers the extent to which the poems’ critics choose for their principal examples colour their understanding of poetic textual transmission in general:

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context and Poem Short-Title</th>
<th>Unreliable/Non-Literate Transmission</th>
<th>Formula Transm.</th>
<th>Accurate Transm.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sisam</td>
<td>Moffat</td>
<td>Jabbour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glossing and Translating Poems</td>
<td>BDS</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fixed Context Poems</td>
<td>Cæd(eorðan)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthologised and Excerpted Poems</td>
<td>MSol</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soul I &amp; II</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dan/Az</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dream/RuthC</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>±</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

---

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

**Legend:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

\[30\] A complete list of all poems known from two or more medieval witnesses can be found in Appendix 1. The
following are too late or irregular to be included in this study: Latin-English Proverbs, Death of Alfred,
Death of Edward, Charm 5/10; and the Hr-Ld1-CArms sub-group of the West-Saxon eordu-recension of
“Cædmon’s Hymn” (all metrically irregular); the Northumbrian eordu-recension of “Cædmon’s Hymn,”
and “Bede’s Death Song” (both show post-conquest or continental developments). For a discussion of the
eordu-version of “Cædmon’s Hymn,” see: Daniel P. O'Donnell, “A Northumbrian Version of ‘Cædmon’s
Hymn’ (eordu-recension) in Brussels Bibliothèque Royale manuscript 8245-57 ff.62r-v.: Identification,
A.A. MacDonald and L. Houwen (Groningen, 1995). I am preparing a study of the Hr-Ld1-CArms sub-
substantive textual variation. As I demonstrate in Chapter Two, this group can be extended to include all other metrically regular poems not copied as constituents of vernacular prose framing texts or as part of an anthology or compilation. Poems which, like the *Battle of Brunanburh*, are found as fixed constituents of larger framing texts, on the other hand, will show a different pattern of textual variation. While most witnesses to these poems show relatively few substantive variants, certain witnesses are far more innovative. As I demonstrate in Chapter Three, the differences between these poems can be shown in all but one case to be related to the pattern of variation found in the surrounding prose. Scribes who show themselves to have been conservative copyists of the framing texts in which these poems are found also produce the most conservative copies of the poems themselves; those who show themselves to be more willing to introduce substantive variation into their poetic texts, on the other hand, also almost invariably produce the most innovative copies of the accompanying frame. Finally, poems which, like *Soul and Body I and II*, the common text of *Daniel* and *Azarias*, and *Solomon and Saturn I*, survive with at least one witness in a compilation or anthology show a third pattern of textual variation. These poems – discussed in Chapter Four – are frequently excerpted from or interpolated into other texts and exhibit a variation which, in contrast to that found in the other two groups, appears at times to reflect the intelligent engagement of the reviser with the poem.

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

---

group of the West-Saxon *eordan*-recension. The transmission of “Bede’s Death Song” is discussed in
of manuscript contexts were more likely to produce multiple copies than others. In the general corpus of Old English poetry, for example, 65% of the approximately 31,000 lines of surviving verse is preserved in the four main ‘Poetic Codices’; in the corpus of multiply attested poetry, however, these same codices supply less than a third of the surviving lines. Poems found as fixed constituents of vernacular prose framing works, on the other hand, are over-represented in the corpus of multiply attested verse. They account for approximately 27% of the lines found in more than one witness, versus about 9% of all surviving Old English poetry.

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

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

Dobbie, *Manuscripts*.

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

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

**About This Dissertation**

**Terminology**

In this study, a “substantive variant” is any form which affects sense, metre, or syntax. This category includes both readings which make good metre, sense, and syntax, and nonsense forms produced by graphic error or scribal misapprehension. “Potentially significant substantive variants” are forms which subsequent readers might reasonably be assumed to interpret as legitimate Old English, whether or not they make good sense, syntax and/or metre. “Significant substantive variants” are alternative readings which make more-or-less acceptable sense, metre, and syntax. Thus, in the *eordan*-recension of “Cædmon’s Hymn,” the B\(_1\) reading *wuldr godes*\(^{34}\) (for T\(_1\) To C(N) O and Ca *wuldorfaeder* [and orthographic variants]) is a significant substantive variant: both forms make reasonable sense, metre, and syntax, and subsequent scribes in the B\(_1\) tradition would be unlikely to reject the innovative form on


\(^{34}\)The sigla in this and the following two examples are discussed at the appropriate places in Chapter 3 (see the following footnotes for references) and are listed in Appendix 2, “Manuscripts and Sigla.”
internal grounds alone. \[35\] ChronD \textit{heord\|weal} for ChronA \textit{bord\|weal} ChronB ChronC \textit{bordweall} in the \textit{Battle of Brunanburh}, line 5b, on the other hand, is a potentially significant substantive variant. \[36\] While \textit{heordweal} is acceptable Old English in its own right, the word makes no sense and is unmetrical in context. Subsequent scribes in the ChronD tradition might be expected to recognise that something was wrong, but would not necessarily be able to reconstruct the original reading from the form in their exemplar. Indeed, they might even be misled into searching for metrically and syntactically appropriate synonyms to the ChronD form. ChronA \textit{cul bod ge hna des} for ChronB ChronC ChronD \textit{cumbol gehnastes} (and orthographic variants) in the \textit{Battle of Brunanburh}, line 56a, finally, is simply substantive. \[37\] It affects – and in this case destroys – sense, metre, and/or syntax without being meaningful or metrically or syntactically appropriate in its own right. While subsequent scribes faced with such forms may or may not be able to recover the original reading – ChronG (a direct descendant of ChronA) reads \textit{cumbelgehna} \textit{des}, correctly guessing the first half without changing the second – they would be unlikely to accept them as legitimate Old English.

\textbf{Scansion}

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

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

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

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

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

**Variant Catalogues**

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

---

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


Chapter 2
Glossing, Translating, and Occasional Poems

_Cædmon’s Hymn_ (ylde- 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

---

41 O’Keeffe, _Visible Song_, pp. 40-41.
42 The sixth, a marginal recension in the s.xii/xiii Tournaï, Bibliothèque Municipale 134 (To), is not discussed by O’Keeffe. See below, Chapter 3, pp. 112 ff. and 135 ff.
43 By my own count there are fifteen substantive variants in this recension of the poem. See Chapter 3, pp. 108-136.
44 Two witnesses to the ylda-text, San Marino CA, Huntington Library, HM 35300 (SanM) and Cambridge, Trinity College R.5.22 (Tr1), date from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Neither is of any textual value. In addition to numerous nonsense forms, there is one potentially significant variant, SanM æ, line 2b, for _and_ in all other witnesses. This is almost certainly the result of the scribal misunderstanding of the abbreviation, æ. For an example of the opposite mistake – the misunderstanding of æ as _j_, cf. CUL F1027...
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 ylde-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.”45

O’Keeffe does not develop the significance of this contrast any further in her book. As the title of her chapter, “Orality and the Developing Text of Cædmon’s Hymn,” suggests, she is at this point more interested in the evidence of textual fluidity and scribal intervention found among the witnesses of the “developing” main-text eordan-recension than the evidence of textual stability and scribal conservatism among those of the marginal ylde-recension. But the observation that differences in the nature and extent of the textual variation found between exemplars of two such closely related texts can be correlated to differences in the textual environment within which each recension characteristically appears is a crucial one, and not least because it calls into question the association O’Keeffe attempts to make between scribal variation and “transitional literacy” – a state she defines as that “between pure orality and pure literacy whose evidence is a reading process which applies oral techniques for the receptions of a message to the decoding of a written text.”46 The fact that two groups47 of roughly

---

45 O’Keeffe, Visible Song, p. 40.
46 O’Keeffe, Visible Song, p. 41.
contemporaneous scribes could copy different versions of a single well-known poem with such
different results suggests that the extent to which a given scribe altered the text of his exemplar
had more to do with the conventions of the tradition in which he was working than the nature
of his individual literacy. While O’Keeffe’s observations concerning the level of substantive
variation found between witnesses to the eorðan-text suggest that scribes could alter their
exemplars, the substantive accuracy shown by the witnesses to the marginal ylda-text shows
that they did not always do so. Rather, the evidence of the witnesses to the ylda-recension –
and of other texts showing similar patterns of substantive textual accuracy – suggests that
Anglo-Saxon scribes could copy to an extraordinary degree of accuracy when they chose or
were instructed to do so. As I shall demonstrate in the following pages, such accuracy was the
norm for all poems of regular alliterative metre not found as part of “poetic” anthologies like
the Exeter, Junius and Vercelli Books, or as fixed constituents to vernacular prose framing
texts like the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle or the Old English translation of Bede’s Historia
ecclesiastica. While the poems found outside these contexts belong to a variety of different
poetic genres and are found in a variety of different manuscript contexts, the low levels and
limited types of substantive textual variation they exhibit indicate the extent to which Old
English poetry could be transmitted accurately.

“Cædmon’s Hymn” (ylda-recension)

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

47No scribe is responsible for more than one version of “Cædmon’s Hymn.” There seems no reason to
when compared with the general consistency of the grammatical pointing found between

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

Table 1: Pointing In Bede’s Latin Paraphrase of “Cædmon’s Hymn” (adapted from O’Keeffe, Visible Song, figure 2) 48

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Witness</th>
<th>Placement of points by clause (Points follow indicated words)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>caelesti creatoris illius gloriae deus extitit tect creavit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>× × × × × × × × × ×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibcil</td>
<td>× × × ×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TibAsiv</td>
<td>× × × × × × ×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr1b75</td>
<td>× × × × × × ×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>× × × × × × × ×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>× × × × × ×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd</td>
<td>× × × × × × × ×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy13CV</td>
<td>× × × × × × × ×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ld</td>
<td>× × × × × × ×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mg</td>
<td>× × × × × × ×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ln</td>
<td>× × × × × ×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr1</td>
<td>× × × × × × ×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hr</td>
<td>× × × × × ×</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). 49 Twelve of

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

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

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

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

---

48 O’Keeffe, Visible Song, p. 42.

49 The description of the punctuation of Bede’s paraphrase of “Cædmon’s Hymn” and of the eorðan- and ylda-

recensions of the vernacular poem in this and the following paragraphs is largely drawn from O’Keeffe,

Visible Song, pp. 42-6. It is treated at length both because I add some additional material to her account

and because of the differences in our conclusions.

50 Citations from the text of the Latin Historia are from Bertram Colgrave and R. A. B. Mynors, eds., Bede’s


Bede’s paraphrase of the Hymn is edited on p. 416.
potentiam creatoris, consilium illis, and facta patris gloriae), and marking the ends of dependent clauses (cum sit aeternus deus, and qui primo filius 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>Placement of points by clause (expressed in half-lines)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T\textsubscript{1}</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B\textsubscript{1}</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ca</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 (B₁) has points at the ends of lines 7b and 9b, the former separating mann cynnes| weard, the first subject of the final clause of the poem, from its subsequent variants, écedrihten, line 8a, and frea ælmihtig, line 9b. The fourth and most heavily punctuated witness to the eordan-recension, Cambridge, University Library, Kk. 3. 18 (Ca), uses four points, at the ends of lines 3a, 4a, 6b and 9b. Like T₁, this witness uses the point at the end of line 6b to separate the final clause of the poem from the preceding text. With the point at the end of line 3a, it divides the first sentence into its component clauses, *nu we sceolan herigean... wera| wuldor fæder*, lines 1-3a and *swa he wuldræs... 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 wuldræs gehwæs / 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 [T₁],” she suggests that “the later manuscript clearly added points to separate the variant objects, but pays no attention to the full stop wanting after onstealde” (pp. 44-5). The “variant objects” of herigean are *heofon rices weard* (l.1b), *metodes midte* (l.2a), *mod ge þanc* (l.2b) and *wera| wuldor fæder* (l.3a). The first point in this witness occurs after the last of these objects and immediately precedes the beginning of the next clause, *swa he wuldræs gehwæs... ord onstealde*. 
Similarly idiosyncratic punctuation is found in the West-Saxon ylde-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 ylde-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*
ylda bearnum / heofon to hrofe (lines 5a-6a) from the subsequent elaboration of its subject, halig scyppend (line 6b) and the final “clause” middangearde... frea ælmyhtig (lines 7-9).

Oxford, Lincoln College, Lat. 31, ff.14-113 (Ln) joins Mg and H in placing a point at the end of line 6a, but does so for a different reason. When taken with unique points in this manuscript at the ends of lines 5b and 6b, the point at the end of 6a serves to break the clause he æryst 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 æryst 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 metoð des mihte (lines 2a and 3a respectively) on the one hand from ond his modgelpan and wurc wuldorfeðer (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 modgelpan and wurc are to be understood essentially as repetitions of the first two objects, modgelpan corresponding to heofonrices we[ard] (God the person), and wurc wuldorfeðer corresponding to metoð des mihte (his works

---

62 A point after line 2a is recorded by O’Keeffe (Visible Song, Figure 3, p. 43), who appears to have examined the manuscript in person (p.xi). The point touches against the horizontal stroke of the abbreviation for ȝ 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 ylde-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 ylde-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 ylde- and eorðan-recensions. Not only is the ylde-recension transmitted to a higher standard of substantive accuracy and more heavily punctuated than the eorðan-text, it also makes far less sense. This is not mentioned by O’Keeffe in her discussion of the differences between the two recensions but is perhaps best seen through a comparison of the ylde-text with that of the Northumbrian

---

63In 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).

64A 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 ylde- and main-text eorðan-recensions of “Cædmon’s Hymn” are roughly contemporaneous with each other, however, this developmental model fails to explain the differences in the
aeldu-recension, an earlier and apparently distantly related version 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 [punc.]*
wurc wuldro fæder.  swa he wundra **ge hwilc**
ec drehten  **ord** astealde.
5  He| ærest **ge sceop**  **ylda** bearnū
heofon to hrofe.  halig scyppend **middan gearde**  man cynnes weard
ec drehten.  *Æfter tiada*
firum  **on foldum**  frea ælmyhtig

**aeldu-recension (M)**

Nuscylun herge’n  hefaenrīca uard
metudas maecti  end his modgidanc
uerc uuldurduur[  sue he undragi**huæs**
ecidrycti  **orastelidae**

5  heaerist **scop**  ___æelda barnū
hebentilhrofe|  halescapesen
**thamiddun geard**  moncyxnæsuard
ecidrycti  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><strong>we</strong></td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>gehwilc</td>
<td>gi<strong>huæs</strong></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>tiadæ</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.

65The standard discussion of the recensional division of “Cædmon’s Hymn” is found in Dobbie, Manuscripts.

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

67We 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 T₀ 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 T₀ (or). O has oor corrected to Ocorr  oor₁. 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 l.3, *gehwilc* is quite ungrammatical since a genitive (*gehwæs* in the other texts of the Hymn) is required here after *ord*, l.4. In l.7, *middangearde*, as a dative-instrumental, has no conceivable relation to its context; and the phrase *on foldum*, l.9, as a dative plural, makes no sense here, for *folde*, in the sense of “earth,” is not recorded in the plural, and in fact could hardly have a plural meaning. The form *tida*, in l.8, for *teode* in the *eordan* 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 *tiade*, 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 *hærst 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</em> herian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td><em>H Ln Mg</em> metudes</td>
<td><em>W</em> meto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Mg</em> W mihte</td>
<td><em>Bd</em> H myhte; <em>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</em> wuldorfæder <em>(with o corrected from u)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td><em>H Mg W</em> gehwilc</td>
<td><em>Ln</em> gehwilc; <em>Bd</em> [gehwi]ylc <em>(with y corrected from i)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td><em>H Mg W</em> ece</td>
<td><em>Ln</em> ece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a</td>
<td><em>H Mg</em> ærest</td>
<td><em>Ln</em> ærest; <em>W</em> [æ]ræst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Ln Mg W</em> gescop</td>
<td><em>H</em> gescop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a</td>
<td><em>H Ln Mg</em> heofon</td>
<td><em>W</em> heofo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>H Ln</em> hrofe</td>
<td><em>Mg</em> W rofe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b</td>
<td><em>H Ln Mg</em> scyppend</td>
<td><em>W</em> scyppend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a</td>
<td><em>H Ln Mg</em> middangearde</td>
<td><em>W</em> middangearde*[de]; <em>Bd</em> [mid]dangearde*[r]de</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7b</td>
<td><em>H Bd Mg</em> mancynnes</td>
<td><em>Ln</em> mancynnes; <em>W</em> mancynnes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>H Mg W</em> weard</td>
<td><em>Ln</em> weard <em>(with e erased after d)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8a</td>
<td><em>H Mg W</em> ece</td>
<td><em>Ln</em> ece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9b</td>
<td><em>Bd Ln Mg</em> frea ælmihtig</td>
<td><em>H</em> frea ælmihtig; <em>W</em> frea ealmihtig <em>(with erasure [o?]</em> between frea and ealmiht)</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, \( OEG \), §§315-318.

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

\(^71\) Campbell, \( OEG \), §321.

\(^72\) Campbell, \( OEG \), §181.

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

\(^74\) Cf. Campbell, \( OEG \), §329.2.
Psalms 90:16-95:2 (Paris Psalter, Eadwine’s Psalter)

Parallel texts of the Old English metrical translation of Psalms 90:16.1-95:2.1 survive in two manuscripts, the Paris Psalter (Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Lat. 8824, PPs) and Cambridge, Trinity College, R. 17. 1 (EPs), a manuscript known variously as “Eadwine’s Psalter,” “The Canterbury Psalter,” and “Eadwine’s Canterbury Psalter.” 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 ylida-recension of “Cædmon’s Hymn” in that it is found exclusively in manuscripts of the Latin text it “translates,” it differs from the Hymn in that its two witnesses are separated by a large number of obvious scribal errors and accidental variants. On the one hand, the two manuscripts share one incontrovertible error, PPs nære (EPs nere) for expected wære (Lat. est) in Psalm 93:16.2b, and at least one probable error, PPs EPs 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 å: EPs oncnæwæn (PPs oncnawan), Psalm 93:8.3b; EPs demæ (PPs dema), Psalm 93:15.1b; for the second element of the diphthong ēa: EPs þearfe (PPs þearfe), Psalm

---

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

80 Baker, “Variant Text,” pp. 270-71; Kenneth Sisam and Celia Sisam, “The Psalm Texts,” in: The Paris Psalter, Colgrave, ed., pp. 15-17 at p. 17. In addition, Baker and the Sisams suggest that the odd word division of the tag worulda woruld (PPs woruld aworuld EPs woruld e woruld) in Psalm 91:6.6 in both manuscripts may be derived from an earlier common exemplar (see “Variant Text,” p. 270 and “The Psalm Texts,” p. 17 and fn. 68). This word-division can be paralleled elsewhere, however, and is equally likely to be the result of chance. Cf. “Gloria I” Jn 121 onworuld aworuld CC201 on worulda world, line 41a.

81 For a detailed discussion of the forms and dialectal implications of the spellings of the lexical glosses in the Eadwine Psalter, see Karl Wildhagen, Der Psalter des Eadwine von Canterbury: Die Sprache der altenglischen Glosse. Ein frühchristliches Psalterium die Grundlage, Studien zur englischen Philologie 13 (Halle: Niemeyer, 1905), pp. 35-208. Although Wildhagen does not include the forms of the metrical portion of the gloss in his dialectal analysis (§7, p. 12), the most common dialectal differences between the two witnesses of the metrical translation are also found in the work of the scribes he does examine.
93:15.2b; **EPs eælle** (**PPs ealle**), Psalm 91:8.2b; and for unstressed e and o in inflectional endings, prepositions, and pronouns: **EPs On|findæn** (for onfinden, present subjunctive plural; **PPs Onfindadô**, 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 æ: **EPs er** (**PPs ær**), Psalm 94:11.2a; **EPs cweð** (**PPs cwæð**), Psalm 94:10.3a; and for unstressed e and o in inflectional endings, prepositions, and pronouns: **EPs eægel|an** (**PPs eægel|an**), Psalm 93:6.2a; **EPs syndæn** (**PPs syndon**), Psalm 92:6.1a.

Other differences separating the two recensions include: the sporadic omission of final vowels in **EPs**; **EPs oðð þe** (**PPs oðð þe**), Psalm 91:3.3a; **EPs Ahef|de|** (**PPs Næfre**), Psalm 93:12.1a; reverse spellings, assimilations and the spurious addition of consonants: **PPs geon** (for **EPs geond**), Psalm 90:16.2b; **EPs cneowrisse** (for **PPs cneorisse**), Psalm 94:9.4a; **EPs sin**

---

82 West-Saxon æ is also preserved, for example, in Psalm 93:9.1-7 where has **EPs eægana** (**PPs eægana**), as well as **EPs ealdum, earan, eallu, sealde, gesceawian, healdaq, eallum, and þrea** (for **PPs ealdum, earan, eallum, sealde, gesceawian, healdaq, eallum, and þrea**).

83 West-Saxon æ is also preserved: **EPs æghwer** (**PPs æghær**), Psalm 91:9.3b; **EPs æt** (**PPs æt**), 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 æa in **PPs gehw|r|f|ed**: **EPs gewerf|e|b** (corrected from gerferf|e|b), Psalm 93:13.1b.
ningrae (for PPs synnigra), Psalm 91:6.2a; EPs urriht (for PPs urriht), Psalm 93:13.2a; EPs onworul æworl (for on woruldae woruld, PPs onworuld aworuld), Psalm 91:6.6a; EPs meæh| (for meæht, PPs miht), Psalm 93:1.1b; PPs foweor|pað (for forweor|pað, EPs for weorðæð), 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 æghwær, EPs æghwer), Psalm 91:9.3b; EPs gewerfæþ corrected from geferfæþ (for gehwerfæþ, PPs gehw|yrfed), Psalm 93:13.1b; dittography and eye-skip: PPs heæhsta (for heahesta, EPs heæhste), Psalm 91:7.2a; EPs Forðon is se| micla god kining., | ofer eall| manne| godu (for: Forðon is se micla god mihtig drihten γ se micla kining ofer eall manne godu; cf. PPs Forðon isse micla| god mihtig drihten| γse 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.

86The two lists are not mutually exclusive. The twenty-one variants discussed below include some – like the omission of mihtig drihten γ 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPs</th>
<th>EPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hinuðin feond</td>
<td>hinuðin feond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feæcne drihten</td>
<td>feæcne drihten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oneordwege</td>
<td>on eordwege</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eælle foweor</td>
<td>ba.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ealle weorðæð.</td>
<td>weorðæð to wrecene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>widwe æror wriht</td>
<td>ðæ þæunriht es</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**PPs** δine is the nominative plural masculine form of the second person possessive adjective *pin*. **EPs** δinre 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** unriht (**PPs** unriht), Psalm 93:13.2a, and **EPs** eælre corrected from eælle (**PPs** ealra), Psalm 93:8.2b.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPs</th>
<th>EPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ahefðe</td>
<td>Ahefdæ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etonellen.</td>
<td>eorðan demæ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eorðan demæ.</td>
<td>eorðan demæ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gyld ofer</td>
<td>gild ofer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swa hi ær</td>
<td>swæ hi er</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 δe > ahefdæ). 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** gefultumede (Psalm 93:15.2a, p. 38 below). The addition or omission of the

---

87 Sievers-Brunner, §372 Anm.
unstressed syllable falls in the preliminary dip of a Type A-3 line. It has no significant effect on metre.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPs</th>
<th>EPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Onfindæð</td>
<td>On</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>þæt ȝongeotað. þe onforlice nu____</td>
<td>ðe onforlice nu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_un</td>
<td>wiseste ealra syndon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dysigehwæt hwýgú deopeþæt oncnæwæn.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Intelligite nunc qui insipientes estis in populo et stulti aliquando sapite*

**PPs** Onfindæð is a plural imperative; **EPs** On|findæn a plural present subjunctive (with æe 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 ongeotæð to ongeotæð, so that Onfindæð and ongeotæð 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, oncnæwæn (EP) render Latin *sapite*, indicating that the OE versifier intended to translate the Latin pl. imperatives with pl. subjunctives. The emendation of ongeotæð to ongeotæð 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

---

88 The variant forms *-an* and *-on* for expected *-en* both have parallels elsewhere in the two texts: *a* for *e* is frequent in unstressed syllables of the Paris Psalter: **PPs** oncnæwan (**EPs** onceæwæn), plural subjunctive, Psalm 93:8.3; **PPs** andettæn (**EPs** an dettæn), plural subjunctive, Psalm 94:2.2a; **PPs** singæn (**EPs** singæn), plural subjunctive, Psalm 94:2.3b; *o* for *e* is less frequent in the Eadwine Psalter, but occurs in **EPs** forwordæne (**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.90

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

**PPs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Nymðe me drihten</th>
<th>dema usser</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gefultumed</td>
<td>fægereæt</td>
<td>þearfe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wenincga</td>
<td>minsawl</td>
<td>sothelle;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EPs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Nimðe me drihten</th>
<th>demæ usser.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gefultumed</td>
<td>fægere æt þearfe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weninga</td>
<td>minsaul</td>
<td>sohte</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[Nisi\ quia\ dominus\ adiuvasset\ me\ paulominus\ habitaverat\ in\ inferno\ anima\ mea\]

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

As the context requires an inflected verb, the PPs reading is to be preferred. Both forms make acceptable metre, however. In PPs gefultumed is either Type C-1 line (with resolution of the second lift) or (with the syncopation of -um- after a long syllable) Type C-2.91

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

---

90 This sort of linkage is an important feature of the variation between witnesses of multiply-attested poems in the major anthologies. See below, Chapter 4. There is one example among the poems discussed in this chapter, Jn121 haliges gastes CC296 halige gastas, “Gloria I,” l.43b. See below, p. 66.

91 See Campbell, OEG, §392. Gefultumed is also used as a half-line in both witnesses to Psalm 93:16.4a.
MPs (PPs/EPs), 93:16.1a

PPs
1 G ific hæs sægde. þmin| sylfes fot.
   ful sarliċe    asliden nære
   þame| mildheortnes    mihtig|an drihtnes
   gefultu|mede    þicfeorh ahте;]

EPs
1 Gif ic ðet| sægde. þ min silfes fot;]
   ful sarliċe.    asliden| nære.
   þæ me mildheortnes|    mihtigan drihtnes
   gefultumede    þic| feorh ahте.

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

EPs ðet PPs hæs 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 þi|nu|dine feond    fæc|ne drijhten
   on eor|dwege    eælle foro|wæ|ð.    ð|æ woer|ðæ|t o|wre|cene    wide| eælle
   þæpe| unrihtës    æor| wphone|tan;

EPs
1 hinu|dine feond    fæc|ne drijhten
   on eor|dwege|    æælle foro|wæ|ð.    ð|æ woer|ðæ|t o|wre|cene    wide| eælle
   ðæ þæunriht es|    æor| wphone|tan;

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

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

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

93 This latter possibility was pointed out to me by Fred C. Robinson.
Baker suggests that PPs has the better reading – albeit without recognising the possibility that EPs hinu might be for heonu.\(^9\) 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 Pinu fyren fulle fol|dan ahta, Lat. ecce). Baker suggests that the variation between h and p can be explained graphically.\(^9\)

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPs</th>
<th>EPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 [assembly</td>
<td>geheal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>his</td>
<td>prea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>se</td>
<td>men</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qui corripit gentes non arguet qui docet hominem scientiam

**EPs pæ** is presumably for the unstressed adverb pæ ‘then’. **PPs pær** 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPs</th>
<th>EPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2  weh</td>
<td>run</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

---


\(^{9}\)Baker reads pæ, but the form is ambiguous in facsimile. The descender of the letter looks more like that used by the scribe for æ than that used for an a. The upper right bow of the æ (assuming it is an æ) is obscured by the descender of the p in Latin corripit from the preceding manuscript line.
Substitution of Stressed Words and Elements (4 examples)

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

**PPs**

1. H ioftust sprecað| unnyt sæcgeað
   γ woh meldiað**wyr|ceað** un riht.|

**EPs**

1. hi oftust sprecæþ. unnyt| secgað
   γ woh meldiað**wrecæþ**| wyrceæþ unriht|

Pronuntiabunt et loquentur iniquitatem loquentur omnes qui operantur iniiustitiam

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

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

**PPs**

1. N eæt fyligeð| þé ahwær| facen ne unriht
   ā| ge fæstnæst| facen sares.

**EPs**

1. Ne et fliðgeð| þe æhwe r| facen ne unriht|
   þu ge fæstnæst| facen sares.

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

Although the **EPs** reading may have its origins in eyeskip or metathesis – **EPs** *et fliðgeð* for *etfliðgeð* or *etfílgeð* (**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 folc| byssum
   wintra ri|mes wunade neah.
   áá. ðýmble cwæð jeac swa oncneow__
   híonheortan hyge| dysegedan|

**EPs**

1. Nu ic| feow ertig folce δýssů]
   wintra rimes. wunedæ| neah
   áá γýmble cwæð.] ἦεac ฏ swa on cneow.]
   ᾧet hi on heo rtan 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. Hiwegæs mine white| neoncneowan
   ðætic| yrre æðe| nemde
gifhíonmi| ne reste ricene| eodon||

**EPs**

1. Hi wegsæ mine white| neon cneowan.
   þic er on| yrre æðe be nemde
gif hi on mine| reste. ricenedon| eodon.||

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

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

---

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>I chine generige</td>
<td>Ic hine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>his naman swylce</em></td>
<td>*his næm æn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>gelwuldrige</em> geon ealle_ wæodea._</td>
<td>*gewul drige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*himlif</td>
<td>dægas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>swylce him minehælu</em> holde æt ywe;</td>
<td>swilce him mine</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** \(\gamma\) 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, \(\gamma\) 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**, \(\gamma\) separates the verb *sille* ‘give’ from its predicate, *lif|dægæs*. Metrically, the conjunction adds or subtracts an anacrustic syllable from the beginning of a Type A-1 line. See also the following variant and pp. 45 and 46, below.

---


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

\(^{100}\)Baker, “Variant Text,” p. 265.
**MPs (PPs/Eps), 91:1.1b**

**PPs**

1 Góðísþætmandrihtme geara andette
neodlice his naman æsinge.
þone heahesþan heleða cynnes :|

**Eps**

1 is\textsuperscript{101} ðet mæn drihtne| ȝ geæræ ændette]
neodlice his næmæn æsinge.
þone heæhestæn heleðæ cynnes

*Bonum est confiteri domino et psallere nominii tuo altissime*

As in Psalms 90:16.3b and 94:10.3b, **Eps** Þ is written directly above Latin et and is probably to be attributed to the graphic influence of the Latin text.\textsuperscript{102} As in the preceding variant, the conjunction in **Eps** separates the verb ændette from its predicate. The **PPs** reading is to be preferred as a result. Metrically the addition or omission of Þ adds or subtracts an anacrustic syllable at the beginning of a Type D\textsuperscript{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 Wutun his ansyne| ærest secean
þ we| andettæn ure fyrenæ.
þwe sealmash| singan mid wynne.|

**Eps**

1 wutun ansine arest seceæn|
þwe an dettæn ure fyrenæ|
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.

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

\textsuperscript{102}Baker, “Variant Text,” p. 265.
As in Psalms 90:16.3b and 91:1.1b, the addition or omission of EPs 7 is probably to be attributed to the graphic influence of the Latin text. While the EPs reading is not nonsense, the insertion of a conjunction between the adverbs eac and swa is awkward. Metrically, PPs line 3b is best scanned as a (poor) Type B-2 with alliteration on eac. In EPs, the equivalent line is probably unmetrical, though scansion as Type E* (with a half-stress on swa) is perhaps possible. Further examples of the graphic influence of the Latin text on EPs are discussed on pp. 43, 44, and 46.

Addition/Omission of Prefixes (1 example)

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

---

104 Cited in B.-T. oncirran B II.
will increase their punishments, if they do not reform first at the end’ (Homl.S.13).105 The prefix falls on the medial dip of a Type A-1 line; its addition or omission is metrically insignificant.

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

**MPs (PPs/Eps), 92:7.1a**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPs</th>
<th>EPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ða ingewitnes is</td>
<td>ða grihten weorcum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weorcum geleafsum</td>
<td>geleafsum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ðmid soðe is</td>
<td>ðmid soðe is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swiðegetrewæd.</td>
<td>swiðe[getrewæp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Testimonia tua domine credibilia facta sunt nimis*

The addition of *drihten* takes **EPs** closer to the Latin text of the Psalm, but breaks the metre. In **PPs**, Psalm 92:7.1a is Type B-1; in **EPs**, the equivalent line is unmetrical. As Baker suggests, the addition is almost certainly the result of the influence of the Latin text.106 The word is written above and slightly to the left of Latin *domine*. For the addition or *g* to **EPs** under similar circumstances, see above, pp. 43, 44, and 45.107

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPs</th>
<th>EPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neæt fyligeð þé ahwær</td>
<td>Neæt fyligeð þe æhwe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facen ne unriht</td>
<td>facen ne unriht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ðu ge fæstnæst</td>
<td>þu ge fæstnæst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facen sares.</td>
<td>facen sares.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Nunquid adheret tibi sedes iniquitatis qui fingis dolorem in precepto captabant in animam iusti et sanguinem innocentem condemnavunt.*

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

---

105 Cited in B.-T(S). *cirran* II 3).
108 When used alone as a conjunction, *eac* appears at the beginning of the clause – see Mitchell, *OES*, §1740.
**EPs.** Without the adverb, the **PPs** version is Type A-3. For examples of similar losses of stressed monophthongs from the last lift of Type B- and Type E lines, see pp. “Gloria I,” line 48a, p. 70, and “Durham,” line 6a, p. 80 below.

**Addition/Omission across Line Boundaries (1 example)**

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

**PPs**

1 Forðon isse michla god mihtig drihten| se michla cynincg| ofer eall mannagodu

1 Forðon is se| michla god| kining| ofer eall| manne| godu

*Quoniam deus magnus dominus et rex magnus super omnes deos*

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

**Rearrangement of Elements within the Line (1 example)**

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

**PPs**

1 S ægdan 淦wædan 淦et| negesawe drihten æfre|dyde swæ he wolde| ne 淦et iacobes god 淦l[gitan cuðe,]  

1 s€gdæn| Æwæðæn  þge ne| sæwe drihten æfre| dyde swæ he wolde  
ne Ædet iacobesgod| ง l[gitan cuðe.

*Et dixerunt non videbit dominus nec intelliget deus iacob*

**PPs** *negesawe* consists of a negative particle and the third person singular preterite subjunctive of *(ge)s€en. **EPs** *ge ne| sæwe* consists ostensibly of the second person plural personal pronoun, a negative particle, and the plural preterite subjunctive of *s€on.*

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 90:16-95:2:1 have been copied in

---

104 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 eordu-recension) is found in three continental manuscripts of the Historia, all of which can be traced to a single insular exemplar: Dijon, Bibliothèque Municipale 574 (Di), Paris Bibliothèque Nationale, 5237 (P₁), and Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale, 8245-57 (Br). The identification of Br and a discussion of the relationships between these witnesses can be found in my article, “A Northumbrian Version of ‘Cædmon’s Hymn’ (eordu-recension) in Brussels Bibliothèque Royale Manuscript 8245-57, ff. 62r2-v1: Identification, Edition and Filiation,” forthcoming in *New Essays on the Venerable Bede*, ed. A.A. MacDonald and L. Houwen.

The second recension of “Cædmon’s Hymn” omitted from discussion here is related to the 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.¹¹²

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

“Cædmon’s Hymn” (aeldu-recension)

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

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

¹¹²See below, p. 53.
¹¹³Ker, 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).
¹¹⁴Ker, Catalogue, art. 122.
¹¹⁵Ker, Catalogue, art. 25.
caedmon istud carmen, and is surrounded by chronological notes on Northumbrian history, and glosses to a number of Latin words and phrases, all but one of which are found in Historia.\(^{116}\)

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Placement of points by clause (expressed in half-lines)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Witness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</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

\(^{116}\) For detailed discussions of the layout of this page, see O’Keeffe, Visible Song, pp. 33-35, Dobbie, Manuscripts, p. 12 and Ker, Catalogue, art. 25
decoding, is a powerful indication of the still strongly oral component in the *Hymn*’s transmission and reception.  

With this last sentence in particular, O’Keeffe attempts to establish a dichotomy between the lightly punctuated (and hence “developing”) texts of the *eordan*- and *aeldu*-recensions of “Cædmon’s Hymn,” and more heavily punctuated (and hence “literate”) witnesses to the *ylda*-recension.  

Were this dichotomy true, however, we would also expect the *aeldu*- and *eordan*-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.” 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) 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.

---


118 Cf. the last sentence of the above citation with her discussion of the textual variation in the *eordan*-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.


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

Substitution of Unstressed Words (1 example)

Cæd(aeldu), 6a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 heærist scop aeldubarnum heben to hrofe halig sceppend</td>
<td>5 heærist scop aeldubarnu hebentillrofe halescethen.</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>heærist scop aeldubarnum heben to hrofe halig sceppend</td>
<td>heærist scop aeldubarnu hebentillrofe halescethen.</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 “Caedmon’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-*, 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

---

121Dobbie, *Manuscripts*, has *aeldu 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.

122See above, fn. 121.


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

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

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

In addition to the long parallel excepts from Old English metrical translation of Psalms 90:16-95:2, the Paris and Eadwine Psalters also share a second much shorter excerpt from Psalm 142:9, lines 1-4.\(^{130}\) In \( PP \), 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 \( EP \), 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. seepe,” p. 296

\(^{130}\) For a discussion and diplomatic transcription of the \( EP \) text, see: O’Neill, “Another Fragment,” pp. 434-436. The text of this version of the Psalm is otherwise unedited. The only facsimile of f.252v is by M.R. James, *The Canterbury Psalter* (London, 1935).
supplements rather than replaces the interlinear lexical gloss to the Roman psalter in which the
metrical translation of Psalms 90:16-95:2.1 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.\footnote{For a discussion of the placement of this text, see O’Neill, “Another Fragment,” p. 435.}

As was the case with the common text of Psalms 90:16-95:2.1, 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 90:16-95:2.1, however, the common text of
Psalm 142:9 also shows a minimal amount of accidental variation. In the four lines of text, the
two witnesses show only two orthographic variants and one scribal error: EPs glewe for PPs
glewe in Psalm142:9.2b; EPs saule for PPs sawle in Psalm142:9.4a; and, in a scribal
reversal of letters, EPs drihtnes for PPs drihtnes in Psalm142:9.3a.\footnote{O’Neill, “Another Fragment,” p. 435.}

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

The texts discussed thus far have all been alike in that they have been associated with
Latin texts and found in predominantly Latin manuscripts. When taken with the generally low
level of substantive variation found among their witnesses, this suggests two things about the
motivation of the scribes responsible for their preservation. In the first place, it suggests that
the poems were chosen less for their intrinsic value as verse than for their functional utility as
translations. Although the margins of manuscripts of texts like the Historia and the Psalter
also were used for collections of verse and miscellaneous texts unrelated to their main texts,\footnote{Bι, a manuscript of the Old English translation of the Historia, for example, also contains copies of two
multiply-attested poems in its margins in addition to a version of the 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 EPs, the metrical text of Psalms 90:16.1-95:2.1 is the only metrical – indeed the only continuous – portion of an otherwise exclusively lexical interlinear gloss; in PPs, the metrical translation of Psalms 50-151 follows and completes a prose translation of the first fifty Psalms.

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

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

134The EPs texts of Psalm 142:9 is not part of the interlinear gloss. See below, pp. 53-54.
which cannot be easily attributed to Latin influence, scribal error, or other graphic or phonological habit: PP$s c_yrre$ EP$s o_n c_yrre$, Psalm 93:13.2a; PP$s h_aes$ EP$s d_et$, Psalm 93:16.1a; PP$s \emptyset$ EP$s e_e_c$, Psalm 93:18.2b; PP$s h_i_s$ EP$s \emptyset$, Psalm 94:2.1a; and L to M til, “Cædmon’s Hymn,” aeldu-recension, line 6b.

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

“Fragments of Psalms”

The “Fragments of Psalms” are forty-five excerpts from the metrical Old English translation of the Psalter arranged and copied as part of a vernacular “Office” in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 121 (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 PP$s. Probably coincidentally, Jn121 has no fragments in common with the glosses in EP$s.
There are no marked dialectal or orthographic differences between these two witnesses to the Psalms, although Jn121 shows a slight preference for the loss of medial vowels after long and short syllables in comparison to PPs: Jn121 halgan: PPs hall|gan, Psalm 53:1.1a; and four examples involving oblique cases of maegen: Jn121 maegne: PPs maegne, Psalm 70.7.1b: Jn121 maegna: PPs maegna, Psalm 79.18.1a; Jn121 maegne: PPs maegne, Psalm 87.13.2b: Jn121 maegne:PPs maegne, Psalm 121:7.1a. In keeping with its nature as a collection of excerpts from the Psalter suitable for an office, the Jn121 version also occasionally drops one or more lines from its version of the Psalm.

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

**Textual Variants**

**Inflectional Difference (3 examples)**

*MPs (Jn121/PPs), 58:1.3b*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jn121</th>
<th>PPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 alysme fram</td>
<td>laðum þeme lugeon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>risanwill</td>
<td>lað. nyme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*et ab insurgentibus in me libera me*

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

---

135 On the other hand, PPs has sawl for J sawul in Ps 118.175.1a.
plural of the strong 2 verb *lēogan* ‘deceive, belie, betray’.\(^{136}\) This makes acceptable sense in context but is unmetrical. In **PPs**, Psalm 58:1.3b is a Type B-1 line with the *lungre* and *on* taking stress.

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

*Jn*\(_{121}\)  

1  Geseoh| pine scelecas  swæsum eagum.  
    *gonpín* agenweorc  écedrihten.  
    *þeorabearn* geréce  bliðum móde.  

*PPs*  

1  Beseoh| binesceal|cas swæsúeagú  
    *gon* hínagen weorc  ece| drihten.  
    *þeora be|argerece bliðe* mode.|  

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

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

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

*Jn*\(_{121}\)  

1  Heðe gesige fæste.  soðre mildse  
    *gēhesige* fæste  soðre| miltse  
    eart υu edniwe|  éarne gelicost.  
    ongeoðe. nu.  gleaw geworden.|  

*PPs*  

1  Heægesige faeste  soðre|| miltse  
    *gæmildhcorte*  mode getry|mede  
    eart þu edne|we  earne gelicast|  
    ongeoðe nú  gleaw| ge worden.  

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

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

---

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

\(^{137}\) Mitchell, *OES*, §1345.
unstressed $a$). As it falls in the internal dip of a Type A-1 line, the variation has no significant
effect on metre.

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

**MPs (Jn121/PPs), 102:4.1a**

**Jn121**

1. Se alysde þin lif. leof of for wyrde. fylde| þinne willan. fægere mid góde.

**PPs**

1. He alysde þin lif leof of for wyrde. fylde| þinne willan fægere mid gode.

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

In **Jn121**, 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 **Jn121**, 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 **Jn121** 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** *Onfindad* **EPs** *Onfíndaen* in Psalm 93:8.1a (discussed above, p. 37),
the **Jn121** form is probably to be ascribed to the influence of the Latin text. Had the scribe
responsible for the innovation in the **Jn121** 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 **Jn121** version is edited in Dobbie, *ASPR* 6, as “Fragments of Psalms.”

139 See Robinson and Stanley, *EEMF* 23, plate 28.13 (f.49v: the Latin of Psalm 102:3 begins on manuscript
line 14; of Psalm 102:4 on line 17; of Psalm 102:5 on line 21). The two other initial Latin *Q*’s used in the
‘Benedictine Office’ are of the type found at the beginning of Psalms 102:3 and 102:5. See plates 28.4 (f.
45r/4), 28.9 (f. 47v/7).
Substitution of Prefixes (1 example)

*MPs* (Jn₁₂₁/PPs), 89:18.1a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jn₁₂₁</th>
<th>PPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 $\text{G }$esoh</td>
<td>$\text{B }$esoh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{þine sceal}</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{cas}</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{swæsum eagum.}</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{Þon}</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{þin}</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{agenweorc}</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{éc} \text{eddrihten.}</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{þheorabearn}</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{ger}</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{ecc}</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{þleum}</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{móde.}</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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 *besōn* is more common.¹⁴⁰

Substitution of Stressed Words and Elements (1 example)

*MPs* (Jn₁₂₁/PPs), 89:15.2b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jn₁₂₁</th>
<th>PPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 $\text{G }$ehweorfus hwæthwygu.</td>
<td>$\text{G }$ehweorfus hwæthwygu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{halig drihten.}</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{wes}</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{þinum scealcum}</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{wel}</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{eað}</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{bene.}</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 $\text{G }$ehweorfus hwÆweorc hwælga</td>
<td>$\text{G }$ehweorfus hwÆweorc hwælga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{haligdrihten}</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{wes}</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{þinum scealcu}</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{wel}</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{eað}</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{bede}</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Conuertere domine aliquantulum et deprecabilis esto super seruos tuos*

The uncorrected form in PPs, *eaðmede* ‘humble’, while generally suited to a religious context, does not fit the specific text of this Psalm. The corrected form, PPs *eað 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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 S wicnamanþinum. néode singe.</td>
<td>1 H wylc seeð þæt þe] soð fæst byð.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>þ</td>
<td>min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ofdæge ondæg.</td>
<td>swa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**PPs**  
*Misericordiam et ueritatem quis requiret eorum; sic psallam nomini tuo, deus, in seculum [sic] seculi, ut reddam uota mea de die in diem.*

With *ic*, **PPs** Psalm 60:6.3-4 is an adverbial clause of purpose or result⁴⁴²: ‘...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.”⁴⁴³ 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 þæ*).⁴⁴⁴

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

---


⁴⁴⁴For a similar use of *þæt* as a general relative marker in the Psalms, see Psalm 121:2,
Respect in servos 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 beséon, 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)

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.  

---

145 Cited in B.-T(S). beséon I (b).

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

A translation of the greater doxology, “Gloria I” is found in two witnesses: Jn\textsubscript{121} and Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 201 (CC\textsubscript{201}), an eleventh-century collection of homilies, laws and miscellaneous religious texts. In Jn\textsubscript{121}, the poem has been copied – like the Psalm fragments discussed above – as part of the “Benedictine Office,” where is it preceded by the first version of Psalm 69:1 and followed by Psalms and poetic reworkings of the *Pater noster* and Creed.\footnote{The Jn\textsubscript{121} versions of these poems have been edited by Dobbie in *ASPR* 6 as “Lord’s Prayer III” and the “Creed” respectively.} In CC\textsubscript{201}, “Gloria I” appears towards the end of the manuscript. It is immediately preceded by an independent translation of the *Pater noster* (“Lord’s Prayer II”),\footnote{Ker, *Catalogue*, art. 49.} and, separated by fifty-five pages of miscellaneous laws, prayers and other texts, a copy of the prose parts of the Jn\textsubscript{121} “office” – a translation of the second book of the *De officiis et orationibus canonica rum horarum* by Hrabanus Maurus, *De clericorum institutione*.\footnote{James M. Ure, *The Benedictine Office: An Old English Text*, Edinburgh University Publications Language, and Literature 11 (Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1957 ), p. 15.}

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

The two manuscripts each contain an example of the sporadic voicing of medial consonants, CC\textsubscript{201} *mildse* for expected *miltse* (as in Jn\textsubscript{121}), line 46b, and Jn\textsubscript{121} *pan gung* for...
expected *puncung* (as in CC201), line 45b. CC201 has one obvious uncorrected error not in Jn121. CC201 *heriað heriað* by dittography in line 36a, and the two manuscripts have what appear to be three inflectional errors in common: an oblique forms (-)frofre for expected the expected nominative singular (-)frofor (two times, lines 13a and 15b), and the use of the strong accusative singular masculine form of *halig* to modify a feminine accusative singular noun *heortlufan* in line 29a, *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

Jn₁₂₁  
Sy þe wul|dor ½|lof.  wide|geopenod.  
geond ēalle|peoda.  þanc ½|wylla|  
mæg(e)n ½|mild|se.  ½|ealles modes ½|lufu  
soð| fæstra sib.  ½|ðīnes ½|ylfes ½|dom.  
5  worul|de| gewl|tegod.  swa|ðu  wealdan miht.  
eall ½|ordan| mæg(e)n  ½|ulp|yte.  
wind ½|wolc|na.  

CC₂₀₁  
Sy þe wul|dor ½|lof.  widege ½|opnod.  
geond ēalle ½|peoda.  þanc ½|wylla|  
mæg(e)n ½|mild|se.  ½|ealles modes ½|lufu.  
soð| fæs ½|tra ½|sib.  ½|ðīnes|½|-silfes ½|dóm.  
5  worul|de| gewlitegod.  swa|ðu  wealdan miht.  
eall ½|ordan| mæg(e)n ½|ulp|fte.  
wind.  ½|wolc|na

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

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

Glor I, 7b

Jn₁₂₁  
7  weal|dest| eall onrh|t.  

CC₂₀₁  
7  weal|dest  eall on rh|t.

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

¹⁵¹ For the use of eall as an independent “Pronoun Adjective,” see Mitchell, OES, §454.
¹⁵² Cf. Chron. 1036: ða ½|dæ micel wealdan on δisum lande, quoted in B.-T., wealdan V (d); also III (e), where the following glosses are given: wylt|presid|et; 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 gastas* is nominative plural and subject of *wunað* and *rixad*, line 41b, parallel to *cyninc*, line 42a, *ge corenan*, line 42b, *wlitige englas*, line 44a, *wuldorgife*, line 44b, *sibe*, line 45a, *þancung*, line 45b, and *mildse*, line 46a. In Jn₁₂₁, *haliges gastes* is (possessive) genitive singular modifying *héah|þynnesse*, line 43a. The variation has no effect on metre.

The substitution Jn₁₂₁ *héah|þynnesse* CC₂₀₁ *heah pryennesse* 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.\(^{153}\)

**Glor I, 55b**

**Jn\(_{121}\)**

```
þugecyddest þ.  
þaðu mihtig god.  mán geworhst.]
55  ðhim ondydest.  orð.  `sawul`.  
sealdest word| ðgewitt.  `þwæstma gecynd.  
  cyddest þine cræftas]
```

**CC\(_{201}\)**

```
þugecyddest þ.  
þaðu mihtig god| mangeworhst.  
55  ðhim ondydest  orð  `sawle`.  
sealdest word| ðgewitt.  `þwæst magecynd.  
  cyddest þine craeftas.
```

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

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

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

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

**Glor I, 43a**

**Jn\(_{121}\)**

```
þ onworuld aworuld  wúnað.  `ríxað
cyning| innanwúldre.  `þhis þagecorenan.  
55  héah|þrímnnesse  haliges gastes.  
  wlitige énglas.  `þwuldorgyfe.  
45  sóðesibbe.  sawla þan gung.  
  modes mildse.
```

**CC\(_{201}\)**

```
And on worlda world.  wúnað  `ríxað.  
cyning innan wuldre.| `þhis þa ðe ðe corenan.  
55  héah|þrímnnesse  halige gastas.  
  wlitige englas.  `þwuldorgyfe.  
45  sóðe sibbe.  sawla þancung.|  
  modes mildse.
```  

The origin of this variant probably lies in the superficially liturgical appearance of the
immediate context, compounded by the etymological confusion of *þrímnys* and *þrínnys* in
late Old English.\(^{155}\) At a purely lexical level, **Jn\(_{121}\)** *héah|þrímnnesse* ‘Holy Trinity’ is an


\(^{154}\)Sievers-Brunner, §252 Anm.2 and §254.2.

\(^{155}\)For a discussion of the development of *þrímnys* in the sense ‘Trinity’ and its subsequent confusion with *þrínnys*, see Roberta Frank, ‘Late Old English *þrímnys* ‘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 \textit{Jn}_{121} form), \textit{haliges gastes}, \textit{onworuld aworuld}, \textit{cyning innan wuldre}, \textit{gecorenan} and \textit{wlitige englas}, are all perfectly suited to a discussion of God and the Holy Trinity. As Roberta Frank has argued recently, moreover, \textit{þrymnys} ‘mightiness’ (\textit{CUL-Fn27} \textit{heah þrymnesse}) had become increasingly associated with \textit{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 \textit{Jn}_{121} scribe appears to have associated with the Holy Trinity refer instead to the hosts of angels and souls in heaven. While \textit{Jn}_{121} \textit{héah|þr}nnesse can be construed as an example of the analogical extension of \textit{-e} to the nominative singular of feminine nouns (examples are reported by Campbell from all dialects except Kentish),\textsuperscript{156} or, more regularly, as an oblique singular (\textit{CUL-Fn27} \textit{heah þrymnesse} is dative or genitive singular), neither construction makes much sense in the local context of \textit{Jn}_{121}. As a nominative plural, \textit{héah|þr}nnesse “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,” \textit{Jn}_{121} \textit{héah|þr}nnesse \textit{haliges gastes}.

A better reading is to follow \textit{CC201} and take the nouns in lines 42-46a as roughly appositive to each other, serving together as the subjects of the plural verbs \textit{wunað} \textit{rixadað} in line 41b. In this reading \textit{heahþrymnesse} is genitive or dative singular ‘(chosen bands) of high mightiness’ or ‘(live and rule) through high mightiness’, while \textit{gecorenan}, \textit{halige gastas} (as in \textit{CUL-Fn27}), and \textit{wlitige englas} are all understood to refer to the hosts of angels and serve with

\textsuperscript{156}Campbell, \textit{OEG}, §592.f.
cyninc innan wuldre, ðwuldorgife, soðe sibbe, and sawla ðâncung as the subject of the two verbs in line 41b.\textsuperscript{157}

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

_Glor I_, 23b (2 variants)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jn\textsubscript{121}</th>
<th>CC\textsubscript{201} 20-23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 þusettest on</td>
<td>foldan. swyðe feala cynna.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ȝtosyndrodesthig.</td>
<td>syððon onmanego.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>þugewrohtest éce gód.</td>
<td>ealle gesceafta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>onsyx dagum.</td>
<td>onþone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The variation Jn\textsubscript{121} ȝonhone| seofoðan : CC\textsubscript{201} seofōdan involves two independent additions or omissions, both of which affect metre and syntax.

The first is the addition or omission of the conjunction _ond_. In Jn\textsubscript{121} the clause ȝonhone| seofoðan þugerestest is related to the preceding clause þugewrohtest... onsyx dagum syntetically. In CC\textsubscript{201}, the relationship of the equivalent clauses þuge worhtest... onsixdagū and seofōdan þuge restest is asyndetic. While the CC\textsubscript{201} reading more “abrupt” as Ure has suggested, both forms of parataxis are common.\textsuperscript{158}

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

\textsuperscript{157}Dobbie and Ure read heahbrynnesse haliges gastes “with the high might of the Holy Ghost” for l. 43b, mixing the Jn\textsubscript{121} and CC\textsubscript{201} readings.

\textsuperscript{158}Ure, Benedictine Office, p. 122. For a discussion of both forms of parataxis, see Mitchell, OES, §§ 1690-78 (asyndetic parataxis) and §§1712-39 (syndetic parataxis with _ond_).
hold,\textsuperscript{159} and the scribe of \textbf{Jn}_{121} or an exemplar may have found it sufficient simply to establish a grammatical distinction between the two phrases. The omission of \textit{on þone} from \textbf{CC}_{201} is an example of the non-repetition of elements which can supplied from a coordinate clause, in this case, the preposition, demonstrative article and (as in \textbf{Jn}_{121}) noun \textit{dæge}.\textsuperscript{160}

Metrically, the \textbf{CC}_{201} reading is to be preferred, although most editors read \textbf{Jn}_{121}.\textsuperscript{161}

While the line is Type A-1 in both witnesses, \textbf{Jn}_{121} \textit{jonbone} adds an unusually heavy four-syllable anacrusis.

\textit{Glor I, 31a}

\begin{tabular}{l}
\textbf{Jn}_{121} \\
31 \textit{þyn þymble. þinesodan weorc.} \\
 \phantom{31} \textit{þinný-|cle miht. manegum swytelα.} \\
 \phantom{31} \textit{swaþine| cæftas hó. cýðaþ wide.} \\
 \phantom{31} \textit{ofer éalle wórul| éce stándeþ.}
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{l}
\textbf{CC}_{201} \\
31 \textit{Andnusymle þine soðan weorc.} \\
 \phantom{31} \textit{þin micle miht manegū| swutelað.} \\
 \phantom{31} \textit{swaþine cæftas híg cyðaþ wide.} \\
 \phantom{31} \textit{ofer ealle world| éce standað.}
\end{tabular}

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

\textit{Addition/Omission of Stressed Words and Elements (1 example)}

\textit{Glor I, 48a}

\begin{tabular}{ll}
\textbf{Jn}_{121} & \textbf{CC}_{201} \\
31 \textit{ærisseo mæste lufu.} & \textit{parisseomæste lufu} \\
 \phantom{31} \textit{halig|domas heofonas syndon.} & \textit{halig domes|| heofonassyndon} \\
 \phantom{31} \textit{þurhþine écan| æghwær fulle.} & \textit{þurh þine écan word| æghwar fulle.|} \\
 \phantom{31} \textit{swasyndon. þinemíhta ofer| middan geard.} & \textit{swasynd þine mihta ofer middan eard.} \\
 \phantom{31} \textit{swutele ðgesyne þðu hysylf| worhtest.} & \textit{50 swutole. ðgesýne| þæt þu| sifl worhtest.}
\end{tabular}

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

\textsuperscript{159}Mitchell, \textit{OES}, §§1177, 1207, 1387-8 and 1421-4.

\textsuperscript{160}Mitchell, \textit{OES}, §§3869-71, especially 3871.

\textsuperscript{161}Dobbie, \textit{ASPR} 6, p. 75; Ure, \textit{Benedictine Office}, pp. 83 and 122. Holthausen for his part assumes the loss of material after \textit{gerestest} and rearranges \textbf{Jn}_{121} as a Type B-1 line followed by a defective verse (“Zur Textkritik altenglischer Dichtungen,” \textit{ES}t 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 eec, p. 46 above); and “Durham,” line 6a (Hickes ∅ CUL_Ff127 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>þueart frofra fæder. þeohr hyrde.</td>
<td>ðu eart frofra fæder. þeohr hyrda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lifes latteow. lehtes wealdend.</td>
<td>lifes laðdeow. lehtes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 asyndrod</td>
<td>framsynnum. swaðinsunumære.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>þurh</td>
<td>clæne gecynd cýning oferealle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beald</td>
<td>gebletsoð. bóca láreow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heah hige frofre</td>
<td>þh alig gast</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 þh 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>þawæs geforðad þin</td>
<td>fægere wéorc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 þusúnnan dæg; sylf halgðest.</td>
<td>þusúnnan dæg sylf halgðest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>þgemær</td>
<td>sødest hine máne</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. In Jn121 the verb of the clause þgemær|sødest hine mánegum tohélpe is gemær|sian, and the subject the same as that of line 25, but not repeated. In CC201, the verb is mær|sian, 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 seofðan 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 terrae,” 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

162Mitchell, OES, §1715.
164The manuscript is described by Ker, Catalogue, art 280; Dobbie, ASPR 6, pp. lxxxvi-vii; Max Förster, “Die altenglischen Beigaben des Lambeth Psalters,” Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen, 132 (1914): 328-335.
165Ker, Catalogue, art. 280.
166Ker, Catalogue, art. 280.
167Ker, Catalogue, art. 280.
168Dobbie, ASPR 6, p. lxxxvi.
foliation does not suggest any missing pages at this point,\textsuperscript{169} however, and it is perhaps just as likely that the scribe of the Canticles omitted the first title while that of “Prayer” decided to end his text with the last word of the sentence he could get on f. 183v.

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

In their fifteen common lines, the two witnesses to “Prayer” share two apparent errors, both involving faulty alliteration (lines 2 and 7). \textbf{Jul}\textsubscript{AII} also has one obvious error not in \textbf{LPs}, \textbf{Jul}\textsubscript{AII} \textit{peo on} for \textbf{LPs} \textit{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.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{169}Ker, \textit{Catalogue}, art. 280.
\item \textsuperscript{170}Ker, \textit{Catalogue}, art. 159.
\item \textsuperscript{171}James E. Cross, and Thomas D. Hill, ed., \textit{The Prose Solomon and Saturn and Adrian and Ritheus}, McMaster Old English Studies and Texts 1 (Toronto: UTP, 1982).
\item \textsuperscript{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, \textit{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,” \textit{ES} 23 [1897]: 433-4). For a counter-argument, see Cross and Hill, \textit{The Prose Solomon and Saturn}, p. 16.
\item \textsuperscript{173}The distichs have been edited (with variants from \textbf{Jn}121), by R.S. Cox, “The Old English Distichs of Cato,” \textit{Anglia} 90 (1972): 1-29.
\end{itemize}
Textual Variants

Inflectional Difference (1 example)

*Pr*, 10b

**Lp**

- Eala frea brihta folces| scyppend.
- Gemilda þin mod me togode.
- 10 Syle| dne are ðinum earminge

**Jul**

- Æla frea beorhta folkes scippend.
- Gemilsa þyn mod me to gode.
- 10 sile þyne are þyne earminge.

Alternation between dative and instrumental singular. The variation has no effect on sense, metre or syntax. 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

**Lp**

- Eala frea brihta folces| scyppend.
- Gemilda þin mod me togode.
- 10 Syle| dine are ðinum earminge

**Jul**

- Æla frea beorhta folkes scippend.
- Gemilsa þyn mod me to gode.
- 10 sile þyne are þyne earminge.

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

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

*Pr*, 14a (2 variants)

**Lp**

- Sebið earming þeon eorðan her
dæges nihtes deofłum compað
- [jsi] willan wyrd wahim þære mirigde.
- þonne hand| lean hafað sceawad
- 15 butan he þæs yfles ærge swicel]

**Jul**

- Se byð earming þeo on eorðan her.
dæiges nihtes deoflon compað.
- 3hys willan wyrd wa him þære mirigde.
- þonne he ða handlean hafað sceawad.
- 15 bute he þæs yfelæs ær geswyce.

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

---


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 \( \text{ða} \), has little or no effect on sense, metre or syntax.

As the material added to LPs or omitted from Jul\(_{\text{AIII}}\) 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\(_{\text{Ff27}}\)), and London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius D. xx (Vit\(_{\text{Dxx}}\)). This second manuscript was almost completely destroyed in the Cottonian fire, and the poem is known to modern scholars exclusively from the editio princeps in Hickes’s Thesaurus (Hickes)\(^{177}\). The poem followed by a life of St. Cuthbert in both manuscripts.\(^{178}\)

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

---

\(^{176}\)Donald K. Fry recently has argued that a third manuscript copy of the poem was known to Francis Junius in the seventeenth century (“A Newly Discovered Version of the Old English Poem ‘Durham,’” in Joan H. Hall, Nick Doane and Dick Ringler, eds, Old English and New: Studies in Language and Linguistics in Honour of Frederic G. Cassidy, pp. 83-96). Since Junius’s transcript of this “third” manuscript (Fry’s J1) contains many of the same errors found in his transcript of an early edition of CUL\(_{\text{Ff27}}\) (Fry’s J2), and since the principal differences between J1 and the known texts of CUL\(_{\text{Ff27}}\) and Vit\(_{\text{Dxx}}\) (i.e. Hickes) involve readings in which J2 exhibits a nonsense reading, the most likely explanation is that J1 is an emended transcription of J2, made by Junius before he had a chance to compare his conjectures with the original manuscript. A third transcript of the poem (British Library, Harley 7567; Fry’s JC) appears to be a direct transcription of CUL\(_{\text{Ff27}}\). I am preparing an article discussing the relationship of J1 to CUL\(_{\text{Ff27}}\) 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-Fn27 $\text{fola}$ (for Hickes $\text{feola}$), line 5a.

**Textual Variants**

**Inflectional Difference (5 examples)**

**Dur, 4a**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hickes 6-10</th>
<th>CUL-Fn27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weor yðum eornað.</td>
<td>weor. ymbo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ean yðum strong.</td>
<td>eayðum. stronge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisca feola kinn.</td>
<td>5 $\text{fola fisca. kyn.}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And ðerinne wunað.</td>
<td>ðer inne wunað</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On floda gemong.</td>
<td>onfloda ge mon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hickes strong** is an endingless nominative plural feminine adjective agreeing with *ean*, while CUL-Fn27 *stronge* is either an adverb or a nominative plural strong adjective in *e*, agreeing with *ea* (for a discussion of the variation Hickes *ean yðum* CUL-Fn27 *eayðum*, see the following entry). In Hickes, the line is a heavy Type E with *eae*, *yðum* and *strong* all taking a full stress; CUL-Fn27 is a Type A*, in which *yðum* takes a half-stress as the second element in a compound.

---

179Hickes 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.

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

Hickes 6-10

Weor ymb eornað.| Ean yðum strong.| Fisca feola kinn.|  
And ðerinne wunað.|  
On floda gemong.|  

CUL-Fr27

weor. ymbeor|nad. eayðum. stronge.  
γ ðer inne wu|nað  
5 ðola fisca. kyn. onfloda ge mont|ge.

Hickes *ean* is an inflected nominative plural parallel to the singular *Weor* and modified by *strong*, ‘streams strong in waves.’ In CUL-Fr27, *ea* is the first part of a dative plural compound *eayðum*, ‘(in) river-waves’, and *stronge* an adverb modifying *ymbeor|nad*:

‘the Weir goes about strongly with river waves’. As a compound, *eayðum* 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, *ðan*, *yðum*, and *strong* all take a full stress.

Dur, 5b

Hickes 6-10

Weor ymb eornað.| Ean yðum strong.| Fisca feola kinn.|  
And ðerinne wunað.|  
On floda gemong.|  

CUL-Fr27

weor. ymbeor|nad. eayðum. stronge.  
γ ðer inne wu|nað  
5 ðola fisca. kyn. onfloda ge mont|ge.

The alternation is between the accusative and dative with *on*. Both patterns are found elsewhere in the corpus, although the Hickes reading *on* + Genitive Plural Noun + *gemong* is the more common. Parallels to Hickes (all with nouns denoting groups of people) include: *on clænra gemang*, Elene 108a, *on clænra gemong*, Juliana 420a, *on feonda gemang*, Elene 118b, *in heardra gemang*, Judith 225a, *on sceadena gemong*, Judith 193b; the only parallel to the CUL-Fr27 reading in the Anglo-Saxon poetic records is: *on wera gemange* Andreas 730b. A more common construction with *gemonge* is Dative Noun + *on* + *gemonge*. Examples include: *godum on gemange*, Psalm 81.1b; *halgum on gemonge*, Christ 1660a, *wyrtum in gemonge*, Phoenix, 265b, *magum in gemonge*, Juliana 528a; *leodum in gemonge* Riming
Poem, 41b, _werum on gemonge_, Exeter Riddle 31, 4a, and _eorlum on gemonge_, Exeter Riddle 31, 11b.\(^{181}\)

If the \textit{CUL\textsuperscript{Ffi27}} form is not an example of the spurious addition of \textit{-e}, the variant does have an effect on the metre: _on flōda gemong_ (Hickes) is a Type B-2 line, _on flōda gemonge_ (CUL\textsuperscript{Ffi27}) a Type A-1 with anacrusis.

\textit{Dur, 6a}

\begin{tabular}{l}
\textit{Hickes} 1-12
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{l}
Is dēos burch breome.| Geond breoten rice. \\
Steopa gestāðolad.| Stanas ymb utan. \\
Wundrum gewæxen.| Weor ymb eornað. \\
Ean yðum strong.| And ðerinne wunað. \\
Fisca feola kinn.| On flōda gemong. \\
And dēre gewexen.| Wuda festern mycel. \\
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{l}
\textit{CUL\textsuperscript{Ffi27}}
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{l}
Is dēos burch. breome geond breoten] rice \\
steppa ge staðolad stanas ymbutan \\
wundrū. ge waxen. weor. ymbeor[nad]. \\
eayðum. stronge. ġ dēr inne wunað \\
5 fōla fisca. kyn. onflōda ge monige. \\
ğ dērge wexen is wuda festern] micel. \\
\end{tabular}

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

\textit{Dur, 20b}

\begin{tabular}{l}
\textit{Hickes} 32-37
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{l}
Eardiað æt ðem eadige.| In inðem mynstre.| \\
Unarimedæ reliquia.| \\
Dær monige wundrum gewurðað.| \\
\textit{De writa} seggeð.| \\
Mid ðene drihtnes wedomes bideð.| \\
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{l}
\textit{CUL\textsuperscript{Ffi27}}
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{l}
Eardiað æt ðem eadige in] inðem minstre \\
un arimedæ. reliquia| \\
20 ðe monia wund runge. wurðað. \\
ðes| ðe \textit{writ}. seggeð. \\
midd ðene drihnes.| wedomes. bideð. \\
\end{tabular}

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

---

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

\(^{182}\)On the use of the dative to denote place where, see Mitchell, \textit{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-Ff27 it is long by position.

Substitution of Unstressed Words and Elements (1 example)

Dur, 20a

**Hickes 32-37**

Eardiað æt ðem eadige. | In indem mynstre.
Unarimeda reliquia. |
Dær monige wundrum gewurðað.| De writa seggeð.
Mid ðene drihtnes werdomes bideð.|

**CUL-Ff27**

Eardiað. ætðem eadige in|indem minstre
un arimeda. reliquia.
20 ðe monia wund rumge. wurðað.
ðes de writ. seggeð.
midd ðene drihnes.| werdomes. bideð.||

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

**Hickes 25-31**

Is ðerinne mid heom.| Æðelwold biseop.| And breoma bocera Beda. | And Boisil abbet.
De clæne Cuðberchte.| On gicheðe.
Lerde lustum.| And he his lara wel genom.|

**CUL-Ff27**

IS ðer inne midd heom.| ðelwold , bispoc.
15 ðbreoma bocera . be|ðisil abbot.
ðe clene cudberte onl gecheðe
lerde. lustum. ðhe wis lara| welgenom.

Hickes *his* is the third person possessive pronoun. For alliterative reasons, the CUL-Ff27 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-Ff27 *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**


**CUL-Ff27**

Eardieð. ætðem eadige in| inðem minstre | un arimeda. reliquia. | 20 ðe monia wund rumge. wurðað. | ðes| ðe writ. seggeð. | midd ðene drihnes. | werdomes. bideð.||

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**

And ðere gewexen. | Wuda festern mycel. | Þærge wexen is | wuda fæstern| micel.

**CUL-Ff27**

6 | Þærge wexen is | wuda fæstern| micel.

The omission of *is* from *Hickes* is almost certainly a mistake. The context requires a finite, singular verb and *gewexen* can only be construed as a past participle or plural preterite. As it takes stress in *CUL-Ff27*, the addition or omission of *is* also affects the metre. *Hickes* is a Type A-3, *CUL-Ff27* 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**

Is ðerinne mid heom. | _Ædelwold_ bisceop.

**CUL-Ffi27**

14 IS ðer inne midd heom. _Ægelwold_ , biscop.

The CUL-Ffi27 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 Tr1 W _j_, “Cædmon’s Hymn” (ylda-recension), line 2b.  

Rearrangement within the Line (1 example)

_Dur, 5a_

**Hickes 6-10**

Weor ymb eornað. | Ean yðum strong.

_Fisca_ feola kinn | On floda gemong.

**CUL-Ffi27**

5 _fola fisca_kyn_ onfloda ge monge.

Both manuscripts make equally good sense (with the exception of the erroneous correction _fola_ in CUL-Ffi27). In CUL-Ffi27, line 5a is Type C-1; in Hickes, the equivalent verse is best scanned as a Type A-1 with full stress on _feola_ and _Fisca_ and a half-stress on _kinn_.

Conclusion

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

---

184 The SanM text is reproduced in facsimile in Robinson and Stanley, _EEMF_ 23, pl. 2.19
original in the case of the West-Saxon *ylda*-recension of “Cædmon’s Hymn,” and a thorough-going dialectal translation in that of the common text of the Paris and Eadwine Psalters.

The remaining texts – “Fragments of Psalms,” “Gloria I,” “Prayer,” and “Durham” – are only slightly less “accurate” than the Glossing poems. While most of the substantive variants these poems exhibit can be attributed to scribal error or orthographic, phonological, or dialectal difference, these poems do show a slightly higher incidence of sensibly, metrically and semantically acceptable alternatives – graphically similar and/or synonymous words and elements, syntactically equivalent case endings and/or conjunctions. While the fact that the “Fragments of Psalms” and “Gloria I” are translations of Latin texts might account for their generally high level of substantive textual accuracy, the fact that similarly low levels of substantive variation are found between the witnesses to the “Occasional” poems “Prayer” and “Durham” suggests instead that such accurate transmission was the norm for all Old English poetry not preserved as constituents to vernacular prose framing texts like the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* and Bede’s *Historia ecclesiastica*, or as part of the major anthologies. How these last two groups of poems differ from the “Glossing, Translating, and Occasional” poems is the subject of the following two chapters. Chapter Three, “Fixed Context Poems,” looks at the variation found among the witnesses to poems like the *Battle of Brunanburh*, the Metrical Preface to the Old English Translation of the *Pastoral Care*, and the version of “Cædmon’s Hymn” preserved in copies of the Old English version of Bede’s *Historia ecclesiastica*. The – much more significant – variation found between the witnesses to the poems of the “poetic anthologies” is discussed in Chapter Four, “Anthologised and Excerpted Poems.”
Appendix
Psalm 117:22 and “Menologium” lines 60-62 (PPs and 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 eað beđe (corrected from eaðmede) EPs eað 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 Brunanburh188 – were it not that the ChronC1 scribe appears to have been a relatively conservative copyist of the Chronicle’s opening annals (as we have no other witnesses to “Maxims II” or the rest of the Menologium, and as the Chronicle poems in ChronC are all copied by later scribes, we have no material with which we can compare the ChronC1 scribe’s verse performance directly).189 As none of the variants between PPs and ChronC1 have a particularly significant effect on sense, syntax, or metre, and as the most significant variant – involving the substitution of stressed elements ChronC1-warum PPs-tudrum – involves the use of a more common word in ChronC1 for a nonce form in PPs, it is perhaps just as likely that the ChronC1 version of Psalm 117:22 has undergone the same kind of memorial trivialisation responsible for such modern “familiar” quotations as “blood, sweat, and tears” (for Churchill’s “blood, toil, tears and sweat”),190 “money is the root of all evil” (for

---

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

\[ \text{pæn} \text{ dream gerist:} \]
\[
\text{well wide gehwær: swa se witega sang.}
\]

PPs

\[ \text{þis is se dæg: } \text{þene} \text{ drihten } \text{ús.} \]
\[
\text{wisfæst worhte: wera cneorissíu.}
\]
\[
\text{eallí|} \text{eorðwarum: eadígu tóblisse.}
\]

The substitution ChronC¹ \[ \text{pæn} \text{ (i.e. } \text{þone}) \text{ PPs } \text{þehine} \] has no significant effect on sense, syntax, or metre. Both forms are found introducing adjective clauses in Old English.¹⁹³

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

Substitution of Stressed Words and Elements (1 example)

MPs (PPs/ChronC¹ [Men]), 117:22.3a/62a

ChronC¹

\[ \text{pæn} \text{ dream gerist:} \]
\[
\text{well wide gehwær: swa se witega sang.}
\]

PPs

\[ \text{þis is se dæg: } \text{þene} \text{ drihten us.} \]
\[
\text{wisfæ|st ge worhte wera cneorissíum eallí|} \text{eorðtudrum| eadígu tóblisse.}
\]

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 1Tim 6:7.
¹⁹² King John IV.ii.11. I am grateful to Pauline Thompson of the Dictionary of Old English for this and the preceding example.
¹⁹³ Mitchell, OES, §§ 2185 ff. and 2122 ff.
Addition/omission of Prefixes (1 example)

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

ChronC¹

\[ \text{þæn dream gerist:} \]

\[ \text{well wide gehwar: swa se witega sang.} \]

60 \[ ðis is se dæg: þæne[rihten ús.} \]

\[ \text{wisfæst worht|e} \]

\[ \text{swa se witega sang.} \]

\[ \text{wo} \]

\[ \text{þæn|e|rihten ús.} \]

\[ \text{eall|e|or|ð|warum: eadig|t|oblisse.} \]

PPs

1 \[ ð is ys se dæg þehine[r]ihten us. \]

\[ \text{wisfæ|st ge worht|e} \]

\[ \text{wera cneoriss|u.} \]

\[ \text{ead|g|um toblisse;} \]

The addition or omission of *ge-* has no significant effect on sense or syntax and a minor effect on metre. In ChronC¹, *wisfæst worht* is Type A-2a; in PPs, the equivalent verse is Type A*. *Gewyrcan* (as in PPs) and *wyrcan* (as in ChronC¹) are synonyms.
Chapter 3
Fixed Context Poems

Metrical Preface and Epilogue to the Pastoral Care;
“Cædmon’s Hymn” (West-Saxon eorðan-recension);
Poems of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle

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

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

194 Two other Chronicle poems are metrically irregular and are omitted from this study: Death of Alfred (1036) and Death of Edward (1065). See O’Keeffe, Visible Song, p. 125 and fn. 62.
witnesses to the Fixed Context poems appear to have varied according to the intentions of the
scribe or scribes responsible for the framing text as a whole, his or their grasp of its material,
or innate competence as copyist(s). Among the Fixed Context poems, the most innovative
witnesses are generally those which transmit the most innovative versions of the prose frame;
scribes and traditions which show themselves to have been conservative transmitters of the
framing text, on the other hand, tend to pass on the most conservative copies of the poetry
these texts contain.

The Metrical Preface and Epilogue to the Pastoral Care

The most striking evidence of the relationship between textual innovation in the prose
framing text and Fixed Context poems is to be seen in the nature and distribution of
substantive variants among the witnesses to the Metrical Preface and Epilogue to the Old
English translation of the Pastoral Care. Although both poems are found as constituents of
the same framing text, they nevertheless appear at first glance to have been copied to vastly
different standards of substantive textual “accuracy.” The Metrical Preface, sixteen lines long
and surviving in five witnesses, exhibits ten substantive variants: four differences of inflection,
one substitution of stressed words or elements, three examples of the addition or omission of
unstressed words or elements, one example of the addition or omission of a prefix, and one
every example of the addition or omission of a stressed word or element. The Metrical Epilogue, in
contrast, thirty lines long and surviving in two witnesses, displays no substantive variants at
all. As we shall see, this difference is not to be attributed to differences in the number of
witnesses in which each poem is found or in the scribes responsible for copying each version,
but to the textual history of the framing text. The substantive textual variants exhibited by the
surviving witnesses to the Metrical Preface are restricted with one exception to two late
representatives of a single, highly innovative tradition of the *Pastoral Care* as a whole. In addition, they agree closely with the pattern of textual innovation introduced by the scribes of these manuscripts (and those of their exemplars) into the surrounding prose. Outside of these two manuscripts (neither of which contains a copy of the Metrical Epilogue), both poems are transmitted to almost identical standards of textual accuracy in all surviving witnesses.

**Manuscripts of the Old English *Pastoral Care***

The Old English translation of the *Pastoral Care* is known to have survived the Anglo-Saxon period in six insular manuscripts, ranging in date from the late ninth to the late eleventh centuries:\(^{195}\) Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 20, A.D. 890-7 (*Hat*\(_{20}\)); †London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. xi, A.D. 890-7 (*Tib*\(_{Bxi}\)); Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 12, s.x\(^2\) (*CC*\(_{12}\)); †London, British Library, Cotton Otho B. ii, s.x/ix (*Otho*\(_{Bii}\)); Cambridge, Trinity College, R. 5. 22, s.x/ix (*Tr*\(_1\)); and Cambridge, University Library, Ii. 2. 4, s.xi, third quarter (*CUL*\(_{Ii24}\)).\(^{196}\) One of these manuscripts, *Tib*\(_{Bxi}\), was almost completely destroyed in fires at

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manuscript</th>
<th>Sigla</th>
<th>Horgan</th>
<th>Carlson</th>
<th>Dobbie</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 12</td>
<td><em>CC</em>(_{12})</td>
<td><em>CC</em></td>
<td><em>C12</em></td>
<td><em>D</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge, Trinity College, R. 5. 22</td>
<td><em>Tr</em>(_1)</td>
<td><em>T</em></td>
<td><em>R5</em></td>
<td><em>T</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge, University Library, Ii. 2. 4</td>
<td><em>CUL</em>(_{Ii24})</td>
<td><em>U</em></td>
<td><em>I2</em></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. xi</td>
<td><em>Tib</em>(_{Bxi})</td>
<td><em>Ci</em></td>
<td><em>C</em></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Junius 53 (a transcription of London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. xi)</td>
<td><em>Jn</em>(_{53})</td>
<td><em>J</em></td>
<td><em>Ju</em></td>
<td><em>J</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London, British Library, Cotton Otho B. ii</td>
<td><em>Otho</em>(_{Bii})</td>
<td><em>Cii</em></td>
<td><em>C.ii</em></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 20</td>
<td><em>Hat</em>(_{20})</td>
<td><em>H</em></td>
<td><em>H</em></td>
<td><em>H</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{196}\) Dobbie incorrectly states that *CUL*\(_{Ii24}\) “does not contain either of the verse texts,” *ASPR* 6, p. cxv.
Ashburnham house in 1731 and the British Museum bindery in 1865; with the exception of a few charred fragments still in the British Library, our only knowledge of its text comes from a seventeenth-century transcription by Francis Junius, now preserved in the Bodleian Library as Junius 53 (Jn53). A second manuscript, OthoBii, was also seriously damaged in the Cottonian fire of 1731, where it lost twenty-seven of its pre-fire total of eighty-two leaves. The lost material included a copy of the Metrical Preface. Variant readings recorded by Junius in the margins of Jn53 provide us with our only knowledge of the lost portions of this manuscript.

Metrical Preface

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

---

198 Ker, Catalogue, art. 175.
200 The most up-to-date list of witnesses for both texts is: Fred C. Robinson and E. G. Stanley, eds., Old English Verse Texts from Many Sources: A Comprehensive Collection, Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile 23 (Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1991).
Saxon eordan-text of “Cædmon’s Hymn” has as long a textual record or survives in as many twelfth-century or earlier insular manuscripts. Likewise, while the parallel text of the *Dream of the Rood* and the Ruthwell Cross Inscription has possibly a longer textual record, its two surviving copies both belong to different recensions of the text and, in contrast to the relatively regular appearance of the Metrical Preface from the late ninth to the eleventh centuries, are found in witnesses separated by an interval of as much as three hundred years.

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

---

201 All pre-twelfth-century manuscripts of “Bede’s Death Song” are continental, and, with the possible exception of The Hague, Koninklijke Bibliotheek, 70. H. 7, are derived from a single (lost) insular antecedent (Dobbie, *Manuscripts*, pp. 49-50, supplemented by ASPR 6, pp. civ-cvii; Ker, “The Hague Manuscript of the *Epistola Cuthberti de obitu bedae* with Bede’s Death Song,” *MÆ* 8 [1939]: 40-4; and K. W. Humphreys, and Alan S. C. Ross, “Further Manuscripts of Bede’s ‘Historia Ecclesiastica’, of the *Epistola Cuthberti de Obitu Bedae*, and Further Anglo-Saxon Texts of ‘Cædmon’s Hymn’ and ‘Bede’s Death Song’,” *N&Q* 220 [1975]: 50-55). Of the recensions of “Cædmon’s Hymn,” the Northumbrian *aeldu-*recension is found in two eighth-century manuscripts (see above, Chapter 2, p. 49); the Northumbrian *eordu-*recension in three fourteenth- and fifteenth-century continental exemplars (derived from a single or two closely related lost insular antecedents; see: Daniel P. O’Donnell, “A Northumbrian Version of ‘Cædmon’s Hymn’ (eordu-recension) in Brussels Bibliothèque Royale Manuscrit 8245-57 ff.62r²-v¹: Identification, Edition and Filiation,” forthcoming in: *New Essays on the Venerable Bede* [provisional title], ed. A.A. MacDonald and L. Houwen); the West-Saxon *ylde-*recension in hands of the mid-eleventh to mid twelfth centuries (see above, Chapter 2, pp. 21 ff.); and the West-Saxon *eordan-*recension primarily in manuscripts of the tenth, eleventh and, in the case of the possibly continental *To*, twelfth centuries (see below, pp. 112 ff.).

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

203 Ker, *Pastoral Care*, p. 22.
Although nothing can be said for certain about the codicology of \textit{Tib}$_{\text{Bxi}}$, Wanley’s description of the manuscript suggests that its prefaces also were written in a hand other than that used for the main text. Ker’s examination of its fragmentary remains also suggests that they were copied on a separate sheet. As Sisam argues, these features suggest that the prefaces were still being worked on after the main text of the translation was first sent out for multiplication.

Whether it is the result of authorial oversight, the royal associations of its framing text, or simply the interest and care of its first scribes, the earliest copies of the Metrical Preface show almost no substantive textual variation. The only exception, a variation between the dative instrumental cases in second part of the compound conjunction/adverb \textit{Hat}$_{\text{20}}$ \textit{Forðæm} (\textit{Tr}$_1$ for \textit{hæm} pe \textit{CUL}$_{\text{II24}}$ for \textit{hãm}) : \textit{Tib}$_{\text{Bxi}}$\textit{(Jn}$_{\text{53}}$) \textit{CC}$_{\text{12}}$ \textit{fordon}, line 8a, is commonly found in multiply-attested texts and has no effect on the sense or metre of the passage in which it occurs.

Instead, it is the late tenth- or early eleventh-century \textit{Tr}$_1$ and late eleventh-century \textit{CUL}$_{\text{I124}}$ which show the most and most significant variation in the poem. In addition to sharing the dative case with \textit{Hat}$_{\text{20}}$ in line 8a, these two manuscripts are between themselves responsible for all nine of the poem’s remaining textual variants. On three occasions, \textit{Tr}$_1$ and \textit{CUL}$_{\text{II24}}$ agree in readings not found in the earlier manuscripts: two inflectional variants: \textit{Tr}$_1$ \textit{CUL}$_{\text{II24}}$ \textit{romwarena} : \textit{Hat}$_{\text{20}}$ \textit{romwara} (\textit{Tib}$_{\text{Bxi}}$\textit{(Jn}$_{\text{53}}$) \textit{Romwara} \textit{CC}$_{\text{12}}$ \textit{ró̂m wara}), line 9b; \textit{Tr}$_1$

\footnote{Ker, \textit{Pastoral Care}, p. 22.}
\footnote{Wanley, p. 217: “Utraque præfatio, sicut in Cod. Werferthiano, ab aliena manu scripta, Codici præmittitur.”}
\footnote{Ker \textit{Pastoral Care}, p. 22.}
\footnote{A detailed discussion of the individual variants in the Metrical Preface can be found below, pp. 98-107.}
**CUL Ii24** me; **Hat20** TibBal(Jn53) min (CC12 min), line 11a; and one example of the addition of a prefix: **Tr1** beþorftan (CUL Ii24 be þorftan) : **Hat20** TibBal(Jn53) CC12 ðorfton, line 15b. On two further occasions, **Tr1** exhibits a unique reading not found in CUL Ii24 or **Hat20** TibBal(Jn53) CC12: one involving the substitution of stressed elements: **Tr1** eorð|bugend: CUL Ii24 egbugendum (Hat20 TibBal(Jn53) igebugendum CC12 ieðbu|endum), line 3a; and a second, the addition of an unstressed particle: **Tr1** for þæm þe : CUL Ii24 for þam (Hat20 Forðæm)

**TibBal(Jn53)** CC12 forðon, line 8a. The most variable of all manuscripts, CUL Ii24, has four unique readings not found in **Tr1** or the earlier manuscripts: one difference of inflection: CUL Ii24 mærða: **Tr1** merþum (Hat20 mær|ðum TibBal(Jn53) CC12 mærðum), line 10b; two examples of the addition of unstressed particles: CUL Ii24 for þam þe : **Tr1** Hat20 TibBal(Jn53) CC12∅, line 13b; and one example of the omission of a stressed word: CUL Ii24∅ **Tr1** CC12 gregorius (Hat20 TibBal(Jn53) Gregorius), line 6a.

The significance of this lop-sided distribution of textual variants among the witnesses to the Metrical Preface to the *Pastoral Care* becomes apparent when it is compared to what is known of the textual stemma of the witnesses to the framing text as a whole (Figure 1). As Dorothy Horgan and Ingvar Carlson have demonstrated, it is possible to divide the manuscripts of the *Pastoral Care* into four main textual groups: **TibBal**-CC12, **Hat20**, **OthoBlii**, and **Tr1**-CUL Ii24. For the most part, these groups are separated by scribal errors and relatively minor differences of wording or syntax. The two earliest manuscripts, **TibBal** and **Hat20**, although in all likelihood copied at the same time and in the same scriptorium, belong to two different branches of the text: **Hat20**, addressed to Wærferð, bishop of Worcester, has no known

---


descendants but shows some affinity with the texts of three later manuscripts: OthoBii, Tr1, and CULi24.\(^{211}\) TibBxi, which has a blank for the addressee of Alfred’s Prose Preface and is assumed to have been copied for use in the king’s “headquarters,”\(^{212}\) is closely related to the tenth-century CC12, although this latter manuscript cannot be directly descended from the text of TibBxi as it is recorded by Junius in Jn53.\(^{213}\) A third group is represented by OthoBii. The prose preface of this manuscript was destroyed in the Cottonian fire, but is reported by Junius to have been addressed to Hehstan, bishop of London.\(^{214}\) Like Hat20, it has no surviving direct relatives, but shares enough common omissions and errors with Tr1 and CULi24 to suggest that all three manuscripts must be derived ultimately from a single early antecedent.\(^{215}\) Tr1 and CULi24 make up the fourth and final textual strand of the Pastoral Care. The youngest of the two manuscripts, CULi24, is addressed to Wulfsige, bishop of Sherborne, from whose copy it is clearly descended. Tr1 omits the Prose Preface (and hence the addressee of its exemplar) but shares enough unique readings with CULi24 as to make it certain that they share a common – and heavily edited – ancestor.\(^{216}\)

\(^{211}\)Carlson, Cotton Otho B.ii, v. 1, pp. 28-9; see also Horgan, “Relationship,” p. 166.

\(^{212}\)Sisam, “Publication,” p. 142.

\(^{213}\)Carlson, Cotton Otho B.ii, v. 1, pp. 27-28 lists “c. 25” readings in which “C [i.e. TibBxi] shows inferior readings to H [Hat20]” and CC12 agrees with Hat20, versus “c. 5” readings in which TibBxi and CC12 agree in an “inferior reading” against Hat20. He also reports that Hat20 and CC12 never agree in an inferior reading against TibBxi.

\(^{214}\)Ker, Catalogue, art. 175.

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

It is the nature of this ancestor that is most important for our understanding of the amount, type, and distribution of the substantive textual variation among the witnesses to the Metrical Preface. With the exception of $\text{Tr}_1$ and $\text{CUL}_{\text{li}24}$, the manuscripts of the *Pastoral Care* have been as a rule conservatively – or at worst, carelessly – copied. While the different textual groups show some evidence of sporadic revision in their prose – particularly in the case of the $\text{Tib}_{\text{Bxi}}$-$\text{CC}_{12}$ group, which, when it differs from $\text{Hat}_{20}$ and $\text{Otho}_{\text{Bii}}$, transmits a text that Carlson reports to be generally “more faithful the Latin original”\(^\text{217}\) – the greater part of their variation is to be attributed to scribal error, haplography in particular.\(^\text{218}\) The text of $\text{CUL}_{\text{li}24}$ and $\text{Tr}_1$, in contrast, shows strong evidence of deliberate “editorial” intervention by the scribe or scribes of their common antecedent.\(^\text{219}\) At a syntactic level, these changes include variation in the use of prepositions, in the choice of connecting words and particles, in the order of words within the phrase, in the use of case, tense, and mood, and in the preferred forms of negation.\(^\text{220}\) At the level of vocabulary and style, Horgan also reports the frequent “use of synonyms and hyponyms instead of or alongside” the forms found in other manuscripts,\(^\text{221}\) a “very large” number of variants involving the substitution of verbal, nominal and adjectival prefixes,\(^\text{222}\) and a general tendency towards “clarification” or “explanation” through the addition of words understood from context in other witnesses (nouns, adjectives, articles, possessive pronouns, and pronominal subjects), and the substitution of relative clauses for

\(^{217}\)Carlson, *Cotton Otho B.ii*, v.1, p. 29.


“shorter elements” such as compound verbs, adjective-noun pairs and accusative-infinitive constructions.  

When the variant types recorded by Horgan (and similar types noted by Carlson) in her investigations into the Tr1 and CUL124 versions of the Pastoral Care as a whole are compared to those found in the text of the Metrical Preface in these two manuscripts, the result is a near-perfect match. Of the three variants shared by Tr1 and CUL124, only one, the relatively insignificant substitution of the weak genitive plural Tr1 CUL124 romwarena for the strong declensional form in Hat20 romwara (TibB6(33) Romwara CC12 róm wara) in line 9b, is not of a type mentioned by Horgan in her discussion of the prose. The addition of the verbal prefix be- to Tr1 beþorftan CUL124 be þorftan (Hat20 TibB6(33) CC12 ðorfton), line 15b, belongs to what Horgan reports to be one of the most common variants separating Tr1 and CUL124 from the other manuscripts of the Pastoral Care.  

The substitution of the pronominal object Tr1 CUL124 me for the possessive adjective Hat20 TibB6(33) min (CC12 mín) in line 11a, likewise, is only one of a number of examples of the “rationalisation of forms” cited by Horgan in her analysis of the prose text.  

The same is true of the readings found in only one or another of the individual manuscripts in this group, the majority of which have parallels among the variants recorded by Horgan from the common text of Tr1 and CUL124. In some cases, these variants are doubtlessly to be attributed to scribes working after the Tr1 and CUL124 traditions diverged.

---

225 Although Horgan cites the “rationalisation of forms” as a category of variation only once and does not tie the term to any specific examples (“Relationship,” p. 162), she supplies several examples in which the Tr1 CUL124 form can be attributed to the influence of surrounding forms: e.g. Tr1 CUL124 seo is modor for Hat20 TibB6(33) CC12 se is modur (214/14), in which the antecedent for selseo is the masculine weak noun willa: gif se yfla willa ðone onwald hæfð ðæs ingedónces, se is modur alices yfelles (222/13-14). Textual references to the Prose Preface here and elsewhere are by page and line number of Henry Sweet,
The omission of *gregorius* from CULi24 line 6a, for example, is almost certainly to be explained as eyeskip on the part of the scribe of CULi24 or an exemplar. Likewise, the substitution of the genitive plural *mærða* in CULi24 for the dative plural in Tr1 and all other manuscripts is perhaps more easily explained as the spontaneous influence of the ending of *romwarena* from the preceding (manuscript and metrical) line of the poem than as a survival of the common antecedent which has been removed independently by the scribe of Tr1.\textsuperscript{226} In other cases, however, the correspondence between the prose variation recorded by Horgan and the verse variation exhibited by these two witnesses to the Metrical Preface is so strong as to suggest that the differences between the two copies have their origins in alternatives already present in their common antecedent.\textsuperscript{227} The substitution of stressed elements in Tr1

\textit{eord[bugendū]: CULi24 egbugendum (Hat20 TibBal(Jn53) iegbu[en]dum), line 3a, for example, is paralleled by many similar substitutions throughout the prose in both manuscripts}\textsuperscript{228}: Tr1 CULi24 deofles Hat20 TibBal fiondes (463/12); Tr1 neat (with orf in the “outer margin”), CULi24 orf Hat20 TibBal(Jn53) CC12 neat (173/20); CULi24 luesta for Hat20 scyl[da] (407/20).\textsuperscript{229} The addition of *pe* to Tr1 for *pæm pe* (CULi24 for *pæm* Hat20 Forðæm TibBal(Jn53) CC12 forðon), line 8a, and of *forpam* and *he* to CULi24 for *pæm he het* Tr1 het (Hat20 heht), line 13b, likewise, are to be attributed to the same impetus for explanation and

\textsuperscript{226}For a discussion of this independence in CULi24, however, see Horgan “Variants,” p. 214. Horgan also cites unique readings from CULi24 and (less frequently) Tr1 throughout her list of textual variants, pp. 215-222.

\textsuperscript{227}On the basis of interlinear readings in Tr1, Horgan assumes that the ancestor of Tr1 and CULi24 was edited in large part interlinearly (“Variants,” p. 214).

\textsuperscript{228}All examples from Horgan “Variants,” p. 215. When relevant, readings from OthoBii are taken from Carlson, *Cotton Otho B.ii*.

\textsuperscript{229}Horgan does not cite the Tr1 or CC12 readings. The text is missing from TibBal and OthoBii.
clarification found in the examples Horgan supplies of the addition of “understood” words and explanatory clauses to the common text of Tr₁ and CUL₁i24.²³⁰

Textual Variants

Inflectional Difference (4 examples)

\textit{CPPref} (Hat₂₀⁻CUL₁i24⁻Tr₁⁻Tib\textsubscript{Bsd}(Jn₅₃)⁻CC₁₂), 8a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tr₁</th>
<th>for \textit{þæm be} he ma n cynnes mæst gestriende.</th>
<th>Horgan hemonn cynnes mæst. gestriende.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rodera wearde. romwarena betst.</td>
<td>rodera wearde. romwarbet betst.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>manna mod welegost. merþum gefrægost.</td>
<td>10  monna mod welegost. merðum gefrægost.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CUL₁i24</th>
<th>for \textit{þam he} man cynnes mæst gestrindende.</th>
<th>Tib\textsubscript{Bsd}(Jn₅₃) forðon he moncynnes. mæst gestrynde.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rodera wearde. romwarena betst.</td>
<td>rodera wearde. Romwarbet betst.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>manna mod welegost. mærða gefrægost.</td>
<td>10  monna mod welegost. mærðum gefrægost.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CC₁₂</th>
<th>forðon hemon, cynnes mæst gestriende.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>roderæ wearde. rõm warabet betst.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>monna mod welegost. mærðum gefrægost.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The only variant which does not involve a unique reading in one or both of Tr₁ or CUL₁i24, the two case endings are syntactically, metrically and semantically equivalent. Tr₁ for \textit{þæm be}²³¹ CUL₁i24 for \textit{þam} and Horgan forðæm are all dative singular; Tib\textsubscript{Bsd}(Jn₅₃) CC₁₂ forðon is instrumental singular. Both cases are found regularly with for in adverbial and conjunctive contexts with little difference in sense or usage.²³²

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

²³¹The addition of \textit{þe} to Tr₁ is discussed below. See p. 103.

The variation is declensional: \textit{Tr\textsubscript{1}} \textit{CUL\textsubscript{Ii24}} \textit{romwarena} is weak; \textit{Hat\textsubscript{20}} \textit{romwara} (\textit{Tib\textsubscript{Bxi}}(\textit{Jn\textsubscript{53}}) \textit{romwara} \textit{CC\textsubscript{12} róm warsa}), strong.\textsuperscript{233} The variation has no effect on sense or syntax and a minor effect on metre: in \textit{Hat\textsubscript{20}} \textit{Tib\textsubscript{Bxi}}(\textit{Jn\textsubscript{53}}) \textit{CC\textsubscript{12}} the line is Type E with a short half-lift (a rare form)\textsuperscript{234}; in \textit{Tr\textsubscript{1}} \textit{CUL\textsubscript{Ii24}}, the half-lift is resolved.

\textit{CUL\textsubscript{Ii24}} \textit{maerða} is a partitive genitive, dependent on \textit{gefrægost} and syntactically parallel to the genitives \textit{romwarena} (line 9b) and \textit{manna} (line 10a): ‘best of Romans,... most talented of men, most known of famous deeds’. In \textit{Tr\textsubscript{1}} \textit{Hat\textsubscript{20}} \textit{Tib\textsubscript{Bxi}}(\textit{Jn\textsubscript{53}}) and \textit{CC\textsubscript{12}}, \textit{maerðum}

\textsuperscript{233}Campbell, \textit{OEG} §610.7, esp. p. 246.

(and accidental variants) is a plural dative of specification: ‘(most known) for famous deeds’. While both readings are syntactically and metrically appropriate, CUL$_{II24}$ is logically nonsensical – as a predicate adjective, gefrægost refers to he (i.e. St. Augustine) rather than a specific action. Presumably the CUL$_{II24}$ scribe was influenced by the syntactic parallelism of line 9b and 10a. A similar motivation may be responsible for the variation between the first person accusative pronoun and possessive adjective in Tr$_1$ CUL$_{II24}$ me :

Hat$_{20}$ Tib$_{Bsl}$(Jn$_{53}$) $min$ (CC$_{12}$ $mín$), line 11a (see below, p. 100).

The variation has no metrical effect.

**CPPref** (CUL$_{II24}$-Tr$_1$: Hat$_{20}$-Tib$_{Bsl}$(Jn$_{53}$)-CC$_{12}$), 11a

Hat$_{20}$

Siiððan $min$ onenglisc ælfred kyning
Awende| worda gehwelc | me his writerum
sende suð ȝ norð. heht him swelcra ma
brengan,| þæt he his biscepum
15 sendan meahte. Forðæm hi his sume dórfton.
Daðe læden. spræce læste cuðon :7 :7

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

Siiððan $min$ on Englisc. Ælfred| kyning.
awende worda gehwelc. | me his writerum
sende suð ȝ norð. heht him swelcra ma.|
brengan be ðære bysene. | ȝæt he his biscepum.|
15 sendan meahte. Forðæm hi his sume dórfton|
da þe læðen spræce. læðe cuðon :-|

CC$_{12}$

sið ðan $min$ onenglisc ælfred cyning.
awende worda gehwelc. | me his writerum
sendesuð | norð | heht him swelcra má.
brenlan be ðære bysene. | ðæt he his biscepum.
15 sendan meahte. Forðæm hi his sume dórfton |
da þe læðen spræce. læðe cuðon :?|

The variation Tr$_1$ CUL$_{II24}$ me : Hat$_{20}$ Tib$_{Bsl}$(Jn$_{53}$) $min$ (CC$_{12}$ $mín$) affects the interpretation of the entire clause in which it is found. In Hat$_{20}$ Tib$_{Bsl}$(Jn$_{53}$) CC$_{12}$, $min$ (and

---

$^{235}$ See Mitchell, *OES* §1356.
orthographic variants) is a possessive adjective modifying *worda gehwelc*, the object of *awende*, l. 12a: ‘Later, King Alfred translated each of **my** words into English...’. In *Tr*$_1$ *CUL*$_{i24}$ *me* is an accusative personal pronoun syntactically parallel to *worda gehwelc* and serving as a direct object of *awende*: ‘Later, King Alfred translated **me** into English, each of words...’.

Like use of the genitive plural *CUL*$_{i24}$ *mærða* in line 10b for the dative in all other manuscripts, this variation may have its origins in a desire for local rhetorical parallelism. With the substitution of *me* for *min*, the clause of lines 11-12a becomes syntactically parallel to the following clause of lines 12b-13a: both begin with a first person accusative singular personal pronoun as direct object, follow with an adverbial phrase and end with a rhyming inflected verb. This parallelism is emphasised further in both manuscripts by the placement of a point after *sende* in the middle of line 13a (and after the inflected verb *awende* and infinitive *bringan* in the middle of lines 12a and 14a in *Tr*$_1$) in addition to the regular metrical points at the ends of the half-lines 12a and 13a$^{236}$:

---

$^{236}$O’Keeffe suggests that the punctuation in these lines in *Tr*$_1$ may be the result of a flaw in the poem’s metre: “Line 12b is technically poor, since it places *writ*erum, the word carrying alliteration, in secondary position. The scribe promotes *writ*erum to first stressed position by adding *sende* to the half-line” (*Visible Song*, p. 93). Since the first syllable of *writ*erum is long, there is no reason to assume that the alliterating syllable does not occupy the first lift of the off-verse (in this case a perfectly regular Type C-2). The fact that the scribes of both manuscripts place points at the line boundaries of 12a and 13a and after *sende* (and in *Tr*$_1$ *awende*) also seems to rule out O’Keeffe’s second suggestion, that the points after the inflected verbs in both manuscripts may indicate that “the scribe... pointed these lines as prose, very much in agreement with his practice of pointing in the translation of the *Regula Pastoralis*, where he points by clause” (*Visible Song*, p. 93). *Worda gehwilc* and *sup and norp* (the material between the points in *Tr*$_1$ lines 12a and 13a) are neither rhetorical clauses nor metrically acceptable units (the “analogous” readings O’Keeffe supplies from the Metrical Psalms – *worda þinra* and *worda æghwylc* – are both Type A lines and hence not metrically parallel). See *Visible Song*, p. 92, fn. 43 and cf. Campbell, *OEG* §90 for the scansion of the first syllable of *æghwelc*. 
Substitution of Stressed Words and Elements (1 example)

**CPPref (Tr1: Hat20-TibBxi(Jn53)-CC12-CULIi24), 3a**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tr1</th>
<th>Hat20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Þis ærynd ge writ Agustinus. ofer sealtne sæ suðan brohte. eorð</td>
<td>bugendū. swa hit ær fore adihtode. dryhtnes cempa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULIi24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dis ærynd ge writ Agustinus ofer sealtne sæ suðan brohte. iegbuendum swa hit ær fore adihtode dryhtnes cempa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rome papa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tr1** eorð|bugendū is vague: for readers of Alfred’s translation, the importance of Augustine’s mission was not simply that he brought the *Cura Pastoralis* to ‘people’ living overseas, but that he brought it specifically to the *iegbuendum*, the inhabitants of the British Isles. Horgan reports that similar (“sometimes misguided”) substitutions are found in both **Tr1** and **CULIi24**. 239 As the compound *eordbu(g)end* is very common in verse (forty-one occurrences in various spellings), O’Keeffe suggests that the **Tr1** form may be the result of a formulaic substitution. 240 There are three other occurrences of *iegbu(g)end* in Old English.

---

237 Manuscript line-division and punctuation.
238 Manuscript line-division and punctuation.
240 O’Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 93.
poetry, all in texts associated with the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: Menologium*, line 185a, *Coronation of Edgar*, line 4a, and *Death of Edgar*, line 37a.\(^{241}\)

The substitution has no effect on syntax or metre.

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

**CPPref** *(Tr\(_1\): Hat\(_{20}\)-Tib\(_{Ba}\)(Jn\(_{53}\))-CC\(_{12}\)-CUL\(_{II24}\)), 8a*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tr(_1)</th>
<th>Hat(_{20})</th>
<th>CUL(_{II24})</th>
<th>Tib(<em>{Ba})(Jn(</em>{53}))</th>
<th>CC(_{12})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>for hæm be he ma ncynnnes mæst gestriende.</td>
<td>Forðæm hemoncynnes mæst.</td>
<td>gestriende.</td>
<td>forðon he moncynnes. mæst gestrynde.</td>
<td>forðon hemon, cynnes mæst gestriende.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rodera wearde. romwarena betst.</td>
<td>rodra wearde romwara betest</td>
<td>rodra</td>
<td>wearde róm warabetst.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manna mod weligost.</td>
<td>monna modwelegost.</td>
<td>monna mod weligost.</td>
<td>monna mod welegost.</td>
<td>monna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mærðum gefrægost.</td>
<td>mærðum gefrægost.</td>
<td>mærðum gefrægost.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The addition or omission of *be* has no effect on sense or syntax. Variation in the use of *be* is common with *forðæm* in both adverbial and conjunctive contexts.\(^{242}\)

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

---

\(^{241}\)Bessinger and Smith.

The addition of *for pam* and *he* to CUL_{ii24} has a significant effect on syntax, but none on metre.

In CUL_{ii24}, *for pam* introduces a “clause of explanation,” used to “amplify, explain or suggest the reason for, a statement”\(^{243}\) – in this case why Alfred sent the *Pastoral Care* south and north to his scribes: ‘[King Alfred] ...sent me southwards and northwards to his scribes, for he ordered them to produce more of the same according to this model, that he might send [them] to his bishops...’ . In Tr_{1} Hat_{20} Tib_{B34(Jn_{53})} CC_{12} ll. 13b-15a follow asyndetically on the preceding sentence: ‘[King Alfred] ...sent me southwards and northwards to his scribes; he ordered them to produce more of the same according to this model that he might send [them] to his bishops...’. 
The addition of *he* to **CUL 1124** is related to the change in syntax brought on by the introduction of *for þam*. In **CUL 1124**, the pronoun is the subject of the clause; in **Tr 1 Hat 20** **Tib 16(Bal 53)** and **CC 12**, the clauses are joined asyndetically with non-repetition of the subject.²⁴⁴ Both are acceptable syntax.

The additions to **CUL 1124** are probably to be attributed to the same propensity to clarification and explication noted by Horgan in her analysis of the main text of **Tr 1** and **CUL 1124**.²⁴⁵ It is also possible, however, that they were prompted by a reinterpretation of an exemplar in *heht* (as in **Hat 20** **Tib 16(Bal 53)** and **CC 12**) as *he het*. As both words fall on the preliminary drop of a Type B-1 line, the addition or omission of *for þam* and *he* has no metrical effect.

²⁴⁴ Mitchell, *OES* §1690.
Addition/Omission of Prefixes (1 example)

**CPPref (CUL\textit{Ii24}\textsuperscript{-}Tr\textsubscript{1}: Hat\textsubscript{20}-Tib\textsubscript{Bx}(Jn\textsubscript{53})-CC\textsubscript{12}), 15b**

**Tr\textsubscript{1}**

Seððan me onenglesc. ælfræd cyningc
awende. worda| gehwilc. ņme his writerum
sende suð | norþ. het him swylcra ma
bringan,| beþære bysene.
ţæt he his bisceopum
15 sendan myahte.

for ųæm hi his| sume beþorftan.
ţa ųe leden spræce læste cuþon.

**CUL\textit{Ii24}**

Siððan me on englisc ælfræd cyning
awende worda ge hwilc. ņme his writerum
sende. suð | norð.

for ųæm he het him swil swilcra ma
brengan be ųære bysne ųæt he his bisceopů
15 sendan meahte.

for ųæm hi his sume beþorftan
ţa ųe leden spræce læste cuþon.

**Hat\textsubscript{20}**

Siððan min onenglisc ælfræd kyning
Awende| worda gehwelc ņmehis writerum
sende suð | norð heht him swelcra má
brengan biðære bisene ųæt he his biscepum
15 sendan meahte. Forðæm hihis sume dorfton
Ďaðe leden. spræçe læste cuþon :7 :7

**Tib\textsubscript{Bx}(Jn\textsubscript{53})**

Siððan min on Enlgisc. Ælfræd kyning.
awende worda gehwelc ņme his writerum
sende suð | norð. heht him swelcra má
brengan be ųære bysene.
15 sendan meahte. forðæm hi his. sume dorfton
Ďa leðen spræce. læðe cuþon :-|

**CC\textsubscript{12}**

sið ðan mín onenglisc ælfred cyning.
awende worda gehwelc. ņmehis writerum
-sendesuð | norð heht him swelcra má
brengan be ųære bisene ųet he his biscepum
15 sendan meahte. forðæmhihis sume dorfton
Ďaðel| læden spræce læste cuþon :7|

The addition or omission of the prefix has no obvious effect on sense or syntax.

Horgan notes that the addition of prefixes is a common feature of Tr\textsubscript{1} and CUL\textit{Ii24}.\textsuperscript{246} The variation does affect metre, however. In Hat\textsubscript{20} Tib\textsubscript{Bx}(Jn\textsubscript{53}) CC\textsubscript{12} the line is a Type C-1 with a resolved first stress. To the extent that the Tr\textsubscript{1} CUL\textit{Ii24} line is metrical, it is Type A-1 with a metrically suspicious four anacrustic syllables.

\textsuperscript{246}Horgan, “Variants,” pp. 214-5.
Addition/Omission of Stressed Words and Elements (1 example)

CPPref (CUL\textsubscript{II24}: Hat\textsubscript{20}-Tib\textsubscript{Bx}l(Jn\textsubscript{53})-CC\textsubscript{12}-Tr\textsubscript{1}), 6a

\begin{align*}
\textbf{Tr}_1 & \quad 5 \quad \text{riht spel monig} \\
\text{gregorius.} & \quad \text{gleaw mód geond wód.} \\
\text{þurh sefan| snytro.} & \quad \text{searo þanca hord.}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\textbf{Hat}_20 & \quad 5 \quad \text{ryhtspell monig.} \\
\textbf{Gregorius} & \quad \text{gleawmod gindwód} \\
\text{ðurh| sefan snyttro.} & \quad \text{searo ðonca hord.}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\textbf{CUL\textsubscript{II24}} & \quad 5 \quad \text{riht spel monig.} \\
\text{---} & \quad \text{gleaw mod geond|wód} \\
\text{þurh sefan snytro.} & \quad \text{searo þanca hord.}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\textbf{Tib\textsubscript{Bx}l(Jn\textsubscript{53})} & \quad 5 \quad \text{ryht spell monig.} \\
\textbf{Gregorius.} & \quad \text{gleaw mod. gind wód.|} \\
\text{ðurh| sefan snyttro.} & \quad \text{searo ðonca hord.}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\textbf{CC\textsubscript{12}} & \quad 5 \quad \text{ryht|spel monig.} \\
\textbf{gregorius} & \quad \text{gleawmod| geondwód} \\
\text{ðurh| sefan snyttro|} & \quad \text{searo ðonca hord.}
\end{align*}

The omission of expected \textit{gregorius} from CUL\textsubscript{II24} is presumably to be explained as a result of syntactic or sensical eyeskip. Since the subject of lines 5b-7 is the same as that of lines 3b-5a and since \textit{gregorius} is appositive to the nominative adjective \textit{gleaw mod}, the proper noun is neither syntactically nor sensically necessary.

The word \textit{is} metrically necessary, however. Perhaps the unusual double alliteration\textsuperscript{247} in the off-verse led the scribe of CUL\textsubscript{II24} into accepting line 6b as a metrically complete long line.

Metrical Epilogue

Although there seems little reason to doubt that the Metrical Epilogue was intended to follow Alfred’s translation of the \textit{Pastoral Care} as the last item in the translation,\textsuperscript{248} it has

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

\textsuperscript{248}Dobbie argues that “there is nothing in the metrical epilogue to connect it inescapably with the \textit{Pastoral Care}, except perhaps the mention of Gregory in l. 23” (ASPR 6, p. cxii). In addition to the reference to Gregory, the poem’s water imagery also seems to provide a connection with the last section of the prose, in which St. Gregory explains how he was \textit{gened... ðæt ic nu hæbbe menege men gelæd to ðæm stæde fullfremednesse on ðæm scipe mines modes} ‘compelled... to lead many men to the shore of perfection in the ship of my mind’ and prays to John his interlocutor for the \textit{on ðæm scipgebroce ðisses andweardan lifes sum bred geræce ðinra gebeda, ðæt ic mæge on sittan oð ic to londe cume} ‘the plank of thy prayers in the shipwreck of this present life, that I may sit on it till I come to land...’ (text and translation: Sweet, \textit{King Alfred’s Version}, pp. 466 and 467). A further reference to water is found in a citation of John 4:13-14.
suffered more seriously than the Metrical Preface from the vicissitudes of fire and age. It survives in only two manuscripts, Hat 20 and CC 12 – although, as all but one of the remaining manuscripts of the Pastoral Care end defectively, it seems likely that its original circulation was wider than the number of surviving copies would suggest.\footnote{Junius’s copy of Tib Br breaks off mid-way through Chapter 49 (with ic mæge hieran ðine stemne, 380/15); Otho III ends in Chapter 56 (pa sculon, 433/25); and CUL 1424 in the middle of the last sentence of the last Chapter (oð ic to lande cume, Chapter 65, 467/25). Only Tr 1 (which also omits the Prose Preface) can be said to have omitted the Epilogue for certain: its text ends with the last sentence of Chapter 65 (minra agenra scylfa, 467/27), and the colophon: Deos gratias. Amen. (Ker, Catalogue, art. 88).}

As was the case with the variation found among the witnesses to the Metrical Preface, the lack of variation found between the witnesses to the Metrical Epilogue can be best explained in terms of the habits and interests of the scribes responsible for its surviving copies. Its two witnesses, although members of different textual groups, are the work of demonstrably careful scribes; scribes who, with the exception of a single relatively minor difference in case (see above, p. 98), transmit substantively identical versions of the Metrical Preface. In copying the Metrical Epilogue, these same scribes – assisted, in the case of Hat 20 by an even more accomplished colleague\footnote{The main scribe of Hat 20, believed by Ker to be responsible for the Metrical Preface (see above, p. 203 and fn. 203), copies most of the first 10 lines of the Metrical Epilogue (to gode, l. 10b and the bottom of f. 98r). The manuscript’s “minor” hand – a much more accomplished scribe – takes over at the top of the verso and arranges the text of the Epilogue in the form of an inverted triangle which tapers to a point in the middle of the page. For a facsimile, see Robinson and Stanley, eds., EEMF 23, plates 6.2.2.1-6.2.2.2.} – copy their texts to an equally high standard of substantive accuracy.

**“Cædmon’s Hymn” (eorðan-recension)**

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

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

\footnote{249}
late tenth-/early eleventh- and late eleventh-century representatives of a single innovative textual tradition of the framing translation. When – as is the case with the Metrical Epilogue and all but the Tr₁ and CUL₁₂₄ texts of the Metrical Preface – the poem was transmitted outside of this innovative tradition, the responsible scribes copied their texts with a minimum of substantive variation.

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

\(^{251}\)Visible Song, p. 39. The variants she lists are as follows: “nu/nu we [l.1a]; weorc/wera/weoroda [l.3a]; wuldfœder [sic, for wuldfœder]/wuldfodes [l.3a]; wundraf/wuldras [l.3b]; gehwæs [sic, for gehwaes]/fela [l.3b]; or/ord [l.4b]; sceop/gescop [5a].” Not included in this total are three variants from London, British Library, Additional 43703 (N) which O’Keeffe – probably correctly – discounts as being the likely result of Nowell’s own copying errors (Visible Song, p. 39; see also below, p. 142, fn. 310); three unique variants from B₁: herigan sculon, l. 1a; astealde, l. 4b; and þe, l. 7a; and the variants from the marginal version of the eorðan-recension in Tournai, Bibliothèque Municipale, 134 (To). This last manuscript is not mentioned in O’Keeffe’s chapter or index. Jabbour discusses nine variants: nelnu, we/∅, l. 1a; weorc/weoroda/berapa, l. 3a; wundral/wuldras, l. 3b; orloord/or, l. 4b; sceop/gescop, l. 5a; eordanl/eorþ, l. 5b; teode/eode, l. 8b; firum/firnū, l. 9a (diss., pp. 195-196, 197).
Table 1: Substantive Variants in the West-Saxon eorðan-recension of “Cædmon’s Hymn”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C(N)</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Ca</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a Ne</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Nu</td>
<td>Nu</td>
<td>Nu</td>
<td>Nu</td>
<td>Nu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a Ø cor. to we</td>
<td></td>
<td>we</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td></td>
<td>we</td>
<td>we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sculan herian</td>
<td></td>
<td>scelōn herigean</td>
<td>scelōn herigean</td>
<td>scelōn herigean</td>
<td>scelōn herigean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a weoroda</td>
<td>wera</td>
<td>wera</td>
<td>weorc</td>
<td>weorc</td>
<td>weorc</td>
<td>weorc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wuldor fæder</td>
<td></td>
<td>wuldor fæder</td>
<td>wuldor fæder</td>
<td>wuldor fæder</td>
<td>wuldor fæder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wundra</td>
<td></td>
<td>wundra</td>
<td>wundra</td>
<td>wundra</td>
<td>wundra</td>
<td>wundra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gehwæs corr. to</td>
<td></td>
<td>gehwæs</td>
<td>gehwæs</td>
<td>gehwæs</td>
<td>gehwæs</td>
<td>gehwæs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gehwæs</td>
<td></td>
<td>gehwæs</td>
<td>gehwæs</td>
<td>gehwæs</td>
<td>gehwæs</td>
<td>gehwæs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b or</td>
<td></td>
<td>odr cor. to oor</td>
<td>ord</td>
<td>or</td>
<td>ord</td>
<td>ær</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>onstealde (f.146v)</td>
<td></td>
<td>onstealde</td>
<td>onstealde</td>
<td>onstealde</td>
<td>onstealde</td>
<td>onstealde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scop</td>
<td>gesceop</td>
<td>gescéop</td>
<td>sceop</td>
<td>sceop</td>
<td>sceop</td>
<td>sceop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eorpū</td>
<td>eordan</td>
<td>eordan cor. to</td>
<td>eordan</td>
<td>eordan</td>
<td>eordan</td>
<td>eordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scypend</td>
<td>scypend</td>
<td>scypend</td>
<td>scypend</td>
<td>scypend</td>
<td>scypend</td>
<td>scypend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a þa</td>
<td>þa</td>
<td>þa</td>
<td>þa</td>
<td>þa</td>
<td>þe</td>
<td>þa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8a eode</td>
<td>teode</td>
<td>teode</td>
<td>teode</td>
<td>teode</td>
<td>teode</td>
<td>teode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9a fiñū</td>
<td>firum</td>
<td>firū</td>
<td>firum</td>
<td>firum</td>
<td>firum</td>
<td>firum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foldan</td>
<td>folda, corr. to foldan</td>
<td>foldan</td>
<td>foldan</td>
<td>foldan</td>
<td>foldan</td>
<td>foldan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By either reckoning, this is a lot of variation for a nine line poem – especially when it is compared with the almost complete lack of substantive variation found among the witnesses to the roughly contemporary West-Saxon ylda-recension of the poem, or the two eighth-century witnesses to the Northumbrian aeldu-recension discussed in Chapter Two.

Comparing the ylda-and eordan-texts, O’Keeffe has suggested that the more extensive...
variation exhibited by the witnesses to the *eorðan*-text is evidence of the fundamentally formulaic approach its scribes took towards the transmission of Old English poetry, the results of which she contrasts with the type of contamination inevitable in all longer copying tasks:

When we examine the variations in the five tenth- and eleventh-century records of the West Saxon [sc. *eorðan*]-version, we see in the despair of the textual editor palpable evidence of a fluid transmission of the Hymn somewhere between the formula-defined process which is an oral poem and the graph-bound object which is a text. We see a reading activity reflected in these scribal variants which is formula-dependent, in that the variants observe metrical and alliterative constraints, and which is context-defined, in that the variants produced arise within a field of possibilities generated within a context of expectations. The mode of reading I am proposing operates by suggestion, by ‘guess’ triggered by key-words in formulae. It is a method of reading which is the natural and inevitable product of an oral tradition at an early stage in its adaptation to the possibilities of writing. These five records of Cædmon’s Hymn give evidence of a reading activity characterized by intense reader inference, where the reader uses knowledge of the conventions of the verse to ‘predict’ what is on the page. Variance in an oral tradition is made inevitable by the subjectivity of the speaker (and hearer), but is constrained by impersonal metre and alliteration. The writing of a poem acts as a very powerful constraint on variance, and in the face of such constraint, the presence of variance argues an equally powerful pull from the oral.

The process of copying manuscripts is rarely simply mechanical. Given the normal medieval practice of reading aloud, or at least of sub-vocalizing, the scribe likely ‘heard’ at least some of his text. And copying done in blocks of text required the commission of several words or phrases to short-term memory. The trigger of memory is responsible for various sorts of contamination, and this is most easily seen, for example, in the importation of Old Latin readings into the copying of the Vulgate Bible. Quite another sort of memory-trigger is responsible for ‘Freudian’ substitutions in a text. Here the substitutes, if syntactically correct, are usually not semantically or contextually appropriate.

The presence of variants in Cædmon’s Hymn, however, differs in an important way from the appearance of memorial variants in biblical or liturgical texts. Both sorts depend to some degree on memory, but the variants in Cædmon’s Hymn use memory not to import a set phrase but to draw on formulaic possibility. Reception here, conditioned by formulaic conventions, produces variants which are metrically, syntactically and semantically appropriate. In such a process, reading and copying have actually become conflated with composing. The integral presence of such variance in transmitting the Hymn in *AE* [i.e. the *eorðan*-recension] argues for the existence of a transitional state between pure orality and pure literacy whose evidence is a reading process which applies oral techniques for the reception of a message to the decoding of a written text.\(^{256}\)

\(^{256}\)O’Keeffe, *Visible Song*, pp. 40-41.
As we shall see, however, the variation found among the witnesses to the West-Saxon eorðan-recension of “Cædmon’s Hymn” has less to do with the formulaic responsiveness of the scribes involved in its transmission than with the attitude these scribes (or the scribes of their antecedents) take towards the framing text as a whole. As was the case with the Metrical Preface and Epilogue to the Pastoral Care, the most innovative versions of the eorðan-recension of “Cædmon’s Hymn” are found in the most innovative witnesses to the framing prose text of the Old English translation of the Historia and show roughly similar amounts and types of textual variation. While the most innovative versions of this recension of the Hymn are not restricted to a single branch of the framing text, the variation they exhibit can be shown to match the demonstrable extra-poetical interests of the scribes responsible for copying them.

Manuscripts of the Old English Historia

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

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

\textsuperscript{258}Nowell’s transcript also contains a copy of ChronG. See below, p. 138, fn. 303.
the poem in the margins of a twelfth-century and perhaps continental version of the Latin Historia, †Tournai, Bibliothèque Municipale, 134 (To).

Since the early eighteenth century, the manuscripts of the Old English Historia have been divided into two textual groups: T₁ B₁ and C(N) O Ca. Of these, C(N) O Ca show the least internal variation, especially O and Ca which are particularly close and probably linearly related. T₁ and B₁, on the other hand, show far more internal variation. While they share a number of common errors and omissions, the text of B₁ in particular has been freely handled, and contains many unique readings not found in any other manuscript.

As was the case with the Pastoral Care, the textual stemma implied by the framing text of the Old English Historia helps clarify the distribution of variants among the witnesses to the poem it contains (Figure 2). Like the framing text, the two earliest manuscripts of the eorðan-recension reproduce relatively similar texts. With the exception of the unique, nonsensical, and probably sixteenth-century variants C(N) ne T₁ nu, line 1a, C(N) eorpū T₁ eorðan, line 5b, C(N) eode T₁ teode, line 8a, and C(N) finū T₁ firum, line 9a, these two originally tenth-century records are separated by a single substitution, C(N) weoroda T₁

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


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

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

On the relationship of T₁ and B₁, see Miller, The Old English Version, v.1, pp. xxv.

weorc, line 3a. As is again true of the framing text, there is also very little variation between the individual members of the C(N) O Ca group. While the manuscripts at the farthest ends of this branch, C(N) and Ca, contain quite different texts of the Hymn, all but two of the variants which separate them are transcription errors in C(N) or can be traced to corrections made in O. In its uncorrected state, Ouncorr has only three readings (apart from the transcription errors in C(N)) which are not found in C(N): a substitution of the stressed synonyms Ouncorr wero (Ocorr wera) for C(N) weoroda, line 3a; the addition of the prefix geo- to C(N) scop (O gesceop), line 5a; and the inflectional difference, Ouncorr folda (Ocorr foldan) for C(N) foldan, l. 9a. In its corrected state, Ocorr supplies all but one of the readings in Ca, the only innovation in the latter manuscript being the inflectional difference and substitution of synonyms Ca wuldres O wundra, line 3b. In the other tradition, To, despite its lack of a framing text, shows an affinity with and lies somewhere between the T1 and B1 versions of the Hymn. Like T1 and B1, To has weorc for C(N) weoroda (Ocorr Ca wera). Like B1, it adds we to line 1a (B1 Ocorr we; T1 C(N) Ouncorr Ca ∅) and reads astealde for T1 on|stealde (C(N) O Ca onstealde) B1 astealde, line 4b. Like T1 (and the members of the C(N) O Ca group), To has sceolon herian for B1 herigan sculon, line 1a; wulder fæder for B1 wuldor godes, line 3a; gehwaes for B1 fela, line 3a; and pa for B1 pe, line 7a. Its two unique variants, To ær (T1 ór C(N) or Ouncorr oór B1 Ca ord Ocorr oør), line 4b, and To drihten (T1 O Ca scyppend B1 scyp|pend C(N) scyppend), line 6b, both have the look of scribal errors: ær for ord/or is presumably to be explained as a graphic error, while drihten for scyppend may reflect the influence of the same word in lines 4a and 8a.

265 An annotated catalogue of potentially significant substantive variation in this recension of the Hymn follows below, pp. 121-136.
This leaves us with two witnesses which are between them responsible for the introduction of the bulk of the textual variation into each textual group: \( B_1 \), and the corrected \( O \).

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

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

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

\(^{266}\) O’Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 40.
The exception is *wera*, line 3. As noted below, this substitution does bring the $O_{\text{corr}}$ version of line 3a into a closer metrical congruence with the *ylda*-text, however. See also p. 125.

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

269Both possibilities are discussed briefly by Jabbour, diss., p. 197.
which are metrically, syntactically and semantically appropriate. Of these, three are found in other witnesses to the eorðan-recension of the Hymn and, as they are also the readings of the ylde-text, are perhaps to be ascribed to a conscious or unconscious conflation of the eorðan-recension with another version: B₁ we for T₁ C(N) O^{uncorr} \emptyset (O^{corr} C T \text{ we}; all manuscripts of the ylde- and Northumbrian eordu-recensions), line 1a; B₁ ord for T₁ òr C(N) or O^{uncorr} oòr (O^{corr} òorr C \text{ ord}; all manuscripts of the ylde-recension except W), line 4b; and B₁ astealde for T₁ on|stealde (C(N) O C a onstealde) To astealde, line 4b.

The remaining four variants, however, are both unique to B₁ and metrically, syntactically, lexically, or visually striking. The inversion of sculon herigan, line 1a, has no effect on sense or syntax, but changes the metre to a Type B-1 from the Type A-3 line found in all other manuscripts of the Hymn.²⁷¹ The substitution of the relative marker B₁ \textit{þe} for the temporal adverb \textit{þa} (and orthographic variants) in the other manuscripts of the eorðan-recension, in contrast, has no effect on metre, but a significant effect on syntax. B₁ wuldor godes (for wuldorfaëder and variants in all other manuscripts), line 3a, while having no effect on sense, metre, or syntax, cannot be the result of a graphic substitution of homographs. B₁ fela (for gehwæs and variants in all other witnesses), line 3b, is equally striking graphically, and has an effect on both metre and syntax.

All these variants make good sense, metre, and syntax, and seem, as a result, to be among the best evidence for the type of “formulaic” reading O’Keeffe suggests is responsible for the textual variation among witnesses to various multiply attested poems. Except that there is nothing particularly formulaic about them. As striking and as appropriate as they are, the variants introduced into the poetic text of “Cædmon’s Hymn” in B₁ correspond in frequency

and type to the more general pattern of variation found throughout the prose of the main text of
the Old English *Historia* in this manuscript,\textsuperscript{272} and as such are less likely “the natural and
inevitable product of an oral tradition at an early stage in its adaptation to the possibilities of
writing,”\textsuperscript{273} or a product of memorial transmission,\textsuperscript{274} than the result of a demonstrable
editorial tendency in the tradition leading up to the *B*\textsubscript{1} text.\textsuperscript{275} Indeed, as the following extract
from Miller’s edition (based at this point on *T*\textsubscript{1})\textsuperscript{276} and his collation of *B*\textsubscript{1} for the page on
which “Cædmon’s Hymn” appears demonstrates, alterations of vocabulary, inflection, and
syntax are as frequent in the surrounding prose of Book IV, Chapter 24 as they are in the
Hymn itself\textsuperscript{277}:

\begin{verbatim}
1  T\textsubscript{1} he: Hwæt sceal ic singan? 
B\textsubscript{1} he: hwæt sceal ic
[MS p. 321] þa cwæð 
[MS p. 322] þa andswarode

2  T\textsubscript{1} þa cwæð: Sing me frumsceaft.  Þa
B\textsubscript{1} þa cwæð: Sing me frumsceaft.  Þa
[MS p. 322] þa onfeng, þa ongan he sona singan  in herenesse

3  T\textsubscript{1} þa onfeng, þa ongan he sona singan on herunge
B\textsubscript{1} þa onfeng, þa ongan he sona singan
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{271}The variants mentioned in this paragraph are discussed in greater detail in the catalogue of textual variants. See below, pp. 129-134
\textsuperscript{272}An exhaustive treatment of the textual variation between *B*\textsubscript{1} and *T*\textsubscript{1} can be found in Grant, *The B-Text*.
\textsuperscript{273}O’Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 40.
\textsuperscript{274}The conclusion of Jabbour, diss., pp. 199-200.
\textsuperscript{275}According to Ker, *B*\textsubscript{1} was copied by two scribes working simultaneously beginning at pp. 1 and 207
(*Catalogue*, art. 32). “Cædmon’s Hymn” (p. 322) was copied by the second scribe. Grant reports no major
differences between the two scribes in terms of the alterations introduced in their sections: “it has not been
found productive to distinguish the changes wrought to the Bede text by the individual scribes. Neither of
the scribes emerges as any more responsible than his colleagues for the alterations, and any commentary on
differences between the practices of various scribes would properly have to be directed to B’s exemplar in
any case” (*The B-Text*, p. 11). The creativity of the second scribe in particular has been frequently
discussed. In “‘Bede’s’ Envoi to the Old English *History*: an Experiment in Editing” (*SP* 78 [1981]: 4-19),
Robinson suggests that the second scribe has actually composed an entire poem and put it into the mouth of
Bede at the end of the Old English *Historia*.
\textsuperscript{276}Miller, *The Old English Version*, v.1, p. xxii.
\textsuperscript{277}Text and line numbers are from Miller, *The Old English Version*, v.1, p. 344 (*Tr*\textsubscript{1}) and v.2, pp. 408-410
(*B*\textsubscript{1}). I have printed substantive variants from *B*\textsubscript{1} in bold-face. Miller records one emendation to *T*\textsubscript{1} in the
apparatus to his edition, *Gode wyrðes* for *T*\textsubscript{1} *godes wordes*, l.17; I have restored the *T*\textsubscript{1} reading. As Miller
gives only the textual variants from *B*\textsubscript{1}, readings from that manuscript in normal type are extrapolated from
the text of *T*\textsubscript{1}. 
Among the substantive variants on this – not unusual – page from the B₁ text of the Historia are many which agree in type with the innovations found in the same manuscript’s text of “Cædmon’s Hymn”: inflectional differences: B₁ gode T₁ godes, line 17; B₁ morgen T₁ morgenne, line 17; B₁ onfangen hæfde T₁ onfeng, line 19; substitutions of nouns: B₁ herunge T₁ herenesse, line 3; B₁ wyrðes T₁ wordes, line 17; of prepositions and conjunctions: B₁ on T₁ in, lines 3 and 16; B₁ dæt he T₁ ṭa pe, line 15; B₁ ṭ T₁ ṭa, line 19; the addition or omission of adjectives and verbs: B₁ andswarode, line 1, B₁ godes, line 4; and of prepositions, pronouns, adverbs and conjunctions: B₁ ṭ, line 2; B₁ ḏa, line 2; T₁ he, line 2; B₁ āer, line 4; B₁ ne, lines 4 and 5; B₁ heora, line 5; B₁ he, line 15; B₁ hyt, line 15; B₁ āer, line 17; B₁ se, line 18.

The closeness of this correspondence can be demonstrated beyond doubt, when the innovation introduced into the B₁ text of the Hymn is compared to that catalogued by Grant from the Old English Historia as a whole.²⁷⁸ The addition of we to line 1a of the B₁ text of “Cædmon’s Hymn,” for example, is paralleled by “83” examples in the Historia in which B₁...
shows the addition of a “noun or pronoun as the subject or object” of a verb which appears without an explicit subject or object in $T_1$. Substitutions of stressed elements such as $B_1$ - godes (“Cædmon’s Hymn,” line 3b), ord (“Cædmon’s Hymn,” line 5b), or, from the prose cited above, $B_1$ herunge $T_1$ herenesse, line 3; $B_1$ wyrðes $T_1$ wordes, line 17, are with over 360 occurrences among the most frequent variants cited by Grant from the $B_1$ text. Variation in the choice of adjectives is also frequent (approximately 150 examples), although “Cædmon’s Hymn” line 3a is the only example Grant cites of a substitution involving fela or gehwa. The substitution astealde for onstealde is but one example of hundreds of similar variants in the use of prefixes with nouns, adjectives, adverbs and verbs cited by Grant. The substitution of the relative pronoun for $þa$ in “Cædmon’s Hymn,” line 7a, likewise is only one of numerous examples of the (correct and incorrect) substitution or addition of the relative particle in $B_1$.

Textual Variants

The following catalogue is arranged on a manuscript-by-manuscript basis. It includes all potentially significant substantive variants found among the witnesses to the Hymn, with the exception of the four nonsensical transcription errors in $C(N)$ discussed above (p. 113). As

---

278 All variants and counts from the main text of the $B_1$ Historia cited in this and the following paragraphs are from Grant, The B-Text.

279 Grant, The B-Text, pp. 331-2, 336-7. The figure “83” is given on p. 331. Although Grant does not break his count down into separate figures for nouns and pronouns, all but one of the examples he cites involve the addition of a pronoun.

280 “Cædmon’s Hymn” line 3b is the only example of variation between -god and -fæder listed by Grant; variation between $B_1$ god and $T_1$ drihten (and, less frequently, vice versa), however, is relatively common. In Grant’s citations, $B_1$ substitutes god(-) for $T_1$ driht(e)n(-) five times, $B_1$ driht(e)n(-) for $T_1$ god- twice. $B_1$ and $T_1$ have god(-) for driht(e)n(-) in other manuscripts of the Historia twice. See The B-Text, pp. 51-2.

281 Grant, The B-Text, pp. 98-108.

282 For examples see Grant, The B-Text, pp. 84-9 (nouns); 109-110 (adjectives); 127 (adverbs); and 197-218 (verbs). The “Cædmon’s Hymn” variant does not appear in Grant’s lists of variants involving verbal prefixes or substitutions.

283 Grant, The B-Text, pp. 131-132 and 143-4.
some innovations occur – presumably independently – in both manuscript groups, there is some duplication in the forms cited.

†London, British Library, Cotton Otho B. xi
(London, British Library, Additional 43703 [C(N)])

Substitution of Stressed Words and Elements (1 example)

*Cæd(eorðan)* (C(N)), 3a

T₁

1 Nu sculon herigean heofonrícæ weard metodes meahte ȝhis modgeþanc
  *weorc* wuldor fæder swahe wundragehwæs ece drihten or on|stealde.

B₁

1 Nuweherigian sculon heofonrícæ weard metodes mihte ȝhismod geþanc
  *weorc* wuldor godes swahe wund ra fela ecedrihten orld|astealde

To

1 Nu we sceolon herian heofonrícæ weard.
  metodes mihte ȝhis mod|geþanc
  *weorc* wuldor fæder swa he wundra gehwæs ece drihten zer|astealde

Ca

1 Nu scelan herian heofonrícæ weard metodes mihte ȝhis mod ge þanc.
  *wera* wuldor fæder swa he wuldres gehwæs ece drihten orld onstealde

The substitution C(N) *weoroda* T₁ B₁ To *weorc* (O¹ercorr wero Ocorr Ca wera) affects sense, metre, and syntax. In T₁, B₁, To (and all other recensions of the Hymn), *weorc* is to be construed as the subject or object of *sculon herian* (and orthographic variants), line 1a.²⁸⁴ with *wuldorfæder* (and orthographic variants) a subordinate genitive of specification: ‘work of the Glorious Father’. In C(N), however, *weoroda* is itself a genitive plural, modifying *wul:|dor fæder* (in this case to be construed as an accusative singular): ‘Glorious Father of hosts’. This leaves *sculon* without a *logical* candidate for the syntactically necessary expressed subject, although it is grammatically possible to construe *we:|ard, mihte* and *mod geþonc* as

nominatives. In C(N), with weorc (as in T₁), line 3a is to be scanned as a Type D-2 or D-4, with resolution of the first stress; with weoroda, the equivalent line is Type D*2 or D*4.

The O\textsuperscript{uncorr} and O\textsuperscript{corr} (Ca) forms are discussed below. See pp. 123 and 125.

**Oxford, Corpus Christi College, 279, pt. ii**

**Uncorrected Text (O\textsuperscript{uncorr})**

**Inflectional Difference (1 example)**

\textbf{Cæd(eorðan)} (O\textsuperscript{uncorr}), 7a

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{T₁}
    \begin{align*}
    5 & \text{he ærest sceop eorðan bærnum} \\
    & \text{heofon tohrofe| halig scyppend.} \\
    & \text{þa middangeard moncynnes weard} \\
    & \text{e| dihten æ|fter teode} \\
    & \text{firum foldan frea ælmihtig.}
    \end{align*}
  \item \textbf{B₁}
    \begin{align*}
    5 & \text{he ærest sceop eorðan bear|num} \\
    & \text{heofon tohrofe halig scypp|end} \\
    & \text{þemiddan geard moncynn|es weard} \\
    & \text{économhten æfter teode|} \\
    & \text{firum foldan frea ælmihtig.}
    \end{align*}
  \item \textbf{O\textsuperscript{uncorr}}
    \begin{align*}
    5 & \text{heærest gesceop| eorðan bear|num} \\
    & \text{heofon to hrofe halig scyppend} \\
    & \text{ðamiddon geard moncynnes weard} \\
    & \text{e|edröhten æ|fter teode|} \\
    & \text{firum|folda frea ælmihtig.}
    \end{align*}
  \item \textbf{Ca}
    \begin{align*}
    5 & \text{he ærest sceop eorðan bear|num} \\
    & \text{heofon to hrofe halig scyppend.} \\
    & \text{þa middan eard moncynnes weard} \\
    & \text{e|| dihten æ|fter teode|} \\
    & \text{firi|foldan frea ælmihtig.}
    \end{align*}
\end{itemize}

\textbf{O\textsuperscript{uncorr} folda (T₁ B₁ To C(N) Ca foldan, O\textsuperscript{corr} folda* )} is almost certainly the result of a graphic oversight. A second possibility, that folda preserves a form similar to foldu (the reading of the Northumbrian ældu-recension) and shows the falling together of unstressed -a

\begin{footnotes}
285\textsuperscript{For} objections to taking sculon as ‘we must’, see Mitchell, "Cædmon's Hymn, Line 1," p. 192. Mitchell’s article is concerned in the first instance with the reading of the Northumbrian ældu-recension and the T₁ version of the eorðan-recension of the poem. His suggestion – that weorc (and orthographic and dialectal variants) be understood as the subject of “scylun or its variants” – does not work in the case of C(N) or O\textsuperscript{uncorr}. These two witnesses have the genitives weoroda and wera respectively for the nominative/accusative plural weorc of T₁. For a further discussion of the point, see below, p. 127.

286\textsuperscript{P}ope argues that line 3 is to be scanned as a Type D-2 with wuldor “pronounced as one syllable, Wuldhr” and the first syllable of fæder understood as an unresolved short half-stress (Seven Old English Poems, p. 113 and fn. 34). If wuldor is scanned as a dissyllable, the line is Type D-4 and the stress on fæder resolved.
\end{footnotes}
and -u, is less likely given the predominately West-Saxon character of the translation. The expected West-Saxon form would be foldan.\(^{287}\)

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

*Cæd(eorðan) (\(O^{uncorr}\)), 3a*

**T\(_1\)**

1. Nu sculon herigean heofonrîces weard metodes meahtæ ȝhis modgeþanc
   \(\text{weorc}\) wuldor fæder swahe wundragewæs ece drihten ɔr onstælde.

**B\(_1\)**

1. Nuweherigan sculon heofonrîces weard metodes mihte ȝhis modgeþanc
   \(\text{weorc}\) wuldor godes swahe wund ra fela ecedrihten ɔrd astealde

**To**

1. Nu we sceolon herian heofonrîces weard.
   metodes mihte ȝhis modgeþanc
   \(\text{weorc}\) wuldor fæder swa he wundragewæs.
   ece drihten ær æstealde.

**Ca**

1. Nu we| sceolon herian heofon rîces weard
   metodæ mihte ȝhis mod ga þænc.
   \(\text{wera}\) wuldor fæder swa he wuldres ge hwaes
   ece drihtæ. ord onstælde

The substitution \(O^{uncorr}\) wero \(C(N)\) weoroda \((C^{corr} Ca wera)\) \(T_1 B_1 To weorc\) is nonsensical. For his part, Dobbie suggests that the \(O^{uncorr}\) form is evidence that \(C(N)\) weoroda is the original reading of the \(C(N)\) \(O\) \(Ca\) group:

In \(O\), \(wera\) was originally written \(wero\), the \(o\) then being corrected to \(a\) by the addition of a long stroke across the upper right-hand side of the letter. The scribe of \(O\) may have found \(weroda\) in his copy, corresponding to the \(weoroda\) of \(C\), and emended it to \(wera\), though why he should have done so is not evident, unless to be rid of the excessively long expanded D2 type line with the double resolution of stress.\(^{288}\)

Jabbour, on the other hand, argues that the change was more likely independent in both manuscripts:

[Dobbie] goes on to argue that \(weoroda\) (in the form \(weroda\)) developed first, then was emended to \(wera\) by \(C\) [sic: for \(O\)]. But the explanation involves more difficulties than the explanation which it set out to avoid. Why one scribe could not

---

\(^{287}\)Campbell, \(OEG\) § 615. Foldu is discussed in Campbell, \(OEG\) § 616.

\(^{288}\)Dobbie, Manuscripts, p. 31.
have transcribed weorc as wera, while two others could have successively converted weorc to weoroda and weroda to wera is hard to fathom. In all likelihood the scribe of C [sic: for O?] (or an ancestor) had before him either werc or weorc (probably the latter), which to his eye looked like wera or weora. If he thought he saw weora, he assumed the o to be from another dialect and dropped it. Or, to complicate matters, the form weoroda in C may have been introduced by the Renaissance transcriber of that now destroyed text.\(^{289}\)

The case is ultimately undecidable. For a discussion of the C(N) and O\(^{corr}\) (Ca) forms, see pp. 121 and 125.

**Addition/Omission of Prefixes (1 example)**

*Cæd(eorðan) (O\(^{uncorr}\)), 5a*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C(N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(T_1)</td>
<td>he ærest sceop eorðan bearñū heofontohrofe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B_1)</td>
<td>he ærest sceop eorðan bearñū heofon tohrofe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(O)</td>
<td>heærest gesceop eorðan bearñū heofon to hrofe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(To)</td>
<td>he ærest sceop eorðan bearñū heofon to hrofe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Ca)</td>
<td>he æres gescön eorðan bearñū heofon to rofe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The addition or omission of ge has no effect on sense or syntax. Without the prefix, the line is a Type B-1; in O and Ca, it is a Type B-2. Both readings can be paralleled from other recensions of the Hymn.\(^{290}\)

\(^{289}\) Jabbour, diss., p. 214.

\(^{290}\) gesceop is the reading of the West-Saxon *ylde*-recension. All other versions omit the prefix.
Substitution of Stressed Words and Elements (2 examples)

_Cæd(eorðan) (O^corr), 3a_

\(T_1\)

1. Nu sculon herigean heofonrícæs weard metodes meahæ. ḳhis modgeþanc
   _wæorc_ wuldor fæder swa he wundrageweæs ece drihten ṙor onstealde.

\(B_1\)

1. Nuweherigan sculon heofonrícæs weard metodes mihte ḳhis modgeþanc
   _wæorc_ wuldor godes swa he wunda geweweæs ecedrihten ọr astaale.

\(T_0\)

1. Nu we sceolon herian heofonrícæs weard. metodes mihte ḳhis modgeþanc
   _wæorc_ wuldor fæder swa he wundrageweæs ece drihten ṙer stealde.

\(C(N)\)

1. Ne sculon her gean heofonrícæs weard metodes mihte ḳhis modgeþanc
   _weoroda_ wuldor fæder swa he wundrageweæs ece drihten ṙor onstealde.

\(O^corr\)

1. Nu we sculan hergean heofonrícæs weard metodes mihte ḳhis modgeþanc
   _weora_ wuldor fæder swa he wundrageweæs ecedrihten ọr astaale.

\(Ca\)

1. Nu we sceolon herian heofonrícæs weard metodes mihte ḳhis modgeþanc
   _weora_ wuldor fæder swa he wuldres geweweæs ece drihten ṙord onstealde.

Assuming that a common antecedent in the O-C tradition read either _weoroda_ or _wera_ (see above, pp. 121 and 123), the substitution \(O^corr\) _wera_ C(N) _weoroda_ (\(O^{uncorr}\) _wero_) has no effect on syntax, and a minor effect on sense and metre. Syntactically, the two readings are identical: \(O^corr\) _wera_ and C(N) _weoroda_ are both genitive plurals modifying _wuldorfæder_ (and orthographic variants). Semantically, God is the _wuldor fæder_ of ‘men’ in \(O^corr\) _Ca_, and of ‘hosts’ in C(N). Metrically, the \(O^corr\) _Ca_ reading produces a Type D-2 or D-4 line with resolution of the first lift. As mentioned above (p. 116), this is metrically closer to the reading of all other recensions of the poem (a Type D-2 or D-4 with a long first lift). The C(N) form is Type D*2 or D*4.
Cæd(eorðan) (Ocorr), 4b

\textbf{T}_1

1. Nu sculon heriegan heofonrices weard metodes meahte \( \text{gr} \) his modgeþanc weorc\( \text{gr} \) wuldor fæder swahe wundrægewæs ece drihten \( \text{or} \) onstealde.

\textbf{B}_1

1. Nuweherigan sculon| heofonrices weard metodes mihte| \( \text{gr} \) his modgeþanc weorc wuldor godes| swahe wund ra fela ecedrihten \( \text{or} \) onstealde

\textbf{Ocorr}

1. Ne sculan her gean heofon rices weard metodes mihte. Ond his mod geþonc weoroda wul|\( \text{or} \) dor fæder swa he wundra gewhwæs ece drihten \( \text{or} \) onstealde.

\textbf{To}

1. Nu we sceolon herian heofonrices weard. metodes mihte \( \text{or} \) his modgeþanc weorc wulder fæder swa he wundra gehwæs. ece drihten \( \text{or} \) onstealde.

\textbf{Ca}

1. Nu we| sceolan heriegan heofon rices weard metodes mihte \( \text{gr} \) his mod ge þanc. wera| wuldor fæder. swa he wuldres ge hwæs ece drihten. \( \text{or} \) onstealde

The substitution Ocorr \( \text{gr} \) (i.e. \( \text{or} \), the reading of B\(_1\), Ca and all members of the ylda-recension except W) Oincorr \( \text{or} \) (i.e. \( \text{or} \), the reading of T\(_1\), C(N) and all witnesses to the Northumbrian aelda- and eordu-recensions) has no effect on sense, metre, or syntax. The two words are synonymous and metrically and syntactically equivalent. The To reading \( \text{or} \) is discussed below, p. 135.
Addition/Omission of Unstressed Words and Elements (1 example)

*Cæd(eorðan)* (Ocorr), 1a

T1

1 Nu sculon herigean heofonrices weard meotodes meahte þhis modgeþanc weorc wuldor fæder swahe wundragehwæs ece drihten or on|stealde.

B1

1 Nu we|erigan sculon| heofonrices weard metodes mihte| þhismod geþanc weorc wuldor godes| swahe wundra ra fela écedrihten ord|astealde

To

1 Nu we| sceolon herian heofonrices weard. metodes mihte| þhis mod|geþanc weorc wulder fæder swa he wundra gehwæs. ece drihten ær|astealde.

C(N)

1 Ne sculon her gean heofon rices we:ard metotes mihte. Ond his mod geþonc weoroda wul|dor fæder swa he wundra gewhwæs ece drihten or|onstealde.

Ocorr

1 Nu|sculan herian heofonrices weard metodes mihte þhismod geþonc werawuldor fæder swahe wundra ge hwæs| ecedryhten oor|onstealde

Ca

1 Nu we| sceolan herigean heofon rices weard metodes mihte þhis mod ge þanc. wera| wuldor fæder. swa he wuldres ge hwæs ece drihten. ord onstealde

The addition of *we* to line 1a in Ocorr has an important effect on sense and syntax but little on metre. In Ouncorr, the subject of *sculan* in line 1 is unexpressed, missing, or, less logically, to be construed as *weard*, and/or *mihte* and/or *mod geþonc*. In Ocorr, as in B1 and all witnesses to the West-Saxon *ylđa*- and Northumbrian *eordu*-recensions, the subject of *sculan* is *we*, while *weard*, *mihte* and *mod geþonc* are objects of *herian*.

The addition or omission of *we* adds or removes an unstressed syllable from the preliminary dip of a Type A-3 line (Type B-1 in B1). It has no significant metrical effect.

---


293 See below, p. 134.
Inflectional Difference (1 example) and Substitution of Stressed Words and Elements (1 example)

*Cæd(eorðan)* (Ca), 3b

T₁

1 Nu sculon herigean heofonrices weard metodes meahte þhis modgelpan weorc wuldor fæder swahe *wundra* gehwæs ece drihten or onståalde.

B₁

1 Nuweherigan sculon| heofonrices weard metodes mihte þhis mod gelpan weorc wuldor godes| swahe *wund ra* fela écedrihten ord| aståalde

O

1 Nu sculan herian heofonrices weard metodes mihte þhis mod gelpec weoroda wul|dor fæder swa he *wundra* gehwæs ece drihten or onståalde.

To

1 Nu we sceolon herian heofonrices weard. metodes mihte þhis mod gelpan weorc wulder fæder swa he *wundra* gehwæs. ece drihten ær| aståalde.

Ca

1 Nu we| sceolon herigean heofon rices weard. metodes mihte þhis mod gelpan wera| wuldor fæder. swa he *wuldres* gehwæs ece drihten. ord onståalde.

The substitution and inflectional difference *Ca wuldres O C(N) T₁ To wundra (B₁ wund ra*) are presumably to be attributed to the influence of surrounding forms. The substitution *wuldr-* for *wundr-* most likely reflects the influence of the first element of *wuldor fæder* in the preceding half-line²⁹⁴. *wuldor* and *wundor* are “often confused” in Old English²⁹⁵ and the variation has no semantic or metrical effect.

The use of a genitive singular by the *Ca* scribe is more problematic, however. When used substantively in the sense ‘each one (thing), each one’, *gehwa* usually goes with a genitive plural noun or adjective.²⁹⁶ Presumably the *Ca* ending is be explained as anticipation of the similar ending on the following noun, the genitive singular adjective *ge hwæs*.

---

²⁹⁵Clark-Hall, *wundor*.
²⁹⁶B.-T.(S) *gehwa*, definition A.I(2a).
There are no readings in this witness which are not found in other copies of the Hymn.

With the exception of four transcription errors and the substitution C(N) *weoroda* T₁ *weorc*, the text of C(N) and T₁ agree closely. See above, p. 113.

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

*Cæd(eorðan) (B₁), 7a*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T₁</th>
<th>C(N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 he ærest sceop eorðan bear nú heofontohrofe</td>
<td>5 he ærest scop eorðu bear nú heofon tohrofe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bæmiddangeard moncynnes weard ece drihten æfter teode</td>
<td>halig scypPEND. bæ middan geard mon cynnes weard ece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>firum foldan frea ælmihtig.</td>
<td>finu foldan frea ælmihtig.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B₁</th>
<th>O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 he ærest sceop eorðan bear num heofon tohrofe</td>
<td>5 heærest gesceop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bæmiddan geard mann cynnes</td>
<td>weard écedrihten æfter teode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>firum foldan freaælmihtig.</td>
<td>firum-folda, finu foldan frea ælmihtig.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To</th>
<th>Ca</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 he ærest sceop eorðan bear nú. heofon to hrofe. halig</td>
<td>drihten. bæ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>firum foldan. frea ælmihtig.</td>
<td>firu foldan. frea ælmihtig.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In B₁, the relative particle *pe* introduces an adjective clause (lines 7-9) modifying *he* (5a) and its variants *halig scyppend* (6b), *mann cynnes|weard* (7b), *écedrihten* (8a) and *frea ælmihtig* (9b): ‘he, the Holy Creator, first made heaven as a roof for the men of earth, who, the Guardian of Mankind, the Eternal Lord, the Lord Almighty, afterwards appointed the middle-earth, the land, for men’. In the other witnesses to this recension, the equivalent lines are an adverbial clause of time introduced by the conjunction *ba*: ‘he, the Holy Creator, first made
heaven as a roof for the men of earth; then [He], the Guardian of Mankind, the Eternal Lord, the Lord Almighty, afterwards appointed the middle-earth, the land, for men’.

The variation has no metrical effect.

**Substitution of Prefixes (1 example)**

*Caed(eorðan) (B₁), 4b*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C(N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T₁</td>
<td>1 Nu sculon herigeān heofonrices weard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>metodes meahte þis modgelānc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>weorc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ece drihten or on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B₁</td>
<td>1 Ne sculon her gean heofon rices weilard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>metodes mihte. Ond his mod geleponc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>weoroda wul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ece drihten or on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>1 Nu&quot;sculan herian heofonrices weard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>metodes mihte þismod geleponc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>werawuldor fæder swahe wundra ge hwæs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ecedryhten œor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To</td>
<td>1 Nu we sceolon herian heofonrices weard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>metodes mihte þis modgelānc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>weorc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ece drihten ær</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To asteadle T₁ on|stealde (C(N) O Ca onstealde) has no effect on sense, metre, or syntax. *Astealde* in various dialectal spellings is the form used in all other recensions of the poem.²⁹⁷

Substitution of Stressed Words and Elements (3 examples)

**Caed(eorðan) (B₁), 3a**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T₁</th>
<th>C(N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Nu sculon herigean</td>
<td>Ne sculon her gean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sculon</td>
<td>heofonrices weard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metodes</td>
<td>metodes mihte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meahte</td>
<td>*ghis mod geþanc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weorc</td>
<td>wul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ece drihten</td>
<td>or</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B₁</th>
<th>O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Nuweherigan sculon</td>
<td>Nu sculan heri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sculon</td>
<td>sculan heri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heofonrices weard</td>
<td>heofonrices weard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metodes mihte</td>
<td>metodes mihte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ghis mod geþanc</td>
<td>wul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weorc</td>
<td>wul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ece drihten</td>
<td>or</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To</th>
<th>Ca</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Nu we sceolon herian</td>
<td>Nu we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scelon</td>
<td>scelon heri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>herian</td>
<td>heofonrices weard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metodes mihte</td>
<td>metodes mihte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ghis mod geþanc</td>
<td>wul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weorc</td>
<td>wul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ece drihten</td>
<td>or</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The substitution in l. 3b of B₁ *wul| dor godes* for *wuldorfæder* (and orthographic variants) in all other manuscripts of the poem, although clearly not the result of a graphic misconstruction, has no effect on metre or syntax, and only a minor effect on sense.

**Caed(eorðan) (B₁), 3b**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T₁</th>
<th>C(N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Nu sculon herigean</td>
<td>Ne sculon her gean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sculon</td>
<td>heofonrices weard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metodes</td>
<td>metodes mihte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meahte</td>
<td>*ghis mod geþanc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weorc</td>
<td>wul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ece drihten</td>
<td>or</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B₁</th>
<th>O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Nuweherigan sculon</td>
<td>Nu sculan heri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sculon</td>
<td>sculan heri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heofonrices weard</td>
<td>heofonrices weard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metodes mihte</td>
<td>metodes mihte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ghis mod geþanc</td>
<td>wul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weorc</td>
<td>wul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ece drihten</td>
<td>or</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To</th>
<th>Ca</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Nu we sceolon herian</td>
<td>Nu we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scelon</td>
<td>scelon heri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>herian</td>
<td>heofonrices weard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metodes mihte</td>
<td>metodes mihte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ghis mod geþanc</td>
<td>wul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weorc</td>
<td>wul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ece drihten</td>
<td>or</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The substitution *B₁ fela T₁ To gehwæs* (O Ca *ge hwæs* C(N) *gewhwæs*) affects syntax and metre. In all other manuscripts of the West-Saxon *eorðan-*, Northumbrian *aeldu-* and
Northumbrian *eordu*-recensions of the Hymn, *gehwæs* (and orthographic variants) is modified by the preceding genitive *wundra* (*Ca wuldres*) and itself modifies the accusative singular noun *ord* or *or* in l. 4b.\(^{298}\) In *B\(_1\)*, the indeclinable form *fela* is probably to be understood as an accusative object of *astealde*, l. 4b, itself.

With the substitution, *B\(_1\)* is a Type B-1 line. It is Type B-2 type line in all other witnesses.

**Cæd(eordan) (B\(_1\)), 4a**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T(_1)</th>
<th>C(N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Nu sculon herigean heofonrices weard metodes meahte þhis modgeþanc weorc wuldor fæder swahe wundraghwæs ece drihten <em>or</em> onstealde.</td>
<td>1 Ne sculon her gean heofon rices we:ard metodes mihte. Ónd his mod geþonc weoroda wul:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>B(_1)</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Nuweherigan sculon heofonrices weard metodes mihte þhismod geþanc weorc wuldor godes swahe wund ra fela écedrihten <em>ord</em> astealde</td>
<td>1 Nu*”sculan herian heofon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>To</em></td>
<td><em>Ca</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Nu we sceolon herian heofonrices weard. metodes mihte þhis mod</td>
<td>geþanc weorc wulder fæder swa he wundra gehwæs. ece drihten <em>ær</em> astealde.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The substitution *B\(_1\)* *ord* for *T\(_1\)* *ór* has no significant effect on sense, metre, or syntax. See above, p. 126. The *To* reading *ær* is discussed below, p. 135.

\(^{298}\)The West-Saxon *yl|da*-text is corrupt at this point. See above, Chapter 2, p. 27-29.
Addition/Omission of Unstressed words and Elements (1 example)

*Cæd(eorðan) (B₁), 1a*

**T₁**

1 Nu sculon herigean heofon rices weard metodes meahte þhis modgeþanc weorc wuldor fæder

**B₁**

1 Nuweherigan sculon heofonrices weard metodes mihte þhis modgeþanc weorc wuldor godes

**O**

1 Nusculan herian heofon rices weard metodes mihte þhis modgeþonc werawuldor faeder

**To**

1 Nu we sceolon herian heofonrices weard metodes mihte þhis modgeþanc weorc wuldor fæder

**Ca**

1 Nu we sceolan herigean heofon rices weard metodes mihte þhis mod ge þanc. wera wuldor fæder.

The addition of *we* to *B₁* has a significant effect on sense and syntax but a minimal effect on metre. In *T₁*, the most likely subject of *sculon* is *weorc*, as in the Northumbrian *aeldu*-recension of “Cædmon’s Hymn.” The addition of *we* as the subject of *sculon* to *B₁* implies that *weorc* is to be construed as an accusative singular or plural. For a discussion of a similar addition in the *C(N) O Ca* recension, see above, p. 127.

---

Rearrangement within the Line (1 example)

*Caed(eorðan) (B₁), 1a*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T₁</th>
<th>C(N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Nu <em>sculon herigean</em> heofonrices weard metodes meahte his modgehanc weorc wuldor fæder swa he wundragehwæs ece drihten or onstealde.</td>
<td>1 Ne <em>sculon her gean</em> heofon rices weard metodes mihte. Ond his mod gepenc weoroda wul</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B₁</th>
<th>O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Nu <em>herigan sculon</em> heofonrices weard metodes mihte hismod gepanc weorc wuldor godes swahe wund ra fela ecedrihten ord onstealde</td>
<td>1 Nu <em>sculan herian</em> heofonrices weard metodes mihte hismod gepanc werawuldor fæder swahe wundra gehwæs ecedryhten oor onstealde</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To</th>
<th>Ca</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Nu we <em>sceolon herian</em> heofonrices weard. metodes mihte his modgehanc weorc wulder fæder swa he wundra gehwæs ece drihten ær onstealde.</td>
<td>1 Nu we <em>sceolan herigean</em> heofon rices weard metodes mihte his mod ge þanc. weræ wuldor fæder swa he wuldres ge hwæs ece drihten ord onstealde</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*B₁ herigan sculon for sculon herian* (and orthographic variants) in all other witnesses to “Cædmon’s Hymn” affects metre but not sense or syntax. With the reversal, B₁ is a Type B-1 line with double resolution; in all other manuscripts of the Hymn, the line is Type A-3 with a resolution of the alliterating stress.
Substitution of Stressed Words and Elements (2 examples)

_Cæd(eorðan) (To), l. 4b_

**T₁**

1. Nu sculon herigean  heofonrices weard metodes meahte  þhis modgeþanc weorc  wuldor fæder  swahe wundragehwæs ece drihten  ‹œr› onstealde.

**C(N)**

1. Ne sculon her gean  heofon rices weard metodes mihte.  Ond his mod geþonc weoroda wulþdor fæder  swa he wundra gewhwæs ece drihten  ‹œr› onstealde.

**B₁**

1. Nuweherigan sculon  heofonrices weard metodes mihte  þhis mod geþonc weorc wuldor godes  swahe wund ra fela  écedrihten  ‹œrd› astealde

**O**

1. Nu wœsculan herian  heofonrices weard metodes mihte  þhis mod geþonc werawuldor fæder  swa he wundra ge hwæs| ecedryhten  _oœr|bœсталde_

**To**

1. Nu we sceolon herian  heofonrices weard metodes mihte  þhis mod geþonc weorc wulder fæder  swa he wundra gehwæs. ece drihten  _œr|_ astealde

**Ca**

1. Nu we| sceolan herigean  heofon rices weard metodes mihte  þhis mod ge þanc. wera| wuldor fæder.  swa he wuldres ge hwæs ece drihten.  _œrd|_ onstealde

The substitution **To œr for T₁ œr (C(N) or O^uncorrœr) B₁ œrd (O^corrœrgbœсталdeCa œrd)** has an important syntactic effect. While the word itself is neither unmetrical nor non-sensical, the substitution of an adverb for an accusative noun leaves _astealde_, l. 4b, without an object ³⁰⁰ and the genitive _wundra gehwæs_ in l. 3b without a word to govern it: ‘...as He, Eternal Lord, first appointed of each of wonders’.

The substitution has no metrical effect.

---

³⁰⁰ All unambiguously transitive examples of _āstellan_ given by B.-T. and B.-T.(S) have an accusative object.
Cæd(eorðan) (To), l. 6b

T₁
5 he ærest sceop eorðan bearñū
   heofontohrofe| halig scyppend.
   þamiddangeard moncynnnes weard
   ece| drihten æfter teode
   firum foldan frea ælmihtig.

C(N)
5 he ærest scop eorpū bearñū
   heofon tohrofe| halig scyppend.
   þa middan geard mancynnnes weard
   ece| drihten æfter eode
   finū foldan frea ælmihtig.

B₁
5 he ærest sceop eorðan bearnum
   heofon tohrofe halig scyppend
   þamiddan geard mancynnnes weard
   ecedrihten æfter teode
   firum foldan frea ælmihtig.

O
5 heærest gesceop eorðan bear|num
   heofon to hrofe halig| scyppend
   ðamiddan geard mancynnnes weard
   ecedrihten æfterteo de
   firumfolda;| freal| ælmihtig.

To
5 he ærest sceop eorðan bearñū.
   heofon to hrofe. halig| drihten.
   þa middan eard mancynnnes weard
   ece drihten æft teode.|
   firum foldan. frea ælmihtig.

Ca
5 he æres ge|scóp__, eorðan bearñū
   heofon to rofe halig| scyppend.
   þa middan geard mon-|cynnnes weard
   ece driht æft teode.
   firū foldan frea ælmihtig.

The substitution To drihten for scyppend (and orthographic variants) in all other manuscripts of “Cædmon’s Hymn” has no effect metre and syntax. Both epithets make sense in context, although scyppend ‘creator’ is more appropriate than drihten ‘lord’ in a sentence about how God ‘made’ the earth and heavens. The substitution is probably most easily attributed to the unconscious repetition of drihten in line 4a or an anticipation of the same word in line 8a.

Poems of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle

The poems discussed above all have been “fixed” in the sense that each has been copied as an integral part of a single coherent framing text. With the single exception of the marginal To, copies of the eorðan-recension of “Cædmon’s Hymn” have all been found at the same place in Book IV Chapter 24 in manuscripts of the Old English translation of Bede’s Historia ecclesiastica. The Metrical Preface and Epilogue to the Pastoral Care, similarly, although not integral to the translation of Gregory’s Cura pastoralis per se, are nevertheless
never found in any other context, and, as the special treatment they receive in their earliest
witnesses suggests, were considered from the beginning to be an important part of Alfred’s
conception of the work as a whole.

The poems of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* are both like and unlike these other poems.
On the one hand, the *Chronicle* poems are clearly “fixed” in the sense that they are part of the
main text of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, are always found in the same place in the witnesses
which contain them, and, despite their at times considerable artistic merit, are never found
anywhere else. On the other hand, however, the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* is itself far from a
single coherent framing text. While most *Chronicle* manuscripts are based on a common,
centrally distributed core text and make use of other common additions, their common
sections have been so frequently revised, corrected, expanded, and edited in the individual
witnesses as to make it nearly impossible for us to speak of “a copy of the *Anglo-Saxon
Chronicle*” in the same way we can speak of Hat20 or CUL4124 as “copies” of the Old English
translation of the *Pastoral Care*.

In the case of the four metrically regular *Chronicle* poems, this complexity is reflected
in the dates and relationships of the scribes responsible for copying the surviving witnesses.
The poems are known to have been copied in at least five manuscripts, although not all four

---

301 This is a common-place of *Chronicle* criticism. For a recent statement, see David Dumville and Simon
Collaborative Edition* 3 (Cambridge: Brewer, 1986). A basic review of the *Chronicle*’s growth is given in
1899), v.2, pp. cxiv-cxvii. This account has not been superseded, although some of its details have been
qualified in subsequent work. See in particular, Bately, “The Compilation of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*
60 B.C. to A.D. 890: Vocabulary as Evidence,” *Proceedings of the British Academy* 64 (1978), 93-129;
and “The Compilation of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, Once More,” *LSE* n.s. 16 (1985), 7-26; Whitelock,
(London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1961), pp. xixxiv; and Campbell, ed., *The Battle of Brunanburh*
appear in each witness\(^{302}\): Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 173, s. ix/x-xi\(^2\) (ChronA); London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. vi, s. \(x^2\) (ChronB); London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. i, s. xi\(^1\)-xi\(^2\) (ChronC); London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. iv, s. xi\(^\text{med}\)-xi\(^2\) (ChronD); and †London, British Library, Cotton Otho B. xi, s. xi\(^1\) (ChronG). Of these, the last witness, ChronG, was almost completely destroyed in the Cotton fire. Its pre-fire text was transcribed by Lawrence Nowell (in N, along with the C-text of the Old English Historia), and also served as the basis for an edition by Abraham Wheloc. Neither transcription is diplomatic: in Wheloc’s edition, the text of ChronG has been freely emended, generally with readings from ChronA, while Nowell later revised his transcript on the basis of his work with other Chronicle witnesses.\(^{303}\)

The metrically regular poems these witnesses contain were copied by six scribes, working at various dates from the mid-tenth to the mid-eleventh centuries:

---

\(^{302}\) In the following discussion, a superscript number following a MS siglum is used to indicate that the work of a specific scribe is being referred to. Thus ChronA\(^3\) is used for the work of the third scribe in ChronA; ChronA\(^5\) refers to the work of the fifth scribe. The use of a siglum without a superscript hand number indicates either that the entire manuscript is intended, or that the specific scribe responsible for the form is irrelevant.

\(^{303}\) Angelika Lutz, ed., Die Version G der angelsächsischen Chronik: Rekonstruktion und Edition Münchener Universitäts-Schriften, Philosophische Fakultät 11 (München: Wilhelm Fink, 1981), pp. ivii-lxv; Campbell, Brunanburh, pp. 133-134. A copy of Nowell’s transcript made by William Lambard (Dublin, Trinity College, 631) before Nowell reworked his text, can be used to help reconstruct Nowell’s original transcription. Because of its late position in the textual history of the Chronicle and its lack of descendants, the text of ChronG is cited only in passing in the following discussion. As with all other manuscripts discussed in this chapter, the variation introduced by the scribe of ChronG into his poetic texts closely resembles the variation he introduces into his prose. For a discussion of the type of variation introduced by the ChronG scribe in general, see Lutz, Die Version G, pp. cli-cxciii, esp. pp. clv-clxii. Individual variants from the Battle of Brunanburh are discussed in Campbell, Brunanburh, pp. 133-144, esp. 141-143. Detailed discussion of the innovations in both prose and verse in ChronG can be found in the notes to Lutz, Die Version G. Nowell revised his transcription of the Chronicle more extensively than he did his transcription of the C witness to the Old English translation of the Historia. See Grant, “Lawrence Nowell’s Transcript of BM Cotton Otho B.xi,” ASE 3 (1974): 111-124; and Lutz, Die Version G, p. lii.
Table 2: Scribes and Witnesses of the Chronicle Poems\textsuperscript{304}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ChronA</th>
<th>ChronG</th>
<th>ChronB</th>
<th>ChronC</th>
<th>ChronD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brun (937)</td>
<td>Hand 3 (s.x\textsuperscript{med})</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hand 2 (s. xi\textsuperscript{1})</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hand 2 (s.xi\textsuperscript{3})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capt (942)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEdg (973)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hand 5(s.xi\textsuperscript{in})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEdg (975)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In two manuscripts, ChronB and ChronG, the entire text of the Chronicle, including all four metrically regular poems, is the work of a single scribe. In a third manuscript, ChronC, the four metrically regular poems are also the work of a single scribe, the second. ChronA is the work of as many as twenty-three pre- and post-conquest scribes,\textsuperscript{305} of which two – working at an interval of between fifty and seventy-five years – are responsible for the four metrically regular poems. The fifth witness, ChronD, is also the work of more than one scribe, the second of which is responsible for the Battle of Brunanburh and Capture of the Five Boroughs.

As we have come to expect from our examination of the other Fixed Context poems, the amount and type of the unique textual variation the individual witnesses to these poems exhibit varies from scribe to scribe.\textsuperscript{306} With nineteen potentially significant substantive unique variants in seventy-three metrical lines of text, the ChronD\textsuperscript{2} scribe’s version of the Battle of Brunanburh contains almost one and a half times as much unique variation as the next most variable text of the same poem, ChronA\textsuperscript{3} (thirteen potentially significant substantive variants) and nearly four times as much as the least variable copy, that of scribe ChronC\textsuperscript{2} (five potentially significant substantive variants). Likewise, while the majority of unique readings


\textsuperscript{305}For a summary of views on the number of scribes in this manuscript, see Bately, MS. A, p. xxi.

\textsuperscript{306}A complete catalogue of the potentially significant substantive variation in the metrically regular Chronicle poems follows below, pp. 161-222.
in ChronD² involve the “substitution” of words through the misinterpretation of individual graphs and are to be attributed to the demonstrable carelessness of the ChronD² scribe as a copyist, the two most common variants in the ChronB¹ copies of the Battle of Brunanburh and Capture of the Five Boroughs involve the apparently intelligent substitution of metrically, sensically and syntactically appropriate prefixes and stressed words by a scribe who appears to have been in the process of revising his exemplar.

The Chronicle poems are unusual, however, in that the variation they exhibit can also differ from poem to poem within the work of a single scribe. The ChronA³ scribe’s copy of the Battle of Brunanburh contains thirteen unique, potentially significant substantive variants: five differences of inflection, one example of the addition or omission of unstressed elements, and seven examples of the syntactic or semantic reinterpretation of existing text. In his copy of the Capture of the Five Boroughs, however, the same scribe introduces five variants: two differences of inflection, two examples of the substitution of stressed words and elements, and one example of the addition or omission of an unstressed word or element – but no examples of the type of textual reinterpretation responsible for the majority of the variants introduced into his copy of the Battle of Brunanburh. Similarly, ChronB¹, whose copies of the Battle of Brunanburh and Capture of the Five Boroughs exhibit a number of sensible and syntactically and metrically appropriate readings not found in either the closely related text of ChronC² or the more distant ChronA³, copies the later Chronicle poems Coronation of Edgar and Death of Edgar with only relatively superficial substitutions of synonyms and syntactically equivalent forms distinguishing it from the unrelated ChronA⁵ version.

Restricting herself primarily to the differences between the scribes responsible for the Chronicle poems, O’Keeffe has suggested that the variation they introduce is time-dependent. On the one hand, she argues, the unique, metrically, syntactically, and semantically
appropriate variants exhibited by the tenth- and early eleventh-century ChronA\(^3\) and ChronB\(^1\) versions of the Battle of Brunanburh and the Capture of the Five Boroughs indicate the “transitional” state of scribes responsible for copying them:

The variants of [Chron]A and [Chron]B in the verses of [the] A[nglo-]Saxon C[harles' Chronicle] annals 937 and 942, which arise so close to the time of composition, reveal the pressure which the old oral ways of understanding and remembering must have exerted. Their scribes are not poets but readers who see, hear and produce richly contextual variants. They must have thought they were faithful and accurate. Accurate they were not, but faithful they were, in their fashion.\(^307\)

The fact that neither the eleventh-century ChronC\(^2\) and ChronD\(^2\) witnesses to the Battle of Brunanburh and Capture of the Five Boroughs, nor any witnesses to the late tenth century poems Coronation of Edgar and Death of Edgar show similar amounts and types of variants, on the other hand, suggests to O’Keeffe the extent to which the “old ways” of copying decayed in the course of the next century:

If we look for such [viz. “authentically formulaic”] variants in the A and B copies of the poems for 973 and 975 [the Coronation of Edgar and the Death of Edgar], however, we will be disappointed. Scribe 5 of A, working in the early eleventh century, is too distant from his material. Judging from a comparison of the full records of the Chronicle versions in both B and C, the relevant scribe of C probably had *B as his exemplar for 937 and 942 and B as his exemplar for 973 and 975. This copyist, working in the mid-eleventh century, produces a fairly accurate record, certainly with none of the interesting and suggestive variants of the earlier two. The scribe of D, working somewhat later, provides certain interesting variants to be sure, but they are revelatory of his unfamiliarity with the formulaic and lexical context of his material. Indeed, for the two rhythmic entries for 1036 and 1065, which C and D share, variation is limited to orthography and substitution (by D) of prose paraphrases for otherwise rhythmical lines.\(^308\)

The trouble, however, is that this apparently chronological distribution of variants among the witnesses to the Chronicle poems is unusual. In the case of the witnesses to the other Fixed Context poems discussed above, it has been if anything the later rather than the earlier witnesses which have shown the most substantive textual innovation, and the earlier,

\(^{307}\)O’Keeffe, Visible Song, p. 125.

\(^{308}\)O’Keeffe, Visible Song, pp. 124-125.
ninth- and tenth-century witnesses have been consistently the most conservative. The most innovative witnesses to the Metrical Preface to Pastoral Care (as indeed to the Pastoral Care itself) were the late tenth-/early eleventh-century Tr1 and late eleventh-century CULb24 – while the manuscripts of the late ninth- and mid tenth-century (Hat20, TibBal(Jn53) and CC12) exhibited almost no variation whatsoever. Similarly, in the case of the eorðan-recension of “Cædmon’s Hymn,” the most innovative scribes were those of the early eleventh-century, B1, and the corrector of O, while the scribes of the tenth-century T1 and C(N), and of the late twelfth-century Ca were all responsible for only minimal amounts of substantive textual innovation.

This is important because the apparently conservative tenth-century scribe of the C(N) text of “Cædmon’s Hymn” is most probably the same as that responsible for the – in O’Keeffe’s terms – “formulaic” versions of the Battle of Brunanburh and Capture of the Five Boroughs in ChronA. As we have seen above (p. 113), the C text of the eorðan-recension of “Cædmon’s Hymn” as recorded by Nowell in N exhibits five potentially significant substantive variants, all but one of which are obvious transcription errors and, most likely, are to be attributed to its modern transcriptionist. The only exception is the substitution of the stressed word C(N) weoroda for T1 B1 To weorc – a reading which, while it adversely affects the poem’s syntax, is nevertheless metrically and semantically appropriate to its immediate context and involves a graphically somewhat similar form. In contrast, the ChronA copies of the Battle of Brunanburh and Capture of the Five Boroughs exhibit eighteen unique variants,

---

309 Ker, Catalogue, arts. 39 (p. 58), 180. Bately, MS. A, p. xxxv. The connection is not mentioned in O’Keeffe. The same scribe is also probably responsible for the Leech Book (London, British Library, Royal D, xvii).

310 Other than the early date of the original manuscript, there is no inherent reason why these nonsensical readings cannot be attributed to the original scribe of C(N). As we shall see below in the work of ChronD, Anglo-Saxon scribes can make similar or worse errors. As similar errors are not recorded by
all of which can be attributed to the scribe of ChronA³ or a predecessor. As we shall see, the majority of these variants belong to two distinct types, occur with one exception in the Battle of Brunanburh, and can be attributed for the most part to difficulties the ChronA³ scribe seems to have had with the poem’s many poetic and rare words; when these variants are excluded from consideration, the ChronA³ scribe introduces approximately the same type of variants in all surviving examples of his prose and verse.

As we shall see in the following pages, the different patterns of substantive variation exhibited by the various witnesses to the Chronicle poems have less to do with the dates at which the scribes responsible for their reproduction worked than with their demonstrable interests, abilities, and intentions. Like the scribes responsible for copying the fixed-context poems discussed above, the scribes of the Chronicle poems rarely copy their verse any differently from their prose. On the few occasions on which they do, the differences between their verse and prose practice can be tied to differences in the nature of the verse being copied, or in the relationship of their copy to its exemplar. As was the case with the eorðan-recension of “Cædmon’s Hymn” and the Metrical Preface and Epilogue to the Pastoral Care, the most innovative scribes of the Chronicle poems are also the most innovative scribes of the surrounding Chronicle prose, while the most conservative copyists of the prose are also the most conservative copyists of the verse.

The pages which follow examine the habits of the five scribes responsible for copying the verse texts in Chronicles A through D. They are followed on pages 161-222 by an annotated catalogue of the textual variation they introduce, arranged on a manuscript-by-manuscript, scribe-by-scribe, and poem-by-poem basis.

Bately from the stint of this scribe in ChronA, however, it seems a fair inference that the nonsensical variants in C(N) are Nowell’s.
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 173, Third Hand (ChronA³)

With the exception of the scribes responsible for the rhythmical poems on the Death of Alfred (1036) and the Death of Edward (1065) in ChronC and ChronD, the third scribe of ChronA has the shortest stint of all scribes responsible for the Chronicle poems. 311 His work comprises a single entry on f. 9v (the annal for A.D. 710) and eleven or twelve entries on ff. 26v-27v (from 924 to 946 or perhaps 955). 312 Including the entry for 955, these annals contain a total of 683 words, of which the Battle of Brunanburh and Capture of the Five Boroughs account for 420 or 61%. Five of the prose annals in this stint (annals 924, 931, 932, 934, 940, and 955) are either unique to ChronA (and its immediate descendent ChronG), or textually unrelated to accounts of the same event in the other Chronicle witnesses. This reduces the total amount of text available for comparison with other manuscripts by 103 words, and raises the proportion of words found in the verse texts to 72%.

Despite its small size, however, this sample is sufficient to demonstrate that the ChronA³ scribe copied his verse and prose essentially alike. With the exception of a single specific type of variant – involving in all but one example poetic, rare, or nonce words and variants found in the Battle of Brunanburh – the majority of the potentially significant substantive innovations in the ChronA³ verse texts have either an obviously graphic origin or parallels in prose copied by the same scribe. 313 The omission of þæra from Battle of Brunanburh, line 26a (ChronA³ þæ : ChronB¹ þara| ðe [ChronC² þaraðe ChronD² þæra þe]), for example, while making good sense and metre, is almost certainly the result of

311 See Ker, Catalogue, arts. 191 and 192.
312 Bately, MS. A, pp. xxxiv-v. There has been some dispute over whether A.D. 955 is in the hand of ChronA³ or of “another scribe, practicing the same style as scribe 3” (Bately, MS. A, p. xxxiv). Bately assigns 955 to ChronA³, and is followed here. For an opposing view, see: Dumville, “The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and the Origins of English Square Minuscule Script,” Wessex and England: Six Essays on Political, Cultural, and Ecclesiastical Revival (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1992), pp. 62-3. The dispute has no significant effect on the argument advanced here.
eyeskip. The use of singular case endings ChronA³ *guma norperna* for the plurals of ChronB¹
ChronC² *guman norðerne* (ChronD² *guman norþærne*), *Battle of Brunanburh* in line 18b,
likewise, can be paralleled by the same scribe’s use of the plural noun *gewealdan* for the
singular *gewealde* in the prose annal for 944: ChronA³ *to gewealdan* ChronB¹ ChronC²
ChronD² *to gewealde*, 944.³¹⁴ The substitution of the stressed graphically similar forms
ChronA³ *maga* ChronB¹ *mæcgea* (ChronC² *mecga*) ChronD² *mægþa*, *Capture of the Five
Boroughs*, line 2a, and ChronA³ *gebegde* ChronB¹ *gebæded* (ChronC² ChronD² *gebæded*),
*Capture of the Five Boroughs*, line 9b, has one parallel in the prose: ChronA³ *fæc* ChronB¹
ChronC² *fyrst*, 942, with similar variants being found in the work of other scribes throughout
the manuscript.³¹⁵ The addition or omission of 7 occurs twice in verse copied by ChronA³
(*Battle of Brunanburh*, line 56a³¹⁶; *Capture of the Five Boroughs*, line 8a) and is relatively
common in the work of the later scribe ChronA⁵ (three occurrences, all in verse) and earlier
scribe ChronA¹ (nine times, all prose).³¹⁷

The only variants in which the scribe of ChronA³ differs significantly from his prose
practice involve the reinterpretation (usually misinterpretation) of individual nouns, adjectives
and verbs found in the other witnesses. In four cases – three of which involve the substitution
of simplices for compounds (or vice versa) – ChronA³ has a form as or more appropriate than
that found in the other witnesses: ChronA³ *secgas hwate* ChronB¹ *secgaswate* (ChronC²

---

³¹³ The forms cited in this and the following paragraphs are discussed more fully below, pp. 161-179.
³¹⁴ Bately, MS. A, p. cxx. The use of “a plural not a singular verb in sequences relating to an army or
collective body of people” where other manuscripts have a singular form is a frequent variation in
ChronA⁴ and ChronA² (for examples, see Bately, MS. A, p. cxx §1[I]).
³¹⁵ Lists of examples are found in Bately, MS. A, pp. cxvii (nouns and adjectives) and cxix (verbs). ChronA³
*fæc* for ChronB¹ ChronC² *fyrst* is mentioned on p. cxvii.
³¹⁶ This example is by correction and is believed by Bately and Lutz to be in a different hand; it is not
discussed in the catalogue of examples below. See Bately, MS. A, p. 72, fn. 8; Lutz, Die Version G, p. 222.
³¹⁷ Bately, MS. A, pp. cxv-cxvi. See below, pp. 149.
ChronD², seega swate). Battle of Brunanburh, line 13a; ChronA³ æra gebland ChronB¹ eargebland (ChronC² ear gebland ChronD² eár gebland), Battle of Brunanburh, line 26b; ChronA³ bradbrimu ChronB¹ brade brimu (ChronC² bradebrimu ChronD² brade brí|mu), Battle of Brunanburh, line 71a; and ChronA³ hunbra éa ChronB¹ humbranéa (ChronC² hunbranéa ChronD² himbran ea) Capture of the Five Boroughs, line 4b. In most cases, however, the ChronA³ reading is metrically, syntactically, semantically, or formulaically more problematic. The ChronA³ forms in the Battle of Brunanburh, lines 56a and 62b – ChronA³ hira land for ChronB¹ íraland (ChronC² yraland ChronD² yra land) and ChronA³ hasopadan for ChronB¹ haspadan (ChronC² hasu padan) ChronD² hasu wadan) – for example, are sensible and syntactically appropriate, but metrically suspect: with the substitution of hira for the first element in yraland (and orthographic variants) in line 56a, ChronA³ eft hira land is unmetrical; with the reinterpretation of hasopadan (and variants) in line 62b, the ChronA³ scribe converts a regular Type C-1 line into an A-1 with an abnormally long three syllable anacrusis. The remaining variants, ChronA³ cnearen flot for ChronB¹ cnear onflot (ChronC² cnear||ónflót ChronD² cneár onflod), Battle of Brunanburh, line 35a; ChronA³ cul bod ge hna des ChronB¹ ChronC² cumbol gehnastes (ChronD² cumbol ge hnastes), Battle of Brunanburh, line 49b; ChronA³ he eardes ChronB¹ ChronC² ChronD² heardes, Battle of Brunanburh, line 25a; and ChronA³ wealas, Battle of Brunanburh, line 72b, are simply nonsense. While o and i are frequently confused in unstressed syllables in later manuscripts, the use of en for the preposition on in line 35a is quite unparalleled in the corpus of multiply attested poetry, suggesting, along with the manuscript word-division, that the ChronA³ scribe misinterpreted an exemplar’s *cnear on as a single (nonsense) word; the spacing of ChronA³ reading cul bod ge hna des, line 49a, similarly, suggests that the scribe was attempting to sound out a word he was unfamiliar with;
in lines 25a and 72b, the ChronA³ spellings *he eardes* and *weealles* may be evidence either of an attempt to indicate the lengthening of short vowels and diphthongs before lengthening groups, or that a scribe of ChronA³ tradition misinterpreted both forms as a combination of pronoun + noun or adjective.

In addition to their problems with sense, syntax, and metre, the majority of these ‘poetic’ variants in the ChronA³ scribe’s work also share two other significant features. In the first place, all but two (the reinterpretation of *heardes* and *wealas* as ChronA³ *he eardes* and ChronA³ *weealles* in the Battle of Brunanburh lines 25a and 72b) involve rare or poetic words – in five cases, words which are either unique to the Battle of Brunanburh or are found at most in one other text: *cnearr* ‘ship’ (probably a Scandinavian loan-word), occurs twice in Old English, as a simplex in Battle of Brunanburh line 35a and as the second half of the compound ChronA³ *negled cnearṛu* (ChronB¹ *nægled cnearc|rum* ChronC² *negledcnearrum* ChronB² *dæg gled ongarum*), Battle of Brunanburh line 53b; *yraland*, Battle of Brunanburh, line 56a is attested only here and in Orosius; *cumbolgehnnastes*, Battle of Brunanburh, line 49b and *hasopadan*, Battle of Brunanburh, line 62b, are nonce compounds, although their simplices, *cumbol*, *gehnnastes*, *hasu* and *pad* are all found elsewhere in Old English, primarily in poetic contexts.

Secondly, all but one of these variants are found in the ChronA³ scribe’s text of the Battle of Brunanburh. With the exception of the variation between the compound and

---

⁠³¹⁹ Campbell, Brunanburh, pp. 116-117.
⁠³²⁰ Cumbol is found as a simplex in Andreas (ll. 4 and 1204), Beowulf (l. 2505), Daniel (l. 180), Judith (l. 332), Exodus (l. 175); and as the first element of a compound in Juliana (ll. 395 and 637), Judith (ll. 243 and 259), and, in the only occurrence (other than in the Battle of Brunanburh) outside of the four major codices, Psalm 50 ([BL Cotton Vespasian D. vi] (l. 11); gehnnastes is found as the second element of hopgehnnastes twice in Exeter Riddle 30 (ll. 27 and 60), wolcengehnastes, Exeter Riddle 3 (l. 60), and as the simplex gehnaste in Genesis (l. 2015).
simplices $\text{ChronA}^3$ humbra $\approx$ $\text{ChronB}^1$ humranéa ($\text{ChronC}^2$ hunbranéa $\text{ChronD}^2$ himbran
ea) in $\text{Capture of the Five Boroughs}$ line 4b, the $\text{ChronA}^3$ version of the $\text{Capture of the Five Boroughs}$ does not contain any examples of the reinterpretation of text like those found in $\text{Battle of Brunanburh}$ – and certainly none involving such non-sensical or non-metrical mistakes as $\text{he eardes}$, $\text{weealles}$, $\text{cnearen flot}$, $\text{cul bod ge hna des}$, $\text{hira land}$, and $\text{hasewan}$.

Taken together, these features suggest that the $\text{ChronA}^3$ scribe, far from being a poetically sensitive reader of Old English verse, was in fact troubled by the unusual and poetic vocabulary he found in the $\text{Battle of Brunanburh}$ – and was willing to remove this vocabulary when he failed to understand it. When not confronted with unusual and poetic words – as he was not in the $\text{Capture of the Five Boroughs}$, his $\text{Chronicle}$ prose, or his copy of the $\text{eorðan}$-recension of “$\text{Cædmon’s Hymn}$” – the $\text{ChronA}^3$ scribe copied his text to a relatively high standard of substantive accuracy, allowing himself only the occasional difference in inflection and verbal substitution.$^{321}$

**Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 173, Fifth Hand ($\text{ChronA}^5$)**

The scribe of $\text{ChronA}^3$ ends his work with the annal for 946 or 955.$^{322}$ After short passages by two further scribes (Bately’s scribes 4 and 4a), a fifth major scribe copies the annals for 973-1001, including the $\text{Coronation of Edgar}$ and $\text{Death of Edgar}$.$^{323}$ With the exception of the two poems, the annals copied by this scribe are unique to $\text{ChronA}$ and its linear descendant $\text{ChronG}$.$^{324}$

---

$^{321}$Cf. Bately, *MS. A*, p. xciii, and O’Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 120.
$^{322}$See above, p. 90, and fn. 312.
$^{323}$Bately, *MS. A*, pp. xxxvii-xxxviii.
$^{324}$Bately, *MS. A*, pp. xcii-xciii.
With no texts available to serve as a control, and with the possibility that ChronC² is a direct copy of ChronB¹ for the equivalent annals (see below, pp. 150-152) it is impossible to compare the prose and verse performance of the ChronA⁵ scribe or determine which tradition of the two poems is the most innovative. In four cases, ChronA⁵ has a more strained, nonsensical, or metrically or formulaically problematic reading than common text of ChronB¹ ChronC²: ChronA⁵ corðre micelre ChronB¹ corðre mycclum ChronC² corþre mycclum (ChronA⁵ micelre shows the incorrect gender), Coronation of Edgar, line 2a; ChronA⁵ agan ChronB¹ ChronC² get (ChronA⁵ is unmetrical and non-sensical), Coronation of Edgar, line 13b; ChronA⁵ ða ChronB¹ ða ChronC² ða (ChronA⁵ is syntactically strained), Coronation of Edgar, line 19b; ChronA⁵ soðboran ChronB¹ woðboran ChronC² woð boran (the ChronB¹ ChronC² reading is more common in poetry), Death of Edgar, line 33a. The remaining readings in which ChronA⁵ stands against ChronB¹ and ChronC², however, all make good sense, metre and syntax. The majority of these variants can be paralleled from the prose and poetry of ChronB¹, although none are so characteristic of that scribe’s work as to rule out the possibility that they originate in the ChronA⁵ tradition. The use of weorþan for beon (ChronA⁵ wæs ChronB¹ ChronC² wearð, Death of Edgar, line 16a), for example, is a feature of ChronB¹, which has wearð for ChronC² wæs six times between 653 and 946, and agrees with ChronC² in reading wearð against ChronA wæs on another five occasions. The addition or omission of 7 in Death of Edgar, lines 24a and 29a, likewise, is typical of ChronB¹, which omits a conjunction present in other versions of the Chronicle eighteen times.

325 The variants cited in this paragraph are more fully discussed below, pp. 179-186.

326 In the annals 797, 800, 838, 868 (2×) and 916 in the Mercian Register (Taylor, MS. B, p. xciii). Taylor adds that ‘This is one of the features shared by BC before 653 and after 946,’ but gives no examples (MS. B, p. xciii). Bately reports that ChronA has wæs for ChronB ChronC wearð as main verb or auxiliary on five occasions: 592, 633, 882, 904, 975. In 592 and 975 ChronB ChronC agree with ChronD (and ChronE in 592); in 633 ChronB ChronC agree with ChronE (Bately, MS. A, p. cxix).
between 726-879\textsuperscript{327}, in ChronA\textsuperscript{5}, the frequency with which \textit{f} is omitted or added in comparison to other witnesses varies from hand to hand\textsuperscript{328}. ChronA\textsuperscript{1} has \textit{f} for ChronB

ChronC ChronD \emptyset five times, and \emptyset for ChronB ChronC ChronD \textit{f} four times, all in prose entries; ChronA\textsuperscript{3} has \textit{f} for ChronB ChronC ChronD \emptyset once (by correction, \textit{Battle of Brunanburh}, line 56a); ChronA\textsuperscript{5} has \textit{f} for ChronB ChronC \emptyset three times (\textit{Death of Edgar}, lines 10b,\textsuperscript{329} 24a, and 29a). The use of \textit{in} for \textit{on} is a feature of ChronA, the scribes of which prefer \textit{in} to ChronB ChronC (and ChronD ChronE, where applicable) \textit{on} on eighteen occasions, including \textit{Death of Edgar}, line 6a.\textsuperscript{330} Variation between \textit{f} (\textit{paet}) and \textit{faer} occurs three times in ChronA and ChronB\textsuperscript{1} ChronC\textsuperscript{2}: on two occasions, annals 633 and 975 (i.e. \textit{Death of Edgar}), ChronA has \textit{paet} for ChronB ChronC \textit{paer/ðær}; on one further occasion, annal 895, ChronA has \textit{faer} for ChronB ChronC \textit{paet}; Bately finds “the A reading preferable to the reading of BCDE” in all three cases.\textsuperscript{332} The addition or omission of \textit{eac} from ChronA\textsuperscript{5} (ChronA\textsuperscript{5} \emptyset ChronB\textsuperscript{1} ChronC\textsuperscript{2} \textit{eac, Death of Edgar}, line 29a) is the only variant for which no definite trend is mentioned by Bately or Taylor.

London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. vi, First Hand (ChronB\textsuperscript{1})

ChronB is the work of a single scribe writing in the third quarter of the tenth century. The last entry is for AD 977, and, as the manuscript is written throughout in insular square

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[328] Bately, \textit{MS. A}, pp. cxv-cxvi.
\item[329] Probably a later addition; this variant is not included in the catalogue of variants below. See also, Bately, \textit{MS. A}, p. 77 and fn. 3.
\item[330] Bately, \textit{MS. A}, pp. cxvii-cxviii; also “Compilation,” pp. 104 and 126.
\item[331] Bately, \textit{MS. A}, p. cxxii.
\item[332] Bately, \textit{MS. A}, p. cxxii.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
minuscule (a type of script which gradually lost favour towards the end of the tenth
century\textsuperscript{333}), it can be dated with reasonable certainty to the period 977-c.1000.\textsuperscript{334}

\textbf{ChronB} is very closely connected to \textbf{ChronC}, in some cases indeed, so closely as to suggest that it may have served at times as the latter manuscript’s immediate exemplar.\textsuperscript{335} The major exception to this is for the annals 653-946, where the two manuscripts are separated by several omissions, additions, and alternative readings.\textsuperscript{336} This is particularly true of the annal numbers in this section, which with a few exceptions are missing from \textbf{ChronB} but present in \textbf{ChronC}. With the annal for 947, the two witnesses are again very close, although they are not necessarily directly related.\textsuperscript{337}

The traditional view of the relationship between \textbf{ChronB} and \textbf{ChronC} sees both manuscripts as the product of independent traditions descending from a hypothetical common exemplar, to which Plummer gave the siglum $\Gamma$.\textsuperscript{338} In this view, the missing annal numbers in \textbf{ChronB} are assumed to have been lost through a intermediate exemplar which was defective for the years 653-946.\textsuperscript{339} More recently, however, Taylor has proposed a more complicated relationship between the two manuscripts. He argues that \textbf{ChronC} had \textbf{ChronB} as its exemplar until 652, the exemplar of \textbf{ChronB} for 653-946, and either \textbf{ChronB} or \textbf{ChronB} and another manuscript for 947-977.\textsuperscript{340} In addition, he suggests that the loss of the annal numbers

\textsuperscript{333}Taylor, \textit{MS. B}, p. xxxiii.
\textsuperscript{334}Taylor, \textit{MS. B}, p. xxxiii.
\textsuperscript{336}Taylor, \textit{MS. B}, p. xxviii \textit{et passim}.
\textsuperscript{338}Plummer, pp. lxxviii-lxxxix.
\textsuperscript{339}Whitelock, \textit{Anglo-Saxon Chronicle}, p. xiii; Plummer, pp. lxxxvii-xc.
\textsuperscript{340}Taylor, \textit{MS. B}, pp. xxxiv-lxii, esp. xxxiv-xxxviii and l-li. This argument extends work by Whitelock (\textit{Anglo-Saxon Chronicle}, pp. xiii-xiv) and Ker (\textit{Catalogue}, art. 191, esp. p. 252).
from ChronB for the annals 652-946 comes not as a result of a defective intervening exemplar in the post-Γ ChronB tradition, but of a thorough-going though incomplete revision of his exemplar by the ChronB¹ scribe. 341 In addition to the removal of the annal numbers, Taylor also points to numerous other erasures, additions, omissions, and substitutions throughout the prose and verse of this section as evidence of the ChronB¹ scribe’s efforts at revision. 342

This explanation of the relationship between ChronB and ChronC is important because it helps to account both for the substantive innovation in the ChronB¹ versions of the Battle of Brunanburh and the Capture of the Five Boroughs, and, just as importantly, the relatively low levels of variation found among the ChronB¹, ChronC² and ChronA⁵ texts of the Coronation of Edgar and Death of Edgar. In her discussion of the variation in the Battle of Brunanburh and Death of Edgar, O’Keeffe mentions three variants which she argues are “suggestive” of what she considers to be the ChronB¹ scribe’s formulaic sensibility: two differences in the use of prefixes (ChronB¹ forslegen ChronA³ beslagen [ChronC² beslegen ChronD² beslægen], Battle of Brunanburh, line 42a; ChronB¹ afylled ChronA³ ChronC² ChronD² gefylled, Battle of Brunanburh, line 67a); and one substitution of stressed words (ChronB¹ forgrunden ChronA³ ChronC² ChronD² ageted, Battle of Brunanburh, line 18a). 343 To these may be added another six unique substantive variants in the ChronB¹ text of these poems: three inflectional differences: ChronB¹ sexan ChronA³ ChronD² seaxe (ChronC² sexe), Battle of Brunanburh, line 70a; ChronB¹ hæþenum ChronA³ hæþenra (ChronC² hæþenra ChronD² hæðenra), Capture of the Five Boroughs, line 10a; ChronB¹ denum ChronA³ ChronD² dæne (ChronC² dene), Capture of the Five Boroughs, line 8b; one

342 Taylor, MS. B, pp. l-lxii.
343 O’Keeffe, Visible Song, p. 120.
substitution of an unstressed word: \textit{ChronB}^1 \tilde{f} \textit{ChronA}^3 \textit{ChronD}^2 \od \textit{ChronC}^2 \od \textit{Chron} (and orthographic variants), \textit{Battle of Brunanburh}, line 16a; and two examples of the substitution of a stressed word: \textit{ChronB}^1 \textit{sake} \textit{ChronA}^3 \textit{ChronC}^2 \textit{sæcce} (\textit{ChronD}^2 \textit{secce}), \textit{Battle of Brunanburh}, line 4a; \textit{ChronB}^1 \textit{sace} \textit{ChronA}^3 \textit{ChronC}^2 \textit{sæcce} \textit{ChronD}^2 \textit{secce}, \textit{Battle of Brunanburh}, line 42a.

As we have come to expect, all but two of these changes correspond to innovations found elsewhere in the prose of this “revised” section of the manuscript. The two substitutions of verbal prefixes mentioned by O’Keeffe are matched by another twelve instances of the addition, omission or substitution of prefixes in the prose of the \textit{ChronB}^1 annals 653-946: six in which \textit{ChronB}^1 “has a prefix different from that employed in the other texts” of the \textit{Chronicle}^{344}; four in which \textit{ChronB}^1 is the only witness with a prefix; and two in which words appear without a prefix in \textit{ChronB}^1 alone.\textit{345} Substitutions of nouns, verbs and adjectives are also relatively common in both the poetry and prose: in addition to O’Keeffe’s example from \textit{Battle of Brunanburh}, Taylor reports five examples of the substitution of non-homographic nouns, verbs and adjectives, and three which, like \textit{ChronB}^1 \textit{sace}, \textit{sake} (for \textit{sæcce}), lines 4a and 42a, involve graphically similar forms.\textit{346}

The same is true of other unique variants in the \textit{ChronB}^1 copies of the \textit{Battle of Brunanburh} and \textit{Capture of the Five Boroughs}. The substitution of \textit{f} for \textit{oð} (as in \textit{Battle of Brunanburh} and \textit{Capture of the Five Boroughs}) is noted by Taylor, \textit{MS B}, p. xcvii. The distinction between homographic and non-homographic substitutions is my own. Taylor mixes the two in both his lists.

\textit{344} Taylor, \textit{MS B}, p. xcviii.

\textit{345} Taylor, \textit{MS B}, p. xcviii.

"Brunanburh", line 16a) is reported by Taylor to be a “distinctive” feature of the ChronB¹ scribe’s work from 755-937, where it occurs a total of ten times.³⁴⁷ The use of the weak form seaxan for seaxe in Battle of Brunanburh, line 70a, though not a unique variant elsewhere in ChronB¹, does occur as a recensional variant in 473, where ChronB ChronC have engle to ChronA ChronE englan.³⁴⁸ The two remaining unique readings in ChronB¹, hæpenum, Capture of the Five Boroughs, line 10a and denum, Capture of the Five Boroughs, line 8b, are, as Taylor suggests, the likely result of the mechanical influence of surrounding forms.³⁴⁹

Taylor’s suggestion that the scribe of ChronB¹ was revising the section from 653-946 also explains a second feature of his poetic performance – the relative lack of substantive innovation in the two later poems, the Coronation of Edgar (973) and the Death of Edgar (975). As O’Keeffe and Bately note, neither the Coronation of Edgar nor the Death of Edgar exhibit much substantive variation in their three surviving witnesses.³⁵⁰ As we have seen above (pp. 140-141), O’Keeffe attributes this to a combination of late scribes in ChronA⁵ and ChronC² and the renewal of a close relationship between ChronB and ChronC for the annals after 947. Were this explanation correct, however, we would still expect to find more substantive variation than we do between ChronA⁵ and the common text of ChronB¹ and ChronC². Even if we assume that the scribe of ChronA⁵ is too late to be properly “formulaic” – an assumption which, as noted above (pp. 141-143), is unwarranted given the fact that the other Fixed Context poems discussed in this chapter have all shown more variation in their later rather than their earlier witnesses – and even if we assume that ChronC² is following ChronB¹ closely enough from 947 on to preclude any independent

³⁴⁷ Taylor, MS. B, p. lvii.
³⁴⁹ Taylor, MS. B, p. lviii.
³⁵⁰ O’Keeffe, Visible Song, pp. 124-5; Bately, MS. A, p. xci.
variation between the two manuscripts, we would nevertheless expect to find more “formulaic” variants than we do between the work of the tenth century – and in O’Keeffe’s terms – “formulaic” scribe of ChronB¹ and the unrelated (though eleventh century) ChronA⁵.

As we have seen above in our discussion of ChronA⁵ (pp. 149-150), however, the three witnesses to these poems show surprisingly little variation that is metrically, semantically or syntactically appropriate and significant. The most appropriate variants separating the two traditions are either graphically similar or have relatively little metrical, semantic or syntactic effect: weorðan : beon (Death of Edgar, line 16a), in : on (Death of Edgar, line 6a), þær (Death of Edgar, line 8b); sodðoran : wodðoran (Death of Edgar, line 33a); the addition or omission of ȝ (Coronation of Edgar, lines 24a, and 29a) and of eac (Death of Edgar, line 29a). Those which have the greatest effect on sense, metre, or syntax, on the other hand, are almost invariably problematic, causing syntactic difficulties in the case of the omission of pa from ChronA⁵ Coronation of Edgar, line 19b; metrical difficulties in that of the substitution ChronA⁵ agan ChronB¹ ChronC² get, Coronation of Edgar, line 13b; and agreement difficulties in that of inflectional difference ChronA⁵ corðre micelre ChronB¹ corðre mycclum (ChronC² corþre mycclum), Coronation of Edgar, line 2a.

What we do not find in these two poems is the type of semantically, syntactically and metrically appropriate and significant innovation characteristic of the ChronB¹ versions of the Battle of Brunanburh and the Capture of the Five Boroughs, with its inflectional differences and substitutions of prefixes and stressed words – substitutions of prefixes and stressed words ChronB¹ forslegen ChronA³ beslagen (ChronC² besle|gen ChronD² beslægen), Battle of Brunanburh, line 42a; ChronB¹ forgrunden ChronA³ ChronC² ChronD² ageted, Battle of Brunanburh, line 18a; and inflectional differences ChronB¹ hæþenum ChronA³ hæþenra (ChronC² hæþenra ChronD² hæðenra), Capture of the Five Boroughs, line 10a; and
ChronB\(^1\) dænum ChronA\(^3\) ChronD\(^2\) dæne (ChronC\(^2\) dene), Capture of the Five Boroughs, line 8b.

If, as Taylor suggests, however, the absence of annal numbers in ChronB\(^1\) from 652-946 is the result of an incomplete attempt at revision by the ChronB\(^1\) scribe, then the relative lack of substantive innovation between the ChronB\(^1\)-ChronC\(^2\) and ChronA\(^5\) versions of the Coronation of Edgar and the Death of Edgar indicate that the revision was either less intensive or largely accomplished after the annal for 946. Rather than the result of the ChronB\(^1\) scribe’s formulaic sensibility, the difference in the nature and amount of the textual innovation exhibited by ChronB\(^1\) versions of the Battle of Brunanburh and Capture of the Five Boroughs on the one hand and the Coronation of Edgar and the Death of Edgar on the other is to be attributed to the editorial intentions of the scribe in question. In the first two poems – both of which occur in the section in which the scribe of ChronB\(^1\) appears to be revising his source, and for which the scribe of ChronC\(^2\) felt compelled to turn to another manuscript to supplement the text of ChronB\(^1\) – the variation introduced by the scribe of ChronB\(^1\) is in keeping with that found in the corresponding prose; by the time he came to copy the second set of verse texts, the ChronB\(^1\) scribe had either stopped his revision or adopted a less innovative approach.

London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. i, Second Hand (ChronC\(^2\))

The mid-eleventh-century scribe of ChronC\(^2\) is the least innovative of all scribes responsible for copying the Chronicle poems. His work exhibits six substantive variant readings not found in the other witnesses to these texts, all in the Battle of Brunanburh.\(^{351}\)

\(^{351}\)Both Campbell and P. R. Orton attribute these variants to the ChronC\(^2\) scribe (Brunanburh, p. 111; Orton “‘The Battle of Brunanburh’, 40b-44a: Constantine's Bereavement,” Peritia 4 (1985): 243-50 at p. 248). As they occur in the Battle of Brunanburh only, and as the Battle of Brunanburh (with the Capture of the Five Boroughs) is found in the section which Taylor suggests the ChronB\(^1\) scribe was attempting to revise,
Only one of the five variants (the addition of *his* in l. 41b) has a significant effect on the sense of the passage in which it occurs.\textsuperscript{352} As five of the six variants occur on unstressed syllables and involve the same type of metrically and syntactically insignificant variation we have seen in the work of all but the most careful scribes of the glossing texts discussed in Chapter 2, moreover, it is impossible to rule out unconscious error or graphic variation as a possible source for most of the ChronC\textsuperscript{2} scribe’s innovations.

**London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. iv, Second Hand (ChronD\textsuperscript{2})**

Of the four surviving witnesses to the first two Chronicle poems, the mid-eleventh-century ChronD shows by far the greatest number of unique substantive variants. The manuscript has been written in five or more hands, of which the second is responsible for both the *Battle of Brunanburh* and *Capture of the Five Boroughs*.\textsuperscript{353} In their eighty-six lines, the ChronD\textsuperscript{2} scribe introduces twenty-two variants with a potentially significant effect on sense, metre, or syntax of the two poems: four differences of inflection, twelve examples of the substitution of stressed words and elements, one example of the addition or omission of unstressed words and phrases, one example of the addition or omission of a prefix, three examples of the reinterpretation of already existing text, and one example of the addition or omission of text corresponding to a metrical unit.\textsuperscript{354}

Very few of these variants offer truly appropriate alternative readings. Of the four unique inflectional endings in the *Battle of Brunanburh* and *Capture of the Five Boroughs*, for example, three involve a confusion of gender: ChronD\textsuperscript{2} *se... gesceaf* ChronA\textsuperscript{3} *sio... gesceaf*

\textsuperscript{352}See below, p. 205.
\textsuperscript{353}Ker, *Catalogue*, art. 192.
\textsuperscript{354}These variants are discussed in greater detail below, pp. 206-222.
(Chron\textsuperscript{B1} Chron\textsuperscript{C2} seo... gesceaf), Battle of Brunanburh, line 16b; Chron\textsuperscript{D2} deopne\textsuperscript{a} wæter
Chron\textsuperscript{A3} deop wæter (Chron\textsuperscript{B1} Chron\textsuperscript{C2} deopwæter), Battle of Brunanburh, line 55a;
Chron\textsuperscript{D2} pisneiglænde Chron\textsuperscript{A3} pis\textsuperscript{a} eiglænde (Chron\textsuperscript{B1} pyseglænde Chron\textsuperscript{C2} pys iglænde),
Battle of Brunanburh, line 66a; and the fourth a non-sensical substitution of a genitive for the
nominative singular: Chron\textsuperscript{D2} eadmundes Chron\textsuperscript{A3} Chron\textsuperscript{B1} Chron\textsuperscript{C2} eadmund, Capture of the Five Boroughs, line 13b. Six of the twelve substitutions of stressed words in this
manuscript, likewise, involve changes to a single consonant in the Chron\textsuperscript{A3} Chron\textsuperscript{B1}
Chron\textsuperscript{C2} form – in most cases as the result of an obvious graphic error: Chron\textsuperscript{D2}: Chron\textsuperscript{D3}
heord\textsuperscript{b} weal Chron\textsuperscript{A3} bord\textsuperscript{c} weal (Chron\textsuperscript{B1} Chron\textsuperscript{C2} bordweall), Battle of Brunanburh, line 5b; Chron\textsuperscript{D2} re\textsuperscript{d} Chron\textsuperscript{A3} Chron\textsuperscript{B1} Chron\textsuperscript{C2} sæd, Battle of Brunanburh, line 20a;
Chron\textsuperscript{D2} flod Chron\textsuperscript{A3} Chron\textsuperscript{B1} Chron\textsuperscript{C2} flot, Battle of Brunanburh, line 35a; Chron\textsuperscript{D2} hal
Chron\textsuperscript{A3} Chron\textsuperscript{B1} Chron\textsuperscript{C2} hár, Battle of Brunanburh, line 39a; Chron\textsuperscript{D2} cuð heafóc
Chron\textsuperscript{A3} guð hafóc (Chron\textsuperscript{B1} guþhaðoc Chron\textsuperscript{C2} guðhaðoc), Battle of Brunanburh 64a;
Chron\textsuperscript{D2} gife Chron\textsuperscript{A3} Chron\textsuperscript{C2} fife (Chron\textsuperscript{B1} fife), Capture of the Five Boroughs, line 5b.
Three other substitutions, although not the result of an error in a single letter, are nevertheless
almost certainly graphic in origin: one substitution of a stressed word or element: Chron\textsuperscript{D2}
sece Chron\textsuperscript{A3} Chron\textsuperscript{C2} sæce Chron\textsuperscript{B1} sace, Battle of Brunanburh, line 42a; and two
examples of the reinterpretation of existing text: Chron\textsuperscript{D2} inwuda Chron\textsuperscript{A3} inwidda
(Chron\textsuperscript{B1} Chron\textsuperscript{C2} inwitta), Battle of Brunanburh, line 46a; Chron\textsuperscript{D2} ðæg gled ongarum
Chron\textsuperscript{A3} negled cnearrū (Chron\textsuperscript{B1} nægled cnear\textsuperscript{d}rum Chron\textsuperscript{C2} neglecnearrum), Battle of
Brunanburh, line 53b.

Of variants involving more than a simple graphic misunderstanding, three involve
difficulties with poetic or nonce words on the part of Chron\textsuperscript{D2}: Chron\textsuperscript{D2} mycel scearpum for
the nonce compound Chron\textsuperscript{B1} Chron\textsuperscript{C2} mylenscearpum (Chron\textsuperscript{A3} mylen scearp), Battle
of Brunanburh, line 24a; ChronD⁵ hryman (early West-Saxon hrēman, non West-Saxon hrēman) ‘lament’ for the poetic ChronA³ ChronB¹ ChronC² hreman (early West-Saxon and non West-Saxon hrēman) ‘exult’, Battle of Brunanburh, line 39b; and the nonsense form ChronB² dyflig for the nonce word ChronA³ difel|in (ChronB¹ dyflen ChronC² dyflin, i.e. ‘Dublin’), Battle of Brunanburh, line 55b. In a fourth example, the ChronD² reading is metrically, syntactically and semantically appropriate but formulaically less common: ChronD² feohte ChronA³ ge|feohte (ChronB¹ ChronC² gefeohhte), Battle of Brunanburh, line 28a. In a fifth, ChronD² substitutes a metrically, syntactically, and semantically appropriate but non-poetic word for a poetic reading in ChronB¹ ChronC²: ChronD² ma|ega ‘of the clan’ for ChronA³ maga ‘of the young men’ (or ‘of the kinsmen’) and ChronB¹ mæ|gea (ChronC², meega) ‘of men’, Capture of the Five Boroughs, line 2a. A sixth, ChronD² ine|ga ChronB¹ mecea (ChronC² meca; ChronA³ mæcan), Battle of Brunanburh, line 40a, involves the substitution of a semantically equivalent prepositional phrase (probably the result of an original minim error) for a noun in ChronB¹ ChronC².

In only two cases does the ChronD² form offer an apparently genuine alternative to those of the other witnesses: the addition of the unstressed particle þe to Battle of Brunanburh, line 51b: ChronD² þæsþe ChronA³ ChronB¹ ChronC² þæs; and the substitution of the first element in the poetic compound ChronD² heora|flyman ChronA³ here fleman (ChronB¹ herefle|man ChronC² hereflyn|man), Battle of Brunanburh, 23a.³⁵⁵

The general lack of appropriate variation in ChronD² is all the more surprising given the relative independence of the ChronD text. The only representative of the northern recension of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle to include the Chronicle poems, ChronD comprises what Whitelock has described as a “a conflation of the northern recension with another text of
the [Southern] Chronicle.” As it is unlikely that ChronA, ChronB or ChronC were the direct ancestor of the southern elements in this compilation, and as, as Whitelock notes, “the task of conflating the two texts cannot have been easy,” we might expect to find more evidence than we do of thoughtful emendation similar to that found in the “corrected” sections of ChronB.

Instead, as Whitelock and Plummer note, the mixture of conservatism and carelessness which characterises the ChronD treatment of the Battle of Brunanburh and Capture of the Five Boroughs is also characteristic of the manuscript as a whole. On the one hand, the scribes of ChronD do not appear to have made much effort to update the language or contents of their exemplar. Plummer reports the ChronD version of the Chronicle to be relatively free of the late forms, spellings and syntax which mark the slightly later, but closely related Peterborough Chronicle (ChronE). On the other hand, however, this orthographic and syntactic conservatism is not matched by a similarly careful attitude towards the details of the text itself. At a textual level, Plummer reports ChronD to be “full of mistakes and omissions” and “from first to last very inaccurately and carelessly written” when it is compared with the applicable sections of ChronE and ChronA ChronB ChronC. In addition, Whitelock and Plummer both record numerous occasions on which the compiler of ChronD has joined material from his two sources in a “clumsy” and repetitive fashion. As was also true of the

---

355 This last example may also be the result of a late back-spelling. See below, p. 210.
357 Whitelock, Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, p. xv.
358 Plummer p. lxxx; Whitelock, Peterborough Chronicle, pp. 28-29
359 Plummer, p. lxxxi; for examples, see Plummer, p. lxxxi, fn. 2 and lxii, fn. 2.
360 See Whitelock, Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, p. xv; Plummer, pp. lxxxi-lxxxii. Both writers use “clumsy” to describe the ChronD compiler’s efforts.
work of the scribes of Chron\textsuperscript{A}3, Chron\textsuperscript{A}5, Chron\textsuperscript{B}1 and Chron\textsuperscript{C}2, the scribe of Chron\textsuperscript{D}2
does not appear to have strayed far from his prose practice in copying his verse.

**Textual Variants**

The following sections treat the substantive variation among witnesses to the
Chronicle poems on a manuscript-by-manuscript, scribe-by-scribe and then poem-by-poem
basis. A separate section between Chron\textsuperscript{A}5 and Chron\textsuperscript{B}1 examines “recensional” variants in
which Chron\textsuperscript{B}1 and Chron\textsuperscript{C}2 agree in a reading different from Chron\textsuperscript{A}3 and Chron\textsuperscript{D}2 (pp.
187-192). These are presumably to be ascribed to their common archetype, Plummer’s
hypothetical \( \Gamma \) (see above, pp. 150-152).

*Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 173
Third Hand (Chron\textsuperscript{A}3)*

**Battle of Brunanburh**

Differences of Inflection (4 examples)

**Brun (Chron\textsuperscript{A}3), 17b**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chron\textsuperscript{A}3</th>
<th>Chron\textsuperscript{B}1</th>
<th>Chron\textsuperscript{C}2</th>
<th>Chron\textsuperscript{D}2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>þær læg secg mænig.</td>
<td>þærlæg secg monig.</td>
<td>þærlæg secg monig.</td>
<td>þærlæg secg monig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gauri ageted.</td>
<td>gauri ageted.</td>
<td>gauri ageted.</td>
<td>gauri ageted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guma norþerna.</td>
<td>guman norðerne.</td>
<td>guman norðerne.</td>
<td>guman norðerne.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ofer scild scoten.</td>
<td>ofer scyldscoten</td>
<td>ofer scyldscoten</td>
<td>ofer scyldscoten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swilce scyttisc eác.</td>
<td>swylce scyttisc eác.</td>
<td>swylce scyttisc eác.</td>
<td>swylce scyttisc eác.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 wergiwig gesæd.</td>
<td>20 wergiwig gesæd.</td>
<td>20 wergiwig gesæd.</td>
<td>20 wergiwig gesæd.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Chron\textsuperscript{A}3, the noun-adjective pair *guma norþerna* is nominative singular; in
Chron\textsuperscript{B}1 Chron\textsuperscript{C}2 and Chron\textsuperscript{D}2, *guman norðerne* (Chron\textsuperscript{D}2 *guman norðerne*) is
nominative plural. Syntactically, the Chron\textsuperscript{A}3 reading is to be preferred, given the use of a
singular form of the participle *scoten* (Chron\textsuperscript{B}1 Chron\textsuperscript{D}2 *sceoten*) in line 19a of all witnesses.

The plural noun and adjective in Chron\textsuperscript{B}1 Chron\textsuperscript{C}2 Chron\textsuperscript{D}2 is perhaps to be ascribed to the
influence of the preceding collective, *secg mænig*, l. 17b. Similarly rapid transitions from the plural/collective to the concrete singular can be paralleled from the battle scenes in *Beowulf*.

The variants are metrically identical. As both require that the scribe make a corresponding change elsewhere in his text, the variants are linked.

**Brun** (ChronA³), 26b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ChronA³</th>
<th>ChronC²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>he eardes hond plegan.</td>
<td>heardes handplegan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hæleþa nanum</td>
<td>hæleþa namū.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>þæmid anlafe</td>
<td>ofer <em>era gebland</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>onlides bosme</td>
<td>onlipes bosme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land gesohtun.</td>
<td>landgesohton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fæge toge</td>
<td>fæge toge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ChronB¹</th>
<th>ChronD²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>myrce</td>
<td>newyrndon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he eardes hond plegan.</td>
<td>heardes handplegan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hæleþa nanum</td>
<td>hæleþa namū.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>þæmid anlafe</td>
<td>ofer <em>ear gebland</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>onlides bosme</td>
<td>onlipes bosme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land gesohtun.</td>
<td>landgesohton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fæge toge</td>
<td>fæge toge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The variation between compound and simplices ChronA³ *era gebland* ChronB¹

*eargebland* (ChronC² *ear gebland* ChronD² *eår gebland*) has no effect on sense and a slight effect on metre. The ChronB¹ ChronC² ChronD² form is found twice more in the poetic corpus: *Metres of Boethius*, VIII. 30a (of *erageblond*), and *Elene* l. 239a: *ofær earhgeblond*. There are no further examples of the ChronA³ reading, although O’Keeffe cites similar collocations from *Andreas*, line 532a (*aryða geblond*) and Exeter Riddle 3, line 22a (*eare geblonden*) as possible parallels.

In line 71a, ChronA³ has the compound *bradbrimu* for *brade brimu* (and orthographic variants) in ChronB¹ ChronC² ChronD² (see below, p. 165).

---


363 O’Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 120.
The variation has a slight effect on metre. In ChronA the line is a Type B-2; in

ChronB ChronC ChronD it is Type B-1

Brun (ChronA), 40a

ChronA

swilce þær eac sefroda. mid fleame cō.  
onhis cyþþe norð. costontinus. 
  hár hilde ring. hreman neþortefte. 
 40 mæcan gemanan. he was| his mæga sceard. 
  freonda gefylled. ónfolcstede. 
  beslagen| ætsæce. þhis sunu forlet. 
  ónægel stowe.  wundun fer grunden.| 
  giungne ætgúðe.

ChronB

S wylce þær eacsefróda mid fleamecóm.  
onhiscyþþe norð constantinus.  
hárhilderinc hremanneþórfte|||  
40 mecea gemanan her was his magasceard.  
freonda gefylled on folcstede.  
forselegen ætsæce þ项sunu forlet.  
onægelstowe wundum forgrunden.  
geongne ætgúðe|

ChronC

Swilce| þær eac sefroda mid fleame cóm.  
onhis cyððe norð. constantinus.  
hár hilderinc. hreman neþortefte.  
40 meca gemanan. her| was hismaga sceard.  
freonda gefylled. on his folcstede.  
beslegen ætsæce. þiisunu forlet.  
onægelstowe. wundum forgrunden.|  
geongne æt guþe.

ChronD

swylce þæreác sefroda mid fleame com  
onhis cyððe norð constantinus|  
hal hylde rínc hryman neþórfte.  
40 inecega geman| an he was his mæga sceard.  
freonda gefylled on folc stede  
beslegen ætsæce| þiissunu forlet.  
onægelstowe wundum forgrunden.|  
geongne æþæcege  

Of the three readings for this line, two – ChronB ChronC mec(e)a gemanan ‘(in/of) the fellowship of swords’ and ChronD inecega geman| an ‘in the fellowship of swords’ – make sense, syntax, and some metre. The third, ChronA mæcan gemanan, is nonsensical.

In ChronA, mæcan is presumably a corruption of either mæcga, the genitive plural of mæcg ‘man’, or mec(e)a, genitive plural of mēce ‘sword’ and the reading of ChronB.

ChronC. Campbell considers this second possibility the less likely, however, as “mece is nowhere else spelt with æ’” and as ChronA (and ChronD) read mecum correctly in line 24a. Since ChronD inecega geman| an ‘in the fellowship of swords’ makes sense and is roughly synonymous with the reading of ChronB and ChronC, however, it is perhaps more likely that ChronA mæcan also comes from an original *meca. Perhaps the ChronA

364 Campbell, Brunanburh, pp. 110-111.
365 Campbell reports the ChronD reading as mæcga, adding that “the m might be read as in” (Brunanburh, p. 88 and fn. 1). There is a clear space between the first and second minim of the “m” in facsimile, however.
scribe was bothered by the poet’s use of such a “striking and original” kenning for battle.\textsuperscript{366}

The addition of final -\textit{n} to ChronA\textsuperscript{3} may be the result of an anticipation of the ending of the following word or the misconstruction of \textit{maecn} as a weak adjective in agreement with \textit{gemanan}. It is in any case further evidence of the ChronA\textsuperscript{3} scribe’s difficulty with the poem.\textsuperscript{367}

The ChronB\textsuperscript{1} ChronC\textsuperscript{2} reading \textit{mec(e)a gemanan} ‘fellowship of swords’ and the ChronD\textsuperscript{2} reading \textit{inecga ge|manan} ‘in the fellowship of swords’ are broadly equivalent semantically and syntactically. In ChronB\textsuperscript{1} ChronC\textsuperscript{2}, \textit{mec(e)a} is a genitive dependent on \textit{gemanan}, which is itself genitive or dative singular and governed by \textit{hreman}, line 39b (while Bosworth and Toller give no examples of \textit{hrēman} governing a simple case ending without a preposition, Campbell reports that the related adjective \textit{hrēmig} appears “sometimes governing the gen., but usually the dat.”\textsuperscript{368}). In ChronD\textsuperscript{2}, \textit{inecga ge|manan} is presumably to be read as a prepositional phrase modifying \textit{hrēman} ‘cry out’, ‘lament’ (the verb of ChronD\textsuperscript{2} line 39b). In this case, \textit{gemanan} is to be construed as accusative or dative singular, modified by the genitive plural \textit{ecga}. \textit{Gemāna} is frequently found in similar prepositional phrases.\textsuperscript{369} Given the ChronD\textsuperscript{2} scribe’s demonstrated difficulties with the script of his exemplar and the failure of his version of the line to show double alliteration, a scribal misinterpretation of an initial minim in \textit{inecga} seems the most likely explanation for his reading.

\textsuperscript{366}Campbell, \textit{Brunanburh}, p. 110.

\textsuperscript{367}Campbell, \textit{Brunanburh}, p. 110; For a possibly similar example of inflectional attraction, see ChronB\textsuperscript{1} \textit{saxan}: ChronA\textsuperscript{3} ChronC\textsuperscript{2} ChronD\textsuperscript{2} se(a)x\textit{e}, l.70a; a further example of a scribe making an adjective from an apparently unfamiliar word is ChronD\textsuperscript{2} \textit{dyf\textsuperscript{2}lig} for ChronA\textsuperscript{3} \textit{dif\textsuperscript{2}lin} (ChronB\textsuperscript{1} \textit{dyf\textsuperscript{2}len} ChronC\textsuperscript{2} \textit{dyf\textsuperscript{2}lin}), \textit{Battle of Brunanburh}, l. 55b; see below, p. 214.

\textsuperscript{368}Campbell, \textit{Brunanburh}, p. 110; for \textit{hrēman} ‘exult’, see B.-T.(S) hrē\textsuperscript{2}man.

\textsuperscript{369}B.-T.(S) gemāna. An example with \textit{on} is given in definition III ‘fellowship, association, society, intercourse’.
Of the three variants, only that in ChronD\(^2\) affects metre significantly. Whether ChronA\(^3\) \textit{mæcan} is intended for \textit{mecga} or \textit{mēca}, the ChronA\(^3\) ChronB\(^1\) and ChronC\(^2\) versions of line 40 are all Type A-1 with double alliteration. In ChronD\(^2\), \textit{inecga ge\textit{manan}} is best scanned as a Type A-1 line with an anacrustic preposition and delayed alliteration.

The ChronD\(^2\) and ChronB\(^1\) ChronC\(^2\) forms are mentioned briefly below, pages 189 and 218.

\textit{Brun} (ChronA\(^3\)), 71a

ChronA\(^3\)

\begin{verbatim}
65     newearð wæl mare.
ólica eignande. æfer gieta.
fócles gefyll. beforan þissū.
swórdes |écgum. þæs þeus segað béc
ealdeuðwitan. síþän eastan hider.]
70     engle ȝseaxe. upbe(coman).
ofer \textit{bradbrimu}. brytene sohton.
wランス wigsniðas. wealallices ofer coman.
eorlas arhwate. eardbgeatan.]
\end{verbatim}

ChronB\(^1\)

\begin{verbatim}
65     newearð wælmare.
onþysiglaende æfregyta.
fócles gefyll. beforan þyssum.
swórdes ecgum. þæs þeus segað béc
ealdeuðwitan. síþän eastan hider.
70     engle ȝseaxe. upp becoman.
ofer \textit{brade brimu}. brytene sohton.
wランス wigsniðas. wealallices ofer coman.
eorlas arhwate. eardbegeatan.]
\end{verbatim}

ChronC\(^2\)

\begin{verbatim}
65     newearð wæl mare.
onþysiglaende æfregyta.
fócles gefyll. beforan þyssum.
swórdes ecgum. þæs þeus segað béc.
ealde uðwitan. síððan eastan hider.
70     engle ȝseaxe. uppe(comon).
ofer \textit{brade brimu}. brytene sohton.
wランス wigsniðas. wealallices ofer coman.
eorlas arhwate. eardbegeatan.]
\end{verbatim}

ChronD\(^2\)

\begin{verbatim}
65     newearð wæl mare.
onþysiglaende æfregitā.
fócles gefyll. beforan þyssum.
swórdes ecgum. þæs þeus segað béc.
ealde uðwitan. síððan eastan hider.
70     engle ȝseaxe. upp becomon.
ofer \textit{brade brimu}. brytene sohton.
wランス wigsniðas. wealallices ofer coman.
eorlas arhwate. eardbegeatan.]
\end{verbatim}

ChronA\(^3\) \textit{brad} can be construed as either the first element of a compound, \textit{bradbrimu}, or an example of an endingless neuter accusative plural in apposition to \textit{brimu}. In ChronB\(^1\)

ChronC\(^2\) ChronD\(^2\) \textit{brade} is an example of the late neuter accusative plural in -\textit{e}.\(^{370}\) \textit{Ofer brad brimu} occurs once more in the poetic corpus (\textit{Genesis}, line 2194a). There are no further examples of the ChronB\(^1\) ChronC\(^2\) ChronD\(^2\) reading.

\footnote{Campbell, \textit{Brunanburh}, p. 120. See also Campbell, \textit{OEG} §641.}
In ChronA\(^3\) the line is Type C-2; in ChronB\(^1\) ChronC\(^2\) ChronD\(^2\) Type B-1 with a resolved second stress.

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

*Brun* (ChronA\(^3\)), 26a

**ChronA\(^3\)**

25 he eardes hond plegan. hæleþa nanum be|mid anlafe.| ofer æra gebland. onlides bosme. land gesohtun. fæge toge|feohte.

**ChronB\(^1\)**

25 heardes hand plegan hæleþa nanum be|mid anlafe.| ofer æra gebland. onlides bosme land gesohtun. fæge toge|feohte.

**ChronC\(^2\)**

25 myrce| newyrndon. hæleþa nanü. parademid| anlafe. ofer ear gebland. onlides bosme land gesohtun. fæge| togefoht.

**ChronD\(^2\)**

25 myrce newyrndon. hæleþa nanum. be|mid anlafe| ofer ear gebland. onlides bosme land gesohtun. fæge| tofeoht.

Although it makes good sense and metre as written, the ChronA\(^3\) *pe* is almost certainly an eyeskip for *þæra pe*\(^371\). A similar variant occurs in Psalm 93:09.6b: PVs *þær* EVs *pe* (see above, Chapter 2, p. 40). The scribe of ChronG normalises the ChronA\(^3\) reading to *pe*\(^372\).

As the omission falls in the preliminary dip of a Type C line, it has no effect on metre.

---

\(^{371}\) Cf. Bately, *MS. A*, p. cxxxix, who includes the variant as a possible example (with *dene* [ChronG *dene*], *Capture of the Five Boroughs*, l.8b) of *æ* for WS *e* in stressed syllables.

Reinterpretation of Existing Elements (7 examples)

Brun (ChronA³), 13a

ChronA³
10 hord þhámas.  het tend] crungun.  
scotta leoda.  
fege feollan.  feld dæn,ede||
segas hwate.  sið þan sunne úp.  
onmorgentid.  mære tun gol.  
15 glad ofer grundas.  godes condel beorht.  
eces drihtnes.  oð sio æþele gesceaft.|  

ChronC²
10 hord þhams]  hetend crungon.  
scotta leode.  
fege feollan|  feld dennade.  
segga swate.  sïðan sunne upp.  
onmorgentid.  mære tungol.  
15 glad ofer grundas.  godes candel beorht  
eces] drihtnes  | ò|seo æþele gesceaft  
sáhtósetle.

ChronB¹
10 hórd þhámas  hettend crungon  
scotta leode|  ðcric flotan.  
fegefeollan  feld dennade.  
seggaswate  sïðan] sunne upp.  
onmorgentid  mære tungol.  
15 glad ofergrundas  godes candel beorht  
eces] drihtnes  | ò|seo æþele gesceaft  
sahtosetle.

ChronA³ secgas hwate is readily explained as a corruption of secca swate: if a scribe took the second s to belong to the first word, he would be very likely to make the meaningless wate into hwate. The error was probably due to the scribe of A, for it occurs in his MS. at the turn of a page, and this may have led to his losing the thread of what he was writing.  

Bately and O’Keeffe note that the form can be made to make some sense, however, “if the preceding half-line [feld dæn,ede]... is understood parenthetically.” In this reading, 

ChronA³ secgas hwate ‘bold men’ is interpreted as the subject of feollan line 12a, while line 12b – ChronA³ feld dæn,ede (ChronG feld dynede) – is understood in an absolute sense as ‘the field resounded’. In ChronB¹ ChronC² and ChronD², the reading secca swate

---

373 Campbell, Brunanburh, p. 100.
374 O’Keeffe, Visible Song, p. 119 (for “Crawford” here and elsewhere in this section of O’Keeffe’s chapter, read “Campbell”); Bately, MS. A, p. cx.
375 See Bately 1986, p. cx. This reading assumes that ChronA³ dæn,ede ChronB¹ ChronC² dennade ChronD² dennode are for West-Saxon dynede as in ChronG. See Robinson, “Lexicography and Literary
(ChronB\(^1\) secgaswate) ‘with the blood of men’ is an instrumental governed by ChronB\(^1\)

ChronC\(^2\) dennade ChronD\(^2\) dennode.

In addition to its effect on syntax and sense, the reinterpretation also affects metre. In

ChronB\(^1\) ChronC\(^2\) ChronD\(^2\), line 13a is Type A-1 with two long lifts. In ChronA\(^3\), it is Type A-4 with a short second lift. As Campbell and O’Keeffe note, both types are attested elsewhere in the corpus.\(^376\)

Brun (ChronA\(^3\)), 25a

ChronA\(^3\)

myrce newyrndon.

25 he eardes hond plegan. hælæþa namnum ðærmid anlæfe. ofer æra gebland. onlides bosme. land gesohtun.

fæge togefeohite.

ChronB\(^1\)

myrce newyrndon.

25 heardes hand plegan hælæþa namnum ðærmid anlæfe. ofer æra gebland. onlides bosme land gesohtun.

fæge togefeohite.

ChronC\(^2\)

myrce newyrndon.

25 he eardes hond plegan hælæþa namnum ðærmid anlæfe. ofer æra gebland. onlides bosme land gesohtun.

fæge togefeohite.

ChronD\(^2\)

myrce newyrndon.

25 heardes hand plegan hælæþa namnum ðærmid anlæfe. ofer æra gebland. onlides bosme land gesohtun.

fæge to feohte.

The ChronA\(^3\) forms here and in line 72b (weeallas, ChronB\(^1\) ChronC\(^2\) ChronD\(^2\) wealas) either are the result of a reinterpretation heardes and weeallas as two independent parts of speech, or reflect an antecedent in which ea was spelled eea before consonants which caused lengthening in late Old English.\(^377\)

If the ChronA\(^3\) scribe interpreted he eardes as two words, the variation affects both sense and metre. The third person pronoun he cannot be the subject of the plural verb

---

\(^376\)Campbell, *Brunanburh*, pp. 99-100; O’Keeffe, *Visible Song*, pp. 118-119, and fn. 32.

\(^377\)Campbell, *Brunanburh*, p. 106.
wyrdon, line 24b, and eardes hondplegan ‘hand-play (i.e. battle) of the earth’ is strained. In 
ChronB¹ ChronC² and ChronD², the line is a Type D*2; with he, ChronA³ would be a type 
D*2 with anacrusis. ChronA³ weeallas is discussed below, p. 172.

Brun (ChronA³), 35a

ChronA³

\[\text{hræge fælmed wearð.}\\
\text{nordan manna bregu.} | \text{nede gebeded.}\\
tolides stefne. \text{little weorode.}\\
35 \text{crate} \text{cnearen} \text{flot.} | \text{cyning utgewat.}\\
onfealene flod. \text{feorh generede.}\]

ChronB¹

\[\text{hærgellymed wearð.}\\
nordan manna brego. \text{nede gebeded.}\\ntolides stefne. \text{lytle weorode.}\\
35 \text{crate} \text{cnear on} \text{flot.} | \text{cing ut gewat.}\\
onfealoneflod. \text{feorh generede.}\\

ChronC²

\[\text{hær geflymed wearð.}\\
nordan manna brego. \text{neade gebeded.}\\ntolides stefne. \text{lytle weorode.}\\
35 \text{crate} \text{cnear on} \text{flot.} | \text{cing ut gewat.}\\
onfealoneflod. \text{feorh generede.}\]

ChronD²

\[\text{hær geflymed wearð.}\\
nordan manna brego. \text{neade gebeded.}\\ntolides stefne. \text{lytle weorode.}\\
35 \text{crate} \text{cnear on} \text{flot.} | \text{cing ut gewat.}\\
onfealoneflod. \text{feorh generede.}\]

ChronA³ cnearen is presumably a slip for cnear on, perhaps due to the unfamiliarity 
of cnear(r), an Old Norse loanword attested in Old English only in the Battle of Brunanburh 
(here and as the second half of the compound negled cnearru, line 53b).³⁷⁸ A second 
possibility, that the ChronA³ scribe intended en for the preposition in/on is unlikely. While 
the falling together of unstressed vowels like e and a is frequent in later manuscripts,³⁷⁹ the use 
of en for the preposition on is unparalleled in the corpus of multiply-attested poems. In 
ChronG the form is corrected to cnear on.³⁸⁰

---

³⁷⁸Campbell, Brunanburh, pp. 108-9. At line 53b the forms are: ChronA³ negled cnearru ChronB¹ negled 
cnear[rum ChronC² negledcnearrum ChronD² deeg gled ongarum.
³⁷⁹Campbell, OEG § 379.
Brun (ChronA³), 49b

ChronA³

midheora herelafŒ[hleþhan neðorfuntu].
þheo beaduweorcæ. bæteran wurdon.
on camp stede. cul bod ge hna des
50 garmit tinge. gæmena geþmo tes.
wæpen gewrixles. þæs hi on wæl felda.
wipæad weardes. æfaran plegodan.

ChronB¹

midheora herelafum hlihhan neþorftan.
þheo beado weorca bæteran wurdan.
oncampstede cumbol gehnastes.
50 gærmittinge gumena gemôtes.
wæpen gewrixles þæsh onwæl felda.
wipæadweardæs eaþran plegodan.

ChronC²

midhyra here lafum hlihhan neðorfuntu.
þheo beadoweorcæ bæteran wurdon.
oncampstede cumbol gehnastes.
50 gar mit tinge gumena gemôtes.
wæpen gewrixles þæs hionwæl felda.
wiþead weardæs æfaran plegodan.

ChronD²

mid hyra here leafum hlybhan neþorftan.
þæt hi beado weorca bæteran wurdon.
on campstede cumbol gehnastes.
50 gær mittunge gumena gemôtes.
wæpen gewrixles þæþeh on wæl felda.
wiþeadweardæs æfaran plegodan;

The ChronA³ form cul bod ge hna des appears to represent less a coherent reading than an attempt at deciphering a nonce compound. Culbod and gehnades are nonsense words. Although line 49b is the only occurrence of cumbolgehnastes as a compound, the elements cumbol ‘banner’ and gehnast ‘clash’ are found elsewhere in Old English both as simplices and in compounds. With one exception (cumbolgebrec, Psalm 50 [British Library, Cotton Vespasian D. vi], line 11), however, these words are found exclusively in poems from the four major codices: Genesis, Exodus, and Daniel (Junius Manuscript); Andreas (Vercelli Book); Juliana, Exeter Riddle 3 (Exeter Book); Beowulf and Judith (Beowulf Manuscript).

The correction l cumbel appears interlinearly, apparently in the same hand as that responsible for ChronG (where the word appears as cumbelgehnades).

---

381 Campbell, Brunanburh, p. 113.
382 Bessinger and Smith. See above, p. 147 and fn. 320
383 Lutz, Die Version G, pp. 86, 221; Campbell, Brunanburh, p. 113.
Both readings make sense, though the ChronB¹ ChronC² ChronD² version has better metre. In its uncorrected form, ChronA³ is to be translated ‘(to seek) their land again’ and is unmetrical.³⁸⁴ With the addition of ȝ before eft, the ChronA³ on-verse is a poor Type B-2 verse. Eft alliterates in preference to land, and the line shows a suspicious distribution of sentence particles into both dips. In ChronB¹ ChronC² ChronD² the half-line is translated ‘(to seek) the land of the Irish again’ and is Type B-1.

Campbell suggests that the ChronA³ reading may be the result of the scribe’s unfamiliarity with the noun ira or yra for ‘Irish’ which “occurs only here, and in the account of the voyages of Ohtere in the Cotton MS. of the O.E. Orosius.... The words Irland and Iras are unknown in O.E. before the tenth century.”³⁸⁵

In ChronG, the line appears as ȝ heora land (i.e. without eft) and fails to alliterate.³⁸⁶

³⁸⁴ O’Keeffe describes the line as a “weak D4 type,” apparently assigning the possessive pronoun hira an unusually heavy stress, and placing the alliteration on the adverb eft in preference to the noun land (Visible Song, p. 120).

³⁸⁵ Campbell, Brunanburh, p. 116.

Brun (ChronA\textsuperscript{3}), 62b

ChronA\textsuperscript{3}

60 letan him behindan. hræ
drettian.
salu wig|padan. |bone sveartan hraefn.
hyrned nebban. |bone hasewan|padan.
earn æftan hwit. æses brucan.
grædigne guð hafóc.| |æt græe deor.
65 wulf onwealde.

ChronB\textsuperscript{1}

60 letan him behindan hraw| bryttigean.
salowig pádan |bone sveartan hraefn.
hyrned| nebben |bone hasopadan.
earn æftan hwit. æses brucan.| |grædigne guþ hafóc. | |ægætgræe deor.
65 wulfonwealde.

ChronC\textsuperscript{2}

60 leton hymbehindon hrá brittigan.
salowig padan |bone sveartan hraefn.
hyrned nebban. |bone hasu padan
earn æftan hwit. æses brucan.
grædigne guð hafóc. | |ægætgræedeor.
65 wulf onwealde.

ChronD\textsuperscript{2}

60 læton him behindan hra bryttinga.
salowig padan |bone sveartan hraefn
hynret nebban. |bone hasu wadan
earn æftan hwit æres brucan.
græ| |æl| |digne guð hæfóc. |ægætgræedeor.
65 wulfonwealde|

ChronB\textsuperscript{1} hasopadan (ChronC\textsuperscript{2} hasu padan) is to be preferred to ChronA\textsuperscript{3}

hasewan|padan on metrical grounds. In ChronB\textsuperscript{1} ChronC\textsuperscript{2} (and ChronD\textsuperscript{2}) the line is Type C-1 with resolution of the first lift; ChronA\textsuperscript{3} is a Type A-1 with a three syllable anacrusis.\textsuperscript{387}

The ChronA\textsuperscript{3} reading seems most likely the result of a misinterpretation of the nonce compound hasupadan as a strong adjective + noun. As the form is preceded by the definite article, and as a weak adjective would be expected in such a position (cf. bone sveartan hraefn in line 61b)\textsuperscript{388}, the scribe then ‘corrected’ hasu to hasewan, a weak declension accusative feminine adjective. Bately also sees the ChronA\textsuperscript{3} reading as a result of the ChronA\textsuperscript{3} scribe’s tendency towards “prosaic diction.”\textsuperscript{389}

\textsuperscript{387}For examples of similar anacrusis in later poems, see Patricia Bethel, “Anacrusis in the Psalms of the Paris Psalter,” NM 89 (1988): 33-43, esp. p. 34.

\textsuperscript{388}Campbell, Brunanburh, p. 119.

\textsuperscript{389}Bately, MS. A, p. xciii.
**Brun (ChronA³), 72b**

**ChronA³**

65 newearð wæl mare.

ón þis eiglande. æfer gieta.
folces gefylled. beforan þissū.
sworde[ng] écgm. þæs þeus segað béc
ealdeuðwitan. sīþan eastan hider.]

70 engle ȝeaxe. upbecoman.
ofer bradbrimu. brytene sohtan.
wlance wigsmiþas. wealles ofer coman.
eorlas arhwate. eard] begeatan.]

**ChronB¹**

65 newearð wælmāre.

onþys eiglande æfregyta.]
folces gefylled beforan þyssum.
swurdes ecgm. þæs þeus segað béc.
ealde úþwitan. siððan eastanhider

70 engle ȝeaxe. uppbecomon.
oferbradebrimu bretene sohton.
wlance wig smiðas. wealas ofercomon.
eorlas árhwáte eard begeaton.]

**ChronC²**

65 newearð wælmare

onþys iglande æfregyta.]
folces gefylled beforan þyssum.
swordes ecgm. þæs þeus segað béc.
ealde úþwitan. siððan eastanhider

70 engle ȝeaxe.] uppbecomon.
oferbradebrimu bretene sohton.
wlance wig smiðas. wealas ofercomon.
eorlas árhwáte eard begeaton.]

**ChronD²**

65 newearð wælmare.

onþys eiglande æfregitá.]
folces gefylled beforan þyssum.
swordes ecgm. þæs þeus segað béc.
ealde úþwitan siððan eastanhider

70 engle ȝeaxe.] uppbecomon.
oferbradebrimu britene sohton.
wlance wig smiðas. wealas ofercomon.
eorlas árhwáte eard begeaton;]

Like **ChronA³** he eardes, line 25a, **ChronA³** wealles represents either a spelling of *ea* as *eea* before lengthening groups or a reinterpretation of the proper noun *wealas* as a pronoun + noun. If **ChronA³** is not an orthographic variant, lines 65b-73 are presumably to be understood as two sentences:

Never yet in this island before this, by what books tell us, ancient sages, was a greater slaughter of a folk felled by the edge of the sword since the Angles and the Saxons, proud warriors, came hither from the east, sought out Britain over the broad seas. We, warriors eager for glory, overcame all, conquered the land. \(^{390}\)

In **ChronB¹** **ChronC²** **ChronD²** lines 65b-73 form a single sentence in which *wealas* serves as the object of *ofercoman*. The **ChronG** form is uncertain. \(^{391}\)

Metrically, **ChronB¹** **ChronC²** **ChronD²** are Type D*¹; if *wealles* is not simply an orthographic variant, the equivalent line in **ChronA³** is unmetrical and does not alliterate.

---

\(^{390}\) Adapted from Whitelock, *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, p. 70.

\(^{391}\) Wheloc reads *Wealles*, Nowell *we eallas*; see Lutz, *Die Version G*, pp. 87 and 224.
**Capture of the Five Boroughs**

**Differences of Inflection (2 examples)**

**Capt (ChronA³), 4b**

**ChronA³**

Heread mund cyning engla þeoden
mægæa mundbora myrce geode
dyre dæd fruma swa dor sceadeþ
hwitanwylles geat. **humbra ea**

5 brada brim|strēa burga fife
ligoraceaster lincylne.
śnotingahám swylce stanfordéac
deora by

**ChronB¹**

H er eadmund cing engla þeoden.
meæga mund bora myrce geode.
dyre dæfredruma swa dor sceadēþ.
hwitanwylles| geat. **hunbranèa.**

5 brada brim stream burga fife.
ligoraceaster lind kylne.
śnotingahám swylce stanfordéac.
śdeoraby

**ChronC²**

Her eadmundcing englaþéoden
mæega mundbora myrce ge eode.
dyre dædfruma swá dor sceadēþ.
hwitan wylles geat. **hunbranèa.**

5 bradabrimstream burga fife.
ligeracester lindcylne.
śnotingahám swylce stanfordéac.
śdeoraby

**ChronD²**

Her eadmund cyning| engla þeoden
meæga mund bora myrce ge eode.|
dyre dæd fruma swa dór sceadēð.
hwitan wylles| geat. **himbran ea**

5 _brada brym stream burga fife.|_
ligeraceaster lincölne.
śnotinga hám. swylce| stanford eác.
śdeoraby.

In **ChronA³ humbra** is nominative singular in apposition to *ea*, and serves – with *ea*, hwitanwylles| geat. line 4a, dor, line 3b, and *brada brim|strēa*, line 5a – as the subject of

sceadēþ, line 3b. **392 ChronB¹ humbran** (**ChronC² hunbran** **ChronD² himbran**), on the other hand, is an “appositive” or “identifying” genitive. **393** Although on the basis of an early genitive singular humbrae, Campbell classifies humbra as an ō-stem, **394** weak forms frequently occur: for example, *into humbran muðan* (**ChronC and ChronD** 1013/5) and *to humbran muðan* (**ChronE** 992/2-3).

---

**392** As Dobbie’s punctuation of lines 1-8 of *Capture of the Five Boroughs* is impossible to construe (his second “sentence,” Burga fife... and Deoraby, ll. 6b-8a doesn’t have a verb), the following is suggested. The text (except for punctuation) is as in ASPR 6.

Her Eadmund cyning, Engla þeoden,
meæga mundbora, Myrce geode,
dyre dædfruma, swa Dor sceadēþ,
Hwitanwylles| geat and Humbra ea,

5 brada brimstream, burga fife,
ligoraceaster, and Lincölne
and Snotingahám, swylce| stanford eác
and Deoraby.

**393** Mitchell, *OES* §1290.

**394** Campbell, *OEG* §587, fn.1.
Metrically, the two readings are identical.

_Capt_ (ChronA\(^3\), 8b)

**ChronA\(^3\)**

daæne wæran _ær_
under| norðmannum nyde gebægede
10 ónhæþenra hæfteclómû]
lange þræga  op hie alysde eft
forhis weorð scipe wiglgendra hlæo
afera eadweardes eadmundcyning
ónfenganlafe]

**ChronC\(^2\)**

daæne wæron _æror_.
under norðmann|. nyde gebæbed.
10 onhæþenra hæfte clomum.
lange þrage  oþhialysde eft.
for| his weorð scype wiggendra hlæo.
afora eadweardes. eadmund| cing.
H er eadmundcing...

**ChronB\(^1\)**

denum wæron _æror_.
under|norð mannum. nede gebæded.
10 onhæþenum hæfte clomum.
lange þragæ oþ hiealysde eft.
forhis weorðscipe wiggendra hlæo|
eafora eadweardes eadmund cining:|
H er eadmund cing...

**ChronD\(^2\)**

daæne wæron _æror_.
under|| norð mannun nydegebæded
10 onhæþenra hæfte clomum
lange þragæ oþ hy alysde eft|
for| his weorðscipe wigendra hlæo
afora eadweardes eadmundes cining.|
H er anlaf abræc...

While both readings make good sense and syntax, **ChronA\(^3\)** is metrically poor. In

**ChronB\(^1\)**, **ChronC\(^2\)** and **ChronD\(^2\)**, line 9b is Type A-1; **ChronA\(^3\)** can only be scanned (as Type E) only if _wæron_ is assumed to carry a half-stress.
Substitution of Stressed Words and Elements (2 examples)

Capt (ChronA³), 2a

ChronA³
Heread mund cyning engla þeoden
maga mundbora myrce geeode
dyre dæd fruma swa dór sceadeþ
dytainwylles geat. þhumbra ea
5 brada brimstræ burga fifel
ligeraceaster þlin kylne.
þnotingahá swylce stanforddéac
deora by

ChronB¹
Heread mund cyning engla þeoden.
mæcgea mund bora myrce geeode.
dyre dæd fruma swa dór sceadeþ.
dytainwylles geat. þhumbranéa.
5 brada brim stream burga fifel.
ligeraceaster þlin cylene.
þnotingahám swylce stanforddéac.
deora by

ChronC²
Her eadmundcenglaþeoden
mægþa mundbora myrce ge eode.
dyre dæd fruma swa dor sceadeþ.
dytain wylles geat. þhumbranéa.
5 bradabrimstream burga fifel.
ligeracester þlin cylene.
þnotingahám swylce stanford eac.
deora by

ChronD²
Her eadmundcengla þeoden
mægba mund bora myrce ge eode.
dyre dæd fruma swa dor sceadeþ.
dytain wylles geat. þhumbræna.
5 bradabrim stream burga fifel.
ligeraceaster þlin cylene.
þnotingahám swylce stanford eac.
deora by

The three variants in these lines, ChronA³ maga ChronB¹ mæcgea (ChronC² mægþa) and ChronD² mægba (genitive plural of mægþ, f. ‘family group, tribe, clan’) are all relatively appropriate to the poem’s immediate context, although neither ChronA³ maga mundbora ‘protector of kin’ nor ChronD² magba mund bora ‘protector of clans’ is found elsewhere in a similar collocation (ChronB¹ mæcgea mund bora [ChronC² mægba mund bora], ‘protector of men’, also occurs in Andreas, line 772a).³⁹⁵ O’Keeffe translates the ChronD² reading as “protector of maidens”, adding that “the lurid reading in D,... while offering an unusual perspective on Edmund, provokes an interesting, if unanswerable, question about scribe 2’s reading background.”³⁹⁶ Mægba ‘of maidens’ and mægba, ‘of the clans’ are metrically indistinguishable, however, and the ChronD² form can as easily be for the latter as the former form.

³⁹⁵O’Keeffe, Visible Song, p. 123.
³⁹⁶O’Keeffe, Visible Song, p. 123.
The three readings are metrically and syntactically equivalent. The ChronB\textsuperscript{1}–

ChronC\textsuperscript{2} form is also mentioned briefly below on p. 191; that in ChronD\textsuperscript{2} on p. 221.

\textit{Capt} (ChronA\textsuperscript{3}), 9b

\begin{tabular}{ll}
ChronA\textsuperscript{3} & dæne wæran ær \\
under| norðmannum nyde \textit{gebæged} & under\, norðmannů,
10 onhæþenra hæfteclommum. & nyde \textit{gebæded}.
  lange \textit{hrage} oþ hie alyysde eft & lange \textit{hrage} oþhialysde eft.
  forhis weorc scipe \textit{wiggendra hleo} & for\, his weorc scype \textit{wiggendra hleo}.
  efora eadweardes \textit{eadmundcyning} & afora ead\, weardes \textit{eadmund|cing}.
  ónt\, fenganlæfe| & \textit{hæftclomum}.
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{ll}
ChronB\textsuperscript{1} & dænum wær\, on æror. \\
under| norð\, mannum.| \textit{nede gebæded} & under\, norð\, mannum nede \textit{gebæded}.
10 onhæþenum hæfte clomum. & 10 onhæþenum hæfte clommum.
  lange \textit{hrage} oþ hie alyysde eft & lange \, hrage oþhialysde eft.
  forhis weorc\, scepe \textit{wiggendra hleo} & for\, his weorc\, scepe \textit{wiggendra hleo}.
  efora ead\, weardes \textit{eadmund|cing} & afora ead\, weardes \textit{eadmund|cing}.
  \textit{H er eadmund cining...} & \textit{Her anlaf abræc...}
\end{tabular}

Both readings are possible and have parallels in other poems, although ChronA\textsuperscript{3} is the
more unusual. O’Keeffe points out that \textit{nyde gebæded} (and accidental variants as in ChronB\textsuperscript{1})

ChronC\textsuperscript{2} ChronD\textsuperscript{2}) is relatively common in the corpus, with exact parallels in Juliana line
343b and Husband’s Message, line 40b.\textsuperscript{397} \textit{Nyde gebegde} (as in ChronA\textsuperscript{3}) is less common,
although a second collocation is found in the Metrical Psalms, \textit{nyde gebiged}, PPs 72:17.3b.\textsuperscript{398}

While the two verbs are not synonyms, the variation does not affect the general tenor
of the passage: ChronA\textsuperscript{3} \textit{nyde gebegde} ‘bowed down by necessity’, ChronB\textsuperscript{1} ChronC\textsuperscript{2}

ChronD\textsuperscript{2} \textit{nyde gebæded} (and variants) ‘afflicted by necessity’. The two readings are
metrically identical.

\textsuperscript{397} O’Keeffe, \textit{Visible Song}, p. 123.

\textsuperscript{398} Bessinger and Smith. The example from the Paris Psalter is missed by O’Keeffe, who cites only the
metrically analogous nearwe gebeged from Christ and Satan 444b (Visible Song, p. 123).
Addition/Omission of Unstressed Words and Elements (1 example)

Capt (ChronA³), 8a

ChronA³
Heread mund cyning engla þeoden
mæga mund bora myrce ge eode.
dyre dæd fruma swa dór sceadep.
hwitan wylles geat. þhumbren ea
5 brada brim strandburga fife
ligora ceaster lincylne.
þnotingahám swylce stanfordeac
deora by

ChronC²
Her eadmundcing englaþeoden
megþa mund bora myrce ge eode.
dyre dæd fruma swádor sceadep.
hwitan wylles geat. þhumbranéa.
5 bradabrimstream burga fife.
ligeraceaster lindcylne.
þnotingahám swylce stanford eac.
þdeoraby

ChronB¹
Her eadmund cing engla þeoden.
mægea mund bora myrce ge eode.
dyre dæd fruma swa dór sceadep.
hwitan wylles geat. þhumbranéa.
5 brada brím stream burga fife.
ligeræaster lincylne.
þnotingahám swylce stanford eac.
þdeoraby

ChronD²
Her eadmund cyning engla þeoden
megþa mund bora myrce ge eode.
dyre dæd fruma swa dór sceadep.
hwitan wylles geat. þhumbran ea
5 brada brym stream burga fife.
ligeræaster lincylne.
þnotingahám swylce stanford eac.
þdeoraby

The addition or omission of ð in line 8a affects sense, metre and syntax. In ChronB¹

ChronC² ChronD² þdeoraby is a Type B-1 line joined to the preceding list of place names by
the conjunction ð. For ChronA³, Lutz and O’Keeffe suggest that the scribe may have divided
swylce stanfordeac deora by between stanford and éac, and understood éac as a conjunction
‘eke, also, likewise, moreover, and’: ‘auch Stamford sowie Derby’³⁹⁹:

ChronA³

7 þnotingahám swylce stanford éac deora by

While the resultant reading is metrically defensible,⁴⁰⁰ the use of eac alone as a conjunction
introducing the last item in a list appears to be without parallel. Mitchell reports that “eac is
occasionally used initially [my emphasis] without ond in a cumulative or resumptive sense

⁴⁰⁰ O’Keeffe cites two examples of an off-verse alliterating on swylce (Visible Song, p. 124 fn. 59): the textual
defective Riddle 89, line 10: [...] swaesendum swylce þrage; and Christ 80b: þet þu in sundargiefe
swylce befenge (both texts from Krapp and Dobbie, ASPR 3). Swylce is not stressed and does not alliterate
in any of her remaining examples: Beowulf 830a, Christ and Satan 321a, Andreas 1036, and Fates of the
Apostles 16a.
‘and, ‘also, too’” but gives no examples of its appearance before the last item in the list.\textsuperscript{401}

Likewise, Bosworth and Toller give no examples of \textit{eac} being used alone as a conjunction in a list without \textit{and} or \textit{or}.\textsuperscript{402} The fact that \textit{stanford} and \textit{eac} are run together in the manuscript, moreover, also suggests that the \textbf{ChronA}\textsuperscript{3} scribe did not divide the text in this fashion: his normal practice elsewhere in the \textit{Capture of the Five Boroughs} is to mark the division between off- and on- verses with a generous space between words.

\begin{center}
\textbf{Cambridge, Corpus Christi College 173}
\textbf{Fifth Hand (ChronA\textsuperscript{5})}
\end{center}

\textit{Coronation of Edgar}

\textbf{Difference of Inflection (1 example)}

\textit{CEDg (ChronA\textsuperscript{5}), 2a}

\begin{tabular}{l}
\textbf{ChronA\textsuperscript{5}} \\
1 Her eadgarwæs englawaldend corðre \textit{mícelre} tocyninge gehalgod. || on ðere ealdan byrig acemannes ceastre. \\
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{l}
\textbf{ChronB}\textsuperscript{1} \\
1 Her eadgarwæs englawaldend corðrem\textit{ycclum} tokinge gehalgod. || onðhere ealdan byrig acemannes ceastre.||
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{l}
\textbf{ChronC}\textsuperscript{2} \\
1 Her eadgarwæs englawaldend corðre \textit{míccl}m tokinge gehalgod. || onðhere ealdan byrig acemannes ceastre.||
\end{tabular}

In \textbf{ChronA}\textsuperscript{5}, the adjective \textit{mícelre} is ostensibly feminine dative singular. In \textbf{ChronB}\textsuperscript{1}

\textbf{ChronC}\textsuperscript{2}, \textit{míccl}m is strong neuter or masculine dative singular. As \textit{cordor} “is found elsewhere only as a neuter,”\textsuperscript{403} the \textbf{ChronA}\textsuperscript{5} reading is evidence either of the decay of grammatical gender (cf. the mistakes with gender made in the slightly later \textbf{ChronD}\textsuperscript{2}, discussed below, pp. 206-208), or the result of the unconscious influence of the final -\textit{re} (misconstrued as a dative singular feminine ending) of the preceding word.\textsuperscript{404}

The variation has no effect on metre.

\textsuperscript{401}Mitchell, \textit{OES}, §1740.

\textsuperscript{402}B.-T. and B.-T.(S) s.v. \textit{eac}.

\textsuperscript{403}Dobbie, \textit{ASPR} 6, p. 150.
Substitution of Stressed Words and Elements (1 example)

_CEdg_ (ChronA⁵), 13b

ChronA⁵

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ðaagangenwæs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|      | tynhundwintra | winter 
|      |  ge teledrímes | 
|      | fræ gebyrd tide | go by, pass, possess 
|      | bremes cyninges | 
|      | leohta ñyrdes | 
|      | buton ðærtolæfe | yet 
|      | ðæs wæs winter | 
|      | ðæs gewritu secgað | 
| 15   | seofan ⁵twentig | twenty |

ChronB¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ðaagangenwæs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|      | tynhund wintra | winter 
|      |  ge teledrímes | 
|      | fram gebyrd tide | go by, pass, possess 
|      | bremes cinges | 
|      | leohta ñyrdes | 
|      | butan ðærtolæfe | yet 
|      | ðæs wæs winter | 
|      | ðæs gewritu secgað | 
| 15   | seofan ⁵XX | 

ChronC²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ðá agangen wæs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|      | tynhund| wintra | winter 
|      |  geteledrímes | 
|      | framgebyrdtide | go by, pass, possess 
|      | bremes cinges | 
|      | leohta hirdes | 
|      | butan| ðærtolæfe | yet 
|      | ðæs wæs winter | 
|      | ðæs degewritusecgað | 
| 15   | seofan ⁵XX | 

ChronA⁵ _agan_ is presumably for _āgan_, ‘to go by, pass’ or the preterite present verb _āgan_ ‘to own, possess’. _ChronB¹_ _ChronC²_ _get_ is an adverb, ‘yet’. The _ChronA⁵_ reading is non-sensical and unmetrical.⁴⁰⁵ In _ChronB¹_ _ChronC²_ the off-verse is Type B-2; _ChronA⁵_ resembles a Type-B verse with an unmetrical three syllables in the medial drop. As “_pa gen_ is of far more frequent occurrence in poetry than _pa giet,_” Bately suggests that _ChronA⁵_ _pa agan_ wæs from an “underlying ‘_pa gen wæs_’ (miscopied perhaps under the influence of ‘_pa agangen wæs_’ a few lines earlier)” may be closer to the original reading.⁴⁰⁶

---

⁴⁰⁴ The “endings” are only graphically similar: the -r- in _cordre_ is the final consonant of _cordor_.

⁴⁰⁵ Cf. Dobbie, _ASPR_ 6, p. 150.

⁴⁰⁶ Bately, _MS. A_, p. xciii.
Addition/Omission of Unstressed Words and Elements (1 example)

**CEdg (ChronA⁵), 19b**

 Chronicles⁶  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CEdg (ChronA⁵), 19b</th>
<th>CEdg (ChronA⁵), 19b</th>
<th>CEdg (ChronA⁵), 19b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>γ him ead mundes eaforahaefde.</td>
<td>γ him ead mundes eaforahaefde.</td>
<td>γ him ead mundes eaforahaefde.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nigon γ XX. nið weorcacheard.</td>
<td>nigon γ XX. nið weorcacheard.</td>
<td>nigon γ XX. nið weorcacheard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wintra onworulde. pis gewordenwæs.</td>
<td>wintra onworulde. pis gewordenwæs.</td>
<td>wintra onworulde. pis gewordenwæs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 γ þa onða</td>
<td>XXX. wæs ðeoden gehalgod :7</td>
<td>20 γ þa onða</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The omission of *pa* in ChronA⁵ implies that lines 17-19a and 19b-20 are to be read as independent clauses: ‘And the son of Edmund, brave of war-works, had spent twenty-nine winters in the world. This happened and then in the thirtieth (year) he was consecrated King’.

With the addition of *da* in ChronB¹ ChronC², lines 19b-20 are a much less strained adverbial clause modifying lines 17-19a: ‘And the son of Edmund, brave of war-works, had spent twenty-nine winters in the world when this happened; and then in the thirtieth (year) he was consecrated King’. ⁴⁰⁷

Metrically, the addition or omission adds or removes an unstressed syllable to the beginning of a Type B-1 line.

---

⁴⁰⁷ ChronB¹ On for expected Ond is an error. See below, p. 201.
Death of Edgar

Substitution of Unstressed Words and Elements (3 examples)

DEdg (ChronA⁵), 6a

**ChronA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>nemnað leoda bærn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>menn onmoldan. þæne monað gehwær</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>þæpe ær wæran.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on rim cræfte. rihte ge togene.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iulus monð.  þæse geonga gewát</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>onþone eahteðan dæg. eadgarof life.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>beorna beahgifa.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ChronB¹**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>nemnað leoda bærn.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>menn onmoldan. þæne monað gehwær.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>þæpe ær wæran.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on þysse eþel tyrf rihte getogene.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iulus monð. þære se geonga gewát.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>onþone eahtoðandæg eadgár oflife.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>beorna beahgifa.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ChronC²**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>nemnað leodabearn.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>menn onmoldan. þæne monað gehwær.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>þæpe ær wæran.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on þysse eþel tyrf rihte getogene.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iulus monð. þære se geonga gewát.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>onþone eahtoðandæg eadgár oflife.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>beorna beahgifa.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The variation has no effect on sense, metre, or syntax. *In* frequently appears in **ChronA** for *on* in the other manuscripts (although the substitution is most characteristic in the work of the first scribe in the manuscript, **ChronA¹**).⁴⁰⁸ Bately records only one example of **ChronA** *on* for *in* in the other witnesses.⁴⁰⁹

---

⁴⁰⁸ Bately, *MS. A*, pp. cxvii-cxviii; her examples, including this occurrence, are found in the following annals: 35, 455, 457, 495, 527, 552, 568, 584, 601, 626, 635, 636, 661, 709 (twice), 855, 893 and 975. See also Bately, “Compilation,” p. 114 and fn. 1 and p. 126, fn. 1.

Both readings make acceptable sense and syntax. In **ChronA**⁵, *þ* serves as an uninflected relative; in **ChronB**¹ **ChronC**², *þær* introduces an adverbial clause of time.

The two readings are metrically identical.

There may be a slight stylistic difference between the two readings. Otherwise there is no difference in syntax or metre. Similar variants can be found elsewhere in the **Chronicle**, and between **ChronA** and **ChronG**.⁴¹²

---

⁴¹⁰Mitchell, *OES* §2784. See also Bately, *MS. A*, p. cxxii, fn.356, who adds, however, that “confusion of *t* and *r* is a common error in Old English manuscripts” (implying that the **ChronB**¹ **ChronC**² reading may stem from an exemplar reading *þæt*). She gives no examples of this confusion and I have not come across any examples in my examination of the multiply attested poetry. The same variation (*þær*) occurs once more: Exeter Riddle 30a/b line 6a. See Chapter 4, p. 250.

Substitution of Stressed Words and Elements (1 example)

DEdg (ChronA⁵), 33a

ChronA⁵

30 steorra onstaðole. þone stið ferhþe. hæleð hige gleawe. hatað wide. comēta beþnaman. craeft gleawe men. wise soðboran. wæs geond| werðeode.

ChronB¹

30 steorra onstaðole. þone stið ferhþe. hæleð hige gleawe. hatað wide. comēta beþnaman. craeft gleawe menn. wise woðboran. wæs geond| werþeode.

ChronC²

30 steorra onstaðole. þone stið ferhþe. hæleð hige gleawe. hatað wide. comēta beþnaman. craeft gleawe menn. wise woðboran. wæs geond wer þeode.

Both readings are lexically, syntactically and metrically appropriate. ChronB¹

woðboran (ChronC² woð boran) ‘orators, prophets’ has parallels elsewhere in the poetic corpus⁴¹³; ChronA⁵ soðboran ‘truth-bearers’ is a hapax legomenon.⁴¹⁴ Given the graphic similarity of insular w and s, and the preponderance of lines with double alliteration in the on-verse in this passage, scribal error is a reasonable explanation for the ChronA⁵ reading.

The variant affects alliteration: in ChronB¹ ChronC², the on-verse alliterates on both lifts; in ChronA⁵, only the first lift alliterates. The two readings are otherwise metrically identical.

---

⁴¹²See Bately, MS. A, p. cxix and Lutz, Die Version G, p. clxii. Bately gives five examples of the use of wæs/wæron against wearð/wurdan, twice as a main verb: the annals 592 (Scribe 1); 975 (Scribe 5), and three times as an auxiliary: annals 633 (Scribe 1), 882 (Scribe 1), 904 (Scribe 2[b]).

⁴¹³ All examples are from the Exeter Book: sum woðbora, Christ, I. 302b; sum bīþ woðbora, Gifts of Men, I. 35b; wisne woðboran, Order of the World, I. 2a; wisum woðboran, Exeter Riddle, I. 31a; oft ic woðboran, Exeter Riddle 80, I. 9 (Bessinger and Smith).

⁴¹⁴Bately, MS. A, pp. xciii, cxvii. Dobbie, ASPR 6, p. 150.
Addition/Omission of Unstressed Words and Elements (3 examples)

**DEdg (ChronA⁵), 24a**

**ChronA⁵**

\[ þawearð eac ádræfed deormod hæleð.\]

25  oslac of earde. ofer yða gewealc.
oferganotes bað. gamolfeax hæleð.
wís word snotor ofer wætera geþring
ófer hwæles eðel. hama bereafod.

**ChronB¹**

\[ ðawearð eac ádræfed deormód hæleþ.\]

25  oslác ofearde ofer yþa gewalc.
ofer| ganotes baþ. gomolfeax hæleþ.
wís word snotor ofer| wætera geþring.
ofer hwæles eþel| hama bereafod.]

**ChronC²**

\[ þawearð eac ádræfed deormod hæleþ.\]

25  oslac of earde. ofer yþa gewalc.
oferganotes baþ. gamolfeax hæleþ.
wís word snotor ofer wætera geþring.
ofer hwæles eþel hama bereafod.]

In **ChronA⁵**, lines 24-28 follow syndetically from the preceding sentence. In **ChronB¹** and **ChronC²**, the parataxis is asyndetic.

The addition of \( \gamma \) to **ChronA⁵** adds a fifth unstressed syllable to the beginning of a Type A-3 line.

**DEdg (ChronA⁵), 29a**

**ChronB¹**

\[ þawearð eac ætywed uppe onroderum.\]

30  steorra onstaðole. þone stið ferhþe.
hæleð hige gleawe. hatað wide.
cométa benaman. cræft gleawe men.
wíse woðboran. wæs geond| werðeode.

**ChronC²**

\[ þawearð eac ætywed uppe onroderû]\n
30  steorra onstaþole| þone stiþ ferhþe.
hæleð hige gleawe| hatað wide.
cométa benaman. cræftgleawe menn.
wíse woð| boran wæs geond| werþeode.

In **ChronA⁵**, lines 29-33a follow syndetically from the preceding sentence. In **ChronB¹** and **ChronC²**, the parataxis is asyndetic.

The addition of \( \gamma \) to **ChronA** adds an additional unstressed syllable to the preliminary dip of a Type A-3 line.
The addition or omission of the sentence adverb *eac* has little effect on sense or syntax, and a slightly more significant effect on metre. Without *eac*, *ChronA* is Type A-3. With *eac*, the equivalent line in *ChronB* and *ChronC* is best scanned as Type A-1 with double alliteration and a heavy anacrusis.\(^{415}\)

---

\(^{415}\)See Dobbie, *ASPR* 6, p. 150.
Recensional Variants

Battle of Brunanburh

Substitution of Unstressed Words and Elements (1 example)

Brun (ChronB¹-ChronC²), 40b

ChronA³

swylce þær| eác sefroda. mid fleame cō,  
       onhis cyþþe norð. costontinus.|  
       hár hilde ring. hreman neþorfte.  

chronB¹ chronC²  

40 mæcan gemanan. he was| his mæga sceard.  
       freonda gefylled.  ònfolcstede.   
       beslagen| ætsæcece.  ṭhis sunu forlet.   
       ònwæl stowe.  wundun fer grunden.]  
       giungne ætguðe.  

ChronC²

swylce þær eac sefroda  midfleame cóm.  
          onhis cyþðe norð. costontínus.  
          hár hilderinc. hreman neðorftē.  

chronB¹ chronC²  

40 meca gemanan. her| was hismaga sceard.  
       freonda gefylded. onhis folcstede.  
       beslegen ætsæcece. ṭhisunu forlet  
       onwælstowe.  wundum forgrunden.]  
       geongne æt guþe.  

ChronB¹

S swylce þær eacesfróda  mid fleamecóm.  
   onhiscyþþe norð  constantínus.  
   härhilderinc  hremanneþórfte||  

chronB¹ chronC²  

40 mecea gemanan  he was his magasceard.  
       freondal gefylded  on folcstede.  
       forslegen ætsæce  ṭhisunu forlet  
       onwælstoew  wundum forgrunden.  
       geongne ætguþe  

ChronD²

swylce þæreác sefroda  midfleame com  
          onhis cyþðe norð  constantínus|  
          hal hylde rinc  hryman neþortē.  

chronB¹ chronC²  

40 ineça gelmanan  hewas his gæçasceard.  
       freonda gefylled  onfolc stede  
       beslagen ætsæcege. ṭhisunu| forlet.  
       onwælstowe  wundum forgrunden.]  
       geongne ætgæþe  

ChronA³ chronD² he is the nominative singular of the third person singular personal pronoun. ChronB¹ chronC² her is a sentence adverb, ‘here, in this place, at this point in time’. The variation affects sense and syntax, but has no effect on metre. In ChronA³ and ChronB¹, he serves as the subject of the clause he was his mæga sceard, most commonly translated ‘he was deprived of his kinsman...’.⁴¹⁶ In the equivalent lines of ChronB¹ chronC²,

⁴¹⁶Campbell, Brunanburh, p. 111. Campbell notes, however, that “the usual meaning of sceard is ‘hacked’, ‘mutilated’. It is found only here in the sense ‘deprived of’. See also Orton, “Constantine's Bereavement,” p. 246. The following paragraphs are based largely on Orton.
the subject of *wæs* is presumably *maga*, which in this case must be the nominative singular of *māga*, ‘son’: ‘here [i.e. at this point] was his son mutilated’.\(^{417}\)

Both readings are problematic. In **ChronA**\(^3\) and **ChronD**\(^2\), the use of the pronoun *he* requires a strained interpretation of *sceard*, line 40b, and *gefyllen* (**ChronD**\(^2\) *ge[fly]ld*), line 41a, as ‘deprived (of)’. As Campbell notes, neither word is found with this meaning elsewhere in the Old English corpus. For *sceard* the more usual translations are ‘hacked’, ‘notched’, ‘mutilated’; for *gefyllan*, ‘to cause to fall’, ‘to strike down’, ‘to cut down’.\(^{418}\)

In **ChronB**\(^1\) **ChronC**\(^2\) on the other hand, the inclusion of the adverb *her* and the interpretation of *maga* as ‘son’ leaves the equally problematic readings *freonda*, line 41a, *forlet*, line 42b, and, in **ChronC**\(^2\) only, *besl[egen]*, line 42a. While the substitution allows both *sceard* and *gefyllen* to be understood in their usual senses, it leaves *freonda* without an obvious word to govern it\(^{419}\) and renders **ChronC**\(^2\) *forlet* (**ChronB**\(^1\) *for|let*) and *beslagen* (the reading – with orthographic variants – of **ChronC**\(^2\), **ChronA**\(^3\) and **ChronD**\(^2\)) meaningless. As Orton notes, “a corpse can scarcely be described simply as ‘deprived’ (*beslagen*), nor as having ‘left’ (*forlet*) anyone behind on the battlefield.”\(^{420}\) In **ChronB**\(^1\), the first of these problems is solved by the substitution of prefixes, *forslegen* ‘killed’ for **ChronA**\(^3\) *beslagen* (**ChronC**\(^2\) *beslegen* **ChronB**\(^2\) *beslægen*) ‘deprived (of)’.\(^{421}\)

\(^{417}\)Orton, “Constantine’s Bereavement,” p. 249.

\(^{418}\)Campbell, *Brunanburh*, p. 111. See also Orton, “Constantine’s Bereavement,” pp. 245-247; and the entries for *sceard* and *gefyllan* II in Clark-Hall, *sceard* and *gefyllan*, -fylde (B.-T.[S] *gefillan*) in B.-T.

\(^{419}\) *Brunanburh*, line 40b is the only example of the use of the genitive with *gefyllan* (B.-T.[S] *gefillan*) in B.-T. and B.-T.(S). In a second occurrence in the poem, *ne weard wæl mare / on þis eiglande    æfer gieta / folces gefylled    beforan þissum*, ll. 65b-67, *gefylled* is a predicate adjective agreeing with the neuter, nominative singular noun *wæl*. The genitive singular *folces* immediately preceding *gefylled* is governed by *wæl* (Campbell, *Brunanburh*, p. 120). As Campbell notes, “a gen. after *wæl* in this sense is fairly frequent” (p. 120).

\(^{420}\)Orton, “Constantine’s Bereavement,” p. 247.

\(^{421}\)Orton, “Constantine’s Bereavement,” p. 248. Cf. Campbell, pp. 111-112 (who interprets the **ChronB**\(^1\) form in the relatively minor sense ‘worsted’); and see below, p. 195.
As it falls on the preliminary unstressed syllables of a Type B-line, the substitution

ChronA³ ChronD² *he* ChronB¹ ChronC² *her* has no metrical effect. Further discussion of the variation in these lines can be found on pp. 190 (ChronB¹ ChronC² *mæga* for ChronA³ ChronD² *mæga*, line 40b) and 195 (ChronB¹ *forslegen* ChronA³ *beslagen* [ChronC² *besla|gen* ChronD² *beslægen*], line 42a), below.

**Substitution of Stressed Words and Elements (2 examples)**

*Brun (ChronB¹-ChronC²), 40a*

**ChronA³**

swilce þær| eác sefroda. mid fleame cō. 
onhis cyþþe norð. costontinus.| 
hár hilde ring. hreman neðorfte. 
40 *meæcan* gemanan.

**ChronB¹**

S wylce þær eac sefródæ mid fleamecóm. 
onhis cyþþe| norð. constantinus. 
hár hilderinc hreman neðorfte. 
40 *meæca* gemanan

**ChronC²**

Swilce| þær eac sefroda midfleame cóm. 
onhis cyþþe norð. constantinus. 
hár hilderinc hreman neðorfte. 
40 *meæca* gemanan.

**ChronD²**

swylce þæreác sefroda mid fleamecom 
onhis cyþþe norð constantinus. 
hal hylde rínc hryman neðorfte. 
40 *ineæga* gelmanan

The variants in this passage are discussed above, pp. 163 ff. The reading of ChronD² is also mentioned briefly below, p. 218.
Brun (ChronB¹-ChronC²), 40b

**ChronA³**

swilce þær| eác sefroda. mid fleame cō.
onhis cyþþe norð. costontinus.|hár hilde ring. hreman nēþorfte.
40 mæcan gemanan. he wæs| his mega sceard.
freonda gefyll. onhis folcstede.
beslagen ætsæcce. ēþhis sunu forlet.
onwæl stowe. wundun fer grunden.|
giungne æt guþe.

**ChronB¹**

S wylce þær eacsefróda mid fleamecóm.
onhiscyþþe norð constantinus.
hárhilderinc hremanneþórfte|
40 ineca gemanan he wæs his magnaseceard.
freonda gefyll. on his folcstede.
forceden ætsace ofhisunu forlet.
onwæl stowe wundum forgrunden.
geongne æt guþe

**ChronC²**

swilce | hær eác sefroda midfleame cóm.
onhis cyþþe norð. costontinus.
| hár hilderinc hreman nédórfte.
40 meca gemanan. her| wæs his magnas sceard.
freonda gefyll. onhis folcstede.
beslegen ætsæce. ēþhisunu forlet
onwælstowe. wundum forgrunden.|
geongne æt guþe.

**ChronD²**

fleame com
| onhis cyþþe norð constantinus|
hal hylde rinc hreman neþórfte.
40 ineca gelmanan hewaþhis mega. sceard
freonda gefyll. onfolc stede
beslagen ætsæce. ēþhisunu forlet.
onwæl stowe wundum forgrunden.|
geongne æt guþe

In **ChronA³** and **ChronD²**, mega is the genitive plural of mæg, ‘kinsman’. The **ChronB¹ ChronC²** form is either for mega (with West-Saxon ð for æ before g + back vowel)⁴²² or the nominative singular of māga, ‘son’. The latter interpretation is the more likely on contextual grounds.⁴²³ See above, pp. 187 ff.

The two readings are metrically equivalent.

---

⁴²² Campbell, *Brunanburh*, p. 8; *OEG* §162. For further examples of variation between æ and a in the context, see **ChronB¹ cneomægum**; **ChronA³ ChronC² ChronD² cneomægum**, line 8a, and **ChronA³ legun** (ChronG lægan): **ChronB¹ ChronC² ChronD² lægon**, line 28b.

Capture of the Five Boroughs

Substitution of Stressed Words and Elements (1 example)

Capt (ChronB⁴-ChronC⁵), 2a

ChronA³
Heread mund cyning engla þeoden
  maga mundbora myrce geeode
  dyre dæd fruma swa dor sceadþ
  hwitanwylles geat. þhumbra ëa
  brada brimstræ burga fife
  ligoraceaster ðlin cilene.
  ðsnotingahãi swilce stanforddíac deora by

ChronB⁴
Her eadmundcing engla þeoden.
  meega mundbora myrce ge eode.
  dyredædfruma swádor sceadþ.
  hwitan wylles geat. þhumbranæa.
  brada brim stream burga fife.
  ligera ceaster ðlin cilene.
  ðsnotingahám swilce stanford eac.
  ðdeoraby

ChronC²
Here eadmund cyning engla þeoden.
  meega mundbora myrce | ge eode.
  dyredædfruma swádor sceadþ.
  hwitan wylles | geat. þhumbranæa.
  brada brim stream burga fife.
  ligera ceaster ðlin cilene.
  ðsnotingahám | swilce stanford eac.
  ðdeoraby

ChronD¹
Her eadmund cing engla þeoden.
  meega mund bora myrice geode.
  dyredædfruma swa dar sceadþ.
  hwitanwyllæ geat. ðhimbran ea____
  brada brim stream burga fife.
  ligera ceaster ðlin cilene.
  ðsnotingahám swilce stanford eac.
  ðdeoraby

The three readings are metrically and syntactically identical and all relatively appropriate to the poem’s immediate context. For a further discussion of all three forms, see above, p. 176. The ChronD² reading is also discussed briefly below, p. 221.
Addition/Omission of Unstressed Words and Elements (1 example)

Capt (ChronB¹-ChronC²), 7a

ChronA³

Heread mund cyning engla þeoden
mæga mundbora myrce geoeode
dyre dæd fruma swa dor sceadeþ
hwitanwylles geat. hîumbra ea
5 brada brim[streå burga fife
ligorceaster ḧlin cylene.
 sóngingahâi swylce stanfordéac
deora by

ChronB¹

Her eadmundcing engla þeoden
mæga mundbora myrce geoeode.
dyre dæd fruma swa dóor sceadeþ.
hwitanwylles geat. hûnbrau ēa
5 brada brim stream burga fife.
ligeraceaster ḧlin cylene.
snötingahám swylce stanfordéac.
deoraby

ChronC²

Her eadmundcing engla þeoden
mæga mundbora myrce geoeode.
dyre dæd fruma swa dóor sceadeþ.
hwitanwylles geat. hûnbrau ēa
5 brada brim stream burga fife.
ligeraceaster ḧlin cylene.
snötingahám swylce stanfordéac.
deoraby

ChronD²

Her eadmundcing engla þeoden
mæga mundbora myrce geoeode.
dyre dæd fruma swa dóor sceadeþ.
hwitanwylles geat. hûnbrau ēa
5 brada brim stream burga fife.
ligeraceaster ḧlin cylene.
snötingahám swylce stanfordéac.
deoraby

In ChronB¹ snotingahám (ChronC² snotingaham) is linked asyndetically to the list of towns freed by Eadmund (lines 5b-8a). In ChronA³ ChronD², 7 joins the town syndetically to the same list. Metrically, ChronA³ ChronD² is a Type B-2; in ChronB¹ ChronC² the line is a Type E.

The variation has no semantic effect

Coronation of Edgar

The variants shared by ChronB¹ ChronC² in the Coronation of Edgar and the Death of Edgar have been discussed above, pp. 179-186.

Death of Edgar

The variants shared by ChronB¹ ChronC² in the Coronation of Edgar and the Death of Edgar have been discussed above, pp. 179-186.
Battle of Brunanburh

Differences of Inflection (1 example)

Brun (ChronB¹), 70a

ChronA³

65

newearð wæl mare.
on þis eiglande. æfer gieta.
folces gefylled. beforan þissū.
sweordes|éc gum. þæs þeus segað béc
ealdeuðwitan. siþpan eastan hider.|  
70 engle |seaxe. upbecoman.
ofer bradrímu. brytene sohtan.
wランス wigsmiðas. weallæs ofer coman.
eorlas arhwate. eard| begeatan.|

ChronB¹

65

newearð wælmar..
on þys eiglande æfregyta.
folces afylled beforan þyssum.
sweorges éc gum þæs þeus sceggeh béc
ealdeuðwitan siþpan eastan hider.|  
70 engle |sexin upp becoman.
oferbrade brimu. brytene sohtan.
wランス wigsmiðas. wealas ofercoman.
eorlas arhwate. eard| begeatan.|  

ChronC²

65

newearð wælmare
on þys eiglande æfregyta.
folces gefylled beforan þyssum.
swurdes éc gum þæs þeus segað béc.
ealde uð witan siððan eastanhider.  
70 engle |sexe. upp becoman.
oferbradebrimu brytene sohton.
wランス wigsmiðas wealas ofercoman.
eorlas árhwæte eard begeatan.|

ChronD²

65

newearð wælmare.
on þys eiglande æfregitá.
folces gefylled beforan þyssum.
sweorges éc gum þæs þeus segað béc.
ealde uð witan siððan eastanhider.  
70 engle |sexe. upp becoman.
oferbrade brimu brytene sohton.
wランス wigsmiðas wealas ofercoman.
eorlas árhwæte eard begeatan.|  

The two readings are lexically, metrically and syntactically indistinguishable.

Although “names of peoples are usually strong in all the Chronicle-texts,” examples of both strong and weak endings are found.⁴²⁴ Campbell suggests that the ChronB¹ reading may be the result of the influence of other -an endings in line 69-70.⁴²⁵

⁴²⁴ Taylor, MS. B, p. xciv. Taylor cites An. 473 “where BC employ the more usual strong ending in Engle, with AE’s weak Englan” (p. xciv, fn. 155); see also Campbell, OEG § 610.7 fn.1.

⁴²⁵ Campbell, Brunanburh, p. 120.
Substitution of Unstressed Words and Elements (1 example)

*Brun* (ChronB¹), 16b

### ChronA³

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>ChronB¹</th>
<th>ChronC²</th>
<th>ChronD²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>hord ʰhám</td>
<td>hettend crungon.</td>
<td>hord ʰhams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>scotta leoda.</td>
<td>scip flotan.</td>
<td>scotta leode.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fæge feollan.</td>
<td>feld dennade.</td>
<td>fæge feollan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>secgas hwayne.</td>
<td>sīðan sunne upp.</td>
<td>secgas swate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>onmorgentid.</td>
<td>mære tungol.</td>
<td>onmorgentid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>glad ofergrundas.</td>
<td>godes candel beorht.</td>
<td>glad ofergrundas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eces drihtnes.</td>
<td>godes candel beorht.</td>
<td>eces drihtnes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sáhtōsetle.</td>
<td>sahtosetle.</td>
<td>sáhtōsetle.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As written, *ChronB¹* lines 13b-17a are non-sensical: ‘...after the sun, the glorious luminary, the bright candle of God, moved over the earth in the hours of morning *that* [so that? with the result that?] the noble creation bowed to rest’. The substitution of *þæt* for *oþ* (*þæt*) is a common feature of the *ChronB¹* text, however.⁴²⁶ The variation has no metrical effect.

---

⁴²⁶Taylor, *MS. B*, pp. lii and lvii. *þ* occurs for *oþ* or *oþ* *þ* 10 times between 755 and 937.
Substitution of Prefixes (2 examples)

Brun (ChronB\(^1\)), 42a

ChronA\(^3\)

swilce þær eac sefroda. mid fleame cò. onhiscyþu norð. costontinus.| hár hilde ring. hreman nèðorfte. 40 mæcan gemanan. he wæs| his mega sceard. freonda gefylled. ónfolcstede. beslagen òtsæce. ḳhis sunu forlet. ónwæl stowe. wundun fer grunden.| giungne ætguðe.

ChronB\(^1\)

S wylce þær eacseфрóda mid fleamecόm. onhiscyþu norð constantinus. hárhilderinc hremanнèðorfte|| 40 meca gemanan. her wæs| his magasceard. freonda gefylled. onhis folcstede. beslegen òtsæce. ḳhisunu forlet. onวลæstowe. wundum forgrunden.| geongne æтguðe.

ChronC\(^2\)

Swilce| þær eac sefróda midfleame cóm. onhis cyððe norð. constantinus. hár hilderinc. hreman nèðorfte. 40 meca gemanan. her| wæs hismaga sceard. freonda gefylled. onhis folcstede. beslegen òtсæce. ḳhissunu forlet onвлæстowe. wundum forgrunden.| geongne æт guþe.

ChronD\(^2\)

swylce þær eacseфрóda mid| fleame com onhis cyððe norð constantinus| hal hyle rínc hryman nèðorfte. 40 inecca желмáна hewa| hrismag a sceard freonda gefylled on folc stede beslegen òтсæce. ḳhissunu| forlæt. onвлæl stowe wundum forgrunden.| geongne æт guþe

The substitution ChronB\(^1\) forslægen ChronA\(^3\) beslagen (ChronC\(^2\) beslegen ChronD\(^2\) beslægen) has an important effect on sense and syntax, and is associated with the recensional substitution ChronB\(^1\) ChronC\(^2\) her ChronA\(^3\) ChronD\(^2\) he in line 40b (see above, pp. 187 and 190). At the same time, however, ChronB\(^1\) shows a strong tendency towards innovation in verbal and nominal prefixes. Taylor cites fourteen examples of the addition, omission or substitution of prefixes in ChronB\(^1\): eight in which ChronB\(^1\) has “a prefix different from that employed in the other texts”, four in which “words... have a prefix only in B”, and “two words which are without a prefix only in B.”

The variants are metrically identical.

---

\(^{427}\)Taylor, MS. B, p. xcviii.
**Brun (ChronB¹), 67a**

**ChronA³**

65 newearð wæl mare.

ón þis| eglande. æfer gieta.

folces gefyllæ. beforeig þissu.

sweordes écgum. þæs þeol saegd béc
ealdeúþwitan. siþan eastan hider.|  

70 engle þæxe. upbecoman.

ofr bradbrimu. brytene sohton.

wlance wigsmiþas. wealales ofr coman.

eorlas arhware. eard| begeatan.|  

**ChronB¹**

65 newearð wælmare.

onþys iglande æfregita.

folces gefyllæ beforan þyssum.

sweordes écgum. þæs þeol saegd béc.

ealde úþwitan. siþan eastanhider.

70 engle þæxe.| upbeccomon.

ofr bradbrimu bretene sohton.

wlance wig smiðas. wealales ofr coman.

eorlas árhwate eard begeatan.|  

**ChronC²**

65 newearð wælmare.

onþys iglande Æfregita,]

folces gefyllæ beforan þyssum.

sweorde eðum. þæs þeol saegð béc.

ealde úþwitan. siððan eastanhider.

70 engle þæse.| uppeccomon.

ofr bradbrimu bretene sohton.

wlance wigmíðas wealæ ofr coman.

eorlas árhwæte eard begeaton.

**ChronD²**

65 newearð wæl mare.

onþiseiglande æfregitá,]

folces gefyllæ beforan þyssum.

sweorde eðum. þæs þeol saegð béc.

ealde úþwitan. siððan eastanhider.

70 engle þæxe úpp beccomon.

ofr bradbrimu britene sohton.

wlance wigmíðas wealæ ofr coman.

eorlas árhwæte eard begeaton;|  

The readings are metrically, syntactically, and semantically equivalent. O’Keeffe notes that _gefyllæ_ and _afyllæ_ both occur in formulaic systems with a preceding genitive, _gefyllæ_ slightly more frequently.⁴²⁸ The two forms are metrically identical, and, while perhaps not exact synonyms, nevertheless appear both to have meant ‘destroy’, ‘cut down’.⁴²⁹

---

⁴²⁸ O’Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 121.

⁴²⁹ B.-T. _gefyllan_ - _fyldæ_ (B.-T.[S] _gefyllan_); B.-T. _afyllan_ (B.-T.[S]) _afyllan_. See also Campbell, *Brunanburh*, p. 120.
Substitution of Stressed Words and Elements (3 examples)

**Brun (ChronB\(^1\)), 4a**

**ChronA\(^3\)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Her æþel stancyning.</th>
<th>eorladryhten.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>beorna</td>
<td>bea ðgifæ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>āhipor eác.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eadmund æþeling.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ealdor langne tîr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geslogan æt secece.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sweorda éc gum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 ymbe. brunanburh.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ChronB\(^1\)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Her æþel stancyning.</th>
<th>eorladryhten.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>beorna</td>
<td>bea ðgifæ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hisbroðor eác.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eadmund æþeling.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ealdor langne tîr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geslogan æt secece.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sweorda éc gum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 embe brunanburh.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ChronC\(^2\)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heræþelstancing.</th>
<th>eorladrihten.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>beorna beahgyfa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>āhipor eác.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eadmund æþeling.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ealdor langne tîr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geslogan æt sescece.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swurda ecgum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 embebrun nanburh.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The substitution **ChronB\(^1\)** sake **ChronA\(^3\)** **ChronC\(^2\)** *sæce* (**ChronD\(^2\)** *sece*) has no effect on sense or syntax. *Sake* (dative singular of *sacu*, f. ‘conflict, strife’) and *sæce* (dative singular of the poetic *sæcc*, f. ‘strife, contest’) are homographs and approximate synonyms.\(^{430}\)

The substitution does have a metrical effect. In **ChronA\(^3\)** **ChronC\(^2\)** **ChronD\(^2\)**, *geslogan æt sæce* (and variants) is a Type A-1 verse with anacrusis; in **ChronB\(^1\)**, the line is Type B-2 with a resolved stress in the second lift.\(^{431}\)

**Brun (ChronB\(^1\)), 18a**

**ChronA\(^3\)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>þær læg secg mænig.</th>
<th>garū ageted. gума norðerna.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ofer scild scoten.</td>
<td>swilec scittisc eác.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 werig wīges sæd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ChronB\(^1\)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>þærlæg secg monig.</th>
<th>garum ageted. guman norðørne.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ofer scyldscoten</td>
<td>swylce scyttisc eác.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 werig wig ges sæd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ChronC\(^2\)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>þærlæg secg monig.</th>
<th>garum ageted. guman norðørne.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ofer scyldscoten</td>
<td>swylce scyttisc eác.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 werig wig ges sæd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both readings make sense and good syntax and are metrically identical. **ChronB\(^1\)** *garum forgrunden* belongs to a frequently attested formulaic system with a preceding dative

---

\(^{430}\)See Taylor, *MS. B*, pp. xcvii-xcviii. Taylor describes the **ChronB\(^1\)** reading as a “trivialisation.”

(Xx forgrunden).\textsuperscript{432} Agietan (the verb of ChronA\textsuperscript{3} ChronC\textsuperscript{2} and ChronD\textsuperscript{2}) although relatively rare and not found in any consistent syntactical construction, is used almost exclusively of spears.\textsuperscript{433}

\textbf{Brun (ChronB\textsuperscript{1}), 42a}

\textbf{ChronA\textsuperscript{3}}

\begin{quote}
swylce þær eác sefroda. mid fleame cóm.
onhis cyþ þe norð. costontinus. 
hár hilde ring. hreman neþórfte.
\end{quote}

\textbf{ChronC\textsuperscript{2}}

\begin{quote}
swylce þær eac sefroda mid fleame cóm. 
onhis cyð þe norð. constantinus. 
hár hilderinc. hreman neðórfte.
\end{quote}

\textbf{ChronB\textsuperscript{1}}

\begin{quote}
S wylce þær eac sefroda mid fleamecóm. 
onhis cyþ þe norð. constantinus. 
hár hilderinc. hreman neþórfte. 
\end{quote}

\textbf{ChronD\textsuperscript{2}}

\begin{quote}
swylce þær eac sefroda mid fleame com. 
onhis cyð þe norð. constantinus. 
hal hylde rinc. hryman neþórfte. 
\end{quote}

As in line 4a (see above, p. 197), the variation ChronB\textsuperscript{1} sace ChronA\textsuperscript{3} ChronC\textsuperscript{2} sæce (ChronD\textsuperscript{2} ñcgce) involves a substitution of homographic synonyms with no effect on sense or syntax. Metrically ChronA\textsuperscript{3} ChronC\textsuperscript{2} is a Type A-1 with anacrusis; ChronB\textsuperscript{1} is a Type B-2 with a resolved second stress. The ChronD\textsuperscript{2} form is discussed below, p. 214.

\textsuperscript{432}O’Keeffe, \textit{Visible Song}, pp. 121-2.

\textsuperscript{433}Campbell, \textit{Brunanburh}, p. 103. DOE ā-gītan, ‘to destroy, strike down (with a spear)’. The verb appears four times with gar (all in poetry). A fifth occurrence (without gar) in Riddle 86 is emended to agnete.
Capture of the Five Boroughs

Differences of Inflection (2 examples)

Capt (ChronB¹), 8b

ChronA³ dæne wæran ær
under norðmannum nede gebegde
10 ónhæþenra hæfteclomum
lange þrage of hie alysde eft
forhis weorð scipe wiggendra hleo
afera eadwearde eadmundcyning
ónfenganlæf

ChronC² dene wæron æror.
under norðmannu. nede gebæded.
10 onhæþenra hæfte clomnum.
lange þrage oþhialysde eft.
for his weorð scype wiggendra hleo.
afora eadwearde eadmund cyning.
Her eadmundcing...

In ChronB¹, denum is a dative of agent, functionally parallel to the prepositional phrase undernorð mannum in line 9a: ‘(They [i.e. the five towns]) were previously oppressed by hardship for a long time by the Danes, under the Northmen, in heathen bonds, until King Edmund, the son of Edward, the protector of warriors, freed them again, to his glory’. In the ChronA³ ChronC² ChronD², dene (and variants) is nominative singular and the subject of wæran (ChronC² ChronD² wæron): ‘The Danes were previously oppressed by hardship for a long time under the Northmen, in the bonds of the heathens, until King Edmund, the son of Edward, the protector of warriors, freed them again, to his glory’.

Of the two readings, that of ChronA³ ChronC² and ChronD² is to be preferred on historical grounds. As Allen Mawer argues, the ‘Danes’ in this case are the inhabitants of the
Danelaw, while the ‘northmen’ are likely to be the forces of the “Norse kings of Northumbria.”

The variation in inflection has no effect on metre.

**Capt (ChronB¹), 10a**

*ChronA³*

da̱næ wæran ær
under| norðmannum nyde gegebde
10 onhæpenra hæfteclamnum| langle þraga oþ hie alysde eft
forhis weorð scipe wig|gendra hleo
æfora ead|weardes eadmundcyning
önfenganlafe||

*ChronB¹*

denum wæron æror.
under norð mannum. | nede gebæded.
10 onhepenum hæfte clamnum.
lange þrage| oþ hialysde eft.
forhis weorðscipe wiggendra hleo| eafora eadweardes eadm|und cing;|
H er eadmund cing...  

*ChronC²*

dene wæron æror.
under norðmanni. nyde gebæded.
10 onhepenra hæfte clammum.
lange þrage oþ hialysde eft.
forhis weorð scipe wig|gendra hleo.
afora ead|weardes eadm|und cing.|
\[ Her eadmundcing...\]

*ChronD²*

dene wæron æror
under norð mannum nydegebæded
10 onheædenra hæfte clammum.
lange þrage oþ hialysde eft.
forhis weorðscipe wig|gendra hleo.
afora ead|weardes eadm|undes cying.|
\[ Her anlaf abræc...\]

In *ChronA³* *ChronC²* and *ChronD²*, *hæpenra* (and orthographic variants) is a genitive plural substantive adjective depending on *hæfteclamnum* ‘in the bonds of heathens’; in

*ChronB¹*, *hepenum* (and orthographic variants) is a dative plural adjective modifying *hæfte clamnum*, ‘in heathen bonds’.

The two readings make good sense and syntax and are metrically identical.

---

Coronation of Edgar

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

**CEdg (ChronB¹), 14b**

**ChronA⁵**

10 Ḟaagangenwæs
tynhundwintra  ge teledrímes.
frā gebyrd tide  bremes cyninges
leōhta hyrdes.  buton| ðærtō lafe Ḟa agan
wæs winter ge teles  þæs gewritu secgað.|
15 seofon Ḟ twentyg.

**ChronB¹**

10 Ḟaagangenwæs.
tynhund wintra  geteledrímes]
fram gebyṛd tide  bremes cinges.
leōthahyrdes  butan| ðærtolafe Ḟaget.
wæs wintergeteles  þæs gewritu secgad.|  
15 seofan ḞXX.

**ChronC²**

10 Ḟ há agangen wæs.
tynhund| wintra  geteled rimes.
framgebyṛdtide  bremes cinges.|  
leōhta hirdes  butanþærtolafe Ḟaget.
wæs wintergetæles|  þæs degewritusecgað.
15 seofan ḞXX.

The addition or omission of Ḟe occurs in the preliminary drop of a Type C-1 line and has no significant effect on metre, sense, or syntax. Demonstrative pronouns are found introducing relative clauses with and without Ḟe.

**CEdg (ChronB¹), 20a**

**ChronA⁵**

gienead mundes  eafora hæfde.
nigon Ḟ XX.|  nið weorca heard.
wintra onworulde.  Ḟis gewordenwæs.
20 Ḟbua onða| XXX. wæs  Ḟeoden gehalgod :7

**ChronB¹**

ḡiim eadmundes  eaforahæfde
n igen Ḟ XX.  niþweorcæheard
wintra onworlde  Ḟapís gewordenwæs.|  
20 Ḟnaon|am. Ḟrittigæfanwæs  Ḟeoden gehalgod.

**ChronC²**

ḡiimeadmundes|  eafora hæfde
n igen ḞXX.  niþweorca heard
wintra on wululde  Ḟapís gewordenwæs.
20 Ḟnuon|amþrittigæfan wæs|  Ḟeoden gehalgod.

**ChronB¹** On Ḟa is a graphic error for Ond Ḟa (as in ChronA⁵ ChronC²). The capitalisation and layout of the text in this manuscript suggest that the ChronB¹ scribe may not have understood his exemplar, especially as Miller’s analysis of the distribution of on and
*ond* in manuscripts of the Old English translation of the *Historia* suggests that (non-Anglian) scribes would change *on* to *ond* where they recognised it as the conjunction.\(^{436}\)

Taylor cites this variant as counter-evidence to his argument that *ChronC\(^2\)* had *ChronB\(^1\)* as its direct exemplar after 947.\(^{437}\)

**London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. i, Second Hand (ChronC\(^2\))**

**Battle of Brunanburh**

**Substitution of Stressed Words and Elements (2 examples)**

*Brun* (ChronC\(^2\)), 25b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>ChronA(^3)</em></th>
<th><em>ChronC(^2)</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>myrce</td>
<td>newyrndon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25  he eardes hond plegen.  hæleþa nanum</td>
<td>25  heardes hand plegen  hæleþa nanum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>þæmid anlafe.</td>
<td>þæmid anlafe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ofer æra gebland.</td>
<td>ofer æra gebland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>onlides bosme.  land gesohtun.</td>
<td>onlides bosme  land gesohtun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fæge togefæohte.</td>
<td>fæge togefæohte.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>ChronB(^1)</em></th>
<th><em>ChronD(^2)</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>myrce</td>
<td>newyrndon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25  heardes hand plegen  hæleþa nanum</td>
<td>25  heardes hand plegen  hæleþa nanum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>þæmid anlafe.</td>
<td>þæmid anlafe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ofer æra gebland.</td>
<td>ofer æra gebland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>onlides bosme  land gesohtun.</td>
<td>onlides bosme  land gesohtun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fæge togefæohte.</td>
<td>fæge to gefæhe.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The *ChronC\(^2\)* reading is the result of a minim error. It has been partially corrected in the manuscript.

\(^{436}\) Miller, *The Old English Version*, v.1, p. xxviii.

\(^{437}\) Taylor, *MS. B*, p. xlviii.
Both readings make reasonable sense, although Campbell suggests that the ChronC² reading may be a simple graphic error:

The scribe, conceivably, had O.N. *lið* in his mind, though it seldom means ‘ship,’ and is not recorded in English till 1052 (Chron., MSS. C, D, E; in the sense ‘fleet’ or ‘band’).  

As the scribe of ChronC² is himself writing in the mid-eleventh century (he is “probably” responsible for the annals 491 to 1048 in his manuscript), and as, as Campbell notes, he correctly writes *lides* in line 34a, the possibility of a (conscious or unconscious) substitution cannot be ruled out.

The variation has no effect on metre. The line is a Type C-1 line with a resolved first stress in all four manuscripts.
Addition/Omission of Unstressed Words and Elements (3 examples)

Brun (ChronC²), 20b

ChronA³
20 wes seaxe förð.| ond long nedæg. eored cistum:
onlast legdon. laþum ðeoðum.
heowan| here fleman. hindan þearle.
mecum mylen scearpan.

ChronB¹
20 west sexeforð.
andlangnedæg eored| cystum.
onlast lægdon laðum þeodum.
heowan here|flynman hindan þearle.
mecum mylcyn scearpum

ChronC²
20 wes sexe forð| andlangnedæg eored cistum.
onlast legdon laþum þeodum.
heowan here|flymon hindan þearle.
mecum mylen scearpan.

ChronD²
20 wes sexe forð.
andlangne dæg eored| cistum.
onlast lægdon laðum þeodum.
heowan heora|flyman hindan þearle.
mecum mycel scearpum.

The addition or omission of γ has a minor effect on sense and syntax. In ChronC² the sentence γ wes sexe forð... mecum mylen scearpan follows syndetically from the preceding clause. In ChronA³ ChronB¹ and ChronD² the sentences are juxtaposed asyndetically. Both constructions are acceptable Old English.

With the addition of γ, ChronC² is a Type B-2 line. In ChronA³ ChronB¹ ChronD² the line is a Type E.

Brun (ChronC²), 31b

ChronA³
fife lægun.
onþam campstede. cyninges giunge.
30 sweordu| aswefede. swilce seofene eác.
eorlas anlafes. unrim heriges.
flotan ¶sceotta.

ChronB¹
fife lagon.
onðæm camp stede| ciningas giunge.
30 sweordum aswefede. swilce vii. eac.
eorlas anlafes. unrim heriges.
flotan ¶sceotta

ChronC²
fife lagon.
onþamcampstede cingas giunge.|
30 sweordum aswefede. swilce vii. eac.
eorlas anlafes. unrim heriges.|
flotan ¶sceotta

ChronD²
fife| lagon
onþam campstede cingingas iunga
30 sweordu| aswefede swilce seofene eác.
eorlas anlafes unrim| herges
flótan. ¶sceotta

See the preceding entry. In ChronA³ ChronB¹ and ChronD² line 31b is Type A-2a.

In ChronC² it is Type A-2a with anacrusis.
**Brun (ChronC²), 41b**

**ChronA³**

swilce þær| eác sefroda. mid fleame cō.
onhis cyþþe norð. costontinus.|
hár hilde ring. hreman neþorfte.

40 mæcan gemanan. he wæs| his mega sceard.
freonda gefylled. onfolcstede.
beslagen| ætsæce. þhis sunu forlet.
ónwæl stowe. wundun fer grunden.| giungne ætguðe.

**ChronB¹**

S swylce þær eacsefróda mid fleamecóm.
onhis cyþþe norð. costontinus.|
hårhilfernc hremanneþórfte.|||

40 mece gemanan. her wæs his magasceard.
freonda gefylled. on folcstede.
forstegen ætsæce. þhis sunu forlet.
onwælstowe. wundum forgrunden.
geongne ætguðe.

**ChronC²**

swilce| þær eac sefroda midfleame cóm.
onhis cyþþe norð. costontinus.
hár hilderinc. hreman neþorfte.

40 meca gemanan. her| wæs hismaga sceard.
freonda gefylled. onhis folcstede.
beslegen ætsæce. þhisunu forlet

onwælstowe. wundum forgrunden.| geongne æt guðe.

**ChronD²**

swylce þæreác sefroda mid| fleame com
onhis cyþðe norð constantinus|
hal hylde rínç hryman neþorft.

40 inecca gelmanan hewæshis mega. sceard
freonda gefylled onfolc stede
beslegen ætæce. þhisunu forlæt.
onwæl stowe wundum forgrunden.|
geongne ætguðe

Campbell notes that “the insertion of his before folcstede by the scribe of C... suggests that he took the word here in the sense ‘dwelling’, ‘home’, and assumed the passage to imply that Constantine found himself with no kinsmen in his home.”

In **ChronA³ ChronB¹** and **ChronD²** on folcstede (and variants) refers to the battlefield at Brunanburh. As it falls on the preliminary dip of a Type C-2 line, the variation has no effect on metre.

---


441 Campbell, *Brunanburh*, p. 111.
Addition/Omission of Prefixes (1 example)

*Brun* (ChronC²), 57a

**ChronA³**

57 *swilce *|pagebroðer| | *begen æt samne.*
cying ṣæþeling.  ṣyþþe sohton.
west seaxena land.| wiges hræmige.

**ChronB¹**

57 *Swylyce *|pagebroðor* | *begen æt somne.*
cing ṣæþeling  ṣyþþe sohtan.
west|seaxenaland  wiggeshræmige.

**ChronC²**

57 *Swilce* þahbroðor  *begen æt somme.*
cing| ṣæþeling  ṣyþþe sohton.
wessexena land  wiggeshræmige.

**ChronD²**

57 *Swylce *|pagebroðor* | *begæ ætrunne*
cyning ṣeaðe|ling  ṣyðþe sohtan
west seaxna land  wiges hremige

**ChronC²** substitutes the simple noun *broðor*, 'brother' for the collective *gebroðor* (and orthographic variants), 'fellowman' in *ChronA³ ChronB¹* and *ChronD²*.⁴⁴²

The addition or omission of the prefix adds or subtracts a metrically insignificant unstressed syllable from the preliminary dip of a Type A-3 line.

*London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. iv,*

Second Hand (ChronD²)

**Battle of Brunanburh**

**Differences of Inflection (3 examples)**

*Brun* (ChronD²), 16b

**ChronA³**

16 *eces drihtnes. oð* |sio| ṣæþele gesceaft|.

**ChronB¹**

16 *eces drihtnes. ṣe*|sæþele gesceaf|t

**ChronC²**

16 *eces| drihtnes  op|sæþele gesceaf|

**ChronD²**

16 *eces drihtnes. oð| sе|æþele gesceaf.

**ChronD²** *se* is nominative singular masculine. *ChronA³ sio* (*ChronB¹ ChronC² se*) is nominative singular feminine. *Gesceaf* is normally feminine or neuter in the singular, although “a masc. pl. *ge-seaftas* occurs.”⁴⁴³ Since *æþele* can be construed as either a strong jó-or (with the confusion of unstressed vowels) a weak-declension nominative masculine singular,⁴⁴⁴ the *ChronD* reading is not necessarily a mistake.

---

⁴⁴²Campbell, *Brunanburh*, p. 117.
⁴⁴³B.-T.(S), *gesceaf*.
The substitution has no metrical effect. Similar variation in gender is found in lines 55a: ChronD^2 deopne (for ChronA^3 ChronB^1 ChronC^2 deep); and 66a: ChronD^3 pisne (for ChronA^3 pis ChronB^1 ChronC^2 pys). 445

Brun (ChronD^2), 55a

ChronA^3
55 oferdeop wæter. difel|in secan.

ChronB^1
55 oferdeopwæter| dyflensecean.

ChronC^2
55 oferdeopwæter dyflinsecan.

ChronD^2
55 oferdeopwæter| dyflensecean.

In ChronD^2, deopne is an accusative singular masculine. In ChronA^3 ChronB^1 ChronC^2, deep is neuter. Bosworth and Toller cite one example of a masculine plural wæteras (Vercelli Homily XV. 55-6 ṭonne æfter þan bioð ealle wæteras | ealle wyllas on blode), although the ending in this case may also reflect the influence of the following noun wyllas. 446

In ChronA^3 ChronB^1 and ChronC^2, line 55a is Type C-2; in ChronD^2 it is Type B-1 with a resolved second stress. Campbell gives four examples of lines metrically similar to that in ChronA^3 ChronB^1 ChronC^2 including three in the on-verse and one from the off-verse. 447 He also cites only one example from the poem of a Type B verse similar to that in ChronD^2, but notes that the form is quite common. 448

For further examples of fluctuation in gender between ChronD^2 and ChronA^3 ChronB^1 ChronC^2, see above, p. 206, below, p. 208.

445See below, pp. 207 and 208.
448Campbell, *Battle of Brunanburh*, p. 23.
In contrast to the preceding examples, in line 66a, the ChronD² reading is a clear mistake. In ChronA³ ChronB¹ ChronC² the demonstrative adjective pis/pys is a neuter instrumental singular agreeing with (e)(i)glane, a neuter dative/instrumental singular noun; in ChronD², the demonstrative adjective is masculine accusative singular.

As the variant falls on the preliminary dip of a Type C line, it has no effect on metre.

For further examples of fluctuation in gender between ChronD² and ChronA³ ChronB¹ ChronC², see the preceding two variants.

Substitution of Stressed Words and Elements (10 examples)

Brun (ChronD²), 5b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ChronA³</th>
<th>ChronB¹</th>
<th>ChronC²</th>
<th>ChronD²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bordweal clufon.</td>
<td>bordweall clufon.</td>
<td>bordweall clufon.</td>
<td>heordweal clufon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heowan heaþolinde.</td>
<td>heowan heaþolinde.</td>
<td>heowan heaþolinde.</td>
<td>heowan heaþolinde.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>afaran eadweardæs.</td>
<td>hamora lafum.</td>
<td>aforan eadweardæs.</td>
<td>hamora lafum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

O’Keeffe suggests that the ChronD² form is the result of “feature recognition” on the part of the ChronD² scribe:

At 5b and 39a in the edited text, D transmits variants which are metrically acceptable, lexically defensible and, in terms of an ‘authorial’ version of the poem, probably wrong. These variants tell us something about the careful scribe of this portion of D, and I should argue that they also tell us something about the process of reading Old English verse which had developed by the mid-eleventh century. The first of these interesting variants is in 5b, bordweal clufon. Both B and C read bordweall. A separates the free morphemes at the end of the line and reads bord/weal. D also separates the free morphemes at the end of the line but reads heord/weal. Now alliterative constraints argue that bord- is licit and heord- is not. But that does not necessarily mean that heord is simply the product of an unclear ‘b’ in the exemplar. More likely, the scribe scanned the morpheme *bord, and by a process of
feature recognition registered an ascender and an ‘rd’ combination. The more familiar form *heord*, ‘care’, ‘custody’ or ‘guard’, with various ecclesiastical overtones, then appeared.\footnote{O’Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 117}

While not impossible, O’Keeffe’s hypothesis of this variant’s origin probably gives the ChronD\textsuperscript{2} scribe too much credit – *heord\textsuperscript{d}weal* makes no sense in context and, as it removes the only alliterating letter in the off-verse, is unmetrical.

The more likely explanation involves a combination of the graphic confusion of insular *h* and *b* with a back-spelling of the late monophthongisation of Old English diphthongs. The same scribe confuses *h* and *b* once more in *Brunanburh*, producing the nonsensical ChronD\textsuperscript{2} *hlybban* for ChronA\textsuperscript{3} *hlehhun* ChronB\textsuperscript{1} ChronC\textsuperscript{2} *hlihhun*, line 47b, and similar confusions of other graphically similar letters are common through his work. The spelling of the stressed vowel *o* as *eo* may be the result of a late back-spelling reflecting the monophthongisation of diphthongs in the eleventh century.\footnote{See Campbell, *OEG* §329.2.} Similar use of digraphs for expected monophthongs in ChronD\textsuperscript{2} include: ChronD\textsuperscript{2} *here leafum* for ChronA\textsuperscript{3} *herela\textsuperscript{f}um* (ChronB\textsuperscript{1} *herela\textsuperscript{f}um* ChronC\textsuperscript{2} *here lafum*), line 47a and ChronD\textsuperscript{2} *ea\textasciitilde{e}\textlling* for ChronA\textsuperscript{3} ChronB\textsuperscript{1} ChronC\textsuperscript{2} *ae\textlling*, line 58a.

Apart from its effect on the alliteration of the line, ChronD\textsuperscript{2} *heord\textsuperscript{d}weal* is metrically identical to the ChronA\textsuperscript{3} ChronB\textsuperscript{1} ChronC\textsuperscript{2} reading.
An example of the confusion of insular s (i.e. s) and r (i.e. r) by the scribe of

**ChronD**². A second example is **ChronD**² æses corrected from æres, line 63b.⁴⁵¹

Although **ChronD**² ræd is non-sensical in context, the substitution has no significant effect on metre: in all four manuscripts, the line is Type D*4.

There are three possibilities for this variant: that **ChronD**² heora- is intended for the poetic word *heoru-* ‘sword-’ (with a for u through the confusion of unstressed back-vowels); that it is intended for the third person plural possessive adjective ‘their’; or that -eo- is a late back-spelling of -e-.

If it is for *heoru-* or a backspelling of *here*, the reading makes both sense and metre. Both *heoru* and *here* are used in compounds, and *heorulfýma* is acceptable in context.
Metrically, the two forms are identical. If it is for hira ‘their’, the ChronD² reading affects both sense and metre. Heora flyman ‘the ones fleeing them’ (?) is nonsensical, and the substitution of the unstressed pronoun for the stressed element here changes the Type D*1 line of ChronA³ ChronB¹ ChronC² to an A-1 (with alliteration on the inflected verb alone) in ChronD². As the ChronD² scribe uses hyra for ChronA³ ChronB¹ heora in line 47a (the only other occurrence of the plural third person possessive in the poem), the last possibility is the least likely.

Brun (ChronD²), 24a

ChronA³

20

wes seaxe fórð.|  
ond long nedæg. eored cystum :  
onlast legdon. laþum þeo dum.  
heowan| here fleman. hindan þearle.  
mecum mylen scearpæn.

ChronB¹

20

west sexefórð.  
andlangnedæg eored| cystum.  
onlast legdon laþum þeodum.  
heowan|lyman hindan þearle.  
mecum mylenscearpum

ChronC²

20

γ wes sexe forð  
andlangnedæg| eored cystum  
onlast legdon laþum þeodon.  
heowan|lyman hindan þearle  
mecum mylenscearpum

ChronD²

20

γ langnedæg| eored cystum.|  
onlast lægdon laþum þeodum.  
heowan|lyman hindan þearle.  
mecum mycel scearpum|

The ChronD² reading mycel scearpum ‘great-sharp (?)’ is presumably a scribal trivialisation of the nonce-compound ChronA³ mylen scearp- (ChronB¹ ChronC² mylenscearp-).⁴⁵²

⁴⁵¹See O’Keeffe, Visible Song, p. 118, fn.29; Jabbour, diss, p. 61.
⁴⁵²For a discussion of the form in ChronA³ ChronB¹ ChronC², see Campbell, Brunanburh, pp. 105-6. The variant is not discussed by O’Keeffe.
*Brun (ChronD)^2*, 35a

**ChronA^3**

35 cread cnearen | cyning utgewat.
| onfealene flod.  feorh generarode.

**ChronD^2**

35 cread cneár| onfló | cining üt géwat.
| onfealoneflód  feorh généröde.

**ChronB^1**

35 cread cnearn onflot| cing ut gewát.
| onfealone flód  feorh generarode.

**ChronD^2**

35 creat cneár onflod  ----
| ----  feorh generarode.

This “substitution” may be no more than the result of an eyeskip. **ChronD^2** is missing the next two half-lines.\(^{453}\)

*Brun (ChronD^3), 39a*

**ChronA^3**

swilce þær| eác sefroda.  mid fleame cō,  
| onhis cyþþe norð.  costontinus.|  
| hár hilde ring.  hreman neþorfte.  
40 mæcan gemanan.

**ChronB^1**

S wylce þær eacsefróda  mid fleamecóm.  
| onhiscyþþe norð.  constantinus.|  
| hár hilderinc  hremanneþórfte||
40 mæca gemanan

**ChronD^2**

Swilce| þær eac sefroda  midfleame cóm.  
| onhis cyþþe norð.  constantinus.  
| hár hilderinc.  hreman neðorfte.  
40 meca gemanan

The substitution **ChronD^2** hal **ChronA^3** **ChronB^1** **ChronC^2** hár could be the result of the graphic confusion of insular l and r or a substitution of homographs. Both readings make sense: hal is found in similar contexts meaning to survive a physical threat and might even be considered ironic.\(^{454}\) As O’Keeffe notes, however, the **ChronA^3** **ChronB^1** **ChronC^2** reading har hilderinc is a relatively common formula in Old English. It occurs perhaps four more times in the poetic corpus (*Beowulf*, 1307a, 3136a [hilderince, conjectured], *Maldon*, 169a; *An Exhortation to Christian Living*, 57a), and is “the only formula with hilderinc in the nominative singular.”\(^{455}\)

\(^{453}\)See Campbell, *Brunanburh*, p. 109, note to line 35.

\(^{454}\)See B.-T.(S), hál, II [2]; cf. *Beowulf* 1501-3a: *Grap pa togeanes, guðrinc gefeng / atolan clommum; no þy ær in gescod / halan lice*; and Daniel 270 *Hyssas hale hwurfon in þam hatan ofne*. 

\(^{455}\)O’Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 118. I do not understand the rest of O’Keeffe’s comments on this substitution: “D reads hal hylde rinc with accent over rinc. D regularly separates free morphemes so the separation of hylde and rinc is probably not significant (nor is a regular pattern discernible in the use of accents in D)."
The variation has no effect on metre.

Brun (ChronD^2), 39b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ChronA^3</th>
<th>ChronC^2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>swilce þær eac sefroda. mid fleame cōm. onhis cyþþe norð. constantinus.</td>
<td>swilce þær eac sefroda mid fleame cóm. onhis cyþþe norð. constantinus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 mœcans gemanan.</td>
<td>40 mœcans gemanan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ChronB^1</th>
<th>ChronD^2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S wylce þær eac sefroda mid fleamecóm. onhiscyþþe norð constantinus. hárhilderinc <em>hreman</em> nEPHIRFE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Campbell notes, ChronA^3 ChronB^1 ChronC^2 *hreman* could be intended for either *hrēman* ‘exult’ (all dialects) or non-West-Saxon *hrēman*, ‘lament’.\(^{456}\) ChronD^2 *hryman*, however, can only be for *hrȳman* the late West-Saxon reflex of non-West-Saxon *hrēman* ‘lament’.\(^{457}\) Presumably the scribe of ChronD^2 or, perhaps more likely, that of a more southern antecedent,\(^{458}\) misunderstood the sense of the passage and attempted to ‘translate’ a form he believed to be the non-West-Saxon *hrēman* ‘lament’ into its West-Saxon reflex.\(^{459}\)

The variation has a great effect on sense. If ChronD^2 is intended for *hrȳman*, ‘lament’, then line 39b does not seem to make sense, unless it is intended ironically: ‘he need not lament in the fellowship of kinsmen’. The two forms are metrically identical.

---

456 Campbell, Brunanburh, p. 110. *Hrēman* ‘exult’ is “connected etymologically with... O.S. *hrom*” (i.e. from Gmc. *œ*; Campbell, Brunanburh, p. 110). The i-umlaut of this is originally *e* (from *œ*) in Southern dialects, *œ* in Anglian, but later *e* in all dialects (Sievers-Brunner, §§101, 27). nWS *hrēman*/WS *hrēman* (hryman) ‘lament’ shows the characteristic distinction in the i-umlaut of *ēa* to nWS *ē* West-Saxon *iē/p* (Campbell, OEG §261).

457 See Campbell, Brunanburh, p. 110; also fn. 456, p. 213 above.

458 On the composite nature of ChronD^2, see Whitelock, Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, pp. xiv-xv.

459 See Campbell, Brunanburh, p. 110.
Brun \((\text{ChronD}^2), 42a\)

\textbf{ChronA}^3
\begin{align*}
40 & \text{he wæs} | \text{his mæga sceard.} \\
& \text{freonda gefyllæ.} \quad \text{ontholcstede.} \\
& \text{beslagenæ}s\text{e}c\text{e}. \quad \text{his sunu forlet.} \\
& \text{önwæl stowe.} \quad \text{wundun fer grunden.} \\
& \text{giungne ætguðe.}
\end{align*}

\textbf{ChronB}^1
\begin{align*}
40 & \text{her wæs his magasceard.} \\
& \text{freonda gefyllæ.} \quad \text{on folcstede.} \\
& \text{forslagenæ}s\text{a}c\text{e}. \quad \text{his sunu forlet.} \\
& \text{önwæl stowe.} \quad \text{wundum forgrunden.} \\
& \text{giungne ætguðe.}
\end{align*}

\textbf{ChronC}^2
\begin{align*}
40 & \text{her wæs hismaga sceard.} \\
& \text{freonda gefyllæ.} \quad \text{on his folcstede.} \\
& \text{beslagenæ}s\text{e}c\text{e}. \quad \text{his sunu forlet.} \\
& \text{önwæl stowe.} \quad \text{wundum forgrunden.} \\
& \text{giungne æt guðe.}
\end{align*}

\textbf{ChronD}^2
\begin{align*}
40 & \text{hewæshis mæga sceard} \\
& \text{freonda gefyllæ.} \quad \text{on folcstede.} \\
& \text{beslagenæ}s\text{e}c\text{e}. \quad \text{his sunu forlet.} \\
& \text{önwæl stowe.} \quad \text{wundum forgrunden.} \\
& \text{giungne æt guðe.}
\end{align*}

The \textbf{ChronD}^2 reading is a probable example of the back spelling of \textit{c} for \textit{cg} (compare \textbf{ChronD}^2 \textit{inecga} \textbf{ChronB} \textbf{ChronC} \textit{mec(e)a} \textbf{ChronA} \textit{mæcan}, line 40a). The other possibilities, that the form is for the first person present indicative singular of \textit{secgan}, \textit{the dative singular of secg}, ‘man’, or the nominative singular of \textit{secge} ‘speech’, do not make any sense in context.

Brun \((\text{ChronD}^2), 55b\)

\textbf{ChronA}^3
\begin{align*}
55 & \text{oferdeop wætær.} \quad \text{difeljin secan.} \\
\end{align*}

\textbf{ChronB}^1
\begin{align*}
55 & \text{oferdeopwætæ}r | \text{dyflensecean.} \\
\end{align*}

\textbf{ChronD}^2
\begin{align*}
55 & \text{oferdeopwætæ}r \quad \text{dyflig secan.} \\
\end{align*}

\textbf{ChronD}^2 \textit{dyflig} is nonsensical. As the \textbf{ChronA}^3 \textbf{ChronB}^1 \textbf{ChronC}^2 form \textit{dyflin} (and orthographic variants) is a nonce word,\textsuperscript{461} the \textbf{ChronD}^2 spelling is presumably to be understood as a scribal attempt at making sense of an unknown word by “correcting” its final syllable to \textit{-ig} to form an adjective.

\textsuperscript{460}With \textit{æ} \([e]\) for West-Saxon \textit{e} as is common in Anglian texts (Campbell \textit{OEG} §762).

\textsuperscript{461}Campbell, \textit{Brunanburh}, pp. 115-116.
Both readings are nonce compounds, metrically acceptable, and make some sense.

_Cuð_- is relatively rare as the first half of a compound, and is not found at all in poetry.\footnote{462}{Bessinger and Smith.}

Campbell cites _guðfugol_ (Exeter Riddle 24,5) as a possible parallel to the **ChronA\(^3\) ChronB\(^1\)** reading. With the exception of proper nouns (gos-, mus-, spear-, etc.) there are no examples of _hafoc_ as the second element of a compound.\footnote{463}{Campbell, _Brunanburh_, pp. 119-120.}

As both _cūð_ and _gūð_ have long vowels the substitution has no effect on the stress pattern of the line. In **ChronD\(^2\)**, line 64a has single alliteration in the on-verse. In **ChronA\(^3\)**

**ChronB\(^1\) ChronC\(^2\)**, the equivalent verse has double alliteration.
Addition/Omission of Unstressed Words and Elements (1 example)

Brun (ChronD\textsuperscript{3}), 51b

**ChronA\textsuperscript{3}**

midheora herelafú. | hliehan neþorfuntun. 
þ heo beaduweorca. beteran wurdon. 
oncamps tede. cul bod ge hna des 
garmit tinge. | gumen ge™ tes. 
waæn gewrixles. | kæs hi ón wæl felda. 
wiþead weardes. | afaran plegodan.

**ChronC\textsuperscript{2}**

midlyra here lafum | hliehan neðorfuntun. 
þi beadoweorca beteran wurdon. 
oncampsted cumbol gehnastes. 
gar mit tin ge gumena gemotes. 
waæn| gewrixles. | kæs hionwælfelda 
wið eadweardes aforan plegodon.]

**ChronB\textsuperscript{1}**

midheora herelafum | hliehan neþorfutan. 
þie beado weorca beteran wurdan. 
 oncamps tede cumbol gehnastes. 
gärminginge | gumen gemótes. 
waæn gewrixles | kæsie ònæl felda. 
wiþead weardes. | eafοran plegodan.

**ChronD\textsuperscript{2}**

mid hyra here leafum hlybban neþorf|tan. 
þet hi beadwoeorca beteran wurdon. 
on| campsted e cumbol ge hnaastes. 
går mittunge | gumena gemotes. 
waæn| gewrixles. | kæshe on wæl felda 
wiðeadweardes aforan plegodon.]

The addition or omission of *he* occurs in the preliminary drop of a Type C-1 line and has no significant effect on metre, sense or syntax.

In both manuscripts, *hæs (he)* can be understood as either a relative marker or a temporal conjunction. Although the verb, *plegodan*, l.52b, requires an accusative object, the possible antecedents for this object, *cumbol gehnastes, garmitinge, gumena gemotes, waængewrixles* (and orthographic variants) are all genitive singular. In **ChronD\textsuperscript{2}, hæs* *he* is either an example of the use of the relative marker with a demonstrative pronoun in the case required by the principal clause (a *se* *he* clause)\textsuperscript{464} or an example of *hæs he* as “a conjunction ‘when’... or ‘because’.”\textsuperscript{465} In **ChronA\textsuperscript{3} ChronB\textsuperscript{1} ChronC\textsuperscript{2}, hæs* *he* is an example either of a demonstrative adjective in the case required by the main clause being used to introduce an adjective clause with the “apparent absence of the relative marker”\textsuperscript{466} or of the temporal conjunction.\textsuperscript{467}

---

\textsuperscript{464} Mitchell, *OES* §2159.

\textsuperscript{465} Mitchell discusses this passage under the later of these two headings. See *OES* §§2302 and 2307.

\textsuperscript{466} Mitchell, *OES* § 2307. See also Campbell, *Brunanburh*, p. 113.

\textsuperscript{467} Mitchell, *OES* § 2680.
Addition/Omission of Prefixes (1 example)

*Brun (ChronD)^2*, 28a

ChronA^3

| 25 | he eardes hond plegen. hæleþa nanum þæmid anlafe. ofer æra gebland. onlides bosme. land gesohtun. fæge to gefeohte. |

ChronB^1

| 25 | heardes hand plegen hæleþa namu. þæraidemid anlafe ofer ear gebland. onlides bosme land gesohtan. fægeto gefeohte. |

ChronC^2

| 25 | heardes hand plegen hæleþa namu. þæraidemid anlafe ofer ear gebland. onlides bosme land gesohtan. fæge to gefeohte. |

ChronD^2

| 25 | heardes hand plegen hæleþa nanum. þæraidemid anlafe ofer ear gebland. onlides bosme land gesohtan. fæge to feohte. |

Both readings are metrically and semantically acceptable. As *gefeohte* is far more common in the poetry, however, the *ChronD^2* form may also be the result of eyeskip (*fæge to gefeohte* > *fage to feohte*).

The pattern *X(x) to gefeohte* (as in *ChronA^3 ChronB^1 ChronC^2*) is found five other times in the poetic corpus: *feðan to gefeohte*, *Andreas*, line 1188a; *folc to gefeohte*, *Andreas*, line 1196a; *fysan to gefeohte*, *Judith*, line 202a; and *frean to gefeohte*, *Maldon*, line 12a.⁴⁶⁸

*Feohte* is found twice, but never in the pattern *X(x) to feohte*: *wearð him seo feohte to grim*, *Vainglory*, line 66b; and *Þa wæs feohte neh*, *Maldon*, line 103b.⁴⁶⁹

As the variant falls on the medial dip of a Type A line it has no effect on metre.

---

⁴⁶⁸ Bessinger and Smith.
⁴⁶⁹ Bessinger and Smith.
Reinterpretation of Existing Text (4 examples)

Brun (ChronD²), 40a

ChronA³

swilce þær eac sefroda. mid fleame cō.
onhis cyþþe norð. costontinus.| hár hilde ring. hreman neþorfte.
40 mecan gemanæn. he wæs his mæga sceard.
freonda gefylled. onhis folcstede.
beslagen æþæcece. þis sunu forlet.
órøel stowe. wundun fer grunden.| giungne ætguðe.

ChronB¹

swylce þær eacsefróda. mid fleamecóm.
onhis cyþþe norð. constantinus.
hár hilderinc. hreman neþórfte.
40 mece gemanæn. her wæs his mæga sceard.
freonda gefylled. onhis folcstede.
beslagen æþæcece. þis sunu forlet.
onwæl stowe. wundun forgrunden.| geongne ætguðe.

ChronC²

Swilce þær eac sefroda. mid fleamecóm.
onhis cyþþe norð. constantinus.
hár hilderinc. hreman neþórfte.
40 meca gemanæn. her wæs his mæga sceard.
freonda gefylled. onhis folcstede.
beslagen æþæcece. þis sunu forlet.
onwæl stowe. wundun forgrunden.| geongne ætguðe.

ChronD²

swylce þær eacsefróda. mid fleamecóm.
onhis cyþþe norð. constantinus.
hár hilderinc. hreman neþórfte.
40 mece gemanæn. her wæs his mæga sceard.
freonda gefylled. onhis folcstede.
beslagen æþæcece. þis sunu forlet.
onwæl stowe. wundun forgrunden.| geongne ætguðe

ChronD² inecega⁴⁷⁰ may be the result either of a minim error (for meca) or a substitution and reinterpretation of an exemplar in meca (as in ChronB¹ ChronC²). The similarity of sense between the ChronD² and ChronB¹ ChronC² forms provides a strong argument in favour of an antecedent in meca. See above, pp. 163 and 189.

⁴⁷⁰In his notes and diplomatic transcription, Campbell gives the ChronD² form as meca, adding “the m might be read as in” (Brunanburh, p. 88, fn.1) There is a clear gap between the first and second minim in facsimile, however. See above fn. 365.
**Brun (ChronD²), 46a**

ChronA³  
45 beorn blandenfax. billgeslēhtes.  
eald inwīdda. ne anlāfþýma.

ChronB¹  
45 beorn blandenfax. bill geslyhtes.  
eald inwīttæ ne anlauf þêma.

ChronD²  
45 beorn blandenfax. bill geslyhtes.  
eald inwūda ne anlauf þêma.

ChronD² inwūda for ChronA³ inwīdda. ChronB¹ ChronC² inwītta appears to reflect a reinterpretation of inwīdda (-wītta) ‘adversary’ as a prepositional phrase inwūda ‘in the woods’, perhaps through a minim error -ud- for -itt-.

Although it is nonsensical as written,⁴⁷¹ the ChronD² form is metrical. With inwīttalinwīdda the ChronA³ ChronB¹ ChronC² form is a Type D-1; with inwūda, the ChronB² line is Type A-4 with a short second lift.

**Brun (ChronD²), 53b**

ChronA³  
gewitan him þa norðmen. negled cneārrū| dreorig daraðalaf. ondyngesmere.  
55 oferdeop wæter. difel|in secan.  
‘eft hira land. æwiscmode.

ChronB¹  
Gewitan himþa norðmenn negled cneārrum  
dreorig darðalaf ondyngesmere.  
55 oferdeopwæter dyflensecan.  
eft yraland æwiscmóde.

ChronD²  
Gewiton hymþa norðmenn. negledcneārrum  
dreoridare|balaf ondinges mere.  
55 oferdeopwæter dyflinsecan.  
eft yraland æwiscmóde.

As Campbell suggests, the variation ChronD² deug gled ongarum for ChronA³ negled cneārrū (ChronB nægled cnear|rum ChronC negledcneārrum) is almost certainly to be attributed to the ChronD² scribe’s failure to understand the “unfamiliar second element of the compound,” -cneārrum.⁴⁷² Basing his emendation on the frame -æ-gled-rum, the scribe has produced forms which, while making some sense perhaps in relation to each other (‘day flame

---

⁴⁷¹See Campbell, Brunanburh, p. 112; also O’Keeffe, Visible Song, p. 30.
[glæd, f.] on spears’ or ‘shining [gled for glæd, adj.] day on spears’), are non-sensical and non-metrical in context.

In ChronD², the substitution destroys the alliteration and produces a line resembling a Type D with three full lifts. In ChronA³ ChronB¹ ChronC², the line is Type A-1.

Brun (ChronD²), 60b

ChronA³
60  letan him behindan. hrá Bryitian. salu wigpadan. þone sweartan hrafen. hyrned nebban. þanheasawanpadan. earn æftan hwit. æses brucan. grædigne guð hafož. þæt græge deor. 65  wulf ónwealde.

ChronB¹
60  letan him behindan. hrá Brytígean. salowig pádan. þone sweartan hrafen. hyrned| nebban. þone hasopadan. earn æftan hwit. æses brucan.| grædigne guðhafoç. þæt grægedeor. 65  wulfonwealde.

ChronC²
60  leton hymbehindon. hrá Brittigan. salowig padan. þoneswear|tan hrafen. hyrned nebban. þonehasu padan. earn æftan| hwit. æses brucan. grædigne guðhafoç. þæt grægedeor. 65  wulf| onwealde.

ChronD²
60  leton him behindan. hrá Brytinga. salowig padan. þone sweartan hrafen. hynnet nebban. þone| hasu wadan. earn æftan hwit. æres brucan. græ|||digne cuð hafoç. þætgrægedeor. 65  wulfonwealde

The ChronD² form – and oblique form of an abstract noun ‘dispensing’⁴⁷³ – makes no sense in context.

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

Brun (ChronD²), 35a

ChronA³
35  cread cnearan flot| cyning utgewat. ónfealene flod. feorh generede.

ChronB¹
35  cread cnearen onflot| cing ut gewát. onfealone flod. feorh generede.

ChronC²
35  cread cneear|ónflot| cining út géwat. onfealone flod. feorh génér ode.

ChronD²
35  cread cneár onflod| ---- feorh generode.

The ChronD² reading is the result of eyeskip flot > flod. See above, p. 212.

⁴⁷²Campbell, Brunanburh, p. 114.

⁴⁷³The declension of abstract nouns in -ung (-ing) is discussed in Campbell, OEG, § 589.8.
Capture of the Five Boroughs

Differences of Inflection (1 example)

Capt (ChronD²), 13b

ChronA³

wæræn ær
under| norðmannum nyde gebegde
10 ónhæþenra hæfteclomum
lange þrage oþ hie alysde eft
forhis weorð scipe wiggendra hleo
afora eadweardes eadmundcyning
ónfenganlaf||

ChronB¹
denum wæræn æror.
dernorð mannum. nede gebæded.
10 onhæþenum hæfte clamnum.
lange þrage oþ hiealysde eft.
forhis weorðscipe wiggendra hleo|
eafora eadweardes eadmund cyning:|
H er eadmund cing...

ChronC²
dene wæræn æror.
der norðmannū. nyde gebæded.
10 onhæþenra hæfte clamnum.
lange þrage oþhialysde eft.
for his weorð scipe wiggendra hleo.
afora eadweardes eadmund cing.
Her eadmundcing...

In ChronD² eadmundes is genitive singular. In ChronA³ ChronB¹ ChronC² eadmund is nominative singular. The context requires the nominative.

The variants also have a significant metrical effect. In ChronA³ ChronB¹ ChronC² the line is Type A-4 with a short final stress. In ChronD² it is Type E with a resolved final stress.

Substitution of Stressed Words and Elements (2 examples)

Capt (ChronD²), 2a

ChronA³

1 Heread mund cyning engla þeoden
mæga mundbora myrce geode
dyre dæd fruma| swa dor sceadeþ

ChronB¹

1 H er eadmund cing engla þeoden.
mæcega mund bora myrce| ge eode.
dyre dædfruma swa dor sceadeþ.

ChronC²

1 Her eadmundceng englaþeoden
mægga mundbora myrce| ge eode.
dyre dædfruma swador sceadeþ.

ChronD²

1 Her eadmund cing engla þeoden
mægha mund bora myrce ge eode.|
dyre dæd fruma swa dor sceadeþ.

The three readings are metrically and syntactically identical and all relatively appropriate to the poem’s immediate context. For a further discussion of all three forms, see above, p. 176. The ChronB¹ ChronC² reading is also discussed briefly above, p. 191.
Capt (ChronD\textsuperscript{2}), 5b

ChronA\textsuperscript{3}

Heread mund cyning engla þeoden
mæga mundbora  myrece geeode
dyre dæd frumal  swa dor scadeþ
hwitanwylles geat.  þhumbra ða
5  brada brim\textsuperscript{str}a  burga \textit{fife}
ligoraceaster  þlin cylene.

ChronC\textsuperscript{2}

Her eadmundcing englaþéoden
mæga mundbora  myerce ge eode.
dyre dædfruma  swádor sceadeþ.
hwitan wylles geat.  þhumbrañéa.
5  bradabrim\hbox{stream}  burga \textit{fife}.
ligoracester  þlin cylene.
snotingaham.  swylce stanford\textit{éac}
deora by

ChronB\textsuperscript{1}

H er eadmund cing engla þeoden.
mægea mund bora  myrece| geeode.
dyre dædfruma  swa dór sceadeþ.
hwitanwylles| geat.  þhumbraða.
5  brada brim\textsuperscript{stream}  burga \textit{fife}.
ligoraceaster  þlin cylene.

ChronD\textsuperscript{2}

Heread mund cyning engla þeoden
mæga mundbora  myerce| ge eode.
dyre dædfruma  swádor sceadeþ.
hwitan wylles geat.|  þhumbraæa.
5  bradabrim\textsuperscript{stream}  burga \textit{fife}.
ligoracester  þlin cylene.
snotingaham.  swylce stanford\textit{éac}.

The scribe of ChronD\textsuperscript{2} appears to have misunderstood his text. In ChronA\textsuperscript{3} ChronB\textsuperscript{1}

ChronC\textsuperscript{2}, \textit{burga fife} (and orthographic variants) is an accusative phrase syntactically parallel to the subsequent town names.\textsuperscript{474} In ChronD, the scribe seems to have read \textit{gife} (for \textit{gifu}) as a variant expression referring to the river and appositive to \textit{humbra ea} and \textit{brada brim\textsuperscript{stream}}: ‘gift of the towns’. The substitution has a metrical effect: in ChronA\textsuperscript{3} ChronB\textsuperscript{1} ChronC\textsuperscript{2}, the line is a Type A-1 with a long vowel in the second lift; ChronD\textsuperscript{2}, to the extent that it is metrical, is a Type A-4 (with a short second lift).

Conclusion

With the exception of a single late witness to the eorðan-recension of “Cædmon’s Hymn,” the seven poems discussed in this chapter survive exclusively as fixed constituents of larger prose framing texts. The Metrical Preface and Epilogue to the Old English translation of the \textit{Pastoral Care} are always found at the same places in manuscripts of the \textit{Pastoral Care},

\textsuperscript{474}For the punctuation of this passage, see p. 174, fn. 392, above. On the inflection of -\textit{ceaster} in place names, see Campbell §589.4, fn.3.
copies of the *Chronicle*-poems are always found at the same places in manuscripts of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, and – with the exception of To – copies of the *eorðan*-recension of “Cædmon’s Hymn” are always found at the same place in the Old English translation of Bede’s *Historia ecclesiastica*.

Despite this common contextual position, however, these “Fixed Context” poems show no generically consistent amount or type of substantive variation. At their most conservative, the witnesses to the Fixed Context poems can vary as little as the least variable of the Glossing poems discussed in Chapter Two; at their most innovative, the scribes responsible for copying these poems show themselves to be perfectly willing to make quite significant changes in their received text – substituting stressed and unstressed words, adding or omitting prefixes, making minor changes in inflection, and, in cases where they appear to have found their text obscure, reinterpretting difficult or poetic vocabulary.

As we have seen in the course of this chapter, the first of these two facts helps explain the second. With one exception, the verse performance of the scribes responsible for copying the Fixed Context poetry has been directly comparable with that of their prose. The most innovative scribes of the Fixed Context poems have been also almost invariably the most innovative scribes of the vernacular prose frames with which these poems are copied; the most conservative scribes of the prose frames have been also responsible for the most conservative copies of their constituent verse. Moreover, the types of textual variation the more innovative of these scribes introduce is in all but one case approximately the same in both prose and verse. The scribe of the B₁ version of “Cædmon’s Hymn,” for example, is as willing to change the vocabulary of his prose as his verse; the graphic errors and misinterpretations which characterise the ChronD² copies of the *Battle of Brunanburh* and *Capture of the Five Boroughs* are equally characteristic of the surrounding prose.
This suggests two things about the way these poems were copied. In the first place, the fact that the majority of scribes responsible for copying these poems introduce similar types and amounts of variation into their prose and verse suggests that the variation itself is not necessarily “poetic” – let alone evidence of the survival of pre-literate methods of composing or understanding traditional poetry. In the second place, the fact that the most (or least) variable witnesses to the Fixed Context texts fail to fall into any single chronological period suggests that the urge to vary is less a function of a single technological or cultural process – be that “transitional literacy,” “memorial transmission,” or pure sloppiness – than the result of specific scribal intentions, habits, or abilities.

Chapter Four looks at the third group of Old English verse texts: the “Anthologised and Excerpted” poems. Like the Glossing, Translating, and Occasional poems discussed in Chapter two, these poems show a generically consistent pattern of substantive textual variation – albeit one that allows far more and far more significant variation than anything we have seen thus far. Like the Fixed Context poems, the specific types of innovation a given witness exhibits often can be linked to the demonstrable interests of the scribe responsible for first collecting, anthologising, or excerpting the text in the relevant context.
Chapter 4
Anthologised and Excerpted Poems

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

The poems we have discussed thus far have all had two things in common. In the first place, all have belonged to what Elliott Van Kirk Dobbie has called the “Anglo-Saxon Minor Poems,” a group of verse texts “most of them short, which are scattered here and there in manuscripts not primarily devoted to Anglo-Saxon poetry.”

Although they make up the greater part of the corpus of multiply attested Old English verse, these poems are a decided minority in the corpus of Old English poetry as a whole, the greatest part of which survives in unique copies in one or another of four principal anthologies: the Exeter Book, Junius Manuscript, Vercelli Book, and Beowulf Manuscript.

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

475 Dobbie, “Preface,” ASPR 6, p. v. While not all the poems discussed in Chapters 2 and 3 are found in this volume of the ASPR, all fit the definition. The metrical portions of the Paris Psalter are edited in ASPR 5: The Paris Psalter and the Metres of Boethius.
in certain witnesses to the *eorðan*-recension of “Cædmon’s Hymn” and the early *Chronicle* poems, the variation these texts have exhibited almost never has been such as to suggest the existence of a coherent scribal interpretation. While a few of the variants we have seen have had important implications for our understanding of the passages in which they occur, only two – both involving relatively insignificant changes in the endings of adjective and noun pairs\(^\text{476}\) – have required the scribe to make semantically, syntactically, or metrically coordinated changes to more than one element in his text. Thus, the addition or omission of *we* in the first line of the West-Saxon *eorðan*-recension of “Cædmon’s Hymn,” while it exerts a fundamental influence on our interpretation of the syntax of the poem’s opening lines, nevertheless requires the scribes responsible for copying the text to do no more than add or omit a single unstressed element in the first half-line. The remaining “differences” all involve the interpretation of grammatically ambiguous but graphically identical forms found in all versions of the text\(^\text{477}\):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{T}_1: \quad & \text{Nu sculon herigean} \quad \text{heofonrícæ weard} \\
& \quad \text{meotudes meaht} \quad \text{þhis modgeþanc} \\
& \quad \text{weorc wuldor fæder}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{B}_1: \quad & \text{Nuweherigan sculon} \quad \text{heofonrícæ weard} \\
& \quad \text{metodes miht} \quad \text{þhismod geþanc} \\
& \quad \text{weorc wuldor godes}
\end{align*}
\]

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

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

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

\(^{476}\)These variants are discussed above, Chapter 2, p. 66, and Chapter 3, p. 161.

\(^{477}\)This variant is discussed above, Chapter 3, p. 133.
compilation: the Exeter Book in the case of Riddle 30a and b, Riddle 35, *Soul and Body* I and *Azarias*; the Vercelli Book in that of *Soul and Body* II and the *Dream of the Rood*; the Junius Manuscript in the case of *Daniel*; and, in the case of *Solomon and Saturn* I, a now fragmentary collection of verse and prose dialogues between the two main characters, Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 422. Moreover, all six poems show a substantive textual variation that is both more frequent and more significant than that found among the witnesses to the minor poems. With forty-three substantive variants in 127 copied lines in two witnesses, for example, the least variable of these “Anthologised and Excerpted” texts, *Solomon and Saturn* I, varies approximately 7% more frequently than the most variable of the minor poems, the West-Saxon *eordan*-recension of “Cædmon’s Hymn” (fifteen variants in 54 copied lines in six witnesses).

In addition, the Anthologised and Excerpted texts also exhibit a variation that is more significant than and often of a type rarely if ever found in the minor poems: syntactically significant differences of inflection, substitutions of graphically and lexically dissimilar words and elements, variation in word order, and variants involving the addition, omission, substitution, or rearrangement of entire lines and half-lines.

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

---

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

479 The differences can also involve relatively insignificant variation as well. For example, all Anthologised and Excerpted poems except the *Dream of the Rood*/Ruthwell Cross Inscription exhibit variants in which a prepositional phrase in one witness is replaced by a bare case ending in the other. These rarely have any significant effect on sense or syntax, but are found only twice in the minor poems discussed above: Ps 89:18.1a, “Gloria I,” 23b. See above, Chapter 2, pp. 62 and 69.
syntactical forms. In others, it involves the adaptation of the text to its surrounding material or physical context. Its most obvious manifestation, however, is to be seen in the greater frequency and significance of grammatically, syntactically, or metrically coordinated (“linked”) variants. All Anthologised and Excerpted texts with the exception of Exeter Riddle 30a/b and the common text of the Dream of the Rood/Ruthwell Cross Inscription exhibit such linked variants, many of which involve changes to such interpretively important features as number, person, tense or mood.

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

Azarias (Exeter Book [E])

wēðæs lifgende
worhton inwōrulde  eacþon wom dydon.
yldran usse  inofēr hygdū[ řīnbibodu bræcon  burg sit tende
had ofer hogedon[ halgan lifes
wurdon wēto wrecene  geond wīdne grund| heapum toworfne  hylda lease
wes ure lif  geond lonða fela  frācūð  gefræge  fold buendū
nubu usic belwrecce  inþas wyrrestan
eorð cyninges  æht gewealda
in hēft heoro grimmes  sceolon weþer hēþenra  þrēa nyr || [strip of c. 4 ll. missing from MS]

Daniel (Junius Manuscript [J])

295 wēðæs lifgende.
worhton onwōrulde.  eac þōn wōm dyde.
user yldrōn.  for oferhīgydum.
bracon bebodo.  burhsīntendū]
had ofer hogedon.  halgan lifes.

300 siendon [w] towrecene.  geond wīdne grund.
heapum tohōrwīfene.  hylde lease.
is user lif.  geond landafela.]
frācōd  gefræge.  folca manegum.
haus ec| bewreccon.  toþæs wyrrestan.

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

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

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

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

The only other scholar to recognise the existence of a systematic distinction in the
amount and nature of the textual variation shown by different types of multiply attested poems
is Alan Albert Jabbour. Writing in an undeservedly ignored 1969 Duke dissertation and
summarising his results in a slightly better known article from the *Chaucer Review*, Jabbour used differences similar to those discussed above in the type and amount of the textual variation exhibited by the multiply attested poems to divide the corpus into two main groups: a “control” group consisting of poems which he believed “can be said with certainty to be scribbally transmitted,” and a second group – the definition of which formed the focus of his dissertation – of which the substantive variation contrasted “so strikingly with the variants of the control group, both in frequency and in type, that memorial transmission at some stage of the line of descent seems the best explanation.”

To his “control” group belonged all the poems discussed in Chapters Two and Three with the exception of certain witnesses to the *eordan*-recension of “Cædmon’s Hymn”; to his memorial group belonged *Soul and Body* I and II, the common text of *Daniel* and *Azarias*, and, less certainly, the *Dream of the Rood/Ruthwell Cross Inscription, Exeter Riddle 30a/b, Exeter Riddle 35/the Leiden Riddle,* and a number of other, metrically irregular, poems not discussed in this study. *Solomon and Saturn,* which varies less frequently than the members of Jabbour’s core “memorial texts” but more frequently and significantly than those of his “control” group, remained unclassified.

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

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

487O’Keeffe, Visible Song, pp. 35-36.
onhæbbe (for expected West-Saxon onhebbe) in the case of Riddle 30, line 7a, and the nonsense words dream and dry (for expected dreor) in that of Solomon and Saturn, line 44a.

For the third, Soul and Body I and II, however, the evidence is more plentiful. As P. R. Orton and Douglas Moffat have argued, the witnesses to this poem exhibit many common errors, unusual forms and metrically suspicious lines, including the nonsensical forms drugu and druh for the expected druge in line 17a; an unusual example of an apparently unstressed eft before the alliterating syllable in line 62b (Exeter Book [E]) and 67b (Vercelli Book [V]): E jeft sona fromde V jeft sona fram pe; and a probably common substitution of acen(ne)da ‘the begotten one’ for ancen(ne)da ‘the only begotten one’ in E 48a/V 51a.

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

489 Robert J. Menner, ed., The Poetical Dialogues of Solomon and Saturn, Monograph Series 13 (New York: MLA, 1941), p. 3. As Menner notes, “the evidence of the spelling appears to confirm the view that neither manuscript was copied from the original.”
producing substantively accurate copies of their exemplars, highly innovative but undoubtedly scribal versions of poems like the Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 41 (B₁) witness to the West-Saxon *eordan*-recension of “Cædmon’s Hymn” and the London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. vi (ChronB) versions of the *Battle of Brunanburh* and *Capture of the Five Boroughs*, demonstrate that other scribes were willing to introduce much greater substantive variation.

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

---

493 Moffat, “MS Transmission”, pp. 300-301. As Moffat points out, E is later corrected to acenda.

494 Jabbour tentatively includes the B₁ text of “Cædmon’s Hymn” with the memorial poems, apparently under the impression that the poem appears in the manuscript’s margins (diss., pp. 199-200). In fact, the B₁ recension of Hymn is part of the main-text of this manuscript – a copy of the Old English translation of the *Historia* – and is certainly copied from a written exemplar. See also Chapter 3, pp. 116 ff. above.

495 See above, Chapter 3, pp. 150 ff., 187-201.
poems discussed in Chapters Two and Three can be described as being primarily a technical problem, among the Anthologised and Excerpted poems, this variation becomes a poetical art.

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

---

496 For a discussion of the omission of these poems from these witnesses to the *Chronicle*, see Dobbie, *ASPR* 6, p. xxxvi; also Dorothy Whitelock, ed., *English Historical Documents: c. 500-1042* (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1955), pp. xii-xiv.
more decisive action with these poems, extracting them for inclusion in another collection, for
example, or replacing the poem in their exemplars with a different text on a similar subject.
Indeed, the closest we get to exceptions to this help prove the rule. While the scribe of the
West-Saxon eorðan-text of “Cædmon’s Hymn” in Tournai, Bibliothèque de la Ville, 134 (To)
is unique among his colleagues in that he copies the poem outside of its usual position in the
main text of the Old English translation of Bede’s Historia ecclesiastica, his ‘innovation’
involves nothing more than moving the poem to the margins of a Latin version of Bede’s
text\textsuperscript{497} – an already well-established context for copies of the vernacular Hymn. Likewise,
while the scribe of the eorðan-recension “Cædmon’s Hymn” in Oxford, Corpus Christi
College, 279 (O) appears to have tried to rewrite his text so as to make it more like the
marginal ylda-recension, he does so only by correction and after first copying a relatively
conservative version of the text found in his exemplar.\textsuperscript{498}

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

\textsuperscript{497}See above, Chapter 3, pp. 112 ff.
\textsuperscript{498}See above, Chapter 3, pp. 115 ff.
\textsuperscript{499}It is unimportant whether this was the Vercelli scribe himself or that of some earlier collection used by the
scribe of the surviving manuscript. See below, pp. 287-291.
of the letters of the *Pater noster* by placing it among his collection of charms and loricas, the scribe who copied the complete text of the poem as the first of the prose and verse dialogues between the two characters collected in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 422 appears to have been attracted to the text on primarily generic grounds.

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

---


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

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

503 See above, Chapter 2, pp. 72 ff.
as an integral part of two otherwise apparently unrelated biblical narratives.\textsuperscript{504} The text of *Soul and Body* appears in the Exeter Book as an apparently complete poem, and in the Vercelli Book as the first part of what seems to have been intended as a two-part dialogue between the Soul and the Blessed and Damned Bodies.\textsuperscript{505}

Above all, however, the variation these poems exhibit often can be tied to differences in the contexts in which their witnesses are found. Where the substantive variation exhibited by the minor poems rarely lent itself to any explanation other than the incompetence, misapprehension, or personal preference of the scribe responsible for its introduction, the substantive variation exhibited by the witnesses to the Anthologised and Excerpted poems often can be shown to be related to differences in the contextual circumstances in which each copy is found. At first glance, for example, the textual variation between Exeter Riddle 35 (E) and the Leiden Riddle (Leid) seems fairly similar to that found between the Northumbrian *aeldu*-recension of “Cædmon’s Hymn” in Cambridge, University Library, Kk. 5. 16 (M) and the most innovative version of the West-Saxon *eorðan*-recension in the main text of Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 41 (B₁). Both sets of witnesses are separated by similar differences in geography, dialect and codicological position, and both sets of witnesses exhibit a relatively large number of substantive variants. Like the M text of “Cædmon’s Hymn,” the Leid text of Riddle 35 is Northumbrian, early, and found on the last page of a Latin manuscript containing the text it translates. Like the B₁ version of “Cædmon’s Hymn,” the E text of Riddle 35 is late West-Saxon and part of the main text of a vernacular manuscript.\textsuperscript{506}

\textsuperscript{504}See below, pp. 359-362.

\textsuperscript{505}Moffat, *Soul and Body*, pp. 41-44; Orton, “Disunity in the Vercelli Book *Soul and Body,*” *Neoph* 63 (1979): 42-44.

\textsuperscript{506}For a discussion of the contexts in which these texts are found, see above, pp. 49-52, 116-120, and below pp. 255-257.
Despite these similarities, however, the two poems show vastly different patterns of textual variation. Leaving aside accidental differences of dialect and orthography, the M and B₁ versions of “Cædmon’s Hymn” exhibit ten significant substantive variants

M

Nu scylun hergĕn hefaen ricaes uard
metudès maecti end his modgidanc
uerculuur fador] sue he undraghiuæs
eci dryctin orasteldæ
5 heaerist scop ældabarnů
heben til hrofe[ halegscæpen,
thatmiddungeard moncytnæs uard
ecidryctin æfter tiadæ
firum foldʉ frea allmectig

B₁

Nuweherigan sculon| heofonrices weard
metodes méhte| hismod géhane
weorc wuldor godes| swae wund ra fela
écedrihten ord| astealde
5 he ærest scop eorðan beæʀnum
heofon tohrofe| halig sceypend
[be]middan geard mann cyntæs| weard
écedrihten æfter teode| fyrum foldan| frea ælmhigt.

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

The E and Leid versions of Riddle 35, on the other hand, exhibit sixteen substantive variants, including a number of types rarely found outside of the Anthologised and Excerpted poems

Leid

Mec se wæta wong wundrum freorig
obhis innaðæ| æerist ce[nd]/
Uuat icmechüworthæ uullanfiliusū
herů ðerh hehcraeft hygidanœ[...]/
5 Uundaiæ. menhioæufel niuc iar phaæae—anþeðæ[ anægdaœæ.] dræ&me hlimmith.
Næmehrutendo hrisil scelath—
me ocmuam aam sceal cnysa
Uyrmanes mec niavefum wyrðcraeftum
10 daði goelů godweu_ geatūfrætuath.[
Uilmechůstræu sueðçh _uðaæ ofær eorðu_—
hatan mith| hæðdum hyhlicgiuæ|/ Sæge
Nian oegun ícme aerig faææ egsanbrogū
ðehōi nil[...n sip njujudicae ocboðrum]\]

E

Mec se wæta wong wundrum freorig
ofhis innæþ ææist cende
ne wat ic mec be wórhtne walle flysum
hæþrum þurh heah cræft hyge þoncum min.
5 wundene mæ |æ beoð wæle neic wearp hæfu
næþæþ breata gæþæþ ðæed mæ ne
set me hrumende| hrisil scræbeð
næmec o hwonan sceal amas cnysæn
wyrðmas mecne á wæfan. wyrða cæftum
10 þæþ geolů godwæþ geatwum frætwað
wile mec mon hwæþre seþæþ ðæide ofær eorðan
hatan forþæðæ| hyth lic gewæde.
 saga sóð cwidum searo þoncum gleaw
wordum wilsæst hwæþ þis ge wædæ sv:j

507 A discussion of the variation within each of these recensions is found above, pp. 52 (æeldu-recension) and 129-134 (eorðan-recension).
508 These variants are catalogued below, pp. 257-264.
509 Leid æerist ce[nd] is written above the first manuscript line over innaðæ.
Me the moist earth amazingly chill first brought forth from its interior. I know myself, in my mind’s deliberations, to be made with the fleeces of wool, by outstanding craftsmanship, with hairs. There are not woofs woven about me; nor do I have warps; nor does the weight thrum for me through strain of pressure upon it; nor do the resounding shuttles shake me; nor does the loom-sley have to thump me anywhere. Those worms which decoratively embroider the yellow silk did not spin me with the skills of Fate. Yet even so, one is pleased along with heroes from wide across the earth to call me a confidence-inspiring garment. I do not dread the flight of arrows, in the terror of peril, though it be taken eagerly from the quiver.

What is significant for our purposes, however, is the relationship between these variants and the contexts in which the different witnesses to each poem are found. In the case of the two versions of “Cædmon’s Hymn,” there is no obvious relationship at all. Other than dialect, there is nothing in the Northumbrian aeldu-text of the Hymn which might prevent it from being used in the Old English translation of Bede’s Historia; and there is nothing in the B1 version of the West-Saxon eordan-text of the Hymn which might make it unsuitable as a gloss to Bede’s paraphrase of the poem in manuscripts of the Latin Historia – as the use of a closely related version of the Hymn in just such a position in To demonstrates.513

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

510 Leid hgiðum hyhtlicgiæ is written above the line, after geatðfraetwath.
511 The sense of Leid drea[...]un is obscure. See below, p. 258.
512 The problem of agreement in E 8b is discussed below, p. 259.
513 The placement of the Hymn in this manuscript is discussed above, Chapter 3, pp. 112 ff.
flight of arrows, in the terror of peril, though it [i.e. an arrow] be [taken] eagerly from the quiver’) are a relatively close translation of the final line of Aldhelm’s original De lorica riddle (Spicula non vereor longis exempta faretris ‘I do not fear darts drawn from long quivers’). In E, these last two lines have been replaced with a common riddling formula: saga soð cwidum searo þoncum gleaw /wordum wis||fæst hwæt þis ge wædu sy ‘say in true words, man clever in cunning, wise in words, what this garment may be’. 514

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

514 See below, p. 262.

515 The discussion that follows assumes that the Ruthwell rune master was excerpting a longer poem – presumably one which looked like that in the Vercelli Book – rather than the other way round. That this was the case is suggested by the fact that Section 3 of the Ruthwell Cross Inscription begins with an off-verse. It is also possible, of course, that the person responsible for putting the Vercelli version in its current form expanded the poem from an original that looked something like the Ruthwell Inscription. In this case, characteristic features of the Vercelli version – such as the dream-vision, and the metaphor of Christ-as-hero are to be attributed to this scribe or performer. The difference has no effect on the argument presented here.
Between Sections 2 and 3, the rune master likewise eliminates approximately six and a half lines recounting the moment of Christ’s death. While the image of the darkening clouds in these lines is both arresting and in keeping with the rune master’s emphasis on the visual impact of the Crucifixion, the removal of these lines in which the Cross speaks in the first person both streamlines the Ruthwell narrative – in his version of the text, Christ ascends the cross in Section 1, is Crucified in Sections 2 and 3, and is buried in Section 4 – and keeps the reader’s attention focused on the Crucifixion as an image throughout the middle section of the inscription. Where the Vercelli version of the lines is full of movement – Christ suffers, shadows go forth, creation weeps – in the Ruthwell Inscription, the Crucifixion is presented, appropriately enough, as an object which can be raised up (Section 2.1) and approached and worshipped by others (Section 3.2), but remains itself essentially passive:

---

516Michael Swanton reports a gap of approximately forty runes down the south east margin of the shaft (The Dream of the Rood [Manchester: Manchester UP, 1970]). This is approximately equivalent to two hypermetrical lines or four regular long lines. The “missing” text of 50-56a in the Dream of the Rood would require approximately 175 runes.
2.1 I [raised up] a powerful King, Lord of the heavens. I dared not bend. Men humiliated us both together, I [was] all soaked with blood [issuing...]

3.1 Christ was on the cross. Yet the noble ones, eager, came together there from afar, nobles together; all this I witnessed. I was sorely oppressed with anxieties... [I] bowed...
all along at pains to emphasise as proper to Christ in his divine nature.”\textsuperscript{517} In this version of the poem, Christ is referred to as a \textit{geong hæleð} and described as \textit{strang \textasciitilde stið mod}; he ‘ascends’ the ‘high’ gallows and ‘wants’ to redeem man-kind. But while this emphasis on the heroic nature of Christ’s action is appropriate to and indeed an important part of the longer Vercelli text, a similar emphasis on Christ-as-hero in the limited space available to the Ruthwell rune master would distract the reader unnecessarily from the Cross and its role in the Crucifixion. In consequence, in carving the equivalent lines of the Ruthwell Inscription the rune master eliminates these references to the ‘heroic’ Christ in favour of a more straightforward description of him as ‘almighty god’:

\textbf{R}

\begin{tabular}{ll}
1.1 & [ + Ond]geredae hinae \textit{god almehttig} \\
 & \textit{ba he walde on gaígu gistīga} \\
 & \textit{[m]\textit{odig} \textit{f[ore} \textit{allæ} \textit{] men} \\
 & \textit{[B]\textit{üg}[a \textit{ic ni dorste}...} \\
\end{tabular}

\textbf{V}

\begin{tabular}{ll}
40 & \textit{Ongyrede hine} \textit{ba geong hæleð} \\
 & \textit{baet was} \textit{god| álmihtig} \\
 & \textit{strang \textasciitilde stið mod}. \\
 & \textit{ge stah} \textit{he ongealgan heanne} \\
 & \textit{modig onmanigra ge syhōe} \\
 & \textit{ba he wolde man cyn lysan}. \\
 & \textit{bifode icba me se beorn vmh clypte} \\
 & \textit{ne dorste ichwædre| bugan to eorðan} \\
 & \textit{feallan tofoldan sceatū}. \\
 & \textit{Ac icscœolde fæste| standan}. \\
\end{tabular}

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

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

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

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

\textsuperscript{517}Pope, \textit{Seven Old English Poems}, p. 66.

\textsuperscript{518}Pope, \textit{Seven Old English Poems}, p. 66.
between the Ruthwell and Vercelli versions of the poem are sooner evidence of a different
than of an inferior vision.

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

E(Az)
Tosweop ṣ|| ṣoswen产妇 ṣpurh swiðes meaht
lieges leoman swa hyra lice nesecod. |
æwæs inham hofne ṣpase engel cwom
windig ṣwynsum ṣwedere onlicust
phalt onsumeres tid ṣended weorþeð
dropena dreorung ṣmid daeges hwile.

J(Dan)
tosweop hine ṣtswende. ṣpurh ṣpa swiðjan miht.
ligges leoma. ṣhyre lice newes.
owiht ṣge egled. ṣacheon andan sloh.
fyron feondas ṣfor fyren ṣdédum.

345 ṣbawæs onham ofne. ṣharl se engel becwóm.
windig ṣwynsum. ṣwedere gelicost.
phalt onsumeres tid. ṣended weorþeð.
dropena drearung. ṣondaeges hwile.
wearmlič wolcna scúr.

519 This is the principal thrust of Moffat and Sisam’s argument against the ‘authority’ of Anglo-Saxon poetical
manuscripts. For a discussion, see Chapter 1.
He swept back and brushed aside the light of the flame through the might of the Great One. Thus it did not harm the body of them, but it was breezy and pleasant in the furnace when the angel came, most like the weather in summertime when a sprinkling of raindrops is sent during the day.

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

Exeter Riddle 30a/b

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

\[520\text{ Or, emending ligges leoma to ligges leoman: ‘[he] swept it back and brished [it], the brightness of the} \]
manuscript, Exeter, Cathedral 3501, ff. 8-130 (E), a mid tenth-century collection of Old English vernacular poetry. In its first appearance, the poem is found as the thirtieth (in Krapp and Dobbie’s numbering) of the fifty-nine vernacular riddles on ff. 101r-115r. In its second appearance, it is found as part of a collection of miscellaneous shorter texts including Exeter Riddle 60, the “Husband’s Message,” and the “Ruin” on f. 122v.

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

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

\begin{footnote}
\end{footnote}

\begin{footnote}
\end{footnote}

\begin{footnote}
\textsuperscript{523}The variation in the root syllable of \textit{on hin gaþ / on hnigað} is discussed below, p. 252. Cf. Liuzza, who gives the \textit{E}(\text{Rid30a}) reading in line 7b incorrectly as \textit{on hin gað} (“Riddle 30,” p. 3).
\end{footnote}

\begin{footnote}
\textsuperscript{524}Liuzza, “Riddle 30,” p. 3. See also above, p. 232.
\end{footnote}
Daniel and Azarias, and nearly twice as high as that exhibited by the witnesses to the most variable of the “minor” poems, the eorðan-recension of “Cædmon’s Hymn.” As is true of the other poems to be discussed in this chapter, the witnesses to Exeter Riddle 30 show many of the same types of variants as are found among the witnesses to the “minor” poems, as well as a number of variants more characteristic of the “Anthologised and Excerpted texts”: two examples of the substitution of stressed non-homographic words and elements, one example of variation between a bare case ending and a prepositional phrase, and one example of the rearrangement of elements within the line. Like the Dream of the Rood/Ruthwell Cross Inscription, Exeter Riddle 30 shows no linked variants. Unique among the Anthologised and Excerpted poems, Exeter Riddle 30 also shows no examples of the addition, omission, substitution, or rearrangement of complete metrical units.

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

525 For the connection of Riddle 30 to the preceding religious texts, see Liuzza, “Riddle 30,” pp. 12-13. The suggestion that the Riddle might be connected to the following texts was first made by F. A. Blackburn, “Husband’s Message and the Accompanying Riddles of the Exeter Book,” JEGP 3 (1901): 1-11.
point suggests that the Exeter Scribe himself saw the Riddle as part of a longer poem or series of closely related poems extending at the least from Riddle 30 to the end of the “Ruin.” As numerous scholars have pointed out, the scribe uses similar-sized capitals to begin Riddle 30, Riddle 60, the three internal sections of the “Husband’s Message,” and the “Ruin.”

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


Textual Variants

Inflectional Difference (1 example)

*Rid30, 8a*

**E(Rid30a)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>þôn ic mec onhæbbe þhi on hin gap. tome monige mid <em>miltse</em> þærícmonnum sceal ycan up cyme eadig nesse :7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**E(Rid30b)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>þôn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Substitution Of Unstressed Words and Elements (2 examples)

*Rid30, 6a*

**E(Rid30a)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ful oft mec gesiðas sendað</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**E(Rid30b)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ful oft mec gesiðas sendað</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

---

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

result clause of E(Rid30a).\(^{530}\) A similar substitution is found in the ChronA\(^{5}\) version of the “Death of Edgar” line 8b (see p. 183 and footnote 410, above).

**Rid30, 8b**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E(Rid30a)</th>
<th>E(Rid30b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 þôn ic</td>
<td>mec onhæbbe þhi on hin gâd tome monige mid mîls</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

**Rid30, 3b**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E(Rid30a)</th>
<th>E(Rid30b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 I cem leg bysig lace mid winde□ bewunden mid wul</td>
<td>dre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

---

\(^{530}\)See also Jabbour, diss., p. 176, who suggests that “either reading is acceptable.”

\(^{531}\)Cf. Liuzza, “Riddle 30,” p. 10, where þær is described as “an adverb with the generalized meaning ‘then’.”

\(^{532}\)For this punctuation, see Liuzza, “Riddle 30,” p. 10.

\(^{533}\)Jabbour and Liuzza both prefer to read lines 8b-9 as an independent clause. See Liuzza, “Riddle 30,” p. 10; Jabbour, diss., pp. 176-177. Krapp and Dobbie punctuate lines 7-9 of E(Rid30a) as a single sentence.
evidence of either a “sophisticated stylistic parallel” or dittography. Of the two verbs, \( \text{gebysgad} \) is the more common in the Exeter Book with eight occurrences against two for \( \text{gemylted} \). In as much as it indicates that the object can be destroyed by fire, the \( \text{E(Rid30b)} \) reading may also reflect a desire for less ambiguity on the part of the person first responsible for the variant.

**Rid30, 7b**

\begin{align*}
\text{E(Rid30a)} & : 7 \text{ þôn ic} \text{ mec onhæbbe} \ ȝhi on \text{ hin gaf}, \text{ tome}\text{ monige mid miltse} \text{ þæricmonnum sceal} \\
& \hspace{1cm} \text{ ycan up cyme} \text{ eadig nesse :}\text{7} \\
\text{E(Rid30b)} & : 7 \text{ þôn} \text{ icmec onhæbbe} \text{ hion hnigad} \text{ tome} \\
& \hspace{1cm} \text{ modge miltsum} \text{ swaic mongum sceal} \\
& \hspace{1cm} \text{ ycan up cyme} \text{ eadignesse :}\text{7}
\end{align*}

\( \text{E(Rid30a)} \) on \( \text{hin gaf} \) is almost certainly a minim error for \( \text{onhnigaf} \) (as in \( \text{E(Rid30b)} \)). The \( \text{E(Rid30a)} \) form (from \( \text{higan} \) ‘to go hence’?) makes no sense in context as written.

**Rid30, 8a**

\begin{align*}
\text{E(Rid30a)} & : 7 \text{ þôn ic} \text{ mec onhæbbe} \ ȝhi on \text{ hin gaf}, \text{ tome}\text{ monige mid miltse} \text{ þæricmonnum sceal} \\
& \hspace{1cm} \text{ ycan up cyme} \text{ eadig nesse :}\text{7} \\
\text{E(Rid30b)} & : 7 \text{ þôn} \text{ icmec onhæbbe} \text{ hion hnigad} \text{ tome} \\
& \hspace{1cm} \text{ modge miltsum} \text{ swaic mongum sceal} \\
& \hspace{1cm} \text{ ycan up cyme} \text{ eadignesse :}\text{7}
\end{align*}

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

---

535 Liuzza, “Riddle 30,” p. 10
The substitution E(Rid30a) monnum E(Rid30b) mongum makes good sense, metre and syntax in both manuscripts. Liuzza suggests that the E(Rid30a) reading may be the result of the Exeter scribe’s “trouble with the letter <g>,” which he reports is crowded in, omitted, miswritten, or otherwise altered on twenty-six occasions in the manuscript.\(^{538}\) As monige is already the reading of the on-verse in this witness, however, the substitution may also be connected to the substitution E(Rid30a) monige E(Rid30b), mongum discussed above.\(^{539}\)

**Addition/Omission Of Unstressed Words and Elements (2 examples)**

**Rid30, 7b**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E(Rid30a)</th>
<th>E(Rid30b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 þon ic</td>
<td>mec onhæbbe  þhi on hin gaþ. tome monige mid miltsel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

\(^{538}\)Liuzza, “Riddle 30,” p. 10.

\(^{539}\)See also Jabbour, diss., p. 177.
The addition or omission of *mid* has no significant effect on sense or syntax (for the change in case ending, see above, p. 250). The addition or omission falls in the medial drop of a Type A-1 line and is metrically insignificant. Such variation between bare case endings and prepositional phrases is a characteristic of the Anthologised and Excerpted poems (see above, p. 227, footnote 479).

**Addition/Omission of Prefixes (1 example)**

*Rid30, 6b*

E(*Rid30a*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>ful oft mec ge siþas</th>
<th>sendað</th>
<th>æfter hondum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>þ mec weras</td>
<td>ðifif</td>
<td>wlonce cysað</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E(*Rid30b*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>ful oft mec gesiþas</th>
<th>sendað</th>
<th>æfter hondu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>þermec weras</td>
<td>ðifif</td>
<td>wlonce gecysað</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The addition or omission of the prefix *ge-* has no significant effect on sense or syntax.

As Liuzza notes, “it is... difficult to determine any significant *lexical* distinction between *cyssan* and *gecyssan*. There is not much kissing in Old English poetry....”\(^{540}\) As it falls in the medial dip of a Type A-1 line, the variant is also metrically insignificant.

**Rearrangement within the Line (1 example)**

*Rid30, 2a*

E(*Rid30a*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>I C eom leg bysig</th>
<th>lace mid winde</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bewunden</td>
<td>mid wuldr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fus forð weges</td>
<td>fyre gebyssad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bearu</td>
<td>blowende</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E(*Rid30b*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>I ceom lig bysig</th>
<th>lace mid winde</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>w</td>
<td>................</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fus forð weges</td>
<td>fyre gemylted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bear[.]</td>
<td>blowende</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

\(^{540}\)Liuzza, “Riddle 30,” p. 8.
Regardless of the original reading, the variant almost certainly has an effect on metre: in
\textit{E(Rid30a)}, the first syllable of the on-verse is clearly anacrustic; in \textit{E(Rid30b)}, it is almost
certainly not.

\textbf{Exeter Riddle 35/The Leiden Riddle}

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

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

\textsuperscript{541}Liuzza, “Riddle 30,” p. 5; Chambers \textit{et al.}, \textit{The Exeter Book}, p. 75.

\textsuperscript{542}Ker, \textit{Catalogue}, Appendix, art. 19.

\textsuperscript{543}On the “remarkably consistent” orthography of the Exeter Scribe, see Megginson, diss., pp. 201-203.

\textsuperscript{544}The \textit{M} version of the Northumbrian \textit{aelda}-recension of “Cædmon’s Hymn” is found in a comparable place.
See above, Chapter 2, pp. 49-52.

\textsuperscript{545}The Riddle and its position on f. 25v have been described several times. See in particular, Johan Gerritsen,
ed. W.-D. Bald and H. Weinstock, Bamberger Beiträge zur englischen Sprachwissenschaft, bd.15 (New
Poems: Cædmon’s Hymn, Bede’s Death Song and the Leiden Riddle}, with a bibliography compiled by M.J.

\textsuperscript{546}Gerritsen, “Leiden Revisited”; “Text of the Leiden Riddle”; and Dobbie, \textit{ASPR} 6, p. cviii.
third scribe working in the tenth century.\textsuperscript{547} The script is Carolingian in form but shows the influence of – and misunderstandings caused by – an insular exemplar.\textsuperscript{548} The text of the riddle is in particularly poor shape and is frequently unreadable due to both wear and the application of an ammonium sulfide reagent in the mid nineteenth century. The text used for this discussion is based on my own transcriptions of the manuscript, supplemented by readings from Parkes, Gerritsen, and Smith.\textsuperscript{549}

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


\textsuperscript{548}See particularly Gerritsen “Text of the Leiden Riddle,” pp. 534-540. Gerritsen’s approach to the script and some of his conclusions have been criticised by Parkes “Manuscript of the Leiden Riddle.” For a reply, see Gerritsen, “Further Thoughts.”
Riddle 35 ends with a close translation of Aldhelm’s final verse. The final couplet in E, on the other hand, replaces the Latin conclusion with a vernacular tag, parallels to which are found throughout the surrounding collection of vernacular riddles.550

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

Textual Variants

Inflectional Difference (8 examples)

LeidR/Rid35, 3a

Leid

3 Uuat icmecbiuorthæ uullanflusü
herū,derh hehкраeft hygiðon’c[...]

E(Rid35)

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

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

549 See the references given above, fn. 545.

550 Examples include Riddles 1, 2, 3, 8, 10, 12, 19 and 23.


552 Variants making poor metre or sense in E include: the inflectional forms E be worhtne (Leid biuorhtæ), 1. 3a (see p. 257), and E amas for Leid aam, 1. 8b (see p. 259). All of the nonsensical readings in Leid are scribal and are to be attributed to the ignorance of the continental scribe responsible for its surviving witness. See pp. 258, 262 and 263, below.
commonly proposed solutions to the riddle, *lorica* and *byrne*, are both feminine. Smith reports, however, that “the gender of the answers to the riddles often fluctuates.”

**LeidR/Rid35, 3a**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leid</th>
<th>E(Rid35)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 Uuat icmecbiuorhæ</td>
<td>ne wat ic mec be worhtne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uullanfliusu</td>
<td>wulle flysum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>herũ,.derh hehcraeft</td>
<td>hæurnished heah craeft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hygiðon’c[...][]</td>
<td>hyge þoncum min.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**LeidR/Rid35, 6a**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leid</th>
<th>E(Rid35)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Uundnæ. menibiaðueflæ nic uar phafæ</td>
<td>5 wundene me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_niderih ðreat[.ungidrían][.]ðræ&amp;me hlímmith.</td>
<td>ne æt me hrutende  hrsil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemehrutendo__hrsíl scelfath____</td>
<td>nemec o hwonan  sceal amas cnyssan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_ne mec ouana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aam sceal cnyssa</td>
<td>þræd mene hlímmeth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**LeidR/Rid35, 6a**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leid</th>
<th>E(Rid35)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 Uundnæ. menibiaðueflæ nic uar phafæ</td>
<td>5 wundene me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_niderih ðreat[.ungidrían][.]ðræ&amp;me hlímmith.</td>
<td>ne æt me hrutende  hrsil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemehrutendo__hrsíl scelfath____</td>
<td>nemec o hwonan  sceal amas cnyssan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_ne mec ouana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aam sceal cnyssa</td>
<td>þræd mene hlímmeth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

---

553 Smith, *Three Northumbrian Poems*, p. 44.
554 B.-T. *wull*.
555 ASPR 6, p. 200.
556 Smith, *Three Northumbrian Poems*, p. 36.
557 Gerritsen, “Text of the Leiden Riddle,” p. 543. In “Further Thoughts,” Gerritsen comes down more firmly for *giðræc*: “my ultraviolet photographs show a clearly separate a and e, as well as most of the e.” Parkes, however, reports the form to be *gið<æ>.*, noting: “two traces which are recognizable as the stem and
reconstructions is correct, then the difference between the two witnesses is one of number. In E, \(gepræc\) is best interpreted as an accusative plural neuter; the reconstructed Leid form \(giðraec\) (or \(giðræc\)) would be accusative singular neuter. The presumed inflectional difference has no significant effect on metre: with \(-u\), E is Type B-2 with resolution of the second stress; without \(-u\), the final stress is long by position.

**Leid/Rid 35, 7a**

Leid

5 Uundnae. menibiaðuelfæ niic uar phafæ\_ \_niðerih ðreal[.][ungiðraec]. ðr&me hlímmith.

E(Rid 35)

5 wundene me] ne beoð wefle neic wearp hafu neðurh þætea geþræ\[cu \ þræd mene hlímmæ\[ð

Leid hrutendo is a strong nominative plural neuter form of the present participle. E hrutende is a strong nominative singular neuter. As Smith notes, this variation is linked to a corresponding variation in the number of the verb in the following half-line, suggesting in turn that hrisol is to be understood as nominative singular in E35, and nominative plural in Leid.\(^{558}\)

For further discussion of the linked variants in this line, see pp. 261 and 263, below.

**Leid/Rid 35, 8b**

Leid

5 Uundnae. menibiaðuelfæ niic uar phafæ\_ \_niðerih ðreal[.][ungiðraec]. ðr&me hlímmith.

E(Rid 35)

5 wundene me] ne beoð wefle neic wearp hafu neðurh þætea geþræ\[cu \ þræd mene hlímmæ\[ð

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

---

\(^{558}\)Smith, *Three Northumbrian Poems*, p. 46.
memorial explanation for this variant. For a discussion of the rearrangement within the line, see below, p. 264.

**LeidR/Rid35, 9a**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leid</th>
<th>E(Rid35)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uyrmas mec niauefung uyrdaræftum</td>
<td>wyrmas mecen æ wæfan. uyrdæ ææftum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 δœði goelu godueb__geatūrætauth.</td>
<td>10 þape geolo godwebb geatwum ææftað</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**LeidR/Rid35, 11a**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leid</th>
<th>E(Rid35)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uilmechec^{ḥ}trae suæðeh__uidæ ofäer eorðu_ _hatan mith\helium hyhtlicgiaw/</td>
<td>11 wile mec mon hwæpre sepeah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The variation is dialectic. **Leid Uil** shows Northumbrian loss of final -e in the third-person singular indicative present.\(^{559}\) **E wile** is the expected form in all other dialects.

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

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

**LeidR/Rid35, 11a**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leid</th>
<th>E(Rid35)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uilmechec^{ḥ}trae suæðeh__uidæ ofäer eorðu_ _hatan mith\helium hyhtlicgiaw/</td>
<td>11 wile mec mon hwæpre sepeah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

---

\(^{559}\)For examples, see Campbell, *OEG*, § 768; also Sievers-Brunner, § 428 Anm. 4.

The variants fall on the internal dip of a Type B-2 line and are metrically insignificant.

**LeidR/Rid35, 12a**

**Leid**

11 Ulmechuc\(b\)rae suæđeh\(____\)uidæ ofaer eordu\(____\)hatan mith|\(\hat{h}e\)ďum\(\hat{h}\)yhtlicgiæ/

**E(Rid35)**

11 wile mec mon hwačpre seþeah| wide ofer eorpan hatan forhæleű | hyht lic gewæde.|

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

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

**LeidR/Rid35, 7b**

**Leid**

5 Uundnae. menibíaďueľæ niic uar phàfae\(____\)nụ̀ðerìh ðreæ,|\(\hat{j}ungìďrae,|\ ðr&me hlɪm̩mìth.

**E(Rid35)**

5 wundene me| ne beoď wefle neic wearp hafu nœụ̀rh ð̣rêa| gepræ[\(c\)u \(\hat{c}\)ræd mene hlɪmmeð

Nemehrutendo\(____\)hrisil **scelfath\(____\)** ne æt me hrutende | hrisil | **scripèð**

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

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

---

**Notes:**

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

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

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

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

\textit{LeidR/Rid35, 13a-14b}

\begin{tabular}{ll}
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leid</th>
<th>E(Rid35)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13 Nian oegun icme aeg faerae egsanbrogu</td>
<td>13 saga sod cwidum searo þoncum gleaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ðehói ni[...n síæ nliudlicæ obcocrum]</td>
<td>wordum wi[fæst hwæt his ge waedu sy :7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
\end{tabular}

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

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

\textit{LeidR/Rid35, 3a}

\begin{tabular}{ll}
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leid</th>
<th>E(Rid35)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 Uuat icmecbiuorthæ uullanflius herü,ðerh hehcraeft hygiðon’c[....]</td>
<td>3 ne wat ic mec be worhtne wulle flysum hæ[rum þurh heah craeft hyge þoncum min.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
\end{tabular}

The addition or omission of \textit{ne} has a fundamental effect on the sense of the riddle as a whole. With \textit{ne}, \textit{E.35} preserves the paradox of Aldhelm’s Latin original: \textit{non sum setigero lanarum vellere facta}, ‘I am not made of the bristling wool of fleeces’. As written, \textit{Leid} implies that the speaker is made of wool (‘I know myself to be made with the fleeces of wool’), destroying the enigma.

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

\(^{564}\)See above, p. 257 and fn. 550.
the **Leid** scribe or the scribe of an earlier exemplar misinterpreted an insular *Niuat* as a Carolingian *Uuat*.565

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

**LeidR/Rid35, 6b**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leid</th>
<th>E(Rid35)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5 Uundnae. menibiaðufela  niic uar phafae__
_niðerih ðrea[,]ungiðæ.]
_Nemehrutendo__hrisil scelfath____
_ne mec ouana| aam sceal cnyssa | 5 wundene me| ne beoð wefel neic wearp hafu
_neÞurh þreata geþæcu  þæd mene hlimmeð
_ne Æt me hrutende hrisil| scriþeð
nemec o hwonan sceal amas cnyssan |

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

**LeidR/Rid35, 7a**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leid</th>
<th>E(Rid35)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5 Uundnae. menibiaðufela  niic uar phafae__
_niðerih ðrea[,]ungiðæ.]
_Nemehrutendo__hrisil scelfath____
_ne mec ouana| aam sceal cnyssa | 5 wundene me| ne beoð wefel neic wearp hafu
_neÞurh þreata geþæcu  þæd mene hlimmeð
_ne Æt me hrutende hrisil| scriþeð
nemec o hwonan sceal amas cnyssan |

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

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

---

565 Gerritsen, “Text of the Leiden Riddle,” pp. 540-542; also “Leiden Revisited,” pp. 56-7. For the reading *Uaat* see Smith, *Three Northumbrian Poems*, p. 44 (“*Uaat* clear with u.v. but under ordinary vision it appears as *Uuat,*”) and Parkes, “Manuscript of the Leiden Riddle,” p. 216. I have examined the manuscript under various natural and ultra-violet lighting conditions and am inclined to agree with Gerritsen. While a stroke does connect the two ascenders, it does not look deliberate. Given the state of the manuscript, the question is probably irresolvable.
**LeidR/Rid35, 11a**

Leid

11 Uilmechueatre suaeðehuidæ ofeær eordu_ 
   _hatan mith\|he\lidoim_ hyhtlicgiue/

E(Rid35)

11 wile mec mon hwæþrepæseæah| wide ofeær eorpæan 
   hatan forheleþu| hyht lic gewæde.[

**E mon** falls on the preliminary dip of a Type B-2 line. Its presence or absence is metrically insignificant. Whether or not the variation has a syntactical effect is hard to say.

Mitchell notes that there are no unambiguous examples of indefinite *hatan* without *man* as subject, but suggests that there enough examples of *magan* in similar contexts to “leave a nagging doubt in one’s mind that *LRid* 11 may be another example of a dying idiom which was not recognized by whoever inserted *mon* in the West-Saxon version.”

**Rearrangement Within Line (1 example)**

**LeidR/Rid35, 8b**

Leid

5 Undnae. menbiadeuflæ niic uard phafae__ 
   _niðerih ðrea\|jung\ltdæ.\| ðr\&me hlimmith.
   Nemehrutendo\|_hrisil scel\fath____ 
   _ne mec ouana| _sam seeal cnyssa

E(Rid35)

5 wundene me| ne beoð wefte neic wearp hafu 
   neþurh ðreata geþraæ\|c u| þread mene hlimmeð 
   ne æt me hrutende \ hrisil| scriðeð 
   nemec o hwonan \ seeal amas cnyssa

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

**Solomon and Saturn I**

*Solomon and Saturn* I is preserved in two manuscripts, Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 422 (CC422), and, in fragmentary form, among the marginal texts of Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 41 (B1). The main text of B1, which also contains a copy of the *eordan*-recension of “Cædmon’s Hymn” (discussed above, pp. 116 ff.), is an early tenth-century copy of the Old English translation of Bede’s *Historia ecclesiastica*. In the late

---

566 The alliteration in this line is discussed above, p. 260 and fn. 560.
eleventh or early twelfth century, the manuscript’s margins were filled with a collection of charms, blessings, and religious prose texts – the first 93 lines of *Solomon and Saturn* I among them. These texts are copied on specially ruled lines in a single unusual hand. The text of *Solomon and Saturn* is found in the margins of pp. 196-198, where it ends defectively with the first letter of metrical line 94a. As this break does not occur at the edge of the page, it is presumably to be attributed to either a scribal decision to stop copying or a defective exemplar.

In CC422, *Solomon and Saturn* I supplies the first part of a lengthy composite prose and verse dialogue between its two main characters. The texts are copied in a single tenth-century hand as part of the manuscript’s main text, and are apparently intended to be read as a single dialogue: *Solomon and Saturn* I ends on p. 6 with a point in middle of manuscript line 12; the prose dialogue which follows begins in the same manuscript line with a small capital S. The first page of this version of *Solomon and Saturn* I has been badly damaged, partially through the use of a reagent. Its first 30 lines are largely illegible, and are ignored as a result for the purposes of the following discussion and catalogue.

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

---


569 The end of the prose dialogue fell on a now missing page. After the missing page(s), the text resumes with a poetic dialogue. A third verse dialogue (beginning in capital letters) follows this.
frequently non-synonymous elements. Of these, perhaps the most interesting is the substitution \textbf{B}$_1$ \textit{laetéð} ‘sets free’ (corrected to \textit{filgið}) for \textbf{CC}$_{422}$ \textit{fylgeð} ‘follow, pursue, persecute’ in line 92b. As mentioned below (p. 280), the \textbf{B}$_1$ reading is lexically, metrically and syntactically appropriate to the context in which it occurs – but semantically exactly the opposite of what the correction tells us was the reading of the scribe’s exemplar. Apparently the \textbf{B}$_1$ scribe was able to follow his text well enough to revise it unconsciously, despite its many metrical and syntactical problems.

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

Inflectional Difference (9 examples)

*MSol, B₁ 38b/CC₄₂₂ 38b*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B₁</th>
<th>CC₄₂₂</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saturnus cwæð</td>
<td>Saturnus cwæð</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Achwamæg eaðusð eallra ge sceafte</td>
<td>36 aehwa mæg eaðost ealra ges[...]fta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ūna halgan duru heofona rices</td>
<td>ūna halgan duru heofona rices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>torhte ontynan ongetælæ rime.</td>
<td>torhte ontynan ongetælæ rime.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In B₁, *getæles* is a genitive singular noun used to qualify the dative prepositional object *rime*: ‘in the count of numbers’. In CC₄₂₂, *getælæ rime* is a nonce compound ‘number-count’ (i.e. order, succession). The variation has no significant effect on sense, syntax, or metre. The line is Type C-1 in both witness. In B₁, the first stress is resolved; in CC₄₂₂ it is long by position.

*MSol, B₁ 45b/CC₄₂₂ 45b*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B₁</th>
<th>CC₄₂₂</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swilceðumiht mid beorhtan gebede</td>
<td>swylce ðu miht mid ðy be[.]tan gebede</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blod onhætan</td>
<td>blod ón</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>þæs deofles[ dry ] him dropan[ ] stigað</td>
<td>þæs deofles dream[ ] him dropan stigað</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 swate</td>
<td>geswī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eges</td>
<td>fullicra[ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>þon</td>
<td>for twelf fyra ty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ofer glēdagripe</td>
<td>gifrost weallæð</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The variation B₁ *intingan* CC₄₂₂ *intingum* either is dialectal or reflects a difference in number. CC₄₂₂ *intingum* is the expected dative plural form of the weak masculine noun *intinga* ‘cause; occasion; sake.’ B₁ *intingan* can be interpreted either as the expected form of the dative singular, or a late West-Saxon spelling of the dative plural, perhaps under the influence of the ending of the preceding word, B₁ *sefan.*

---

570 Bessinger Smith.
Although, as Menner notes, the sense of the phrase is obscure in both witnesses, it seems unlikely that the difference in ending has a significant effect on the sense or syntax of the passage.\textsuperscript{571} The two forms are metrically identical.

\textit{MSol, B1 46a/CC\textsubscript{422} 45b}

\begin{tabular}{ll}
\textbf{B1} & \textbf{CC\textsubscript{422}} \\
Swilceðumih\textsuperscript{t} mid beorhtan gebede & swylce \textit{ðu} miht mid \textit{ðy} be[.]\textit{tan} gebede \\
blo\textit{d onhætan} & blo\textit{d onhætan} \\
\textit{ðæs} deofles\textsuperscript{dry} \textit{þ} him dropan\textsuperscript{stigað} & \textit{ðæs} deofles\textit{dream} \textit{[.]t} him dropan\textsuperscript{stigað} \\
\textit{swateg} \textsuperscript{swiðed} sefan\textsuperscript{intigað} & \textit{swateg} \textit{geswiðed} seofan\textsuperscript{intingum} \\
\textit{eges[fullicra]}\underline{\textit{bane seo| ærene gripo}} & \underline{\textit{eges fullicran}} \textit{ðön seo ærene} \textit{gripu} \\
\underline{\textit{þön}} for twelf \textit{fýra} \\ty\text{dernessum} & \underline{\textit{ðön heo for xii} \textit{[.]yra}} \textit{tydernessu} \\
ofer gle\textit{dagaripe} & \underline{\textit{ofe}r gleda| grip} \\
& \underline{\textit{gifrost weallað}} \\
\end{tabular}

\textit{CC\textsubscript{422} eges fullicran} is the nominative plural comparative form of the adjective \textit{egesfullic}. It agrees with \textit{dropan}, line 44b: ‘drops rise up... more terrible than the brazen kettle’; \textit{B1 eges[fullicra]} is an example of the Northumbrian loss of -\textit{n} from the nominative plural comparative,\textsuperscript{572} a nominative singular comparative, or a genitive plural weak adjective. A nominative plural comparative is required by context.

\textit{MSol, B1 52a/CC\textsubscript{422} 52a}

\begin{tabular}{ll}
\textbf{B1} & \textbf{CC\textsubscript{422}} \\
for\textit{ðan hafað| se cantic} ofe\textit{r| ealle cristes| bec} & for \textit{ðon hafað} se cantic \textit{ófer| ealle cristes bec} \\
\textit{wid mærost| word hegewritu| lereð} & \textit{wid mærost word hege writu læreð|} \\
\textit{stefnú} storeð \textit{\[.) stede} healdeð & \textit{stefnú storeð \[.) stede} healdeð \\
\textit{heofonríc\textit{es| heregea|owe wegeð|}} & \textit{heofona ríc\textit{es| heregeat\textit{e\textit{wa wigeð.}}}} \\
\end{tabular}

\textbf{B1 heofonríc\textit{es}} is the genitive singular of \textit{heofonríc} ‘heaven-kingdom’, a well-attested compound.\textsuperscript{573} \textit{CC\textsubscript{422} heofona ríc\textit{es}} ‘of the kingdom of the heavens’ is made up of the corresponding simplices. The variation has no significant effect on sense, but a great effect on metre. In \textit{CC\textsubscript{422}}, line 52a is a Type A-1 verse with a resolved first stress. The equivalent line

\textsuperscript{571}Menner, \textit{Solomon and Saturn}, pp. 109-110. See also \textit{ASPR} 6, pp. 161-2. Menner translates the phrase as “possibly... ‘because of the heart’ or even ‘by pressure on the heart’,” p. 109; Dobbie translates: “in the affairs of his mind,” p. 162.

\textsuperscript{572}On the loss of final -\textit{n} in Northumbrian, see Campbell, \textit{OEG}, § 472; for a brief discussion of Anglian forms in the two witnesses, see Menner, \textit{Solomon and Saturn}, p. 4.

\textsuperscript{573}Bessinger-Smith record 56 occurrences.
in \textit{B}_1 is metrically deficient. As O’Keeffe notes, \textit{B}_1 \textit{heofon} “is written at the end of the column, and it is entirely possible that the variant before us is a simple product of an eyeskip rather than a grammatical substitution.”\footnote{O’Keeffe, \textit{Visible Song}, p. 62.} As the \textit{B}_1 scribe invariably uses \textit{heofn}- for oblique cases of \textit{heofon} elsewhere in the poem, however, it is equally possible that the scribe intended to write the compound.\footnote{Cf. \textit{B}_1 \textit{heofna} (\textit{CC}_{422} \textit{heofonas}), l. 37; \textit{B}_1 \textit{heofnas} (\textit{CC}_{422} \textit{heofonas}), l. 40; \textit{B}_1 \textit{heofnum} (\textit{CC}_{422} \textit{hefenum}), l. 60.}

**\textit{MSol, B}_1 \textit{75b/CC}_{422} \textit{74b}**

\begin{verbatim}
\textit{B}_1 & \textit{CC}_{422} \\
75 & 74 \\
he is modigra middangeardes. & He [.s modigra middangear\textit{de} \\
staðole| he is strengra| bön ealle stána| gripe. & staðole strengaðön ealra stana gripe
\end{verbatim}

Both readings make good sense, syntax, and metre.\footnote{See also, O’Keeffe, \textit{Visible Song}, p. 62.} In \textit{CC}_{422} \textit{middangear\textit{de}} is dative singular expressing place where: ‘he is more powerful on earth’; in \textit{B}_1 \textit{middangear\textit{des}} is genitive singular, again expressing place where.\footnote{See Mitchell, \textit{OES}, § 1395-1399, who cites a number of parallel passages, including the \textit{Wife’s Lament} 45b-47a: \textit{sy ful wide fah / feorres folclondes} ‘let him be an outcast far afield in a distant land’.}
The two forms are metrically identical.

**\textit{MSol, B}_1 \textit{76b/CC}_{422} \textit{75b}**

\begin{verbatim}
\textit{B}_1 & \textit{CC}_{422} \\
75 & 74 \\
he is modigra middangear\textit{des}. & He [.s modigra middangear\textit{de} \\
staðole| he is strengra| bön ealle stána| gripe. & staðole strengaðön ealra stana gripe
\end{verbatim}

In \textit{CC}_{422}, \textit{ealra} is a genitive plural strong adjective agreeing with \textit{stana}: ‘than the grip of all stones’. In \textit{B}_1, \textit{ealle} is presumably to be understood as an adverb qualifying \textit{strenga}:
'he is stronger entirely in [his] foundation than the grip of stones'. Metrically, the two forms are identical.

**MSol, B₁ 81b/CC₄₄₂ 80b**

B₁

Lamana| he is læce  leoh|t winci,³ndra
swil|ce he hisdeafra| duru  deadra| tunge.
scl|d ig|ra 80  scl|d scip|pends seld
80  flodes| feriend  folces n|friend

CC₄₄₂

lame|na he islæce  leoh|t wince[...].ra
swilce he isdeafra| duru  dumbra tunge
scyd|gra scyd  scypp|pends seld
flodes feriend  folces nerigend

80  ýða yrfe|weard  earmra  fisca
ý|wyrma [.]elm  wil|deo|ra holt|
ön  westenne weard  weord  mynt|a geard

**CC₄₄₂ earmra** is a strong genitive plural adjective modifying *fisca* ‘of wretched fish’.

B₁ *earma*, if not a mistake for *earmra* (perhaps due to the influence of the following form *fixa*), is nominative or accusative plural feminine or a weak nominative singular masculine, none of which fit the context. The two forms are metrically identical.

**MSol, B₁ 83a/CC₄₄₂ 82b**

B₁

Lamana| he is læce  leoh|t winci,³ndra
swil|ce he hisdeafra| duru  deadra| tunge.
scl|d ig|ra scild  scip|pends seld
80  flodes| feriend  folces n|frend

CC₄₄₂

lame|na he islæce  leoh|t wince[...].ra
swilce he isdeafra| duru  dumbra tunge
scyd|gra scyd  scypp|pends seld
flodes feriend  folces nerigend

80  ýða yrfe|weard  earmra  fisca
ý|wyrma [.]elm  wil|deo|ra holt|
ön  westenne weard  weord  mynt|a geard

The inflectional variation B₁ *westenes* CC₄₄₂ *westenne* is linked to addition or omission of the preceding preposition *on* (see below, p. 283). In B₁, *westenes* is a genitive of specification qualifying *weard*, syntactically parallel to the genitives in lines 77a-82b and 83b: ‘guardian of the wasteland’. In CC₄₄₂, *westenne* is dative singular, object of the preposition *ón*: ‘guardian in the wasteland’. This destroys the parallelism of the passage as a whole, but makes perfectly good sense.

---

579 Menner construes the B₁ form as "[accusative] p[plural] m[asculine]" (Solomon and Saturn, Glossary, p. 150). There are no other accusative plural masculine nouns in the sentence, however.

580 B₁ *scild ig|ra* with *scild ig* corrected from *swilce*. 
The inflectional difference has no direct effect on metre, although the two lines are not metrically congruent due to the addition or omission of the preposition. CC<sub>422</sub> line 83a is Type B-2; in B<sub>1</sub>, the equivalent verse is a Type E with a short syllable in the half-lift.<sup>581</sup>

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

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

\[\text{gseðe| wile geornlice } \text{þono godes cwide|} \]
\[\text{singan sméalce| } \text{'hine symle l miał|} \]
\[\text{wile butan| leahtrū } \text{hemēg| } \text{þone laðan gesið|} \]
\[\text{fohterne feoñd| } \text{fleonde gebriçgan|} \]
\[\text{Gyf } \text{þu him ærest| ufan } \text{þorn gebriçgeð.} \]
\[\text{plogo prim.| } \text{þam is .p. nama.|} \]

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

\[\text{gseðe wile| geornlice } \text{ðone godes cwide|} \]
\[\text{singan soðlice } \text{'hine| siemle wile|} \]
\[\text{lufian butan leahtrum } \text{he mæg } \text{ðone| laðan gæst} \]
\[\text{fohtende feoñd } \text{fleonde gebriçgan|} \]
\[\text{gif } \text{ðu } \text{hī ærest } \text{ón ufan } \text{irne gebriçgestop.} \]
\[\text{proloca prima } \text{ðamis P. nama|} \]

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

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

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

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

\[\text{Lama|na he } \text{is lœcæ } \text{leoh| winci,'ñdra} \]
\[\text{swil|ce } \text{hisdeafra| } \text{duru deadra| tunge.} \]
\[\text{scild ig|ra scild } \text{scılpended seld} \]
\[\text{flodes| feriend } \text{folces neriend|} \]
\[\text{ýþæyr| ford } \text{earma fis|} \]
\[\text{wyrm|a wencia } \text{wil|deora holt} \]
\[\text{westenes| weard } \text{wer|ð } \text{myn|ta geard} \]

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

\[\text{lame|na he islæce } \text{leoh| wince[...]|ra} \]
\[\text{swilce } \text{hisdeafra| } \text{duru dumbra tunge} \]
\[\text{scyldигра scyld } \text{scyppened| seld} \]
\[\text{flodes ferieng| } \text{folces nerieng|} \]
\[\text{ýþæyr| ford } \text{earma fis|} \]
\[\text{wyrm|a wencia } \text{wil|deora holt} \]
\[\text{ón westenne weard } \text{wer|ð } \text{myn|ta geard} \]

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

---

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

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

<sup>583</sup> pane/pone occurs twice in B<sub>1</sub> for CC<sub>422</sub> ponne (lines 46 and 76).

<sup>584</sup> Sievers-Brunner, § 217 Anm. 1.
Substitution Of Prefixes (2 examples)

*MSol*, B₁ 59a/CC₄₂₂ 59a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B₁</th>
<th>CC₄₂₂</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57b mec þæs</td>
<td>on worulde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fyrwe</td>
<td>t frin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mod ge</td>
<td>ond</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The substitution B₁ geond- CC₄₂₂ ge- in line 59a has no effect on syntax or metre, and probably little effect on sense. As a nonce word, the sense of B₁ geond mengeð can only be derived from its component parts. It is usually translated as ‘confuses’, though ‘mixes up’ is an equally appropriate calque. CC₄₂₂ ge mengeð ‘mix, combine’ is also used in a literal and figurative sense, though Bosworth-Toller gives no examples of the verb in the sense ‘confuse’.

Metrically, the two prefixes are identical.

*MSol*, B₁ 73a/CC₄₂₂ 72a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B₁</th>
<th>CC₄₂₂</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>73 hungor</td>
<td>he</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72 hungor hé</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B₁ ge hided and CC₄₂₂ ahie|ð| are metrically and syntactically identical. Assuming B₁ -hied|ð| ‘hides’ is a graphic mistake for -hided|ð| ‘plunders’ (see below, p. 277), the substitution has no significant effect on sense. The corrected dittography in B₁ (see footnote 587) suggests that the exemplar to this witness may have read he gehided|ð|.

---

585 For the stress of geond- see Campbell, *OEG*, § 74.
587 B₁ hege hege with first hege underlined for deletion.
Substitution Of Stressed Words and Elements (18 examples)

**MSol, B₁ 32a/CC₄₂₂ 32a**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B₁</th>
<th>CC₄₂₂</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30  þôn him bið leafre  dôn eall þæos leohete gesceaft</td>
<td>30  [...][l] leofre dôn eall þæos leohete gesceaft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goten fræm ðamgrunde    goldes-þilofres</td>
<td>geg[.][l] fræm ðam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fêder s cettê full fyrn gestreöna</td>
<td>fêder sceatû full feoh gestreona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gif he æfre þæs organes    ówiht cuðe.</td>
<td>gif he æfre þæs organes    ówiht cuðe.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B₁ *fêder s cettê* is a nominative singular feminine adjective agreeing with *gesceaft*, line 30b: ‘all this bright creation, four cornered, full of ancient treasures.’⁵⁸⁸ CC₄₂₂ *fêder sceatû* is a masculine dative plural noun ‘four quarters’: ‘all this bright creation in its four quarters full of treasures.’⁵⁸⁹

**MSol, B₁ 32b/CC₄₂₂ 32b**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B₁</th>
<th>CC₄₂₂</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30  þôn him bið leafre dôn eall þæos leohete gesceaft</td>
<td>30  [...][l] leofre dôn eall þæos leohete gesceaft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goten fræm ðamgrunde    goldes-þilofres</td>
<td>geg[.][l] fræm ðam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fêder s cettê full <em>fyrn gestreöna</em></td>
<td>fêder sceatû full <em>feoh gestreona</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gif he æfre þæs organes    ówiht cuðe.</td>
<td>gif he æfre þæs organes    ówiht cuðe.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The variants B₁ *fyrn gestreöna* ‘ancient treasure’ CC₄₂₂ *feoh gestreona* ‘wealth-treasure’ are metrically and syntactically identical. Both make good sense in context, without being exact synonyms. As O’Keeffe points out, the first element of the B₁ reading, *fyrn-*, occurs as the first element in eighteen Old English compounds, eleven of which are nonce words: “if the occurrence of these compounds may be considered representative of their use in Old English verse then *fyrn-* was clearly a popular morpheme with which to build nonce-words.”⁵⁹⁰

---

⁵⁸⁸See B.-T. *fêder-scette.*

⁵⁸⁹See B.-T. *fêder-sceatâs.*

⁵⁹⁰O’Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 65.
As O'Keeffe notes, \textit{B1 unge sibb} ‘not related’ and \textit{CC422 ungelic} ‘unlike, different’ are “semantically, metrically and syntactically acceptable” and attested elsewhere in Old English.\footnote{O’Keeffe, \textit{Visible Song}, p. 64.}

\textit{MSol, B1 35a/CC422 35a}

\texttt{B1} \\
Fracōð he bið ðanne ūfremeð frean ælmihtigum \hspace{1cm} \texttt{CC422} \\
35 \text{englū} \textbf{unge sibb} ána hwearfað. \hspace{1cm} 35 \text{englum} \textbf{ungelic} ána hwearfað.

\textit{MSol, B1 41b/CC422 41b}

\texttt{B1} \\
SALON cwæð \hspace{1cm} \texttt{CC422} \\
phinx ge pa’m twigude pater ūr. \hspace{1cm} Salomon cwæð \hspace{1cm} \textquoteright{}pat noster\textquoteright{} \\
40 heofnas ontyneð hāllie geblissað \hspace{1cm} 40 heofonas ontyneð halige geblissað \\
metod gemiltsað mordor \textbf{gefilleð} \hspace{1cm} metod gemiltsað mordor \textbf{gesyldĕ} \\
adwæscede deofles fyr ĕn dryhtnes onæleð. \hspace{1cm} adwæscede deofles fyr dryhtnes ónæleð

\texttt{B1 gefilleð} ‘strikes’ \textit{CC422 gesyldĕ} ‘gives, sells, betrays’ are metrically, semantically, and syntactically appropriate without being synonyms. In \texttt{B1}, the \textit{Pater noster} is said to ‘strike down’ murder; in \textit{CC422}, it ‘betrays’ it.\footnote{B.-T(S). sellan V (c).} Given the graphic similarity of \textit{f} (i.e. \textit{f}) and \textit{s} (i.e. \textit{s}) in insular script, it is likely that the substitution has its origins in a visual error.\footnote{O’Keeffe lists this among her examples of the visual errors separating the two texts, \textit{Visible Song}, p. 61, fn. 45.}
**MSol, B₁ 44a/CC₄₂₂ 44b**

B₁

Swilceðumiht mid beorhtan gebede

blod onhætan
dæs deofles dry  þ him dropan stigað

45 swategelswed  sefan intingan
ges fullicrað  hane seo ærene gripo
þön for twelf fyra  tydernessum
ofor glédagripe  gifrost weallað

**CC₄₂₂**

swylce ðu miht mid ðy be[.]tæn gebede

blod ðon[uetan]
dæs deofles dream  [...]t him dropan stigað

45 swate[geswided] seofan intingum
ges fullicran  ðon seo ærene[] gripu
ðon heo for xiï  [...]lyra tydernessðu
ofer gleda[ripe] gifrust wealleð.

The substitution B₁ *dry* ‘magician, sorcerer’ CC₄₂₂ *dream* ‘joy, gladness’ has a great effect on sense, although, as O’Keeffe and others have noted, neither version of the poem is particularly intelligible at this point.⁵⁹⁴ It has no metrical or syntactic effect.

**MSol, B₁ 53a/CC₄₂₂ 53a**

B₁

Saturnus cwæð| ac hulic is se[ ]**organan**  ingemynundum
tobeh[ ]gangen ne  þæ[ ]hæ his gesæt[ ]wile
55 miltan wið morðre  merian of sorge
Asceadden of scylðū

**CC₄₂₂**

Saturnus cwæð

ac hulic ísse[ ]**organ** ingemynů

tobe gonganne  ðam ðe his gast[ ]wile
55 meltan wið morðre  mergan ofsorge
asceadan of scyldigů

As Menner suggests, the B₁ reading is “probably an error, perhaps the result of the scribe’s acquaintance with *organana*, pl. *organan*, in the sense of ‘organ’.”⁵⁹⁵ As the use of the nominative singular masculine form of the demonstrative article *se* presupposes a nominative masculine singular noun, the B₁ reading (which cannot be nominative singular) is syntactically problematic. The substitution also affects metre. In CC₄₂₂, line 53a is Type A-3; as written, B₁ is presumably to be scanned as a Type C-2.

Given the B₁ scribe’s demonstrable problems with dittography elsewhere in his text (e.g. *hege* *hege* hideð, line 73a), it is possible that *organana* is a graphic mistake for *organ*.

---

⁵⁹⁴ O’Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 64. See also Menner, *Solomon and Saturn*, pp. 3 and 109, and *ASPR* 6, p. 162.

MSol, B₁ 56a/CC₄₂₂ 56a

Saturnus cwæð
ac hulic is se| organan ingemundum
tobe| gangen ne  þæ | þe his gæst| wile
55  meltan wið morðre| merian of sorge
Asceadan of scyldū

CC₄₂₂
Saturnus cwæð
ac hulic ísse| organ ingemundū
tobe gonganne  þam  þe his gast| wile
55  meltan wið morðre  mergan ofsorge
asceadan| of scyldigū

B₁ scyldū is the dative plural of the feminine or masculine noun scyld ‘offence’; CC₄₂₂ scyldigū, the strong dative plural form of the adjective scyldig, ‘guilty’. Both readings make good sense, metre, and syntax, although as Menner points out, the noun in B₁ corresponds “to the other abstract nouns morðre, sorge (55)” in the surrounding lines, while the adjective in CC₄₂₂ breaks the parallelism. Metrically, line 56a is Type A-1 with anacrusis in B₁; Type D*2 (or A-1) with anacrusis in CC₄₂₂.

Suggesting that the CC₄₂₂ reading “can be argued to be a mechanical error,” O’Keeffe excludes this variant from her count of “‘formulaic’ lexical variants”.

MSol, B₁ 57a/CC₄₂₂ 57a

Saturnus cwæð
huru h[| scipp end geaf]
wundor licne| wuld
56b  56b

wuldricne| wlude

wuldorlicne| wlude

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

596 Menner, Solomon and Saturn, p. 110.
597 Campbell reports the syncopation of -ig- after long syllables to be “the rule in Old English metre (often against the manuscript spelling),” OEG, § 358.
598 O’Keeffe, Visible Song, p. 63.
**MSol, B1 60b/CC422 60b**

**B1**

nænig monna| wat
60 hæleðaunder heofnum huminhige dregeð
bisieæfter bocum hwyl[|] me bryne stigeð
hige heortan hearde wealleð.

**CC422**

næ[...] manna wat
60 hæleða[|] under hefenum hu min hige dreoseð
bysig ææter boc[|] hwilum me bryne stigeð
hige heortan neah hædre wealleð.]

**B1** dregeð **CC422** dreoseð are metrically and syntactically identical third-person preterite indicative singular inflected verbs. While both words are appropriate to the context in which they appear, they are not synonyms. In **CC422**, Saturn reports that his spirit ‘became weak’ (*drōsan*, ‘become weak, fail’) in his studies; in **B1**, he notes that nobody knows how hard it has ‘worked’ (*drōgan* ‘do, work, perform’) at them. As the two words differ in a single letter, graphic error in one or another text is a possible cause of the variant.

**MSol, B1 62b/CC422 62b**

**B1**

nænig monna| wat
60 hæleðaunder heofnum huminhige dregeð
bisieæfter bocum hwyl[|] me bryne stigeð
hige heortan hearde wealleð.

**CC422**

næ[...] manna wat
60 hæleða[|] under hefenum hu min hige dreoseð
bysig ææter boc[|] hwilum me bryne stigeð
hige heortan neah hædre wealleð.]

**B1** hearde **CC422** hædre are metrically and syntactically identical. Both readings make good, but different, sense in context: **B1** ‘welled furiously’; **CC422** ‘welled brightly’.

**MSol, B1 73a/CC422 72b**

**B1**

73 Hu’gor hege hege hideð helle gestrudeð
wylm to worpeð] wuldor getym|breð.

**CC422**

72 hungor hé ahieðeð helle gestrudeð
wylm toweor|peð wuldor getimbreð

As written, **B1** ge hideð ‘hides’ seems semantically inappropriate, though metrically and syntactically acceptable. As O’Keeffe, suggests, however, the form is most likely for *gehided* (cf. **CC422** ahieðeð), ‘plunders, ravages’. See also above, p. 272.

---

599 The adverb in **CC422** is usually taken (with a changing selection of examples from other poems) as evidence for the existence of a poetic adverb *hædre* ‘oppressively’ (cf. **B.-T.**, **CH**, *hæðr*; Menner, *Solomon and Saturn*, Glossary, p. 154). *Hædre*, an adverbial form of *hādor*, ‘bright’ is metrically indistinguishable, however, and makes equally good sense in all examples cited by **B.-T.** I am preparing a study of the form.

600 O’Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 64.
**MSol, B₁ 78b/CC₄₂₂ 77b**

**B₁**

Lamanæ he is læce leohæ winci, λνdra
swil[ce he hisdeafra] duru [deadra] tunge.
scild ig[ra scild] scip[pendes seld]

80 flodes[feriend folces nefriend]
 _yþayrfe[weard earmæ fixa]
 wyrmæ wlenço wil[deora holt]
 westenes[weard weorð mynæa geard]

**CC₄₂₂**

læme[na he islæce leohæ wince[.].ra]
swilce he isdeafra duru [dumbræ] tunge
scyldig[ra scyld scyppendes seld]
flodes ferigend folces nergend

80 yða yrfe[weard earmæ fisca]
 _wyrma [.]elm wildeora holt|
 ôn westenne weard weorð myn[.].a geard

Both readings make good sense and metre, although CC₄₂₂ dumbræ tunge seems to offer a closer parallel to the other qualities of the Pater noster discussed in lines 77-78. As Sisam suggests, however, “even... deadra tunge [‘tongue of the dead’] might be defended if there were no second manuscript to support dumbræ.”

**MSol, B₁ 82a/CC₄₂₂ 81a**

**B₁**

Lamanæ he is læce leohæ winci, λνdra
swil[ce he hisdeafra] duru deadra tunge.
scild ig[ra scild scip]pendes seld

80 flodes[feriend folces nefriend]
 _yþayrfe[weard earmæ fixa]
 wyrmæ wlenço wil[deora holt]
 westenes[weard weorð mynæa geard]

**CC₄₂₂**

læme[na he islæce leohæ wince[.].ra]
swilce he isdeafra duru dumbræ tunge
scyldig[ra scyld scyppendes seld]
flodes ferigend folces nergend

80 yða yrfe[weard earmæ fisca]
 _wyrma [.]elm wildeora holt|
 ôn westenne weard weorð myn[.].a geard

Both B₁ wlenço ‘pride, glory’ and CC₄₂₂ [.]elm (presumably for welm ‘surging flame’) make good sense, metre, and syntax. As O’Keeffe notes, “among the fantastic terms of this litany, neither welm nor wlenço can claim pride of place.” The substitution is linked metrically to the addition or omission of j at the beginning of the line. In B₁ (without j), the verse is Type A-1; in CC₄₂₂ (with j), it is Type B-1. See also below, p. 282.

---

601 Sisam, “Authority,” p. 34.
602 O’Keeffe, Visible Song, p. 64.
The two adverbs are metrically and syntactically identical. O’Keeffe notes that B1

`smealice` ‘closely, thoroughly, accurately’ is perhaps to be preferred to CC422 `sodlice` ‘truly’ as a description of the preferred manner of singing the Pater noster, “but... is otherwise unattested in verse.”

Both readings make good sense and are syntactically identical. In B1, the `feond` is described as a hateful `gesið` ‘companion’, in CC422, as a hateful `gæst` ‘spirit’. Metrically, the half-line is Type B-2 in B1 and B-1 in CC422. O’Keeffe cites parallels to the CC422 reading in Soul and Body II 110b and Guðlac 361b; she finds parallels to the B1 reading in Daniel 661b and Juliana 242.

---

603 O’Keeffe, Visible Song, p. 64.
604 O’Keeffe, Visible Song, p. 64.
The B1 reading is in error. For the confusion of e and o in the B1 scribe’s work, cf. B1.

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

As mentioned above (p. 266), the uncorrected B1 reading leeted ‘set free’ means exactly the opposite of CC422 fylged ‘follow, pursue, persecute’, but makes equally good syntax, sense, and metre. As there is nothing in the immediate context to suggest that the variation is the result of a visual error, it seems more likely that the variant is a result of the B1 scribe’s anticipation of his exemplar (as he immediately corrects his substitution, we know that his exemplar, like CC422, read filgið). This is at the same time evidence for how variants such as those found throughout the Anthologised and Excerpted texts may have arisen, and, since the scribe did not allow his variant to stand, evidence that the B1 scribe was interested in the accurate reproduction of his text. The fact two examples of the omission of metrically,
syntactically and semantically necessary from the final lift of Type B and E verses also occur in B₁ suggests further that the B₁ version of the poem – as its marginal context in a collection of charms would suggest – is being copied to a standard of accuracy similar to that followed by the scribes of the translating and occasional texts discussed in Chapter Two. See also p. 266, above.

Addition/Omission Of Unstressed Words and Elements (8 examples)

MSol, B₁ 43a/CC₄₂₂ 43a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MSol, B₁ 43a/CC₄₂₂ 43a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swilceðumiht mid beorhtan gebede toolond blyth beorhtan gebede</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḏæs deofles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swatege</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eges fullicran____bæne seo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[hœn] for twelf fyræ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ofer glëðagripe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The addition or omission of ḏy has no significant effect on sense, metre, or syntax.

Metrically, the demonstrative pronoun falls in the preliminary drop of a Type B-2 line. While the use of a weak form of the adjective beorhtan in both witnesses would lead us to expect the demonstrative pronoun in a prose text, weak forms of the adjective appear without the demonstrative in verse.⁶⁰⁵

MSol, B₁ 47a/CC₄₂₂ 47a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MSol, B₁ 47a/CC₄₂₂ 47a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swilceðumiht mid beorhtan gebede toolond blyth beorhtan gebede</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḏæs deofles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swatege</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eges fullicran____bæne seo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[hœn] for twelf fyræ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ofer glëðagripe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The addition or omission of heo has no significant effect on sense, metre, or syntax. In

CC₄₂₂. heo is the subject of wealled (line 48b), and refers back to the feminine noun gripu

⁶⁰⁵Mitchell, OES, § 3964.
‘kettle, cauldron’) in line 46b. In B1, the equivalent lines show the non-expression of a subject which has to be supplied from a noun in a neighbouring principal clause (in this case gripo, line 46b). Both are acceptable Old English.

**MSol, B1 76a/CC422 75a**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B1</th>
<th>CC422</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>He is modigra middangearde.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>staðole he is strengra</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The addition or omission of *he is* has no significant effect on sense, metre, or syntax. In both witnesses, the subject and verb of the clause in line 76 are the same as that of line 75. In B1, this subject and verb are repeated before the predicate adjective *strengra*; in CC422, they are not. Both readings are acceptable Old English syntax.607 O’Keeffe’s suggestion that the B1 reading “does not conform to the classical shape of the half-line, since the beginning of the independent clause is not coincident with the beginning of the metrical unit”608 rests on the assumption that *staðole* belongs to the same clause as B1 75a-b. I see no reason why the noun cannot be construed as a dative of place in the clause of line 76: ‘at [his] foundation, he is stronger entirely than [pone for ponne] the grip of stones.’

**MSol, B1 82a/CC422 81a**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B1</th>
<th>CC422</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>flodes feriend folces nefriend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ýþayrfe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>scyldigra</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The addition or omission of *j* in B1 82a/CC422 81a has an important effect on metre, but little significant effect on sense or syntax. In both manuscripts, the line forms part of a

---

long list of epithets for the *Pater noster*. In B₁, the epithet is joined asyndetically to the preceding text; in CC₄₂₂, it is linked syndetically. Both versions are acceptable Old English syntax.

Metrically, the addition or omission of *ſ* is linked to the substitution of stressed words B₁ *wlenco* CC₄₂₂ [*elm* later in the same half-line (see above, p. 278). In B₁ (with *wlenco* and without *ſ*), line 82a is Type A-1; in CC₄₂₂ (with [*elm* and *ſ*]), the same line is Type B-1.

**MSol, B₁ 83a/CC₄₂₂ 82a**

B₁

```
Lamanæ he is læce leoct[ [winci,] ndra
swil[ce he isдеafra| duru  dédra| tunge.
sclid [g[ra scild  sci[p]p]endes seld
80 flo[des| feriend] fol[ces ne|riend]
     yþayref| weard  earma fixa]
wyrma wlenco wil[deora holt
westenes| weard  weord myn|ta geard
```

CC₄₂₂

```
la[m] na he istæce leoct wince [...]ra
swilce he isдеafra| duru  dumbra tunge
80 flo[des feriend] fol[ces nerigend
     yða yrf|weard  earmra fisca
jwyra [*elm* wildeora holt]
 ōn  weste[ne weard  weord myn] la geard
```

The addition or omission of *on* in B₁ 83a/CC₄₂₂ 82a has an important effect on the local syntax of the clause, but is of little metrical or semantic significance. In CC₄₂₂, *ōn* introduces a prepositional adverbial phrase: ‘[he is] guardian in the wasteland’; in B₁, the same syntactic task is performed by an adverbial genitive case ending. The addition or omission of *on* is linked to the case ending of *weste(n)e(s)*. See above, p. 270.

In CC₄₂₂ the line is Type B-2; in B₁ is it Type E.

---

608 O’Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 62. *Staðole* is included in the clause of line 76a in the punctuation of Dobbie’s and Menner’s editions.
The addition of *on* has no significant effect on syntax, sense, or metre. *Ufan* is found both with and without *on*, and the addition or omission falls in the medial drop of a Type B line. Such variation in the use of prepositions is a feature of the Anthologised and Excerpted texts. See also the addition or omission of *on* in B1 83a/CC422 82a, p. 283.

The addition or omission of a ‘ever’ to B1 91b/CC422 90b has no significant effect on sense, metre, or syntax. The variant falls on the preliminary dip of a Type B-1 line.

The addition or omission of *him* in line 92b has no significant effect on sense, metre, or syntax. In both witnesses, the object of the verb in line B1 92b/CC422 91b (CC422 *fylgeð*, B1 *læted* corrected to *filgið*) is the same as that of the preceding clause (i.e. *bone grymmnan feond*, B1 91b/CC422 90b). In B1, the object of the first clause is not repeated in the second (the
normal pattern in Old English); in CC422, it is replaced by the dative third person singular pronoun. Both are acceptable syntax.\(^609\)

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

**MSol, B\(_1\) 62a/CC422 62a**

\[\begin{align*}
\text{B\(_1\)} & \quad \text{nae}nig \text{ monna} \mid \text{ wat} \\
60 & \quad \text{hæle}\text{ða}nuer \text{ heofnum} \quad \text{humin}hige \text{ dreogeð} \\
& \quad \text{bisig} \text{æfter} \text{ bocum} \quad \text{hwyl}l\text{u} \mid \text{ me} \text{ bryne} \text{ stigeð} \\
& \quad \text{hige} \text{ heorton} \quad \text{hearde} \text{ wealleð}. \\
\text{CC422} & \quad \text{na[...]} \text{ manna} \text{ wat} \\
60 & \quad \text{hæle}\text{ða} \mid \text{ under} \text{ hefenum} \quad \text{hu} \text{ min} \text{ hige} \text{ dreoseð} \\
& \quad \text{bysig} \text{æfter} \text{ bocu} \mid \text{hwilum} \text{ me} \text{ bryne} \text{ stigeð} \\
& \quad \text{hige} \text{ heorton} \text{neah} \quad \text{hædre} \text{ wealleð}. \\
\end{align*}\]

The addition or omission of \textit{neah} has an important effect on sense, metre, and syntax.

In CC422, \textit{neah} governs \textit{hige} (to be construed as a dative singular noun), and \textit{bryne} is the subject of both \textit{stigeð} and \textit{wealleð}: ‘at times the fire ascends me, wells brightly near the thoughts of my heart.’ Metrically, the line is Type E-1.

In B\(_1\), \textit{hige} is itself the subject of \textit{wealleð} and parallel to \textit{bryne}: ‘at times fire ascends me; thought of the heart wells vigorously.’ With the omission of \textit{neah}, B\(_1\) line 62a is unmetrical. Similar omissions of metrically (and often syntactically and semantically) necessary words from the final stress of Type B and Type E lines are found among the marginal and glossing poems discussed in Chapter Two. See also B\(_1\) ∅ CC422 leaf, line 64a (p. 286), the discussion of B\(_1\) \textit{læteð CC422 fylged}, p. 280, and pp. 46, 70, 80 and 266.

\(^{609}\)On the “pattern... in which the direct object is expressed with the first verb only,” see Mitchell, \textit{OES}, § 1575. Sequences following the pattern “noun object...pronoun object” are discussed by Mitchell in § 1570. O’Keeffe describes the omission of \textit{him} from B\(_1\) as “probably the result of eyeskip,” \textit{Visible Song}, p. 64. \textit{Fylgan} is found with dative as well as accusative objects. See Mitchell, \textit{OES}, § 1092.
**MSol, B₁ 64a/CC₄₂₂ 64a**

**B₁**

63 gylden isse| godes cwide  
   hafað seolofren

**CC₄₂₂**

Salomon cwæð  
   gylden isse godes cwide  
   hafað sylfren **leaf**

**CC₄₂₂ leaf** seems necessary for sense, metre and syntax. In **CC₄₂₂**, line 64a is Type B-1; **B₁** is unmetrical. See also **B₁ Ø CC₄₂₂ neah**, line 62a (p. 285), the discussion of **B₁ læted** **CC₄₂₂ fylgeð**, p. 280.

**Addition/Omission Of Metrical Units (1 example)**

**MSol, B₁ 67**

**B₁**

66 hebið seofan snytero  
   saule hunig  
   *modes meolc maerja gesælgost.*

**CC₄₂₂**

66 he bið seofan snytro  
   *saule hunig*

Lines 66 and (in **B₁**) 67 introduce a series of clauses detailing the qualities of the *Pater noster*. While line 67 introduces some further epithets for the prayer, line 66 is syntactically complete without it.

**Rearrangement across Line Boundaries (1 example)**

**MSol, B₁ 85b-86a/CC₄₂₂ 84b-85a**

**B₁**

85 singan smealice  
   *hine* symle *lufian*  
   wi:le butan| leahrtrue| hemæg| *hone* lañan gesi:ð|  
   feohterne feond| feonde gebrengan|  
   Gyf þu him ærest| ufan| yorn gebri:nged.  
   *plogo prim.*  
   *þam is .p. nama.*

**CC₄₂₂**

85 *lufian* butan leahrtrue  
   meæg *done* godes cwide  
   singan soðlice  
   *hine* *siemle* *wile*  
   *feohtende feond*  
   *feonde gebrengan*  
   *gif ðu* hærest  
   *ðon ufan*  
   *ierne gebrengest*  
   *prologa prima*  
   *ðamis P. nama*

The rearrangement affects the metre of the two lines. In **CC₄₂₂**, line 84b is Type B-1 with resolution of the second lift; line 85a is Type A-1. In **B₁**, *lufian* (for *lufian*) adds a third (unmetrical) dip at the end of line 85b; line 86a is Type A-3.⁶¹⁰ In addition to the metrical problems in **B₁**, the double alliteration in **CC₄₂₂** line 85a suggests that it preserves the original reading.

---

⁶¹⁰ See also O’Keeffe, *Visible Song*, pp. 62-63. Menner’s arrangement of **B₁** lines 85b-86a with the line division between *symle* and *lufian* does not solve the problem: *hine* *siemle* has only one lift.
Reinterpretation (1 example)

*MSol*, B₁ 65b/CC₄₂₂ 65b

**B₁**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SALON. ē.</th>
<th>CC₄₂₂</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gylden isse</td>
<td>godes cwide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gzym mum astæned.</td>
<td>gylden isse godes cwide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hafað seolofren</td>
<td>sundor mæg æg hwylc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 þurh gastæ</td>
<td>gife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 ðurh gastes</td>
<td>gife</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B₁** *god spellian* is a compound verb ‘evangelise’. **CC₄₂₂** *god spel secgan* consists of an accusative object and infinitive ‘preach the gospel’. While O’Keeffe describes the **B₁** reading as being “the weaker version and only marginally acceptable,”⁶¹¹ both readings appear to make good sense and metre. Metrically, **B₁** is Type D-2 and **CC₄₂₂** Type A-2a.

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

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

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

---

⁶¹¹ O’Keeffe, *Visible Song*, p. 62.

Meyvaert have argued that this awkward and unusual layout is instead evidence that the poem was added to the cross after it was erected.\textsuperscript{613}

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

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

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


\textsuperscript{614}See Celia Sisam, ed., \textit{The Vercelli Book: A Late Tenth Century Manuscript Containing Prose and Verse}. \textit{Vercelli Biblioteca Capitolare CXVII}, EEMF 19 (Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1976 ), pp. 37-44.
verse paragraph by the use of a *positura* (:7) and blank space extending to the end of the manuscript line; a second *positura* follows *treow* at the end of metrical line 17. With the beginning of quire 15, however, the poem is both more compactly arranged on the page and punctuated according to a different system. As mentioned above, the first pages of the bridging quire are ruled for 32 lines instead of the 24 lines of quire 14. With f. 105r, moreover, the scribe abandons the use of the *positurae* and begins to mark his poem with metrical points. Where f. 104v contains only seven points, f. 105r has thirty-four. Where the scribe included two *positurae* in the first 21 metrical lines of f. the poem on 104v in quire 14, the text’s remaining 135 metrical lines (most of which are in quire 15) contain only one variant form (:~) after the last line of the poem as a whole on f. 106r.615

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

It is probable that, before quire 16 became part of the Vercelli Book, it was preceded by a quire *15, which, like quires 16 and 17, had 31 lines to a page. It would have contained homily XIX and the first part of homily XX; these would have occupied most of the last six leaves of the quire, and homily XIX would have begun part-way down the recto of the third leaf. Before it must have come matter not wanted for the Vercelli Book; matter which could not be excised because it occupied part of the recto of the leaf on which homily XIX began. In its place the Vercelli compiler inserted the shorter *Dream of the Rood*. With characteristic economy, he began it in the blank space after ‘Deceit’ [i.e. “Homiletic Fragment I”] on the last page of quire 14; then made a new quire 15, exactly tailored to contain the rest of *The Dream of the Rood*, and the homilies (XIX and part of XX) which had to be recopied from his original quire *15.616

---


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

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

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

---

617 Ó Carragáin, “Vercelli Collector,” p. 82.

618 As mentioned above (fn. 515), it seems more likely that the Ruthwell rune master was adapting a poem similar to the Vercelli Book text than that the poet of the Vercelli version was expanding a text like the Ruthwell Inscription – the argument remains the same, however, no matter which version represents the innovation.
The witnesses to the *Dream of the Rood* exhibit thirteen potentially significant substantive variants in their 30 copied lines. While these include no syntactically or metrically linked variants and no examples of variation between prepositional phrases and bare case endings, they do include most of the other variant types most characteristic of the Anthologised and Excerpted texts: one example of the substitution of stressed, non-homographic forms, two examples of the addition or omission of lines and half-lines, and three examples of recomposition (involving among other changes the substitution of metrical units and rearrangement of material within the line).

**Textual Variants**

**Inflectional Variants** (2 examples)

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R⁶¹⁹</th>
<th>V(Dream)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>[äbôf] ic riicne kyiniNc heafunæs hlafard hælda ic ni dorstæ. Bismæræðu uNket men ða ætgæd[re]</td>
<td>Rod wæs icaræred. ahol icricne cyning heofona hlaford. hyldan me nedorste. þurh drifan hime mid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bi[goten of]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

---

⁶¹⁹For ease of reference, the text of the Ruthwell Cross Inscription is based on the transliteration by Michael Swanton. For reference, see fn. 516.
**Dream/RuthCr, V 48b/R 2.2b**

**R**

2.1 [āhōf] ic riencæ kyniNc  
heafunæs hlafard ḡælda ic ni dorstæ.  
Bismærædæ uNket men bā ætgæd[re] |  
ic [wæs] mīþ blōdæ [b]istēmi[d]  
bi[goten of]

**V(Dream)**

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

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

**Substitution Of Unstressed Words and Elements (3 examples)**

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

**R**

2.1 [āhōf] ic riencæ kyniNc  
heafunæs hlafard ḡælda ic ni dorstæ.  
Bismærædæ uNket men bā ætgæd[re] |  
ic [wæs] mīþ blōdæ [b]istēmi[d]  
bi[goten of]

**V(Dream)**

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

**V** hie ‘they’ and **R** men ‘men’ are syntactically and metrically identical, but have an important effect on the poem’s historical point of view. In **V**, Christ’s tormentors are identified as ‘they’. This establishes a sense of historical distance between the reader and the
events of the Crucifixion, and is in keeping with the nature of the V text as a dream-vision in which the Cross tells the dreamer of his historical experiences at Christ’s Crucifixion. The use of *men* in R, on the other hand, eliminates the historical distance by emphasising the fact that the tormentors – like the reader of the inscription – were ‘men’. This is in keeping with the fragment’s position on a monument to the Crucifixion, the purpose of which – among other things – is to remind Christians that Christ was killed by and for all mankind, and not simply the inhabitants of Classical Judea.

A further example of such historical distancing in the V text of the poem is found in line 63a, see below, p. 294.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>V (Dream)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Rod wæs iccaræd. ahof ic rie ne cyning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>heofona hlaforde. hyldan me nedorste.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>þurh drifan hime mid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on me syndon þa dolg ge siene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>opene inwid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ne dorste ic hira næning sceðdan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bysmeredon hie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eal ic wæs mi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>begoten of] þæs guman sidan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>siðdan he hæfde his gast onsended.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**V unc** and **R uNket** are both forms of the first person dual personal pronoun (**R uNket**, is a form more commonly associated with late prose). As both pronouns fall in the preliminary drop of a hypermetric Type-D line, the substitution has no effect on metre.

---

620 *man* is used as an indefinite in the nominative singular only. See Mitchell, *OES*, § 363.

621 Campbell, *OEG*, § 703; Swanton, *Dream of the Rood*, p. 117.
Dream/RuthCr, V 63a/R 4.2a

R

4.1 ὑπὸ στρελόματα ἐγκατέστησεν

ἡνέκα λιμῷ ῥηγνέα

γείσεξας γυμνάτῳ

[β]ήθη[λ]δου[σ] [η] ἡ[ξ] [β][ρ] [.........]

V(Dream)

62b ἐὰν τὸ ἐπὶ στρατίφωμα ὑπὸ τοῦ στροφημένου

Ἀλέων ἡνέκα λιμῷ ῥηγνέα

ἐπὶ τὸν γυμνότατον

[β]ήθη[λ]δου[σ] [η] ἡ[ξ] [β][ρ] [.........]

The substitution of V δαήρ ῾Ρ ηνέκα has a significant effect on sense and syntax. In ῾Ρ, the accusative pronoun ηνέκα anticipates the immediately following noun λιμῷ ῥηγνέα: ‘they laid him down, limb-weary...’ In V, λιμῷ ῥηγνέα is the sole object of ᾿Αλέων, while δαήρ serves as an adverb of place: ‘they laid down the limb-weary [one] there...’ As with the substitution V ηεὶ ῾Ρ μεν in line 48a (discussed above, p. 292), the use of δαήρ helps establish a sense of historical distance from the events of the Crucifixion in V.

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

Substitution Of Prefixes (1 example)

Dream/RuthCr, V 62b/R 4.1a

R

4.1 ὑπὸ στρελόματα ἐγκατέστησεν

ἡνέκα λιμῷ ῥηγνέα

γείσεξας γυμνάτῳ

[β]ήθη[λ]δου[σ] [η] ἡ[ξ] [β][ρ] [.........]

V(Dream)

62b ἐὰν τὸ ἐπὶ στρατίφωμα ὑπὸ τοῦ στροφημένου

Ἀλέων ἡνέκα λιμῷ ῥηγνέα

ἐπὶ τὸν γυμνότατον

[β]ήθη[λ]δου[σ] [η] ἡ[ξ] [β][ρ] [.........]

R γυμνάτῳ and V for wundod are close synonyms. They are metrically and syntactically identical.
Substitution Of Stressed Words and Elements (1 example)

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

**R**


**V(Dream)**

Rod wæs icaræred. ahoft ic ricne cyning 45 heofona hlaford. hyldan me nedorstæ. þurh drifan hime mid| deorcan nægli. on me syndon þa dolg ge siene opene inwid|lemmas. 

ne dorste ic hira nænigü sceðdan bysmeredon hie| unc butu ægtædere. 

eall ic wæs mid blode bestemed. begoten of| þæs guman sidan. 

siððan he hæfde his gast onsended.

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

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

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

**R**


**V(Dream)**

Rod wæs icaræred. ahoft ic ricne cyning 45 heofona hlaford. hyldan me nedorstæ. þurh drifan hime mid| deorcan nægli. on me syndon þa dolg ge siene opene inwid|lemmas. 

ne dorste ic hira nænigü sceðdan bysmeredon hie| unc butu ægtædere. 

eall ic wæs mid blode bestemed. begoten of| þæs guman sidan. 

siððan he hæfde his gast onsended.

The addition or omission of the intensifying adverb eall falls on the preliminary drop of a hypermetric Type A-1 line. It has no significant effect on sense, metre, or syntax.
Addition/Omission of Metrical Units (2 examples)

Dream/RuthCr, V 46-47

R

2.1 [abhof] ic riicne kyniNc
heafunæs hlafard  hælda ic ni dorste.
Bismaerædu uNket men bā ætgad[re] |
ic [wæs] miþ blōdæ [b]istem[i][d]
bi[goten of]

V(Dream)

45
Rod wæs icaræred.  ahof ic ricne cyning
heofona hlaford.  hyldan me nedorste.
þurh drifan hime mid| deorcan næglį
on me syndon þa dolg ge siene
opene inwiden|lemmas.
ne dorste ic hira nænigü sceðdan
bysmeredon hie| unc butu ætgædere.
eall ic wæs mid blode bestemed.
begoten of] þæs guman sidan.
siððran he hæfde his gast onsended.

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

The absence of V 46-47 from R might be construed as evidence that they are a later addition to the poem. As argued above, pp. 241-244, however, their omission is also in keeping with the Ruthwell rune master’s demonstrable interest in keeping his text focused on the Crucifixion – rather than the character of the Cross or the dreamer.
V 50-56a contain a description of the moment of Christ's death. As argued above, pp. 241-244, the elimination of these lines from R is in keeping with rune master's emphasis on simplicity of narrative – Christ ascends the cross in Section 1, is Crucified in Sections 2 and 3, and is buried in Section 4 – and on the Crucifixion as an object of adoration.

622 That these lines are eliminated from the Ruthwell Cross rather than added to the Vercelli Book is suggested by the fact that Section 3.1 begins with the off-verse, but appears to have been marked by a cross. If the Ruthwell text was original, we would expect the fragment to begin with an on-verse. See also above, p. 241, fn. 515.
Recomposition (3 examples)

Dream/RuthCr, V 39-40/R 1.1

R

1.1  [+ Ond]geredæ hinae god almehtig
    þa he walde on galgu gistīg
    [modig [fore alle] men]
    [B]ūg[la ic ni dorstæ...]

V(Dream)

Ongyrede hine þa geong hæleð
    bet was godi ælmihtig
40  strang ǧistið mod.
    ge stah he ongealgan heanne|
    modig onmanigra ge syhðe.
    þa he wolde man cyn lysan.|  
    bifode icþa me se beorn ymb clypte.
    ne dorste ichwæðrel bugan to eorðan
    feallan tofoldan sceatū."
    Ac icseolde fæste| standan.

R 1.1 and V 39-40 both express closely similar ideas. Of the material in V, R omits the reference to Christ as a geong hæleð and his qualities strang ǧistið mod, and combines the remaining text from the lines into a single hypermetric long line alliterating on g.\(^{623}\)

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

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

\(^{624}\) Pope, Seven Old English Poems, p. 66.
As is also true of V 39-40/R 1.1, the recomposition in V 41-2/R 1.2 involves either an abridgement of V by R or an expansion of R by V. As ûg are the only letters to survive at this point in R, however, it is impossible to tell how close the two versions might originally have been. The usual reconstruction of R, \[m\]odig f[ore allæ] men \[B\]ûg[a ic ni dorste...], does not alliterate, and, if correct, may represent an “unmetrical abridgement” as Pope suggests.\(^{625}\)

As Swanton notes, the principal difference between these two half-lines is a “displacement of the attribute” \(æpelæ/æþeling\).\(^{626}\) In R, \(æþþilæ\) (nominative plural of \(æþæle\), ‘noble’) is the subject of \(kwæmu\), line 3.2b and refers to the people who hastened to see Christ on the cross: ‘the noble ones, eager, came together (\(til\ \ænum\)\(^{627}\) there from afar...’; in V, \(æþþilæ\) (dative singular of \(æþæling\), ‘nobleman, prince’) is the object of \(to\) and refers to Christ himself: ‘eager ones came there from afar to that Prince...’

\(^{625}\)Pope, *Seven Old English Poems*, p. 66.

\(^{626}\)Swanton, *Dream of the Rood*, p. 40.
The two lines have a very different metre. In \textbf{R}, line 3.3a is Type A-1; in \textbf{V}, the equivalent line is Type C-1.

**Soul and Body I and II**

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

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


\textsuperscript{628}Moffat, \textit{Soul and Body}, pp. 41-44. See also Orton, “Disunity,” \textit{passim}.

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

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

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

---

630 Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 78.
631 The most complete discussion of common errors and unusual forms in the two witnesses is Orton, “A
Further Examination.” Moffat, “MS Transmission,” *passim*, and *Soul and Body*, pp. 8-9, offers some
supplemental evidence.
632 The E form is subsequently corrected to *a"cenda*.
it is scarcely conceivable that an error of this type should have been transmitted by reciters and also preserved in both written texts of the poem: some alteration to achieve good sense is to be expected in such circumstances. It is much more likely that the archetype version took the form of a written text which contained at this point some obscurity which later scribes were unable or unconcerned to correct.

Textual Variants

Inflectional Difference (24 examples)

_Soul I/II, V 5a/E 5a_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V(Soul I)</th>
<th>E(Soul II)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H uru ðæs be hofað</td>
<td>HÜRÜ ĐAES BE HOFAÐ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḥæleða æghwylc</td>
<td>ḥæleða æghwylc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>þæt he his</td>
<td>sawle sið sið</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hu þæt bið deoplic</td>
<td>þón</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asyndreð þa sybbe</td>
<td>asun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>þæthehis sawle sið</td>
<td>þæthehis sawle sið</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>þæt he his</td>
<td>sawle sið</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_V sawle_ is accusative singular, parallel to _lic_, apposite (with _lic_ to _sybbe_ ‘kinsmen’ (line 4b), and direct object of _asyndreð_: ‘...when the Death comes, separates the kinsmen, who were earlier together, body and soul.’ In _E_, _sawl_ may be a mistake for _sawle_ (as in _V_), a nominative singular, or perhaps an example of the Anglian endingless accusative singular.635

As _lic_ and _sibbe_ have the same form in the nominative and accusative, either reading is grammatically possible. If _sawl_ is nominative, _lic ṣawl_ are singular and the subjects (with _sibbe_) of _asun|drað_, which in turn must be understood as intransitive and plural (with _a_ for _e_ through the confusion of vowels in unaccented syllables): ‘...when the Death comes. The kinsmen who were together, body and soul, will separate.’ If _sawl_ is accusative, the passage is to be construed as in _V_.

In _V_, line 5a is Type A-1; in _E_, the equivalent line is unmetrical as written, although restoring the unsyncopated form of the nominative/endingless accusative singular (_s@wol_) gives satisfactory metre (Type A-1).

---


635 For the endingless accusative singular, see Sievers-Brunner, § 252 Anm. 2 and § 254.2. See also “Gloria I,” line 55b, where the same variation occurs.
**Soul I/II, V 17a/E 17a**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>V(Soul I)</strong></th>
<th><strong>E(Soul II)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 hwæt druðu dreorega tohwæn drehest ðu me eorðan[ñ]lynes ealfor wisnað lames ge licnes</td>
<td>17 hwæt druguþu dreorga to hwæn dreahest[þ] ðu me eorþan fylnes ealfor weornast lames gelicnes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>V(Soul I)</strong></th>
<th><strong>E(Soul II)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35 þæt me þuhte ful oft þæt hit war.xxx.</td>
<td>þæt were britig þuhtu ful oft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to þinu dead dæge</td>
<td>þusend wintra toþinum dead dæge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

---


\(^{637}\)Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 67. For the loss of the second person ending of strong verbs before þu, see Sievers-Brunner § 364 Anm. 2.

\(^{638}\)ASPR 2, p. 126. B.-T.(S) dru.
E, \textit{ware}\ occupees the preliminay dip of a Type A-3 line. In the unlikely event that V \textit{war} is not an error for \textit{ware}, the equivalent line in V is Type C-1.

\textbf{Soul I/II, V 42a/E 39a}

\textbf{V(Soul I)}
\begin{verbatim}
Forðan þu ne hogodest her on life
syððan icðe onl worulde wunian sceleode
þæt ðu ware þurh flæsc| þurh fyren lustas
\end{verbatim}

\textbf{E(Soul II)}
\begin{verbatim}
þærþu þón hogode her onlife
\end{verbatim}

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

\textbf{Soul I/II, V 45a/E 42a}

\textbf{V(Soul I)}
\begin{verbatim}
Forðan þu ne hogodest her on life
syððan icðe onl worulde wunian sceleode
þæt ðu ware þurh flæsc| þurh fyren lustas
\end{verbatim}

\textbf{E(Soul II)}
\begin{verbatim}
þærþu þón hogode her onlife
\end{verbatim}

\textit{V strange} is an adverb meaning ‘strongly’; \textit{E strong} can only be a mistake for \textit{stronge} (as in \textit{V}) or a strong nominative adjective apposite to \textit{þu} (E 41a). In \textit{V}, \textit{strange} qualifies \textit{ge stryned} ‘born’ in line 45: \textit{þu ne hogodest... þæt ðu ware þurh flæsc... ge stryned, ‘you did not consider... that you were strongly born [ge stryned, see below, p. 325] through flesh and through sin’; in \textit{E strong} presumably modifies the subject of the sentence \textit{þu}, perhaps with an eye towards establishing a contrast between the physical strength of the body and the incorporeal support offered by the soul: ‘you had not considered... that you, strong, were
directed [gestyred, see below, p. 325] through flesh and through sin... Both versions are grammatical, though E makes better sense than V. As the inflectional ending adds or subtracts an additional unstressed syllable in the medial dip of a Type A-1 line, the variation is metrically insignificant.

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

**V(Soul I)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forðan þu ne hogdest</th>
<th>her on life</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>syððan icðe on</td>
<td>wurlde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ðæt du ware</td>
<td>ðurh flæsc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strange ge stryned.</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ðæc wæs gast onðe</td>
<td>fram gode sended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>næfre</td>
<td>ðu me mid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nege neredest</td>
<td>ðurh þinra meda lust.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**E(Soul II)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>þærþu þon hogode</th>
<th>her onlife</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>þenden icðe inworul</td>
<td>wunian sceolde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ðæt ðuwæere</td>
<td>ðurh flæsc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strong gestyred</td>
<td>gestaðelad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ðicgwæs gast onþe</td>
<td>from gode sended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>næfre þumec</td>
<td>swa heardra helle wita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ne gearwode</td>
<td>ðurh þinra neol</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**V heardþ helle witum** is the dative plural object of *mid* ‘with hard hell-torments’. E *heardra helle wita* is genitive plural, ‘of hard hell-torments’. Both readings are problematic. As Orton and Moffat have pointed out, the E reading is grammatically unattached to the rest of the sentence, and cannot be construed without emendation. In V, the problem lies in the use of the preposition *mid* ‘with’ with *ge neredest* ‘rescued, saved, liberated’. See below, p. 340. Because the variant involves changes to both the adjective and noun, it is linked.
Soul I/II, V 54a/E 52a

V(Soul I)
ne eart þu þon leofra nænig lifigendra
men to ge meccan. ne meder ne fæder.
ne nænigum ge sybban. þon, ’sæl swearta hrefn
55 syðdan ic ana ofðe utsiðode
þurh þæs sylfes hand þe ic ær onsended wæs.

E(Soul II)
ne eart þu nüpon leofre nængu lifigendra
50 menn toge meccan nemedder nefæder
nænigum gesibbra þon se swearta hrenf
sibban icana of þe utsiðade.
þurh þæs sylfes hond þeic ær onsended wæs.

V ge sybban is a weak dative singular adjective apposite to nænigum: ‘to no
kinsman’.

E gesibbra is a strong genitive plural adjective modifying næn|gum: ‘to none of
[your] kinsmen.’ The two forms are metrically identical.

Soul I/II, V 57a/E 54a

V(Soul I)
ne meæg þe nuþon heonon adon hyrsta þy readan.
ne gold ne seolfor ne þinra goda nán
ne þinre byrde beag. ne þin| gold wela.
60 ne nanþara goda þeþu iu ahtest.
Ac her| sceolon on bidan ban be reafod
be sliten synum. þe| þin sawl sceal
† minum unwillu oft gesecan
wemman| þe mid wordu swa ðu worhtest to me.

E(Soul II)
Nemagon þe nu heonan adon hyrste þa readan
55 negold|ne sylfor neþinra goda nán
ac her sculon abidan ban| hireafod
besliten seonwum þe þin sawl sceal
min| un| willan oft gesecan
wemman mid wordum swaþu worhtest| tome.

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

The use of the instrumental pa for expected pa, however, suggests instead that the V scribe could not

---

641 On the substantive use of the weak adjective declension, see Mitchell, OES, §§ 133-4.
642 -e for -a is common in unstressed syllables, see Campbell, OEG, § 379.
643 Mitchell, OES, § 1524.
follow his exemplar at this point (see the following variant).\(^\text{644}\) The variants fall on the preliminary dip of a Type B-2 line and have no significant metrical effect.

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

\[V(Soul \ I)\]

ne mæg þe nu| heonon adon  hyrsta \(by\) readan.
ne gold ne seolfor| ne þinra goda nán
ne þinre bryde beag.  ne þin\(\) gold wela.
60 ne nan\(\)para goda  þeðu iu ahtest.
Ac her\(\) sceolon on bidan  ban be reafod
be sliten synum.  ßpe| þin sawl sceal
\(\) minum unwillu  oft gesecean
wemman\(\) þe mid wordu\(\) swa ðu worhtest to me.

\[E(Soul \ II)\]

Nemagon þe nu heonan adon  hyrste \(pa\) readan
55 negold\(\)ne sylfor  neþinra goda nán
ac her sculon abidan  ban\(\) bireafod
besliten seonwum  ßpe| þin sawl sceal
minu\(\) un\(\)willan  oft gesecean
wemman mid wordum  swaþu worhtest\(\) tome.

\(E \ pa\) is the nominative plural demonstrative pronoun. \(V \ by\) is ostensibly the instrumental singular masculine form. The required case is nominative singular (or perhaps nominative plural, if we accept Mitchell’s suggestion that \(hyrsta\) is being used as a “collective”).\(^\text{645}\) For a discussion of the relationship between this variant and the number of the verb in line 57a, see above, p. 306.

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

\[V(Soul \ I)\]

ne mæg þe nu| heonon adon  hyrsta \(by\) readan.
ne gold ne seolfor| ne þinra goda nán
ne þinre bryde beag.  ne þin\(\) gold wela.
60 ne nan\(\)para goda  þeðu iu ahtest.
Ac her\(\) sceolon on bidan  ban be reafod
be sliten synum.  ßpe| þin sawl sceal
\(\) minum unwillu  oft gesecean
wemman\(\) þe mid wordu\(\) swa ðu worhtest to me.

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

---

\(^{644}\) Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 74.

Soul I/II, V 74b/E 69b

V(Soul I)  
ne synt þine æhtaawiht
75 þe ðu her on moldan  mannû eowdest.

E(Soul II)  
esindon þine geah|be wiht
70 þaþu her onmoldan  monnum eawdest.

V wiht is a nominative plural feminine strong adjective agreeing with æhta

‘possessions’: ‘nor are your possessions [æhta] of value, which you showed off to men here on earth.’ E wiht is a nominative singular neuter noun ‘anything’: ‘nor are your extravagances [geah|be] anything, which you showed off to men here on earth.’ Both readings are semantically and syntactically appropriate.

With wiht, V 74b is hypermetric Type D*1; the equivalent line in E is Type B-1.

As the result of other changes in the line, the V version of the poem does not alliterate. For further discussion of the variants in this line, see pp. 319 and 329, below.

Soul I/II, V 82a/E 77a

V(Soul I)  
forðan þewære| selre  swiðe mycle
þon þe waren ealle  eorðan speda.| butan þu hie gedælde  dryhtne sylfum
þær ðu wurde æt fryð|e| fugel  oððe fisc onsg
80 oððe on eorðan nea|t  ætes tiolode| feld gongende  feoh butan snyttr|o oððe onwestenne| wild deora
þær wyrreste  þær swa god wolde, ge þeah|ðu were  wyrm cynna
85 þ grimmeste  þær swa god wolde :7| þonne ðu æfre onmoldan  mangle wurde, oððe æfre felwiht|e  onfon sceolde.

E(Soul II)  
forþon| þewære selle  swiðe micle
þon þeweran ealle  eorþan spel|de butan þu hyge dælde  dryhtne sylf|u
þær þuwurde ætfrum sceafte fugel  opfe fisc onsg.
75 oððe eorþan nea|t  ætes tiolode| feld gongende  feoh butan snyttro ge on| westenne  wildra deora
þgrim mest|e  þarswa god wolde| ge þeah| þu ware  wyrm cynna  þær wyrreste
80 þon þu æfre| onmoldan  mangle wurde opfe æfre fulwiht|e  onfon sceol|de

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

\*Moffat cites unged|fenlce (Beowulf, l. 2345b) as a possible parallel to ne synt þine æhta wiht (Soul and Body, § 3.8 [d], p. 22). Given the differences in stress pattern between the two lines, the parallel is at best slight. On the stress of wiht see Campbell, OEG, § 393.
Soul I/II, V 88a/E 82a

V(Soul I)

þonne Ḟu for unc bæm| and wyrdan scealt
onðam miclan dæge  þonne mannij beoð
90 wunda on wrigene  þaðe onworulde ær
fyræn fulle men  fyrnæng worhton.
Þön wyle dryhten sylf| dædalge hyran
hæleða gehwylces  heofena scippend
Æt ealra| manna gehwæs  mûdes reorde
95 wunde wiðer lean.

E(Soul II)

þön Ḟu for unc bú  ondwyrdan scealt
onðam miclan| dæge  þön eallum monnij beoð
wunde onwrigene  þaðe in| worulde ær.
85 firen fulle menn  fyrn geworhton.
ðön wirle| dryhten sylf| dæda gehryan
Æt ealra monna gehwam| mûxes reorde
wunde wiðer lean

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

Soul I/II, V 94a/E 87a

V(Soul I)

þonne Ḟu for unc bæm| and wyrdan scealt
onðam miclan dæge  þonne mannij beoð
90 wunda on wrigene  þaðe onworulde ær
fyræn fulle men  fyrnæng worhton.
Þön wyle dryhten sylf| dædalge hyran
hæleða gehwylces  heofena scippend
Æt ealra| manna gehwæs  mûdes reorde
95 wunde wiðer lean.

E(Soul II)

þön Ḟu for unc bú  ondwyrdan scealt
onðam miclan| dæge  þön eallum monnij beoð
wunde onwrigene  þaðe in| worulde ær.
85 firen fulle menn  fyrn geworhton.
ðön wirle| dryhten sylf| dæda gehryan
Æt ealra monna gehwam| mûxes reorde
wunde wiðer lean

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

647 Moffat, Soul and Body, p. 78.
Soul I/II, V 98b/E 91a

V(Soul I)

þonne| nebið nan natoþæs lytel lið
online aweaxen.
þðu ne| scyle for anra  ge hwylcum on sundrū
rihtagildan. ||| þon reðe bìð
100 dryhten æt þam dome

E(Soul II)

90  þôn nebið næning topæs lytel lið]   
online geweaxen
þæt þune scyle for æghwylc  anra on|sundran
ryht agieldan.  ðonne reþebið
dryhten æt do|mē

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

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

Soul I/II, V 98b/E 91b

V(Soul I)

þonne| nebið nan natoþæs lytel lið
online aweaxen.
þðu ne| scyle for anra  ge hwylcum on sundrū
rihtagildan. ||| þon reðe bìð
100 dryhten æt þam dome

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

648Moffat, Soul and Body, p. 78.
649Moffat, Soul and Body, p. 78.
Soul I/II, V 113a/E 108a

V(Soul I)

bið þæt heafod tohliden handa to| liðode
gæaglas toginene góman toslitene
110 sina beoð ásocene swyra be cowen
fingras tohrorene
rib reaf|iað reðe wyrmas
beoð hira tungan toto|genne ontn̄| healfa
hungregu tofrofre
forþan hie ne magon| huxlicum
115 wordum wrixlian wið þone werian gast.|  

E(Soul II)

biþ þæt heaf|īfod tohliden hond|a tohleō|pode
gæalas toginene góman toslitene
105 seonwe beoð asogene sweora bicowen
rib reaf|āð reþe wyrmas
drincæð hloþum hrá | heolfres |urst|ge.
bið seo tunge totogen on tyn healf|e
hungrum to| hroþor
forþon heone mag horscl|ice
110 wordū wrixlan| wið þone wergan gæst.

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

See the discussion of V tungan E tunge, below.

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

V(Soul I)

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

E(Soul II)

biþ þæt heaf|īfod tohliden hond|a tohleō|pode
gæalas toginene góman toslitene
105 seonwe beoð asogene sweora bicowen
rib reaf|āð reþe wyrmas
drincæð hloþum hrá | heolfres |urst|ge.
bið seo tunge totogen on tyn healf|e
hungrum to| hroþor
forþon heone mag horscl|ice
110 wordū wrixlan| wið þone wergan gæst.

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

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

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

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

In V, on the other hand, the tungan are almost certainly those of the reðe wyrmas mentioned in
line 112b. In this version of the text, the direct catalogue of punishments stops with fingras
tohrorene, line 111. With line 112, the poet turns his attention to describing the horrific nature of the worms, with their lash-like tongues and terrible silence:

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

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

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

**V(Soul I)**

bīð þæt heafod tohliðen  handa to|līðode
gæglas toginene  góman tosλitene
110 sina beoð|āsocene  swyra be cowen
fingras tohrorene
rib reaf|jāð  reðe wyrmas
beoð hira tunγen totogen|e  ontyn|healfa
hungregū tofrofre
forþan hie ne magon|huxlicum
115 wordum wrixlian  wið þone werian gast.|

**E(Soul II)**

bīþ þæt healfod tohliðen  hondatohleþode
gæflas toginene  goman| tosλitene
105 seonwe beoð asogene  sweora bicowen
rib reaf|jað  reþe wyrmas
drincað hlōþum hrā  heolfres þurst|ge.
bið seo tunγa totog|en  on tyn healfe
hungrum to|l hroþor
forþon heone mæg horslice
110 wordū wrixlan|  wið þone wergan gæst.

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

In addition to their effect on sense and syntax, the variants also affect metre: in E, line 108a is Type B-2; in V, the equivalent line is a metrically poor Type A-1 with three anacrustic syllables.
V *(Soul I)*  
bið þæt heafod tohilden  handa to| liðode  
geaglas toginene  góman toslitene  
110 sina beoð| ásocene  swyra be cowen  
fingras tohrorene  
rib reaf|iað  reðe wyrmas  
beoð hira tungan toto| gene  onty[| healfa  
hungregi| tofrofre  
forþan hie ne magon| huxlicum  
115 wordum wrixlian  wið þone werian gast.]  

E *(Soul II)*  
bið þæt heaf|fod tohilden  honda tohole|pode  
geaflas toginene  góman toslitene  
105 seonwe beoð asogene  sweora bicowen  
r| reb reaf|iað  reðe wyrmas  
| r| incað hlo|pum hrá  heolfres þurst[|ge.  
bið se| o to| togen  on tyn healfh  
hungrum to[| hro|for  
forþan heone maga| horscl|ce  
110 wordu| wrix|lan|  wið þone wergan gast.

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

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

V *(Soul I)*  
bið þæt heafod tohilden  handa to| liðode  
geaglas toginene  góman toslitene  
110 sina beoð| ásocene  swyra be cowen  
fingras tohrorene  
rib reaf|iað  reðe wyrmas  
beoð hira tungan toto| gene  onty[| healfa  
hungregi| tofrofre  
forþan hie ne magon| huxlicum  
115 wordum wrixlian  wið þone werian gast.]  

E *(Soul II)*  
bið þæt heaf|fod tohilden  honda tohole|pode  
geaflas toginene  góman toslitene  
105 seonwe beoð asogene  sweora bicowen  
r| reb reaf|iað  reðe wyrmas  
| r| incað hlo|pum hrá  heolfres þurst[|ge.  
bið se| o to| togen  on tyn healfh  
hungrum to[| hro|for  
forþan heone maga| horscl|ce  
110 wordu| wrix|lan|  wið þone wergan gast.

*V magon* is third person plural present indicative; *E meag* is third person singular, present indicative. The variation is linked to a corresponding difference in the number of the pronoun subject in each version and to a number of other differences in number throughout *V* 113-115/*E* 108-110. The variation affects the preliminary dip of a Type C-2 verse and is metrically insignificant.
The two words are declensional variants of the athematic noun tōp. V has the expected form with i-mutation. E topas is by analogy with the masculine a-declension.650 The variation has a minor effect on metre. In V, line 119 is Type B-1; in E it is B-2.

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

V ge mynde is dative singular ‘a reminder’; E ge myndū is dative plural ‘reminders’.

As the poem is concerned with a single body, the singular seems preferable to the reading in E.

The two words are otherwise metrically, semantically, and syntactically identical.

650 Campbell, OEG, § 623.
651 See Moffat, Soul and Body, p. 81.
Substitution Of Unstressed Words and Elements (14 examples)

\textbf{Soul I/II, V 10a/E 10a}

V(Soul I)  
Sceal se gast cuman | geohðum hremig  
10 symble \textit{ymbe} seofon niht | sawle findan |  
þone lichoman | þe hie ðær lange wæg  
þreo hund wintra | butan ðær ðeod cyning  
ælmihtig god | ende worulde  
wyr|can wille | weoruda dryhten :7

E(Soul II)  
Scealse gast cuman | gehþum hremig  
10 symble \textit{ymb} seofon niht | sawle findan |  
þone lic homan | þe| heo ðær lange wæg  
þreo hund wintra | butan ðær wyrce | ece| dryhten  
ælmihtig god | ende worlde.

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

\textbf{Soul I/II, V 33b/E 30b}

V(Soul I)  
eardode icþe oninnan  
30 meahte icþe ||| of cuman  
flæsce befangen | mefyrren lustas  
35 þine geþrungon

E(Soul II)  
eiþe Ininnan noicþe of meahte  
flæsce bifongen| ðmefyrren lustas  
þinegeþrungon

\textit{V ne} and \textit{E no} are both negative adverbs. The substitution has no significant effect on sense, metre, or syntax.\(^{652}\)

\textbf{Soul I/II, V 37b/E 34b}

V(Soul I)  
á ic uncres geda|les onbád  
earfoðlice | nis nu huru se ende to góð. |  
35 earfoðlice nis nu se ende| togod.

E(Soul II)  
hwæt ic uncres geda|les bád.  
35 earfoðlice nis nu se ende| togod.

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

\(^{652}\)See Mitchell, \textit{OES}, § 1128.
The substitution V Forðan E þær is linked to the tense and mood of V hogodest/E hogode in line 42a/39a and the substitution of verbs V ge neredest E gearwode in line 48a/45a. The variant has an important effect on the syntax of V 42-48/E 39-45. In E, lines 39-43 are a conditional clause dependent on E 44-45:

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

The equivalent lines of V, on the other hand, can be interpreted in three different ways:

as a clause subordinate to V 40b-41 (jofþyrsted was / godes lichoman gastes drynces):  

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

as an independent clause, with forðan being used as an adverb:

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

or as contrary-to-fact condition subordinate to V47-48:

---

653 See Moffat, Soul and Body, p. 70 (who does not accept this interpretation). That this was not the interpretation of the V scribe himself is indicated by the heavy punctuation he places at the end of metrical line 41b (7).
Because you did not think while alive here, after I had to dwell in the world with you, that you were strongly begotten through flesh and through criminal desires, and strengthened by me, and [that] I was a soul sent by God in you, you never protected me with [mid for wið ‘against?’] such hard hell-torments through pleasure of your desires.

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

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

**V(Soul I)**

Forðan þu ne hogodes 
her on life

syððan icðe on| worulde wunian sceolde

þæt ðu ware þurh flæsc| þurh fyren lustas

45 strange ge stryned.  ðestaðolod| þurh me.

icðe wæs gast onðe fram gode sended

næfre| ðu me mid swa hearðu helle witum nege neredest| þurh þinra meda lust.

**E(Soul II)**

þærþu þn hogode her onlife

40 þenden icþe inworul|de wunian sceolde

þæt þu ware þurh flæsc þurh fyren lustas

strong gestyred  ðestaþelad þurh mec.|

icþæþæ gast onþe from gode sended

næþæ þumec| swa hearðu helle wita

45 ne gearwode þurh þinra neoþda lust

E þenden is a conjunction indicating coincidental time: ‘If you had thought then, while alive here, while I had to dwell in the world with you....’ V syððan is a conjunction indicating either time from which or time after which. The two words make good sense and syntax, and are metrically identical.

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

**V(Soul I)**

Forðan þu ne hogodes 
her on life

syððan icðe on| worulde wunian sceolde

þæt ðu ware þurh flæsc| þurh fyren lustas

45 strange ge stryned.  ðestaðolod| þurh me.

icðe wæs gast onðe fram gode sended

næþæ| ðu me mid swa hearðu helle witum nege neredest| þurh þinra meda lust.

**E(Soul II)**

þærþu þn hogode her onlife

40 þenden icþe inworul|de wunian sceolde

þæt þu ware þurh flæsc þurh fyren lustas

strong gestyred  ðestaþelad þurh mec.|

icþæþæ gast onþe from gode sended

næþæ þumec| swa hearðu helle wita

45 ne gearwode þurh þinra neoþda lust

E mec and V me are variant forms of the accusative of the first person plural personal pronoun. The scribe of E frequently prefers accusative pronouns in -ec, although these

---

654 See Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 70 (who does not accept this interpretation) and ASPR 3, pp. 55-6.

655 This interpretation is preferred by Moffat, *Soul and Body*, pp. 70-71.

656 See Campbell, *OEG*, §702.
forms are often later corrected to -e. See also V 47a/E 44b, p. 318, below. E corrects *pec* to *pe* three times: V 57a/E 54a, V 62b/E 57b, V 73a/E 67a.

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

V(Soul I)  
Forðan þu ne hogodeset her on life  
syððan icðe on| worulde wunian sceolde  
þæt ðu ware þurh fyren lustas  
45 strange ge stryned.  ṭgestadolod| þurh me.  
þæc wæs gast onðe fram gode sended  
næfre| ðu me mid swa heardū helle witum  
nege neredest| þurh þinra meda lust.

E(Soul II)  
þær þu þon hogode her onlife  
þæt þu wære þurh flæsc  þurh fyren lustas  
strong gestyred  ṭgestatolad þurh mec.]  
þicwæs gast onþe from gode sended  
næfre þunec swa swa heartra helle wita  
45 ne gearwode þurh þinra no|da lust

*Mec* and *me* are variant forms of the first person accusative plural personal pronoun.

See the preceding variant.

**Soul I/II, V 65b/E 60b**

V(Soul I)  
65 eart ðu nu dumb|| ðeaf  
nesýnt þine dreamas awiht  

E(Soul II)  
60 eart þu dumb ðeaf  
nesíndan þine dreamas| wiht.

V *synt* and E *sindan* are variant forms of the third person plural present indicative of *bēon*. The lines are not metrically similar due to the variation V *awiht* E *wiht* (see below, p. 347). In E, *sindan* falls in the preliminary drop of a Type B-1 line; in V, *synt* is one of a metrically suspicious four anacrustic syllables in what is best scanned as a Type A-2b verse.

An identical substitution occurs in V 74b/E 69b. See below, p. 319.

**Soul I/II, V 66a/E 61a**

V(Soul I)  
sceal icðe nihtes| swa þeah nede gesecan  
synnum ge sargod  þeft sona| fram þe  
hweorfan onhancred  þon|m halige men  
lif|endum gode  lof| song doð  
70 secan þa ha|mas  þe ðu me| her scrife.  
þa arleasan eardung stowe.  
þe sculon| her mold wyrmas manige ceowan  
slit| t sarlice swarte wihta  
gifre grædige  

E(Soul II)  
sceal icðe nihtes seþeah nyde gesecan  
synnum ge|sargad  þeft sona from|ðe  
hweorfan onhoncred.  þon|m|al|e man  
lif|endum  lof| song doð  
65 secan þa ha|nmas  þep|ume ascrife  
þa arleasan eardung stowe.  
þe sculon mold wyrmas monige ceowan.  
seonowum bes|lia|n swarte wihta  
gifre grædige

The forms *swa þeah* and *seþeah* appear to be synonyms. As noted above (p. 260), *seþeah* is a characteristic spelling in E. It occurs twelve times (vs. seven for *swa þeah*)
including once more for *swa þeah* (*Leid suaedæh*) in Riddle 35, line 11. The form is not found in verse outside the Exeter Book.

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

V(*Soul I*)

319 ne synt þine æhta awihte.] 75 þe ðu her on moldan mannñi eawdest.

V(*Soul I*)

77 eawdest.

V synt and E sindon are variant forms of the third person plural present indicative of *bêon*. The variation affects the preliminary dip of the line in each manuscript, and is metrically insignificant. The forms are otherwise syntactically and semantically identical. For a similar variation see p. 318, above. The metre is discussed below, pp. 329 and 347.

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

V(*Soul I*)

Forðan þewære| selre swiðe mycle
þön þe weor on ealre speda.| butan þu hie gedælde dryhtne sylfum
þær ðu wurde æt ryðe| fugel oððe fisc onseð
80 oððe on eorðan neat ætes tilode| feld gangende feoh butan snyttro oððe onwesdene| wild deora
þær wyrreste þær swa god wolde.
ge þeal| ðu ware wyrm cynna
85 þ grimmeste þær swa god wolde :7| ðonne ðu æfre onmoldan mange wurde.
oððe æfre| fulwihte onfon sceolde.

V oððe and E ge are both conjunctions meaning ‘or’. The substitution falls on the preliminary drop of a Type C-1 line and has no metrical, syntactic, or lexical significance.

**Soul I/II, V 97a/E 90a**

V(*Soul I*)

þonne nebið [nan] natoþæs lytel lið
online aweiænæn.
þu ne scyle for anra ge hwylcum on sundrũ
rihtagildan. || þon reðe bið
100 dryhten æt þam dome

V *nan* and E *nænig* are approximate synonyms. The substitution falls on the preliminary dip of a Type B-1 line and has no significant metrical effect.
**Soul I/II, V 113a/E 108a**

**V(Soul I)**

bið þæt heafod tohliden handa to líðode
gæglas toginene göman toslitene
110 sina beoð ásocene swyra be cowen
fingras tohrorene
rib reaf|iað ređe wyrmas
beoð hira tungan totogenne ontyn| healfa
hungreugu tofrofre
forþan hie ne magon| huxlicum
115 wordum wrixlian wið þone werian gast.|  

**E(Soul II)**

bið þæt heaf|fod tohliden honda tohleōpode
gæflas toginene göman| toslitene
105 seonwe beoð asogene sweora bicowen
rib reaf|iað ređe wyrmas
drincað hlo|pum hrai| heolfres þurst|ge.
bið seo tunga tunga on tyn healfa
hungrum to| hro|for
forþan heone mag horscilce
110 wordū wrixlan| wið þone wergan gæst.

**V hira** is the third-person plural possessive adjective. It agrees with *tungan* ‘their tongues’ and refers to the *wyrmas* of V 112b. **E seo** is the nominative singular feminine form of the demonstrative article. It agrees with *tun|ge* ‘the tongue’. The variants are part of a number of linked differences in number throughout V 113-115/E 108-110. See above, p. 311.

In V, the adjective adds two syllables to the unusually long anacrustic drop of a Type A-1 line.

In E, *seo* falls in the preliminary syllables to the unusually long anacrustic drop of a B-2 line.

**Soul I/II, V 116b/E 111b**

**V(Soul I)**

116 gifer hatte se wyrm be þa eaglas beoð
nædle scær|pran.

**E(Soul II)**

111 Gifer hatte sewyrm pam|ba gæflas| beoð
nædle scær|pran

The variation between V *pe* (the relative particle) and E *pam* (a demonstrative pronoun used to introduce an adjective clause) is metrically, syntactically, and semantically insignificant. Both forms are used frequently in Old English to introduce adjective clauses.
Substitution Of Prefixes (4 examples)

Soul I/II, V 51a/E 48a

V(Soul I)  
50 onðam myclan dæge þonne eall manna cynn
se accenna ealle gesamnað.

50 onðam myclan dæge þonne eall manna cynn
se accenna ealle gesamnað.

E(Soul II)  
46 scealt þunu hwæþre minra gescenta sco|me þrowian
60 onþam miclan dæge þon monna cynn
se\| a\ cenda ealle gegædrað.

The substitution V accenna and Ecorr a\ cenda affects sense and metre. As Moffat and Orton point out, the common reading of V and Euncorr is unmetrical and semantically less appropriate than that of Ecorr: the prefix a- never takes metrical stress (in contrast to an-), and acen(ne)da 'begotten one' is less appropriate as an epithet for Christ than ancenda 'only begotten one'.

Soul I/II, V 61a/E 56a

V(Soul I)  
657 Ecorr means “the E reading after correction”; Euncorr means “the E reading before correction.” For a discussion of the sigla used in this dissertation, see Appendix 2.

658 Orton, “A Further Examination,” p. 188. Moffat regards the common use of acen(ne)da in V and Euncorr as ‘decisive’ proof of the common scribal origins of the two versions of the poem, “MS Transmission,” 300-302.

V on bidan and E abidan are both infinitives, approximate synonyms and metrically identical. The substitution has no significant effect on sense, metre, or syntax.

V(Soul I)  
60 ne nainðara goda þeðu iu áhtest.
Ac her| sceolon on bidan ban be reafod
be sliten synum. þe| þin sawl sceal
| minum unwillu oft gesecan
wemman| þe mid wordū swa ðu worhtest to me.

E(Soul II)  
55 negold|pe sylfor neþinra goda nán
ac her sculon abidan ban| bireafod
besliten seonwum þe þin sawl sceal
minu| un|willan oft gesecan
wemman mid wordum swaþu worhtest| tome.
Soul I/II, V 97b/E 90b

V(Soul I)

þonne| nebið nan natoþæs lytel lið
online aweaxen.
þðu ne| scyle for anra  ge hwylcum on sundrũ
rihtagildan. ||| þon reðe bið
100 dryhten æt þam dome

E(Soul II)

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

V aweaxen and E geweaxen are approximate synonyms, and metrically and
syntactically identical. The substitution has no significant effect on sense, metre, or syntax.

Soul I/II, V 98b/E 91a

V(Soul I)

þonne| nebið nan natoþæs lytel lið
online aweaxen.
þðu ne| scyle for anra  ge hwylcum on sundrũ
rihtagildan. ||| þon reðe bið
100 dryhten æt þam dome

E(Soul II)

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

The substitution of prefixes, E æg- V ge- has no apparent lexical effect. The two are
not metrically identical however. In E 91a, æghwylc alliterates with anra and contributes both
stresses to a Type C-1 line. In V 98b, ge hwylcum falls in the preliminary dip of a Type C-1
line. For further discussion of the metrical variation in this line, see pp. 310, and 355.

Substitution Of Stressed Words and Elements (21 examples)

Soul I/II, V 2b/E 2b

V(Soul I)

H uru ðæs be hofað  hæleða æghwylc
þæt he his| sawle sið sið                     sylfa ge þence.
hu þæt bið deoplic  þon| se dead cymeð
asynðreð þa sybbe  þe ær samod wæron]
5 lic þaswe

E(Soul II)

HURU DÆS BE HOFAP]  hæleþa æghwylc
þæþehis sawle sið                     sylfa be|witige
huþæt bið deoplic  þonse dead cymeð
asun[drað þasibbe  þape ær somud wæron
5 lic þawle

While V ge þence (from geperc, ‘to employ the mind on something, consider’) and
E be|witige (bewitian, ‘to have charge or direction of’) are not synonyms, the variation has
little effect on the immediate sense of the passage as a whole and no significant effect on

659 For the suggestion that on sundrũ has a full stress on on and sundrũ, see Orton, “A Further Examination,”
p. 189 and Moffat, Soul and Body, p. 78. Moffat reports that onþundran “bears alliteration on its prefix in
extant OE verse only in Instructions to Christians, l. 114” (Soul and Body, p. 78).
syntax or metre. In V, line 2 is Type A-1 with both stresses long by position; in E, the equivalent line is Type A-1 with a resolved second stress.

Soul I/II, V 18b/E 18b

V(Soul I) E(Soul II)
17 hwæt druðu dreorga tohwan drehtest ðu me eorðan[fulnes] ealf for wisnad eorpan fylnes ealf for weornast lames ge licnes lames gelicnes

V for wisnad is the past participle of forwisnian ‘to wither away’; E for weornast is the second person singular present indicative of forweornian, ‘dry up, wither away.’ The two forms are metrically identical and approximate synonyms.

The substitution does have an important syntactical effect, however. In V, for wisnad is nominative singular, and, as the subject of drehtest, syntactically parallel to ðu, eorðan[fulnes], and lames ge licnes: ‘What have you done, blood-stained one? Why did you afflict me, foulness of the earth, entirely withered away, figure of clay?’ In E, for weornast is the main verb of a new clause eorpan fylnes ealf for weornast lames gelicnes: ‘foulness of the earth, (you) wither away, figure of clay.’

Soul I/II, V 19b/E 19b

V(Soul I) E(Soul II)
20 tohwan þinre sawle þing siððan wurden lyt ðu ge mundest| lyt þuge bohtes syððan oflic| homan læded wære : sílþan heo of lic homan læded wære.

The two words are roughly synonymous in context, and metrically and syntactically identical.

660 See Moffat, Soul and Body, p. 67.
The substitution V *þing* ‘affair’ E *sið* ‘journey’ has an important effect on the imagery of lines V 19-32/E 19-29. In E, the experiences of the soul after the death of the body are presented using the consistent metaphor of a journey (cf. of... *læded* ‘unloaded’, E 21b; *hu þis*| is long hider ‘how long it is to here’, E 23b; and *on|sende* ‘sent forth’, E 25a). In V, the soul’s experiences are not presented in any consistent fashion.

The use of the masculine *sið* in E for the neuter *þing* in V also clears up an agreement problem in V. As Moffat notes, “there is no clear antecedent for *þis*” in V 26b, which he suggests “must refer in a general way to *wyrmum to wiste*, i.e. to the situation of the body in the grave.” With the omission of V 23b-25a and the substitution *sið* for V *þing* in E, however, *þis* refers to the nature of the journey the Soul must undergo, taking *sið* as its masculine singular antecedent. For a discussion of further changes in the line, see below, p. 351.

In E, line 20 is Type B-1 with double alliteration. In V, the line is Type B-1 with single alliteration on the first lift.
Soul I/II, V 22a/E 22a

V(Soul I)

hwæt wite ðuðu me weriga
hwæt| ðu huru wyrmu gyfl
lyt ge þöhést  þa ðu lust gryrum| eallū
ful geodest  huðu on eorðan scealt
25  wyrmum to| wiste.

E(Soul II)

22  hwæt wite þume| werga.

Here and in V 122b/E 117b, E has werg- for V werig(-). As Moffat suggests, the E form could be either for wearg ‘accursed one’ or wērig ‘weary, miserable’ (as in V). In this instance both possibilities make good sense, metre, and syntax. In line 112b/117b, a form of werig is to be preferred on metrical grounds. See p. 334, below.

In V, line 22a is Type C-2 line (Type A-3 if -ig- is assumed to be syncopated). In E, the equivalent line is Type A-3 as written.

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

V(Soul I)

Forðan þu ne hogodest  her on life
syððan icðe on| worulde  wunian sceolde
þæt ðu ware þurh flæsc| þurh fyren lustas
45  strange ge stryned,  gestaðolod| þurh me.
þæt ðu ware þurh flæsc| þurh fyren lustas
þærþu þæt ðume| werga
nege neredest| þurh þinra meda lust.

V ge stryned is the past participle of strīenan ‘beget’; E gestyred is the past participle of gestīerian ‘guide, direct’. The substitution affects sense and syntax. In E, gestyred emphasises how the body is driven by conflicting impulses: on the one hand, it is ‘directed’ (gestyred) ‘through flesh and sinful lusts,’ on the other ‘strengthened’ (gestaþelad) by the soul. In V, the contrast appears to be between the physical nature of the body’s birth (‘you were strongly begotten through flesh and criminal desires’) and the ethereal nature of the soul’s support (gestaðolod| þurh me, ‘and [you were] strengthened through me’). 663

662 Moffat, Soul and Body, p. 80.
663 Cf. Moffat, “Scribal Revision,” p. 4; Soul and Body, p. 72.
The two forms are metrically identical.

**Soul I/II, V 48a/E 45a**

V(Soul I)  
Forðan þu ne hogodest her on life
syððan icðe on| worulde wunian sceolde
þæt ðu ware þurh flæsc| þurh fyren lustas
45

V ge neredest| þurh þinra meda lust.

E(Soul II)  
þærþu þôn hogode her onlife
40
þenden icþe inworul|de wunian sceolde
þæt þu ware þurh flæsc| þurh fyren lustas
strong gestyred | gestaþelad þurh mec.
þæþæð gest onþe from gode sended
næfre| þu me mid swa heard| helle witum
ne gearwode| þurh þinra neðda lust
45

V ge neredest is the second person singular preterite indicative of **generian** ‘saved, rescued; preserved, defended’. E **gearwode** is the singular preterite subjunctive of **gearwian** ‘equip, prepare, make ready’. The difference in mood is linked to the substitution V Forðan E þær and the corresponding difference in the mood of hogian in V 42a/E 39a. See above, pp. 304 and 316.

Both verbs are semantically and syntactically appropriate to the contexts in which they appear but fail to alliterate. In V, this seems most likely the result of a scribal misinterpretation of minims in meda ‘pleasure’ (see below, p. 327). In E, the origins of the failure of alliteration are less obvious. Krapp and Dobbie, following Holthausen, emend ne to ned (nïed) ‘distress, privation’ or nëaru ‘danger, distress’, thus providing a noun to govern the genitives of line 39 and an alliterating syllable to line 40.664 More recently, Orton and Moffat have suggested emending gearwode to genearwode (from genearwian ‘to force in, cramp, confine’).665 As genearwode does not govern the genitive, this second option requires a further emendation in the preceding line. See also above, p. 305.

---


665 Moffat, Soul and Body, p. 71.
In addition to these metrical difficulties, both versions of the text suffer from lexical or syntactical difficulties in their predicates. These are discussed above, p. 305, and below, p. 340.

**Soul I/II, V 48b/E 45b**

V(Soul I)

Forðan þu ne hogodest her on life
syððan icðe on| worulde wunian sceolde
þæt ðu ware þurh flesc| þurh fyren lustas

E(Soul II)

þærþu þönn hogode her onlife
benden icþe inworul|de wunian sceolde
þæt þu wære þurh flæsc þurh fil|ren lustas

strange ge stryned.  ðegestaðolod| þurh me.

45

þæt þu wære þurh flæsc
þurh fi|ren lustas

gestaðolod| þurh me.

strange ge stryned.  ðegestaðolod| þurh me.


cæst ðu minra gesynta| sceame þrowian
50 onðam myclan dæge þonne eall| manna cynn
se acenneda ealle gesamneð.

E(Soul II)

scealt þunu hwæþre minra gescenta
scoþme þrowian

onþam miclan dæge þönn monna cynn
se| þærþu þönn hogode her onlife
benden icþe inworul|de wunian sceolde
þæt þu wære þurh flæsc þurh fil|ren lustas
strange ge stryned.  ðegestaðolod| þurh me.

helle wita

ne gearwode þurh þinra ne|da lust

45

ne gearwode þurh þinra ne|da lust

The sense is strained and the line fails to alliterate. The most likely cause of the ‘substitution’ is a minim mistake: meda for nieda. See also above, p. 326.

**Soul I/II, V 49a/E 46a**

V(Soul I)

scealt ðu minra gesynta| sceame þrowian
50 onðam myclan dæge þonne eall| manna cynn
se acenneda ealle gesamnað.

E(Soul II)

scealt þunu hwæþre minra gescenta
scoþme þrowian

onþam miclan dæge þönn monna cynn
se| þærþu þönn hogode her onlife
benden icþe inworul|de wunian sceolde
þæt þu wære þurh flæsc þurh fil|ren lustas
strange ge stryned.  ðegestaðolod| þurh me.

helle wita

ne gearwode þurh þinra ne|da lust

The substitution V gesynta E gescenta affects both sense and metre. As Moffat and others have noted, the V reading gesynta ‘prosperity, health’ “gives an unusual twist to the address of a damned soul – the introduction at this juncture of the soul’s ‘health’.”666 It also destroys the alliteration.667

E gescenta is presumably from *gescentu, a word otherwise known only from a gloss in the Junius Psalter, Sien gegerede þa be telēð me mid scome & scien oferwrigene swa swa
twitelgode gescentðe his “where it glosses the Latin Confusio.” This makes better sense, and alliterates with sco|me, E 46b.

**Soul I/II, V 51b/E 48b**

V(Soul I)  
seac|t ðu minra gesynta|  sceame þrowian  
onðam myclan dæge  bonne eall| manna cynn  
se acen|neda  ealle gesamndað.

E(Soul II)  
46 sceal þunu hwa|þpre minra gescenta  
sco|me þrowian  
onþam mi|clan dæge  þon monna cynn  
se|cenda  ealle gegædrað.

The two verbs are essentially synonymous and metrically and syntactically identical.

The variation has no significant effect on sense, syntax, or metre.

**Soul I/II, V 70b/E 65b**

V(Soul I)  
seac|t icðe nihtes| swa þeah  nede gesecan  
synnum ge sargod  ðeft sona| fram þe  
hweorfan onhancred  bonne halige men  
lif|endum gode  lof sang doð  
70 secan þa|hamas  þe ðu mel| her scrife.

E(Soul II)  
sceal ic|þe nihtes seþeah  nyde gesecan  
synnum ge|sargad  ðeft sona fromðe  
hweorfan onhoncred.  þon|l halege menn  
gode lifgendum  lof song doð  
65 secan þa|hamas  þeþume erscrife

V her is an adverb of place modifying scrife (from scrifan ‘prescribe, impose on’). E aer is an adverb of time: erscrife ‘had prescribed.’ While both readings make good (though different) sense and syntax, E aer destroys the alliteration. In V, her alliterates with hamas.

Scragg, however, has suggested that the E scribe had difficulties with initial and medial h and may have substituted aer for her unconsciously.669

---

668 Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 72 (Old English cited from Moffat).
Soul I/II, V 74b/E 69b

V(Soul I)  
ne synt þine æhta awihte.]  
75 þe ðu her on moldan memann eowdest.

E(Soul II)  
nesindon þine geahþe wiht  
70 þaþu her onmoldan monnum eawdest.

The substitution V æhta ‘possessions’ E geahþe ‘care, anxiety’ affects sense and metre. E line 69 is Type B-1, alliterating on g. In V, the equivalent line is a hypermetric Type D*1, but fails to alliterate with the on-verse, gifre ȝgrædige. See also pp. 308, 319 and 347.

Soul I/II, V 79a/E 74a

V(Soul I)  
Forðan þewære| selle swiðe mycle  
þon þe weor on ealde eorðan speda.|  
butan þu hie gedælde dryhtne sylfum  
þær ðu wære æt fyrðef] fuegel oððe fisc onse.]  
80 oððe on eorðan neat ætes tilode|  
feld gangende feoh butan snyttro  
oððe onwestenne| wild deora  
þæt wyrreste þær swa god wolde.  
ge þeal| þu ware wyrm cyanum  
85 þæt grimmeste þær swa god wolde :7|  
Þonne ðu æfre onmoldan mange wurde.  
oððe æfre| fulwihte onon sceolde.

E(Soul II)  
forðon| þæware selle swiþe micle  
þon þewær ealle eorðan speda|  
butan þu hyge dælde dryhtne sylfű  
þær þuwære ætfrum sceafte fuegel oþþe fisc onse.]  
75 oððe eorðan neat ætes tiolode|  
feld gongende feoh butan snyttro  
gi on| westenne wildra deora  
þæt grimmaeste þærswa god wolde|  
ge þeal þu ware wyrm cyanum ðær wyrreste  
80 þon þu æfre| onmoldan monge wurde  
oþþe æfre| fulwihte onon sceolde.

V frýðe, dative singular of frymð ‘origin, beginning’, and E frum sceafte, dative singular of frumsceafte ‘first creation, origin’, are approximate synonyms and syntactically identical. Their substitution affects metre, however. In V, line 79a is Type B-1. In E, the equivalent line is Type B-2 with -sceafte providing a half-lift in the medial dip.

---

670 Moffat’s suggestion that “geahþ [sic] in E... is more likely to be the nominative plural of geahd,” than from geahþu ‘care, anxiety’ is unnecessary. It requires both the assumption of an orthographic error (the medial h) and the reinterpretation of geahþ as having a “less pejorative meaning than ‘foolishness’, something nearer to dream ‘joy’” (Soul and Body, p. 75). Since geahþe (the MS reading in E) is a perfectly acceptable form of the nominative plural, and is lexically appropriate in context, I see no reason for the emendation.

671 On the convoluted syntax of this passage, see Moffat, Soul and Body, p. 75 and Mitchell, OES, § 3415.

672 Moffat describes the E as having an “improbable length” (Soul and Body, pp. 75, 20 [§ 3.2], and 22 [§ 3.7 (b)]). For a parallel, see Dream of the Rood, line 86b: þæra þe him bǐþ egesa to me.
The two words are synonymous and metrically identical. Moffat notes that *geagl* appears else where only in prose.\(^673\) A similar substitution occurs in \(V\ 116b/E\ 111b\) (see below, p.333). *hungreg* is the dative plural of the adjective *hungri* ‘hungry’, here used substantively to refer to the worms. *E hungrum* is the dative plural of the noun *hungor* ‘hunger’. As Moffat suggests, “it is unclear why ‘hunger’, if that is what was intended, would appear in the plural.”\(^674\) Eyeskip from an exemplar in *hungrigum* cannot be ruled out. With a half-stressed medial syllable, \(V\) is a Type A* line, A-1 if the medial syllable of *hungregu* is omitted from scansion; \(E\) is Type A-1.

\(^{673}\) Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 17.

\(^{674}\) Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 79.
Soul I/II, V 114a/E 109a

V(Soul I)

bǐð þæt heafod tohliden handa to|liðode
geaglas toginene góman toslitene
110 sina beoð|äsocene swyra be cowen
fingras tohrorene
rib ref|iað reðe wyrmas
beoð hira tungan totogenne ontn|healfa
hungregü to|frofre
forþan hie ne magon|huxlicum
115 wordum wrixlian wið þone werian gast.|

E(Soul II)

bǐð þæt healfod tohliden honda tohleoðode
gaelas toginene goman toslitene
105 seonwe beoð asogene sweora bicowen
rib ref|iað reþe wyrmas
drincað hloþum hrá heolfres þurst|ge.
bið seo tunge totogen on tyn healfe
hungrum to|horþor
forþon heone mag horslice
110 wordu wrixlan| wið þone wergan gast.

V frofre and E horþor are syntactically identical and synonymous, although horþor “is almost wholly confined to verse usage in extant OE.”675 Metrically, E line 109a is Type A-1 with double alliteration; in V, the equivalent line is Type A* (Type A-1 if the middle syllable of hungregü is assumed to be syncopated) with single alliteration.

Soul I/II, V 114b/E 109b

V(Soul I)

bǐð þæt heafod tohliden handa to|liðode
geaglas toginene góman toslitene
110 sina beoð|äsocene swyra be cowen
fingras tohrorene
rib ref|iað reðe wyrmas
beoð hira tungan totogenne ontn|healfa
hungregü to|frofre
forþan hie ne magon|huxlicum
115 wordum wrixlian wið þone werian gast.|

E(Soul II)

bǐð þæt healfod tohliden honda tohleoðode
gaelas toginene goman toslitene
105 seonwe beoð asogene sweora bicowen
rib ref|iað reþe wyrmas
drincað hloþum hrá heolfres þurst|ge.
bið seo tunge totogen on tyn healfe
hungrum to|horþor
forþon heone mag horseslice
110 wordu wrixlan| wið þone wergan gast.

The substitution V huxlicum (dative plural of huxlice ‘shameful, ignominious’) E horseslice (dative singular of horseslice, ‘briskly, readily’) affects sense and syntax. The difference in number between the two forms is linked to similar differences in number throughout lines V 113-115/E 108-110. The forms are metrically identical.

Moffat suggests that the substitution may be the result of an originally graphic mistake:

The dative plural adjective huxlicum appears for E’s adverb horseslice, a word that occurs elsewhere only in glosses. Horslice means ‘briskly, readily’ while huxlice should mean ‘shameful, ignominious’. Perhaps horseslice was confused with horseslice

---

675 Moffat, Soul and Body, p. 79.
‘squalid’ and the latter was then exchanged for *huxlice* because of their similar meanings.\(^{676}\)

When considered in light of the thoroughgoing change in number throughout lines V 113-115/E 108-110, however, the substitution seems less accidental. As mentioned above (p. 313), the subject of *mæg* in E 109b is *heo*, referring either to the body whose tongue is being shredded or the tongue of the body itself. In this version, the adverb *horslice* qualifies the manner in which the body cannot exchange words with the soul: ‘the tongue is torn into ten pieces as a solace for the hungry ones; therefore it cannot briskly trade words with the damned spirit’. This returns to a point made in both manuscripts immediately before the litany of punishments begins in line V 108/E 103, where the narrator describes how the body after death will be forced to listen to the soul without being able to answer back:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V(Soul I)</th>
<th>E(Soul II)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>105 nemæg him ṣware ænige ge hatan geomrum gaste</td>
<td>100 nemæg him ṣware ænige secgan geomrum gaste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nemæg him ṣware ænige ge hatan geomrum gaste</td>
<td>nemæg him ṣware ænige secgan geomrum gaste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The dust will remain where it was.</td>
<td>The dust will remain where it was.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nor can he answer it [i.e. the soul], offer</td>
<td>Nor can it give any answer to it [i.e. the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>any help or consolation to the grieving</td>
<td>soul], nor offer any shelter there, help, or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ghost.</td>
<td>consolation to the grieving ghost.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In V, however, the subject of the *magon* is *hie*, referring in this case to the worms (see above, p. 311). Here, *huxlicum* ‘shameful, ignominious’ is a dative plural adjective used adverbially\(^{677}\) or with *wordum* to describe how the worms would speak were their tongues not torn: ‘their [i.e. the worm’s] tongues are torn into ten pieces, as a pleasure for the hungry ones: therefore they [i.e. the worms] cannot shamefully trade words [or: trade shameful words] with the weary soul.’

\(^{676}\)Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 17

**Soul I/II, V 115a/E 110a**

**V(Soul I)**  
bið þæt heafod tohliden  handa toliðode  
eglas toginene  goman tosilitene  
110 sina beoð àsocene  swyra be cowen  
fingras tohrorene  
rib reaf|iað  reðe wyrmas  
beoð hira tungan totojenne  onty|n healfa  
hungregi tofrofre  
forþan hie ne magon| huxlicum  
115 wordum *wrixlian* wið þone werian gast.]

**E(Soul II)**  
biþ þæt heaf|lod tohliden  honda tohle|ophage  
eglas toginene  goman tosilitene  
105 seonwe beoð asogene  sweora bicowen  
rib reaf|lað  repe wyrmas  
дринка|д hло|п hра  heolfres þurst|ge.  
bið seo tunge totojen  on tyn healfe  
hungrum to| hroþor  
forþan heone me| horsclice  
110 word|*wrixlan* wið þone wergan gast.

The two verbs are conjugational variants. **V wrixlian** is weak II; **E wrixlan** is weak I.

Moffat notes that **V** “is the only verse occurrence of *wrixlian*” and suggests that it is unmetrical.\(^{678}\) Parallel stress patterns are found elsewhere with the preterite of weak II verbs,\(^{679}\) however, and Sievers gives six examples from *Beowulf* of Type D-2 lines in which the -*i*- of a weak II infinitive ending is scanned as a short half-stressed syllable, all from the on-verse: *wong wisian*, 2409a; *feorh ealgian*, 2668a; *hord sceawian*, 2744a; *gold glitinian*, 2758a; *heah hlifian*, 2805a; *flod fieðmian*, 3133a.\(^{680}\) Assuming wordum *wrixlian* is an acceptable verse, **V** line 115 is Type D*2*; the equivalent line in **E** is Type A-1.

**Soul I/II, V 116b/E 111b**

**V(Soul I)**  
116 gifer hatte se wyrm  þe þa *eaglas* beoð  
nædle scearp|ræn.  

**E(Soul II)**  
111 Gifer hatte sewyrm  þamþa *geaf|las* beoð  
nædle scear|præn

**V eaglas** is presumably for *gæglas* with Kentish loss of *g* due to transference of stress.\(^{681}\) Moffat notes that **E geaf|las** “preserves a poetic usage while **V** introduces a more

---

\(^{678}\) Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 23.

\(^{679}\) For example, in the *Battle of Maldon: Byrhtnoþ maðelode* (Type D*2*), lines 42a and 309a. See Pope, *Seven Old English Poems*, p. 114.


\(^{681}\) Sievers-Brunner § 212 Anm. 2.
common form, one that... does not occur elsewhere in the extant verse except in V 109a/E 104a: **V** *geaglas E* *geaflas*, see above, p. 330). The words are synonyms and (assuming that *eaglas* is for *geaglas*) metrically identical.

**Soul I/II, V 117b/E 112b**

*V*(Soul I)  

`Sege nydde` to me  

ærest eallra onþam eordscræfe|  

þœthe þa tungan to tyhð  þa teð þurh smyhð.  

120 þha eagan| þurh eteð ufàn onþ heafod.  

þa to ætwelan oðrum gerymeð.|  

wyrmum towiste þonne þæt werie  

lic acolod bið.  þæt| lange ær  

werede mid wædum

*E*(Soul II)  

`sege nepeð` to  

ærest ealra onþa eord| scræfe  

heþa tungan to tyhð.  þa toþas þurh smyhð  

115 þto ætwelan oþrum gerymeð  

þha eaxon þurh iete ð ufôn onþ heafod  

wyrmum towiste þon biþ þæt werge.  

lic acolad þæt| he longe ær  

werede mid wædum

*E* *ge nepeð* (from *genēðan* ‘venture forth’) seems more appropriate in context than *V* *ge nydde* (from *genēdan* ‘compel, force, urge’), a fact which may also have prompted *V* to add *me* at the end of the line (see below, p. 349). The two verbs are syntactically and metrically identical, although the addition or omission of *me* affects the metre of the line as a whole.

**Soul I/II, V 122b/E 117b**

*V*(Soul I)  

`Sege nydde` to me  

ærest eallra onþam eordscræfe|  

þœthe þa tungan to tyhð  þa teð þurh smyhð.  

120 þha eagan| þurh eteð ufàn onþ heafod.  

þa to ætwelan oðrum gerymeð.|  

wyrmum towiste þonne þæt werie  

lic acolod bið.  þæt| lange ær  

werede mid wædum

*E*(Soul II)  

`sege nepeð` to  

ærest ealra onþa eord| scræfe  

heþa tungan to tyhð.  þa toþas þurh smyhð  

115 þto ætwelan oþrum gerymeð  

þha eaxon þurh iete ð ufôn onþ heafod  

wyrmum towiste þon biþ þæt werge.  

lic acolad þæt| he longe ær  

werede mid wædum

As in *V* 22a/E 22a, *E* *werg-* could be for *wearg-* ‘accursed’ or *wēr(i)g-* ‘weary, miserable’ (as in *V*). Here, the *V* reading *werie* (for *wērige*) is to be preferred on metrical grounds. With *werie*, *V* 122b is Type C-2; if *werge* is for *wearge* in *E*, the equivalent line is

---

682 Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 80.
Type A-3. This is a type more properly restricted to the on-verse. In V 22a/E 22a, both forms are metrically acceptable. See p. 325, above.

**Substitution of Metrical Units (1 example)**

*Substitution of Metrical Units (1 example)*

**Soul I/II, V 27a/E 24a**

**V(Soul I)**

25 hwæt ðu onworulde ær
   lyt ge þohtest   hu þis is|þus lang hider
   hwæt be la engel  ufan of roderum
   sawle| onsende  þurh his sylfes hand
   meotod ælmihtig  of his mægen þrymme.

30 þæge bohte  blode þy halgan.
   þu me mid þy heardan  hungre gebunde
   þe heft nedest| helle witum.

**E(Soul II)**

25 lyt geþohtes  hu þis| is long hider
   þeburh engel  ufan ofroderum
   sawle on|sende  þurh his sylfes hond
   meotud ælmihtig  of his mægen þrymme
   þeþa gebohte  blode þyalgan
   þume| þy heardan  hungre gebunde
   þy hæftna dest  helle| witū

Moffat gives a good summary of the differences between the two versions:

The two versions differ here in syntax and in meaning. In E, *engel* is accusative following *þurh* and apparently parallel to *þurh his sylfes hond*, 28b [i.e. E 25b\(^{683}\)]; the subject of the sentence is *meotud*, 29a [E 26a]. In V, *engel* is nominative, appositive to *meotod*. *La* as an interjection frequently intensifies the meaning of the preceding word, in this instance the pronoun *pe*.

There are a handful of passages in OE verse where Christ is called an angel, and V27a seems to be one of these. The clearest references are *engla beorhtest* in *Christ I*, 104... and *halig encgel* in *Christ and Satan*, 585.... [S]uch references, while most often associated with early Christianity, are not inappropriate in OE.... However,... it is not so easy to find the orthodoxy in the E passage. The *engel* in E seems unambiguously to be an agent of *meotud ælmihtig*. Grein, Wülker, and Orton all prefer the E text, and exchange *þurh* for *la*. My own view is that a deliberate scribal change from the unusual reading of V to the surprising and perhaps doctrinally questionable reading of E would be unlikely. Therefore I suspect E is original.\(^{684}\)

\(^{683}\)Moffat uses a non-standard line-numbering in his edition.

Addition/Omission Of Unstressed Words and Elements (27 examples)

*Soul I/II, V 4b/E 4b*

**V(Soul I)**

H uru ðæs be hofað hæleða æghwylc
þæt he his| sawle sið sið sylfa ge þence.
hu þæt bið deoplic þon| se dead cymeð
asynræð þa sybbe be| ær samod wæron|
5 lic ðsawle

**E(Soul II)**

HURU ðÆS BE HOFA| hæleþa æghwylc
þæt his sawle sið sylfa be| witige
huþæt bið deoplic þon| se dead cymeð
asun| drað þasibbe baby| ær somud wæron
5 lic ðsawl

The addition or omission of *þa* has a minor effect on metre and sense, but none on syntax. In *E*, *þa* serves to identify the case and number of the antecedent to the relative clause introduced by *þe*. In *V*, *þe* is an indeclinable relative particle. Both are acceptable Old English syntax. The variation falls on the preliminary drop of a Type C-1 line and is metrically insignificant.

*Soul I/II, V 16b/E 16b*

**V(Soul I)**

15 Cleopað þön swa cearful| cealdan reorde
spreceð grimlice se gast toþamduste.|

**E(Soul II)**

15 Cleopað þonne| swa cearful caldan reorde
spriceð grimlice gast toll| haman duste

The addition or omission of the demonstrative pronoun *se* adds or subtracts an anacrustic syllable at the beginning of an A-1 line. It has no obvious effect on sense or syntax.

*Soul I/II, V 21a/E 21a*

**V(Soul I)**

lyt þu ge mundest|
20 tohwan þинre sawle þing siðþan wurde
syððan oflic| homan læded wære :

**E(Soul II)**

lyt þuge þohites
20 towon þinre sawle sið sîþan wurde|
sîþan heo of lic homan læded wære.

The addition or omission of the nominative singular feminine pronoun *heo* has no significant effect on the metre, sense, or syntax of the passage. Metrically, the variant adds or removes an unstressed syllable in the preliminary drop of a Type C-2 line; in terms of sense and syntax, it reiterates the subject of the clause, tying it firmly *sawle*, l.20a. Mitchell notes that the “non-expression of a pronoun subject which can be supplied from a preceding clause
must be accepted as idiomatic OE” and gives many examples in which the subject of a
subordinate clause has to be supplied from a preceding main clause.685

Soul I/II, V 26b/E 23b

V(Soul I)  E(Soul II)
25 hwæt ðu onworulde ær  lyt geþohtes  hu þis| is long hider
lyt ge þohtest  hu þis is þus lang hider  þeþa gebohte  blode þy halgan.
hwæt þe la engel  ufan of roderum  þu me mid þy heardan  hungre gebunde
sawle| onsende  þurh his sylfes hand  þe haet nedest|  helle witum.
meotod ælmihtig  of his mægen þrymme.
25 þeþurh engel  ufan ofroderum
þeþurh engel  ufan ofroderum
sawle| onsende  þurh his sylfes hand
meotod ælmihtig  of his mægen þrymme.
þeþa gebohte  blode þy halgan
þume| þy heardan  hungre gebunde
þe haetna dest  helle| witū

The addition or omission of þus has little effect on sense, syntax, or metre. Metrically,
the adverb falls on the preliminary drop of a Type C-2 verse.

Soul I/II, V 30a/E 27a

V(Soul I)  E(Soul II)
25 hwæt ðu onworulde ær  lyt geþohtes  hu þis| is long hider
lyt ge þohtest  hu þis is þus lang hider  þeþa gebohte  blode þy halgan.
hwæt þe la engel  ufan of roderum  þu me mid þy heardan  hungre gebunde
sawle| onsende  þurh his sylfes hand  þe haet nedest|  helle witum.
meotod ælmihtig  of his mægen þrymme.
25 þeþurh engel  ufan ofroderum
þeþurh engel  ufan ofroderum
sawle| onsende  þurh his sylfes hand
meotod ælmihtig  of his mægen þrymme.
þeþa gebohte  blode þy halgan
þume| þy heardan  hungre gebunde
þe haetna dest  helle| witū

The addition or omission of the sentence adverb þa in V 30a/E 27a has no significant
effect on sense, metre, or syntax. In E, þa specifies the logical/temporal relationship between
the clause þe... gebohte blode þyhalgan (E 27) and the preceding clause; in V, no temporal
relationship is expressed. The addition or omission adds or removes an unstressed syllable
from the preliminary dip of a Type A-3 line and is metrically insignificant.

685Mitchell, OES, §§ 1512 and 1513.
**Soul I/II, V 31a/E 28a**

**V(Soul I)**

25 hwæt ðu onworulde ær
lyt ge þohtest hu þis is þus lang hider
hwæt þe la engel ufan of roderum
sawle| onsende þurh his sylfes hand
meotod ælmihtig of| his mægen þrymme.

30 þege bohte blode þy halgan.
þu me mid þe heardan hunger gebunde
þege hæft nedest helte witum.

**E(Soul II)**

lyt geþohtes hu þis| is long hider
þeþeþurh engel ufan ofroderum
25 sawle onsende þurh his sylfes hond
meotud ælmihtig of| his mægen þrymme
þeþape gebohte blode þyhalgan
þeþume| þe heardan hunger gebunde
þege hæftna dest helte| witu

In **V**, mid **by** heardan **hunger** is a prepositional phrase expressing means: ‘with hard hunger’; **E** by heardan **hunger** is an example of the instrumental/dative case being used alone to express means: ‘with hard hunger’. Both are acceptable Old English. The addition or omission affects the preliminary drop of a Type A-3 line and is metrically insignificant.

**Soul I/II, V 33a/E 30a**

**V(Soul I)**

V 33a/E 30a are both Type A-3. For the addition or omission of **cuman** (and related changes) in the off-verse, see below, pp. 127 and 354.

**E(Soul II)**

V eardode ‘dwell’ is essential to sense and syntax, although its addition or omission has no significant metrical effect. **V** 33a/E 30a are both Type A-3. For the addition or omission of **cuman** (and related changes) in the off-verse, see below, pp. 127 and 354.

**Soul I/II, V 36a/E 32a**

**V(Soul I)**

35 þæt me þuhte ful oft
þæt hit wær.xxx.| busend wintra
to þinu deãð dagge

**E(Soul II)**

32 þæt hit wær.xxx.| busend wintra
to þinu deãð dagge

Both forms are idiomatic. The addition or omission of **hit** has no significant effect on sense, metre, or syntax.

---

The addition or omission of the interjection *huru* adds or removes two unstressed syllables in the preliminary drop of a Type B-2 line. The variation has no significant effect on sense or syntax.

*E* *ic* provides an expressed subject for *was* and marks a change in person from the second (*nedest, *E* 37a) to the first. *V* is potentially confusing since *offyrsted was* could be either first or third person and *godes lichoman* (*V* 41a) provides a grammatically suitable third person subject for the verb. This suggests that the pronoun *ic* was mistakenly omitted from *V*. The addition or omission of the pronoun falls in the preliminary drop of a Type B-1 line in both manuscripts: it is metrically insignificant.

The addition or omission of *ne* in *V* 42a *E* 39a is linked to the substitution of unstressed words *V* *Fordan* *E* *hær* at the beginning of the line. In *E*, lines 39-43 are a contrary-to-fact condition introduced by *hær*, ‘if’. As a result, the main verb of the clause (*hogode*) is subjunctive and positive: ‘If you thought then, while alive here...’ The most likely interpretation of the equivalent lines in *V* is as a causal or result clause introduced by *Fordan*.
'because, therefore’ (for a discussion of other possible translations of V see above, p. 316).

Consequently, hogodest is indicative and negative: ‘Because you did not think while alive here...’ The change affects the preliminary drop of a Type A-3 line and is metrically insignificant.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V(Soul I)</th>
<th>E(Soul II)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forðan þu ne hogodest her on life syððan icðe on</td>
<td>worulde wunian sceolde þæt du were þurh flæsc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The addition or omission of þön (i.e. þonne ‘then, when’) has no significant effect on sense, syntax, or metre. In E, þön is an adverb of time correlative with þenden: ‘If you thought then, while alive here...’ Together with nu, E 46a, þön also helps emphasise the relationship between the body’s earlier actions and its subsequent punishments. See below, pp. 341 and 342. Its presence is not syntactically necessary, however, and its absence in V is without syntactic significance. The adverb falls on the preliminary dip of a Type A-3 line and is metrically insignificant.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V(Soul I)</th>
<th>E(Soul II)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forðan þu ne hogodest her on life syððan icðe on</td>
<td>worulde wunian sceolde þæt du were þurh flæsc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The addition or omission of mid in V 47a/E 44a is one of a number of highly significant changes in V 46-48/E 43-45. Both versions of the text are problematic. In V, mid introduces a prepositional phrase mid swa heardū helle witum: ‘with such hard hell-torments’.

340
As the main verb of the clause in V is ge neredest ‘protect’, mid ‘with’ is lexically suspect and most editors emend to wið ‘against’. In E, swa heardra helle wita is a genitive plural phrase without any obvious grammatical relationship to the rest of the clause. It cannot be construed without emendation. The omission has no significant effect on metre, removing or adding a single unstressed syllable in the preliminary drop of a Type A-3 line.

For further discussion of the variation in these lines, see pp. 305, 318, 326 and 327, above.

Soul I/II, V 49a/E 46a

V(Soul I)

scealt ðu minra gesynta| sceame þrowian
50 onðam myclan dæge þonne eall| manna cynn
se acenneda ealle gesamað.

E(Soul II)

46 scealt þunu hwæþre minra gescenta
sco|me þrowian
onþam miclan dæge þon monna cynn
se|| a,cenda ealle gegædrað.

The addition or omission of the adverb nu in V 49a/E 46a has no significant effect on syntax or metre. Together with þon in E 39a (see above, p. 340), nu emphasises the connection between the body’s current and future punishment and its previous behaviour. Neither adverb is syntactically, metrically or syntactically necessary, however. As it falls on the preliminary dip of a Type A-3 verse, the addition or omission of nu has no significant metrical effect. See also pp. 340 and 342.

Soul I/II, V 49a/E 46a

V(Soul I)

scealt ðu minra gesynta| sceame þrowian
50 onðam myclan dæge þonne eall| manna cynn
se acenneda ealle gesamað.

E(Soul II)

46 scealt þunu hwæþre minra gescenta
sco|me þrowian
onþam miclan dæge þon monna cynn
se|| a,cenda ealle gegædrað.

Like E nu, lines 46a and 51a, and E þon, line 39a, E hwæþre emphasises the contrast between the body’s previous behaviour and its current and future punishment. It is not

---

687 Moffat, Soul and Body, pp. 70-71.
syntactically necessary, however, and, as it falls on the preliminary drop of a Type A-3 line, is metrically insignificant. See also pp. 340, 341 and 342.

**Soul I/II, V 52a/E 51a**

**V(Soul I)**

ne eart ðu þon leofra nænig lifigendra
men to ge mæccan. ne meder ne fæder.
ne nænigum ge sybban.
Þonn, s se swearta hre fen
55 syððan ic ana ofðe utsiðode
þurh| þaes sylfes hand þe ic ær onsended wæs.

**E(Soul II)**

ne eart þu þon leofre næng lifigendra
menn to ge mæccan nemeder nefæder
nænæn|gum gesibbra þon se swearta hre fen
sipban icana of þe utsiðade.
þurh þæs sylfes hond þeic ær onsended wæs.

The addition of *nu* to *E* continues the contrast between past actions and present/future judgement found throughout *E* 39-60. It falls on the preliminary drop of a Type A-3 line. For further examples, see pp. 340, 341 and 342.

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

**V(Soul I)**

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

**E(Soul II)**

Nemagon þe nu heonan adon hyrste þa readan
55 negold|ne sylfor neþinra goda nán
ac her sculon abidan ban| bireafod
besliten seonwum þe þin sawl sceal
minu|willan oft gesecean
wemman| mid wordů swaþu worhtes| tome.

The addition or omission of *þ* in *V* 63a/E 58a affects sense, syntax, and metre. In both manuscripts, *V minum unwillu E minũ áin|willan* is best construed as a dative of manner or accompaniment: ‘with my lack of will(s) (i.e. unwillingly)’. Of the two versions, *E* seems the less strained: in *V*, *þ* comes between the verb and its predicate. Metrically, the addition or omission adds or subtracts an unstressed syllable from the preliminary dip of a Type C-1 line.

The character has been partially erased in *V*. 
**Soul I/II, V 64a/E 59a**

V(Soul I)

ne mecg þe nu| heonon adon   hyrsta þy readan.
ne gold ne seolfor|   ne þinra goda nán
ne þinre byrde beag.  ne þin| gold wela.
60 ne nanþara goda   þedu iu ahtest.
Ac her| sceolon on bidan   ban| be reafod
be sliten synum.   þeþ| þin sawl sceal
γ minum unwillu   oft gesecan
wemman| be mid wordðu   swa ðu worhtest to me.

E(Soul II)

Nemagon þe nu heonan adon   hyrste þa readan
55 negold| he sylfor   neþinra goda nán
ac her| sceolon abidan   ban| bireafod
besliten seonwum   þeþ| þin sawl sceal
minũ ŵn| willan   oft gesecan
wemman mid wordum   swaþu worhtest| tome.

V þe is the accusative singular of the second person personal pronoun and object of
wemman ‘defile, besmirch’. In E the object of wemman is to be inferred from gesecan and is
not expressed. Both are acceptable syntax. 688 The addition or omission of þe occurs on the
medial dip of a Type A-1 line and is metrically insignificant.

**Soul I/II, V 65a/E 60a**

V(Soul I)

65 eart ðu   nu dumb||
nesynt þine dreamas awiht

E(Soul II)

60 eart þu dumb  γdæf
nesindan þine dreamas wiht.

The addition or omission of nu in V 65a/E 60a has no significant effect on sense,
syntax, or metre. The line is Type B-1 in both manuscripts.

**Soul I/II, V 72a/E 67a**

V(Soul I)

sceal icðe nihtes| swa þeah   nede gesecan
synnum ge sargod   þeft sonal fram þe
hweorfan onhancerd   þonne halige men
liflendum gode   lof sang doð
70 secan þahamas   þe ðu me| her scrife.
†ba arleasan   eardung stowe.
þe sculon| her mold wyrmas   manige ceowan
slitan sarlice   swear|te wihta
gifre  γgrædige

E(Soul II)

sceal icþe nihtes seþeah  nyde gesecan
synnum ge| sargad   þeft sona fromðe
hweorfan onhoncred.   þönn| halege menn
gode liflendum   lof song doð
65 secan þa halmas   þeþume erscrife
†ba arleasan   eardung stowe
þe sculon mold wyrmas   monige ceowan.
seonowum besli|tan   swearte wiht
gifre  γgrædige

The presence of her in V 72a emphasises the physical nature of the punishments which
are to be suffered by the body here on earth. The adverb falls on the preliminary drop of a
Type C-1 line and is not essential to sense, metre, or syntax. See also below, p. 345.

Soul I/II, V 96a/E 89a

**V(Soul I)**

95  Ac hwæt wylt ðu þær.

87  onhā dōðege dryhtne secgan.

**E(Soul II)**

88  ac hwæt wilt þuþær

ondōmldēge dryhtne secgan.

The addition or omission of the dative singular masculine demonstrative pronoun hā adds or removes an unstressed syllable from the preliminary drop of a Type C-2 verse. It has no significant effect on sense and syntax.

Soul I/II, V 97a/E 90a

**V(Soul I)**

þonne nebið nan natoþes lytel lið

online aweaxen.

þu ne scyle for anra ge hwylcum on sundrū

rihtagildan. ||| þon ređe bið

100 dryhten æt þam dome

**E(Soul II)**

90  þon nebið nænig topæs lytel lið|

online geweaxen

þet þune scyle for æghwylec anra on|sundran

ryht agieldan.  ðonne repëbið
dryhten æt do|më

V na is not syntactically, semantically, or metrically necessary. Both ne and nænig negate the verb in E. The adverb falls on the preliminary dip of a Type B-1 line and has no significant effect on metre.

Soul I/II, V 100a/E 93a

**V(Soul I)**

þonne nebið nan natoþes lytel lið

online aweaxen.

þu ne scyle for anra ge hwylcum on sundrū

rihtagildan. ||| þon ređe bið

100 dryhten æt pam dome

**E(Soul II)**

90  þon nebið nænig topæs lytel lið|

online geweaxen

þet þune scyle for æghwylec anra on|sundran

ryht agieldan.  ðonne repëbið
dryhten æt do|më

The addition or omission of the dative singular demonstrative pronoun pam falls in the medial dip of a Type A-1 line. It is metrically, semantically, and syntactically insignificant.

Soul I/II, V 101a/E 95a

**V(Soul I)**

100  ac hwæt do wyt unc.

sculon wit þon eft æt somne siðidan brucan

swylcra yrmiða swatu unc her ær scrife.

**E(Soul II)**

achwæt dowit unc

þon he unc hafað geadbyrdeð| ofre siþe

95  sculon wit þonne æt|somne siþþan brucan

swylcra yrmiþa swañu unc ær scrife

V eft emphasises the extent to which the miseries suffered by the soul and body are the result of the body’s earlier actions: ‘But what will we two do for ourselves? We shall then
again experience such miseries afterwards together as you imposed on us both here earlier’.

The adverb falls on the preliminary dip of a Type A-3 verse and is not necessary for sense, syntax, or metre.

**Soul I/II, V 102b/E 96b**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V(Soul I)</th>
<th>E(Soul II)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 ac hwæt do wyt unc</td>
<td>95 ðôn he unc hafað geedbyrðed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sculon wit þôn eft æt somne siddan brucan</td>
<td>85 sculon wit þonne ætsonne sîþan brucan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swylcra yrmiða swafu unc her ær scrife</td>
<td>swylcra yrmiða swafu unc ær scrife</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As in V 72a, V her 102b emphasises the extent to which it is the body’s actions on earth which lead to its subsequent punishment (see also above, p. 343). As her is presumably equal in stress to the alliterating adverb ær, its addition adds a non-alliterating and unmetrical stress before the first lift of what would otherwise be a Type C-1 line.

**Soul I/II, V 119a/E 114a**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V(Soul I)</th>
<th>E(Soul II)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>120 þa eagan þurh eteð ufan onþ heafod.</td>
<td>115 þa eaxan þurh ðeð ufan onþ heafod.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sege neþeð to ærest eallra onþam eorðscræfe</td>
<td>sege neþeð to ærest ealra onþæ eorð</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>þæt he þa tungan to tyhð þa teð þurh smyhð.</td>
<td>þæt he þa tungan to tyhð. þa topas þurh smyhð</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wyrmum towiste</td>
<td>wyrmum towiste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to ætwelan oðrum gerymeð.</td>
<td>to ætwelan oþrum gerymeð</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The addition of þæt to V suggests that lines V119-121a were understood in this version to be an adverbial clause of purpose or result: ‘He, first of all in that earthly grave, compelled þæt to me† [see below, p. 349], so that he then pulls apart the tongue, and pierces through the teeth.’ The omission of the conjunction in E indicates that the equivalent lines were understood as an independent clause: ‘He, first of all in that earthly grave, ventures forth. He then pulls apart the tongue and pierces through the teeth’. The addition or omission falls in the preliminary dip of a Type B-1 line and is metrically insignificant.
The addition or omission of *he* in V123b/E118b affects syntax. In E, *he* is the subject of *werede*, ‘dressed’, the object of which is the accusative singular neuter demonstrative/relative *þæt* (for which *lic*, E118a, is the antecedent): ‘then that wretched body has cooled, which he long ago dressed with clothes’. The pronoun seems to be syntactically necessary. *þæt* cannot be the subject of *werian*, as Bosworth and Toller give no examples of *werian* without a direct object (for which *þæt* is the only candidate). Nor is there any obvious candidate in V (or E) for an unexpressed subject to be understood from the preceding clause.

At the same time *he* is also without an obvious expressed antecedent. While *gæst* (V115b/E110b) provides a grammatically acceptable candidate, it seems unlikely that the poet means that the soul dressed the body with clothes. Wülker’s suggestion that *he* refers generally to ‘der Mensch’ whose body and soul are the focus the poem seems the most likely explanation. The addition or omission is metrically insignificant and falls on the preliminary drop of a Type B-1 line.

---

689 B.-T. s.v. *werian*.

690 See Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 81.

Addition/Omission Of Prefixes (3 examples)

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

V(Soul I)
37 á ic uncres geđales onbád
earloðlice nís nu huru se ende to góð.

E(Soul II)
35 hwæt ic uncres gedales bád.
earfoðlice nís nu se ende to god.

The addition or omission of the prefix adds or removes an unstressed syllable in the
medial drop of a Type B line. It has no significant effect on sense or syntax.

Soul I/II, V 65b/E 60b

V(Soul I)
65 eart ðu nu dumb||gdeaf
nesynt þine dreamas awiht

E(Soul II)
60 eart þu dumb gdeaf
nesindan þine dreamas wiht.

The (normally stressed)\(^{692}\) prefix of V awiht creates metrical problems. In E, line 60b
is Type B-1; in V, the equivalent line is closest to a Type A-2b with four anacrustic syllables.
The addition or omission does not have a significant effect on sense or syntax. The same
substitution is repeated in V 74b/E 69b.

Soul I/II, V 74b/E 69b

V(Soul I)
74 ne synt þine æhta awiht.
75 þe ðu her on moldan mannū eowdest.

E(Soul II)
70 nesindan þine geahþe wiht
70 þaþu her onmoldan monnum eawdest.

Together with the difference in case, the addition of the prefix ð- creates metrical
problems in V.\(^{693}\) In E, line 70b is Type B-1, alliterating on geahþe. In V, the equivalent half
line is closest to a D*-1, but with four anacrustic syllables. With the substitution V æhta E
geahþe, V also fails to alliterate. See also above, pp. 308, 329 and 347.

\(^{692}\) See Campbell, OEG, § 393. V 64b and 74b are the only examples (in 36 occurrences) in which the prefix
in \(\text{awiht}(e)/\text{uht}(e)\) is not certainly stressed. There are no examples in which the second syllable of
\(\text{awiht}(e)/\text{uht}(e)\) is necessary for alliteration on \(w\).

\(^{693}\) See above, fn. 692
Addition/Omission Of Stressed Words and Elements (6 examples)

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

V(Soul I)       E(Soul II)

eardode icþe oninnan       30 ic þe Ininnan
nemeahte icþe ||| of cuman
flæsce befangen  þ-mefyren lustas
35 þine geprüfungen

V cuman is the complement of meahte ‘could come’. In E, the equivalent line has meahte with the non-expression of a verb of motion. This is a common idiom in Old English. In V, cuman provides the second lift in a Type C-2 line (the first and alliterating lift is provided by the post-positive preposition of in each witness). In E, the second lift is provided by the first syllable of meahte. In this case, the verse is Type C-1. The variant is metrically linked to the position of meahte, see below, p. 354.

Soul I/II, V 50b/E 47b

V(Soul I)       E(Soul II)

scealt ðu minra gesynta| sceame þrowian
50 onðam myclan dæge  þonne eall| manna cynn
se acenneda  ealle gesamnað.
46 scealt þunu hwæþre minra gescenta
    sce翁 ne þrowian
    onþam mcílan dæge  þön monna cynn
    se||a,cénda  ealle gegædrað.

V eall is a nominative singular neuter strong declension adjective modifying manna cynn ‘all the race of men’. This is a syntactically acceptable construction, and, as the adjective falls in the preliminary dip of a Type B-1 line early in the clause, is probably metrical. A similar variant occurs in V 89b/E 83b. See the following variant.

---

694 Mitchell, OES, § 1007.
Soul I/II, V 89b/E 83b

V(Soul I)

þonne ðu for unc bæm| and wyrðan scealt
ondum miclan dæge  þonne mann| beoð
wunda on wrigene  þæðe onworulde ær
fyren full|le men  fyrme worhton.
ðôn wyle dryhten sylf  dædalge hyran
hatlæða gehwylces  heofena scippend
æt ealra| manna gehwæs  muðes reorde
wunde wîder lean.

E(Soul II)

þôn þu for unc bû  ondwyrdan scealt
ondum miclan| dæge þôn eallum monn| beoð
wunde onwrigene  þape in| worulde ær.
85 firen fulle menn  fyrn geworhton.
ðôn wile| dryhten sylf  dæda gehyran
æt ealra monna gehwam| muðes reorde
wunde wîper lean

E eallum is a dative plural adjective agreeing with monn| ‘to all men’. In V mann| is unqualified. Both versions are syntactically and lexically acceptable, although Moffat suggests that ‘eallum... has crept into the E version by analogy with the common collocation ‘all men’ used in this poem and elsewhere.’ As in the preceding variant, eallum falls in the preliminary dip of a Type B-1 line and is probably unstressed. See also V eall| manna cynn, V 50b/E 47b.

Soul I/II, V 117b/E 112b

V(Soul I)

Sege nydde to me
ærest ealra  onþam eord| scræfe|
þæthe þa tungan to tyhð  þa teð þurh smyhð.
120 þa eagan| þurh eteð  ufan onþ heafod.
þæto ætwelan  oðrum gerymeð| wyrmum towiste  þonne þæt werie
lic acolod bið.  þæt| lange ær
werede mid wædum

E(Soul II)

sege neþeð to
ærest ealra  onþa| eorð| scræfe
heþa tungan to tyhð.  þa toþas þurh smyhð
115 þo ætwelan  oðrum gerymeð
þæxan þurh| iteð  ufan onþ| heafod
wyrmum towiste  þôn biþ þæt werie.
lic acolad  þæt| he longe ær
werede mid wædum

As Krapp suggests, the addition of me in V is probably “an unreflecting impulse on the part of the scribe to provide to with an object.” While the pronoun makes good sense and syntax at a local level within the clause itself, it is illogical in the larger context of the poem as a whole as the body is not speaking at this point. The scribe may have been confused by the poor sense of nydde (see above, p. 334). With me, V is Type B-2 with an odd distribution of sentence particles; without me, the equivalent line in E is Type B-1.

695Moffat, Soul and Body, p. 77.
Soul I/II, V 125a/E 120a

V(Soul I)  
bið þôn wyrma gifel  
125 on| eorþan þæt mæg æghwylcum  
mento ge mynde modsnotra| gehwam :7|  

E(Soul II)  
bið þôn wyrmes giefl  
120 æt| oneorþan þæt mæg æghwylcum  
men toge myndū mód snot|terra :7|  

E æt| oneorþan is syntactically parallel to wyrmes giefl, E 119b and part of the predicate of bið: ‘then he is a worm’s food, dinner in the earth...’. In V, on| eorþan is an adverbal prepositional phrase of place used to explain where the body is: ‘then he is worms’ food in the earth...’. In E, æt is the first lift of a Type A-1 line with double alliteration. The equivalent line in V is unmetrical.

Soul I/II, V 126b/E 121b

V(Soul I)  
bið þôn wyrma gifel  
125 on| eorþan þæt mæg æghwylcum  
mento ge mynde modsnotra| gehwam :7|  

E(Soul II)  
bið þôn wyrmes giefl  
120 æt| oneorþan þæt mæg æghwylcum  
men toge myndū mód snot|terra :7|  

The addition or omission of V gehwam has a significant effect on the syntax of the passage. In E mód snot|terra is genitive plural, dependent on men, line 121a: ‘then he [the body] is a worm’s food, dinner in the earth, which may be a reminder to each man of the prudent ones’. In V, modsnotra| gehwam is a dative of interest parallel to æghwylcum men: ‘then it is worms’ food in the earth, which may be a reminder to each man, to each of the prudent ones’.

Metrically, E line 121b is Type D-1. V is Type E.

696 ASPR 2, p. 128.
Addition/Omission of Metrical Units (7 examples)

**Soul I/II, V 19b-26**

V(Soul I)

hwæt wite ðuðu me weriga
hwæt| ðu huru wyrma gyfl
lyt ge þohtest  þa ðu lust grýrum| eallu
ful geodest  hudu on corðan scealt
wyrnum to| wiste. hwæt ðu onworulde ær
lyt ge þohtest  hu þis is| bus lang hider
hwæt þe la engel  ufân of roderum
sawle| onsende  þurh his sylfes hand
meotud ælmihtig  of his mægen þrymme.

E(Soul II)

hwæt wite þume| werga.
hyt ge þu huru wyrma gifl.
lyt geþohtes  hu þis is long hider
þepurh engel  ufân of roderum
sawle on|sende  þurh his sylfes hond
meotud ælmihtig  of his mægen þrymme
þepa gebohte  blode þyhalgan
þume| þy heardan  hu þis is long hider
þe þa gebohte   blode þyhalgan
þume| þy heardan  þy halgan.

The simplest explanation for this variant is eyeskip lyt ge þohtest (V 23a/E 23a) to lyt ge þohtest (V 25a).697 V contains little or no information missing from E, however, leaving editorial intervention a possibility. The resulting lines E 23a-b, E 26a-b, V 23a-b are all metrical.

**Soul I/II, V 59-60**

V(Soul I)

ne mæg þe nu| heonon adon   hyrsta þy readan.
ne gold ne seolfor| ne þinra goda nán
ne þire bryde beag.  ne þin| gold wela.
ne nanbora goda   þeðu| þu ahtest
Ac her| sceolon on bidan   ban be reafod
be sliten synum.  þe| þin sawl sceal
þf minum unwillu   oft gesecan
wemman| þe mid wordu   swa ðu worhtest to me.

E(Soul II)

Nemagon þe nu heonan adon   hyrsta þa readan
negold| þe sylfor   neþinra goda nán
ac her sculon abidan   ban| bireafod
besliten seonwum  þe| þin sawl sceal
minu| þin willan   oft gesecan
wemman mid wordum  swa þu worhtest| tome.

A possible explanation for the absence of V 59-60 from E is eyeskip: ne þinra goda nán > ne ne þara goda. As Moffat notes, however, this does not directly explain the absence of the following half-line þeðu| þu ahtest (V 60b).698 Neither of the lines omitted from E alliterate in V, a fact which leads Jones-Gyger, Orton, and Moffat to suspect interpolation on

---


the part of the V scribe (or predecessor). This is perhaps supported by the nature of the verses themselves, which continue a list of the worldly things which cannot take the body away from its earthly prison. A similar metrically suspicious addition to a list occurs in V 111.

See below, p. 353.

Soul I/II, V 93

V(Soul I)  
þonne ðu for unc bæm| and wyrdan scealt  
onðam miclan ðæge þonne mann[u] beoð  
90 wunda on wrigene þaðe onworulde ær  
fyre full[le] men fyrne worhton.  
Dðn wyle dryhten sylf ðædalge hyran  
haeleða gehwylces heofena scippend  
æt ealra[m] manna gehwæs muðes reorde  
wunde wiðer lean.

E(Soul II)  
þôn þu for unc bú ondwyrdan scealt  
onþam miclan ðæge þôn eallum monn[u] beoð  
wunde onwrigene þaþe in worulde ær.  
85 firen fulle menn fyrn geworhton.  
ðôn wile[| dryhten sylf ðeda gehyran  
æt ealra monna gehwam[| muþes reorde  
wunde wiþer lean  

V 93 neither adds nor detracts from the sense of the surrounding text. There is no obvious explanation for either the omission of the line from E or its addition to V.

Soul I/II, E 94

V(Soul I)  
100 æc hwæt do wyt unc.|  
sclon wit þôn eft æt somne  
siððan brucan  
swylcra yrmiða swaðu unc her ær scrife.  

E(Soul II)  
achwæt dowit unc  
þôn he unc hafað geedbyrded| oþre siþe  
95 sclon wit þonne ætsonne  
siþan brucan  
swylcra yrmiða  swaþu unc ær scrife  

The absence of E 94 from V leaves a terse but complete question: ‘and what are we two to do with ourselves?’ In E, the two lines are somewhat fuller: ‘and what are we two to do with ourselves / when he has regenerated us a second time?’ There is no obvious textual reason for the omission or addition of E 94 in either manuscript.

---

**Soul I/II, E 101**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E(Soul I)</th>
<th>E(Soul II)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nemæg him  eğer</td>
<td>nemæg him  eğer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ßware  genige</td>
<td>ßware  genige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>genige ge hatan</td>
<td>genige seogan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geomrum gaste</td>
<td>néber edringe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geoce odðe frore.</td>
<td>enge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gæste geomrum</td>
<td>geoce odpe frore</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most likely explanation for the absence of E 101 from V is eyeskip: *ænige seogan*

(E 100b) > *ænige ge|hatan* (E 101b/V 106b). Both versions make good sense, however.

**Soul I/II, V 111**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E(Soul I)</th>
<th>E(Soul II)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bið þæt heafod tohliden handa to</td>
<td>liðode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geaglas toginene</td>
<td>geaglas toginene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>göman toslitene</td>
<td>göman toslitene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110 sina beoð</td>
<td>ásocene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swyra be cowen</td>
<td>sweora bicowen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fingras tohrorene</td>
<td>fingras tohrorene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rib reaf</td>
<td>iað</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reðe wyrmas</td>
<td>drincað hloþum hrá</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beoð hira tungan totogenne</td>
<td>heolfr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>onty</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hungregu totrofre</td>
<td>hungregu totrofre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>forþon heone meg horsclice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>forþon hie ne magon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115 wordum wrixlian</td>
<td>110 wordu wrixlian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wið þone wergan gast.</td>
<td>wið þone wergan gast.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V is metrically incomplete, and, while it continues the list of the punishments which will overcome the body begun in V 108/E 103, is not syntactically necessary to the clause as a whole. A similar example – where V again has the longer list of parallel items – involves V 59-60. In both examples, the additional text shows metrical problems. See above, p. 351.

Moffat suggests the omission of the off-verse from E may be the result of eye-skip “given the similarity of the participial endings in this passage.”

Interpolation in V seems at least as likely given the line’s metrical difficulties.

---

700 Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 79
This is the opposite of the variant in V 111. The passage absent in V but present in E is syntactically parallel to V 112/E 106, but not necessary for sense. Orton suggests that the poetic word heolfor may have led the V scribe to omit the line.\(^{701}\) Interpolation in E seems at least as likely.

### Rearrangement Within The Line (3 examples)

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

**V(Soul I)**

35  þine geþrungon

30  ic þe Ininnan noicþe of meahte

**E(Soul II)**

35  þine geþrungon

30  ic þe Ininnan noicþe of meahte

The rearrangement within line V 33b/E30b is linked metrically to the addition or omission of cuman in the same line. In V, of and cuman carry stress; meahte comes earlier in the line and is unstressed. In E, meahte comes at the end of the line, occupying the (metrically necessary) second lift. See also above, p. 348.

---

\(^{701}\) Orton, “A Further Examination,” p. 185.
The rearrangement has a significant effect on metre: in E, line 64a is Type D-1; in V, the equivalent verse is Type E. Krapp suggests that the V reading has “a more usual alliteration.”

The two versions are semantically, syntactically, and metrically identical.

The rearrangement (when taken with the inflectional difference and substitution V ge hwylcum E æghwyle) affects stress and the alliteration pattern in the line. In E, the on-verse is Type C-1, the off-verse Type A-1. In V, the equivalent verses are Type A-3 and C-1. See above, p. 322.

---

702 ASPR 3, p. 318.
Soul I/II, V 122b-123a/E 117b-118a

V(Soul I)
Sege nydde to me
ærest eallra onþam eordscrafe|
þæthe þa tungan to tyhð. þa teð þurh smyðh.
120 þa eagan| þurh teð윤 ufan onþ heafod.
þæthe þa ætwelan oðrum gerymeð.|
wyrum towiste bonne hæt werie
lic acolod bidð. hæt lange ær
werede mid wædum

E(Soul II)
sege næpeð to
ærest eallra onþam eordscrafe
heþa tungan to tyhð. þa toþas þurh smyðh
115 þa eaxon þurh teþ윤 ufan onþ heafod
wyrnum towiste þon bib hæt werge.
lic acolad hæt he longe ær
werede mid wædum

The rearrangement of V 122b-123a/E 117b-118a has a significant effect on metre, but none on sense or syntax. In E, bid appears in the preliminary drop of a metrically inappropriate Type A-3 (if E wege is for wēarge) or (more appropriate) Type C-2 (if E wege is for wērige) line. In V 123a, bið is fully stressed and adds a metrically illicit third full lift to what would otherwise be a Type A-1 line. Moffat cites the Phoenix, line 228b hrā bið acolad as an example of the metrical arrangement of a similar line.

Rearrangement Of Metrical Units (2 examples)

Soul I/II, V 83-85/E 78-79

V(Soul I)
Forðan þewære| selre swiðe mycle
þon þe wæron ealle eordan speda.| butan þu hie gedælde dryhtne sylfum
þær þu wurde æt frýð| fugel oðde fisc onsg. 80 oðde on eordan neat ætes tilode|
feld gangende feoh butan snyt tro oðde onwestenne| wild deora
bet wyrreste þær swa god wolde| ge þeal| þu wære wyrm cynna
85 þær grimmeste þær swa god wolde| ge þeal| þu wære wyrm cynna
bonne þu æfre onmoldan mange wurde. oðde æfre fulwiht onfon sceolde.

E(Soul II)
forþon þe wæron ealle swiþe micle
þon þewæran ealle eorpan spede| butan þu hyge dælde dryhtne sylfum
þær þu wurde æt frýð| fugel oðde fisc onsg. 75 oðde eorpan neat ætes tilode|
feld gangende feoh butan snyt tro ge on| westenne wildra deora
þæt wyrreste þær swa god wolde| ge þæt þu wære wyrm cynna
80 þæt wyrreste þæt wyrreste þær grimmeste þær swa god wolde| ge þæt þu wære wyrm cynna
bonne þu æfre onmoldan monge wurde. oðde æfre fulwiht onfon sceolde.

The origins of this complex set of variants seem to lie in V: of the three lines in that manuscript, the first off-verse alliterates improperly, the second off-verse is a syllable short of a complete line, and the third off-verse repeats the first. In contrast, lines 78-9 in E show

703 See above, p. 334.
704 Moffat, Soul and Body, p. 81.
appropriate alliteration, metre, syntax and sense. Orton suggests that the V version may have
its origins in an eyeskip (Þgrimmeste > þæt wyrreste), which was subsequently caught and
reworked to avoid correction.705

_Soul I/II, V 120-1/E 115-116_

**V(Soul I)**

Sege nydde to me
ærest eallra onþam eorðscræfe
þæthe þa tungan to tyhð  þpa teð þurh smyhð. 120 þæa eagan þurh eteð  ufan onþ heafod. 120 to ætwelan  oðrum gerymed. 115 to ætwelan  oprum gerymed. wyrmum towiste þonne þæt werie lic acolod bið.  þæt lange ær werede mid wædum

**E(Soul II)**

sege neþeð to  ærest ealra onþa eorð scraper. heþa tungan to tyhð. þpa þofas þurh smyhð  115 to ætwelan  oprum gerymed.  þpa eaxan þurh iðe ufan onþ heafod wyrmum towiste þon biþ þæt werge. lic acolad þæt he longe ær werede mid wædum

Both readings make sense, although the Gifer’s progress seems more logically
organised in V. The lines are otherwise metrically, syntactically and semantically identical.

_Recomposition (2 examples)_

_Soul I/II, V 12-14/E 13-14_

**V(Soul I)**

Sceal se gast cuman| geohðum hremig
symlæ ymb seofon niht| sawle findan|
þone lichoman| þe hæ ær lange wæg
þreo hund wintra| butan ær þeo cyning
eælmìhtig god| ende worulde
wyr|can wille| weoruda dryhten :7

**E(Soul II)**

Scealse gast cuman| geþum hremig
þe|le ymb seofon niht| sawle findan|
þone lihoman| þæl hæ ær lange wæg
þeo hund wintra| butan ær wyrce| eæl| dryhten
eælmìhtig god| ende woerlde

Both versions of the passage make good sense and reasonable syntax. The principal
syntactic and lexical differences are: variation in the main verb of the clause between the
present subjective of wyr|can in E (wyrce, line 13a), and the present subjunctive of willa plus
the infinitive wyr|can in V (line 14a); the addition or omission of V þeo cyning as an epithet
for God (line 12a); and a variation between the genitive plural V weoruda and the adjective E
ece in the epithet: V weoruda dryhten (line 14b); E ece| dryhten (line 13b).

705Orton, “A Further Examination,” pp. 186-187; see also Moffat, _Soul and Body_, p. 76.
Of the various variants, the most problematic readings are in E: the substitution of wyrce (E 13a) for þeod cyning (V 12b) leaves the on-verse preo hund wintra (E 12a) without an appropriately alliterating off-verse. While wyrce alliterates with wintra, the verse is either Type A-3 or Type C-1 with wyrce on the second lift. Neither is appropriate as an off-verse in a line with alliteration on w. In addition, Orton reports that the word order of the two lines (butan... Verb, Subject, Object) “is unparalleled in Old English verse.”

This suggests in turn that E is responsible for the variation and reorganisation of these lines. Orton suggests that the variation may have its origins in the unusual use of V þeod cyning (line 12b) to refer to God, instead of ‘king (of a nation)’ as in all other recorded instances. In this case, the subsequent recomposition and rearrangement of material is presumably to be seen as an attempt at salvaging metre: all the lines in E are rhythmically acceptable verses, and, with the exception of E 12, alliterate correctly.

**Soul I/II, V 73a/E 68a**

**V(Soul I)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E(Soul II)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sceal icðe nihtes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sernum ge sargod    þeft sonal fram þe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hweorfan onhancréd ponne halige men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liflendum gode     lof sang doð</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 secan þahamas    þe ðu mej her scrif.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>þa arleasan eardung stowe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>þe sculon her mold wyrmes      manige ceowan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sli̯tan sarlice swearðe wihta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gifre    ðgrædige</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are three differences in this half-line: an addition or omission of the prefix be-; a substitution of stressed words (V sarlice E seonowum); and the rearrangement of elements within the line.

---

These variants affect sense, metre, and syntax. In V, *slitan sarlice* is a variation on the preceding half-line *manige ceowan*: ‘and here shall many earthworms chew you, tear sorely, dark creatures...’; E *seonowum besli|tan*, on the other hand, introduces a new punishment, ‘tear(ing) from sinews’,\(^{708}\) to the litany: ‘and many earthworms shall chew you, tear [you] from your sinews, dark creatures...’.

Metrically, V 73a is Type D*1; E is Type A-1. Moffat points out that “the on-verse in E is a repetition with reversed word order of 61a, although the verb form has changed from past participle to infinitive.” He suggests that the variation was introduced in V.\(^{709}\)

**Daniel and Azarias**

*Daniel* and *Azarias* are the names given to two biblical poems preserved in the Junius Manuscript (Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 11 [J]) and Exeter Book (E) respectively. In J, Daniel is the last of three biblical poems copied in the manuscript’s first hand. It begins on page 173 (in quire 14) and extends to page 212, the first verso of the seventeenth quire. It is preceded in quires 1-14 by two other retellings of biblical stories, *Genesis* and *Exodus*. On page 213 it is followed by a fourth poem or group of poems known to modern editors as *Christ and Satan*. This final text or texts is in three hands of the early eleventh century and fills all but the first page and last verso of quire 17 (pages 213-229). As Daniel appears to end imperfectly, and as pages 213-229 are ruled differently from the rest of the manuscript, Ker has suggested that *Christ and Saturn* was inserted into J to replace leaves lost from the middle of the manuscript’s last quire.\(^{710}\)

The Exeter Book Azarias begins, probably defectively, on f. 53r and ends on f. 55v. It is followed after two blank lines by an unrelated poem, the *Phoenix* and preceded, on f. 52 v,

\(^{708}\)Beslitan is found only in *Soul and Body* (Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 75). See also V 62a/E 57a.

\(^{709}\)Moffat, *Soul and Body*, p. 75.
by the apparently defective ending of Guðlac. A strip approximately seven centimetres wide has been cut from the top of f. 53, immediately above the “first” line of Azarias. As Pope and Ker have pointed out, there is considerable paleographic evidence to suggest that the text of this missing strip belonged to Azarias.\footnote{Ker, Catalogue, art. 334. For an opposing view, see Farrell, Daniel and Azarias, pp. 5-6.} The first letter of the surviving poem is, as Pope notes, “of a size commonly used by the scribe for a new section within a long poem,”\footnote{Pope, “Paleography and Poetry,” pp. 35-41. Ker, rev. of The Exeter Book of Old English Poetry, with Introductory Chapters by R.W. Chambers, Max Förster and Robin Flower, MÆ 2 (1933): 224-31. For an opposing view, see Farrell, Daniel and Azarias, pp. 39-40 and “Some Remarks on the Exeter Book Azarias,” MÆ 41 (11972): 1-8.} and remains of two letters above the first line indicate that the “poem” was not preceded by a blank line – contrary to the scribe’s standard practice at the beginning of a new text in this part of the manuscript.\footnote{Pope, “Paleography and Poetry,” pp. 35-36.} As f. 53r is the first page of its quire, and as Guðlac appears to end defectively at the foot of f. 52v, it seems likely that the missing text included one or more quires. On the assumption that a single quire is missing between the current quires 6 and 7, Pope has suggested that the missing text might have filled as many as “250 or 300 lines.”\footnote{Ker, rev. of The Exeter Book, p. 227.}

The two poems share a common section of approximately 75 lines (corresponding to J 279-364/E 1-75) and show occasional similarities of vocabulary and phrasing for most of the remainder of Azarias (J 365-464/E 76-191, especially J 365-415/E 76-175). These common sections correspond to the Vulgate Daniel 3:24-90 and include two long prayers, “The Prayer of Azarias” and the “Song of the Three Children.”\footnote{Pope, “Paleography and Poetry,” p. 41.}

\footnote{See Krapp, ASPR 1, pp. xxxii-xxxiii. Jabbour, diss., pp. 115-161 (esp. pp. 116-17 and 148-152). As the similarities between the two versions of the “Song of the Three Children” are too slight to lend themselves to the type of variant-by-variant analysis on which this study is based, the following discussion and catalogue is concerned almost entirely with the “Prayer of Azarias.” That the “common” text of “Song of the Three Children” shows even more evidence of recomposition and reworking than does the “Prayer of Azarias” strengthens rather than weakens the conclusions drawn here, however, as it demonstrates an even}
The two poems use this material in different ways. In Daniel, the common text appears as part of a sequential retelling of the Vulgate Daniel. The two prayers are preceded by a section corresponding to Daniel 3:1-50 (in which Nebuchadnezzar orders the Children to be thrown into the furnace), and followed by an account of the rescue of the Children from the fire (corresponding to Dan 3:91-97), and Nebuchadnezzar’s dream (corresponding to Dan 4-5). In Azarias, on the other hand, the common text appears at first glance to make up the entire poem. The first line of the surviving text corresponds to Dan 3:25, and the poem ends with a translation of Dan 3:90. This corresponds almost exactly with the deuto-canonical section of the Vulgate Daniel (3:24-3:90) added by Jerome to his translation of the Hebrew Bible, parts of which were used as canticles in a number of contemporary liturgies. Were it not for the evidence that Azarias begins defectively, this would suggest that the Exeter book poem was intended as a translation of the prayer alone. What preceded the text as it now survives, however, is impossible to tell. As the remains of the letters from the last line on the strip cut from f. 53r – “g at the margin and, after the space of one letter, a letter with a long descender (f, p, r, s, ð, or ð)” – do not match anything in the corresponding line of Daniel (þe hie generede wið þam niðhete, J 278), it seems fairly safe to assume that the missing text was not closely related to the Junius poem.

---

716 Cf. the warnings before 3:24 and after 3:90 in the Vulgate Daniel: Quae sequuntur in hebraeis voluminibus non reperi and Hucusque in hebraeo non habetur; et quae posuimus de Theodotionis editione translata sunt. See also Farrell, Daniel and Azarias, pp. 24-25.


718 This is the basis of Farrell’s suggestion that the Exeter Scribe saw Azarias as containing “appropriate songs of praise and celebration” with which to conclude a defective exemplar of Guðlac (“Some Remarks,” pp. 5-6). For objections to this reading, see Celia Sisam’s review of the Finnsburh Fragment and Episode and Daniel and Azarias, RES n.s. 27 (1976): 324-26.

With 120 potentially significant substantive variants in 160 copied lines, the common
text of Daniel and Azarias is the most variable in the entire corpus of multiply attested Old
English poetry. Like Soul and Body I and II, Daniel and Azarias show all variant types
characteristic of the anthologised poems: twenty-four linked variants; twenty-two examples of
the substitution of stressed words (the majority of which involve non-homographs); three
examples of alternation between case forms and prepositional phrases; three examples of the
substitution of lines and half-lines; five examples of the addition or omission of metrical units;
five examples of rearrangement within the line; and one example of the rearrangement of
entire lines and half-lines. As was the case in Soul and Body, many of these variants are
clustered in passages showing important interpretative differences – although the common text
of Daniel and Azarias shows a generally more even spread of its substantive variation.

Textual Variants

Inflectional Difference (18 examples)

Az/Dan, E 3a/J 281a

E(Az)                                      J(Dan)

1 Himþa azarias ingæþoncum               δa| azarias ingæþancum.
   hleoþredæ halig þurh| hatne lig
   dreag ❂dædum ❂georn ❂dryhten herede
   wis| inweorcum þæs word acwæδ

   280 hleoðrade halig.| þurh hatne líg.
   ❂dæda ❂georn. ❂dryhten herede.|
   wer womma leas. þæa word ácwæδ.

E ❂dædum is dative plural. J ❂dæda is genitive plural. The variation has no significant
effect on sense or metre. In both witnesses, ❂dæd- modifies ❂georn ‘eager, zealous’. Mitchell
reports that ❂georn is found with both cases, with no apparent difference in meaning.720 The
endings are metrically identical. For a discussion of the addition or omission of E ❂dreaq and
the resulting metrical differences between the two witnesses, see below, p. 402.

---

720 Mitchell, OES, § 219, p. 92.
Az/Dan, E 12a/J 291a

E(Az)  
roldera waldend  
geoca us georne gasta scyppend  
|purh hylde help halig drihten  
nuwe þec forþeard|fum |for préa nydum  
15 |føre eað medum arena| bidda|  
lege bilegde

J(Dan)  
290 rodora waldend.  
geo cuser georne. nu gasta scyppend.  
|purh help halig drihten.  
nu="|hec for þreaum. =|for ðeo nydum.  
|for ea|hmedum. arna biddað.  
295 líge beleg|de.

E us is the normal West-Saxon form of the accusative or dative of the second person plural pronoun. J user is the Northumbrian and poetic form of the genitive of the second person plural pronoun. The difference reflects a variation in the rection of gœcian, which can take a dative or genitive object. 721

Although the two half-lines are metrically quite different, both us and user make good metre. In E, us falls in the medial drop of a Type A-1 line. In J, user is found in the preliminary drop of what is best analysed as a Type B-1.

Az/Dan, E 19b/J 298b

E(Az)  
weðæs lifgende  
worhton inwo|rulde eacþon wom dydon.  
yldran usse inofer hygdu|  
þinbibodu þræcon burg sit tende  
20 had ofer hogedon| halgan lifes

J(Dan)  
295 weðæs lifgende.  
worhton onworulde. eac don wóm dyde.  
user yldran. for ofer|hygdu|.  
bræcon bebodo. burhsittend|t|  
had ofer hogedon. halgan lifes.

E burg sit tende is nominative plural, parallel to yldran, line 18a, and subject of bræcon, line 19a: ‘Our forefathers, city-dwellers, also broke your commandments in pride’. In J, burhsittend|t is a dative of possession or interest: ‘Our forefathers also broke the commandments for the city dwellers on account of pride’. 722 The two forms are metrically identical.

721 Mitchell, OES, § 1092.

722 Farrell, p. 65, note to Daniel, 298; also Jabbour, diss., p. 126, who points to Daniel 729 to þam beacne burhsittendum as a syntactic parallel.
Az/Dan, E 23a/J 302a

E(Az)  

wurdon weto wrecene   geond widne grund|
heampum to\textsuperscript{h}worfn\textsuperscript{e}   hylde lease
\textit{wæs} ure lif   geond lon\textsuperscript{id}a fela
fracuð \textit{g}e\textit{fræg}e   fold buend\textsuperscript{u}

J(Dan)  

300 siendon\textsuperscript{w}|| towrecene. geond widne grund.
heampum tohworf\textsuperscript{e}n\textsuperscript{e}. hylde lease.
\textit{is} user lif. geond landaf\textsuperscript{a}la.\textsuperscript{]}
frac\textit{o}d \textit{g}e\textit{fræg}e. folca manegum.
\textit{ða}s \textit{æ}\textit{c}\textit{i} bew\textit{rae}\textit{c}\textit{o}. \textit{t}\textit{ða}s wyr\textit{r}\textit{e}\textit{stan}.

25 nut\textit{u} isic \textit{be}\textit{wrae}\textit{ce}   \textit{ín}\textit{h}\textit{a}s wyr\textit{r}\textit{e}\textit{stan}
eor\textit{ð} cyninges   \textit{ǽ}\textit{ht} geweal\textit{d}a
in\textit{l} h\textit{æ}\textit{ft} heoro grimm\textit{es}
\textit{sceolon we}\textit{ð}\textit{æ}\textit{r} hæ\textit{ð}\textit{ena}
þrea nyd || [strip of c. 4 ll. missing from MS]


E \textit{wæs} is the third person preterite indicative of \textit{bēon}; J \textit{is} is the third person present indicative. The variation occurs as part of a series of linked changes in tense and number throughout E 21-28/J 300-307a. As argued above (pp. 228 ff.), E 21-28 have as their primary focus the current predicament of Azarias and the Children in Nebuchadnezzar’s furnace. The linked preterite verbs in 21a and 23a indicate that in this version of the prayer, the Babylonian captivity of the Jewish people as a whole is seen primarily as a historical background to Azarias’s request for aid. In J, on the other hand, Azarias is speaking as a representative of his people. His use of the present tense for the verbs of lines 300a and 302a indicate that he sees the captivity of the Jews as a current problem in its own right. The effect of these changes on the passage as a whole are discussed above, pp. 228 ff. For the variation in the verb of E 21a/J 300a, see below, p. 376.

Az/Dan, E 25a/J 304a

E(Az)  

wurdon weto wrecene   geond widne grund|
heampum to\textsuperscript{h}worfn\textsuperscript{e}   hylde lease
\textit{wæs} ure lif   geond lon\textsuperscript{id}a fela
fracuð \textit{g}e\textit{fræg}e   fold buend\textsuperscript{u}

J(Dan)  

300 siendon\textsuperscript{w}|| towrecene. geond widne grund.
heampum tohworf\textsuperscript{e}n\textsuperscript{e}. hylde lease.
\textit{is} user lif. geond landaf\textsuperscript{a}la.\textsuperscript{]}
frac\textit{o}d \textit{g}e\textit{fræg}e. folca manegum.
\textit{ða}s \textit{æ}\textit{c}\textit{i} bew\textit{rae}\textit{c}\textit{o}. \textit{t}\textit{ða}s wyr\textit{r}\textit{e}\textit{stan}.

25 nut\textit{u} isic \textit{be}\textit{wrae}\textit{ce}   \textit{ín}\textit{h}\textit{a}s wyr\textit{r}\textit{e}\textit{stan}
eor\textit{ð} cyninges   \textit{ǽ}\textit{ht} geweal\textit{d}a
in\textit{l} h\textit{æ}\textit{ft} heoro grimm\textit{es}
\textit{sceolon we}\textit{ð}\textit{æ}\textit{r} hæ\textit{ð}\textit{ena}
þrea nyd || [strip of c. 4 ll. missing from MS]

\textit{E be}\textit{wrae}\textit{ce} is second person singular preterite indicative of \textit{bewræcan} ‘drive; drive away, banish’; its subject is the pronoun \textit{þu}, referring to God. \textit{J bewræcon} is the plural
preterite indicative; the subject in this version is *ha*, a plural demonstrative pronoun with *folca manegum* as antecedent. The variation is one of a linked series of changes in number and tense in *E* 21-28/*J* 300-307a. A full discussion of the effect of these variants on the passage as a whole is given above, pp. 228 ff. The variation has no effect on metre.

**Az/Dan, E 26a/J 305a**

**E(Az)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>wurdon weto wrecene</th>
<th>geond widne grund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>heapum tohörworfne</td>
<td>hylda lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wäs ure lif</td>
<td>geond lon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fracoð ðgefæge</td>
<td>fold buendū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 nuþu usic beþwæce</td>
<td>inþas wyrrestan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eord cyninges</td>
<td>æht gewealda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in</td>
<td>hæft heorogrimmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sceolon wþepær hæþenra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>þrea nyd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**J(Dan)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>300 siendonwel</th>
<th>towrecene.</th>
<th>geond widne grund.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>heapum tohörworfene.</td>
<td>hylda lease.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is user lif.</td>
<td>geond landafela.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fracoð ðgefæge.</td>
<td>folca manegum.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>þaus éc</td>
<td>bewræcon.</td>
<td>toþæs wyrrestan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305 eord cyninga</td>
<td>æhta gewealde.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>onhæft heoru grimra</td>
<td>ðwe</td>
<td>nu hæþenra.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>þeow ned þoliað.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**E eord cyninges** is possessive genitive singular. It qualifies *æht gewealda* ‘power’ and is modified by the genitive singular superlative adjective *wyrrestan* ‘most terrible’: ‘into the power of this most terrible earth-king.’ **J eord cyninga** is a partitive genitive plural. It modifies *wyrrestan*, a possessive genitive singular superlative adjective, in this case used substantively to qualify *gewealde*: ‘into the power of this most terrible of earth-kings’. The two forms are metrically equivalent.

Despite their similarity to other linked changes in number and tense throughout *E* 21-28/*J* 300-307a, these variants are not an integral part of the interpretative differences in the passage: in both cases, a single king is being referred to.
\textit{Az/Dan, E 26b/J 305b}

E(Az)

\begin{quote}
wurdon weto wrecene geond widne grund
heapum to\textsuperscript{h}worfn\textsuperscript{e} hylda lease
wæs ure lif geond lon\textsuperscript{d}a fela
fracu\textsuperscript{d} ˈgetra\textsuperscript{e} fold buend\textsuperscript{u}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\text{25} núþu usic be\textsuperscript{h}wraece in\textsuperscript{h}pas wyrr\text{estan}
\textit{eorð cyninges əht geawelda}
in\textit{hæt heero grimm\textit{es}}
\textit{sceolon wæþer hæ\textit{ðenra}}
\textit{þrea nyd} \text{[strip of c. 4 ll. missing from MS]}\end{quote}

\textit{E aht geawelda} is a dative singular neuter compound noun (with \textit{a} for expected \textit{e})

\textquoteleft power\textquoteright: \textquoteleft you have exiled us into the power of this most terrible earth-king\textquoteright. In \textit{J}, \textit{æhta} is most likely an accusative plural feminine noun \textquoteleft chattels, slaves\textquoteright\textsuperscript{723} appositive to \textit{us éc} (line 304a): \textquoteleft who have exiled us as chattels into the power of this most terrible of earth-kings\textquoteright. The inflectional ending adds or subtracts an unstressed syllable from the medial dip of a Type A-1 line and is metrically insignificant.

\textit{Az/Dan, E 27a/J 306a}

E(Az)

\begin{quote}
wurdon weto wrecene geond widne grund
heapum to\textsuperscript{h}worfn\textsuperscript{e} hylda lease
wæs ure lif geond lon\textsuperscript{d}a fela
fracu\textsuperscript{d} ˈgetra\textsuperscript{e} fold buend\textsuperscript{u}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\text{25} núþu usic be\textsuperscript{h}wraece in\textsuperscript{h}pas wyrr\text{estan}
\textit{eorð cyninges əht geawelda}
in\textit{hæt heero grimm\textit{es}}
\textit{sceolon wæþer hæ\textit{ðenra}}
\textit{þrea nyd} \text{[strip of c. 4 ll. missing from MS]}\end{quote}

\textit{E heero grimm\textit{es}} is a genitive singular substantive adjective. It is appositive to \textit{þas} [for \textit{þas}] \textit{wyrr\text{estan eorð cyninges}} and refers to Nebuchadnezzar: \textquoteleft the bondage of the savage one\textquoteright. In \textit{J}, \textit{heoru grimm\textit{ra}} is genitive plural and refers either to Nebuchadnezzar’s henchmen or to the \textit{folca manegum} responsible for oppression of Jews as a whole: \textquoteleft the bondage of savages\textquoteright.

In contrast to the difference in the number of \textit{eorð cyninges / eorð cyninga} in line 25a/305a,

\textsuperscript{723}B.-T. \textit{œht}, I d. (cf. \textit{Gif hwylc man his œht of\text{f}lyh\text{ð} ‘if any man strikes down his slave’)}
the variation in number here is part of the linked changes in number and tense throughout E
21-28/J 300-307a (see pp. 228 ff. above). The two forms are metrically identical.

**Az/Dan, E 32b/J 315b**

E(Az)

- þuhimgete þurh hleopor cwidas
- þæt þu hyra fromcynn onfyrn dagum
dyan wolde þhit æfter him

- 35 oncyne|ryce cenned wurde
- yced oneorþan þæt swa unrime
- had to| hebban swa heofon steorrnan
- bugað bradne hwearft oðbrim|fodos.
- swa waroþa sond ymb sealt wæter

- 40 yþe geond ear| Grund þæt swa unrime
- ymb wintra hwearft weordan scoel|de

**J(Dan)**

- 315 þu him þgehète. þurh| hleodor cwye|de.
- þ þu hyra from cyn. infyrn| dagum.
- ðcan wolde. þe æfter him.
- oncneor|rissum. cenned wurde.
- ¤seo menigeo mæ|re| were.

- 320 hat to hebbanne. swa heofon steorr|jan.
- bebugað bradne hwyrft. oð h| brim|faro. þæs
- sæ faroða sand. geond seal|te| wæg.
- me ære grynde|ð. þ his unrima.

- inwintra| worn. wurðan scoelde.

**E hleopor cwidas** is accusative plural. **J hleodor cwye|de** is dative singular. In both

versions the noun is the object of *þurh*. Both make good sense, syntax and metre, although the

use of the plural in E adds an extra weight to Azarias’s petition by emphasising the repeated

nature of the prophesy. The endings are metrically identical.

**Az/Dan, E 37a/J 320a**

E(Az)

- þuhimgete þurh hleopor cwidas
- þæt þu hyra fromcynn onfyrn dagum
dyan wolde þhit æfter him

- 35 oncyne|ryce cenned wurde
- yced oneorþan þæt swa unrime
- had to| hebban swa heofon steorrnan
- bugað bradne hwearft oðbrim|fodos.
- swa waroþa sond ymb sealt wæter

- 40 yþe geond ear| Grund þæt swa unrime
- ymb wintra hwearft weordan scoel|de

**J(Dan)**

- 315 þu him þgehète. þurh| hleodor cwye|de.
- þ þu hyra from cyn. infyrn| dagum.
- ðcan wolde. þe æfter him.
- oncneor|rissum. cenned wurde.
- ¤seo menigeo mæ|re| were.

- 320 hat to hebbanne. swa heofon steorr|jan.
- bebugað bradne hwyrft. oð h| brim|faro. þæs
- sæ faroða sand. geond seal|te| wæg.
- me ære grynde|ð. þ his unrima.

- inwintra| worn. wurðan scoelde.

**E hebban** is the infinitive, **J hebbanne** the inflected infinitive, of *hebban* ‘to raise, lift,
exalt’. While *to* + the inflected infinitive is the norm in Old English, Callaway reports that

---

724 The equivalent verse in the Vulgate Daniel makes no mention of the number of times the promise was made: *Quibus [sc. Abraham, Isaac, and the people of Israel] locutas es quod multiplicares semen eorum...*(Dan 3:36).
“occasionally the *to* is followed by an infinitive in *-an*.”

In *E*, *had to*| hebban* is Type A-1; *J* *hat to hebbanne* is D*#1.

**Az/Dan, E 39b/J 322b**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E(Az)</th>
<th>J(Dan)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>þuhimge hete þurh hleoðor cwidas</td>
<td>315 þu him þgehête. þurh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>þæt þu hyra from</td>
<td>cynn onfyrn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ycan wolde þhit æfter him</td>
<td>ð þu hyra from cyn. infyrn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 oncyne</td>
<td>rype cenned wurde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yced oneorðan þæt swa unrine</td>
<td>oncneorissum. cenned wurde.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>had to</td>
<td>hebban swa heofon steorran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bugað bradne hwearft oðbrim</td>
<td>flodas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swa waroþa sond ymb sealt wæter</td>
<td>sæ faroða sand. geond sealtne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 yþe geond ear</td>
<td>grund þæt swa unrine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ymb wintra hwearft weordan sco</td>
<td>lde</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The inflectional variation between *E sealt* *J sealtne* is linked to the substitution of stressed words immediately following. In *E*, *sealt* is the accusative singular neuter strong form of the adjective, agreeing with *wæter*, an accusative singular neuter noun. In *J*, *sealtne* is accusative singular masculine strong, agreeing with the accusative singular masculine noun *wæg*. The two forms are not metrically equivalent, but each is appropriate to the metrical context in which it occurs. In *E*, *sealt* provides the first lift for a Type C-2 line. In *J*, the accusative ending *-ne* occupies the dip of a Type B-1 line.

---

Az/Dan, E 40b/J 323b

E(Az)
þuhimge hete þurh hleoðor cwidas
þæt þu hyra fromcynn onfyrn dagum
ycan wolde þhit æfter him
35 oncynelrce cenned wurde
yced oneorðan þæt swa unrime
had to hebban swa heofon steorran
bugað bradne hwearft oðbrimirfolas.
swa waroða sond ymb sealt water
40 yþe geond eargrund þæt swa unrim
ymb wintra hwearft weordan sceolde

J(Dan)
315 þu him þgehéte. þurh hleoðor cwode.
þ þu hyra frum cyn. infyrn dagum.
ycan wolde. þætte æfter him.
oncynerrissum. cenned wurde.
þæt mænigeo mære were.
320 hat to hebbanne. swa heofon steorran.
bebugað bradne hwyrf. oð þ brimirflodos.
sæ faroða sand. geond sealtne wæg.
me ðe gryndeð. þ þis unrima.
inwintra worn. wurðan sceolde.

J unrim is a nominative singular noun, subject of sceolde (that unrima is not a graphic variant for unrim is indicated by the preceding genitive pronoun his726; see below, p. 381). Its clause, J 323b-324, is either a noun clause governed by gehéte (line 315a), or a purpose/result clause qualifying to hebbanne (l. 320): ‘you promised them... that a countless number of it [his, referring to hat, line 320a] should always come into being in a span of years’ or ‘you promised them... to raise a race as the stars of heaven enclose the wide heaven... so that a countless number of it should always come into being in a span of years’.727

E unrim is a nominative singular masculine adjective, ‘innumerable’, and the predicate of weordan. As in J, E 40b-41 can be construed as a purpose/result or noun clause: ‘you promised... that [it, i.e. had, ‘race’ line 37a] should become so innumerable in the span of years’, or ‘you promised them... to raise a race... so that [it, i.e. had, ‘race’ line 37a] should become so innumerable in the span of years’. This is only one of a number of highly significant syntactic and lexical variants in E 32-41/J 315-324. The passage is convoluted and possibly corrupt in both witnesses.728

---

726 On the use of pronouns in a partitive sense, see Mitchell, OES, § 1268.
727 Both translations of lines 323b-324 are based on Farrell, Daniel and Azarias, p. 67. Farrell understands the lines as a purpose clause, as do Bradley, Anglo-Saxon Poetry, p. 75, and Gordon, Anglo-Saxon Poetry, p. 123.
728 See also Farrell, Daniel and Azarias, pp. 66-67, 91-92.
The variation has an effect on metre. In E (with the inflected form *unrime*), line 40b is Type C-1; in J (with *únrim* and the adverb *a*), the same line is Type B-1. The addition or omission of *a* is discussed below, p. 417. The substitution E *swa J his* on p. 381.

**Az/Dan, E 45b/J 328b**

**E(Az)**

gecyð cræft ȝmeaht  nu| þec caldeas
45 ṣeac fela folca  gefregen habban| ṣeæt þu an| eart  ece dryhten
sige rof set tend  ṣsoð meo tod
wulders| waldend  ṣworuld sceafa

**J(Dan)**

gecyð cræft ȝ| miht.  þp|caldeas.
45 ṣfolca fela.  gefrigen hab|bað.
ðafæ under heofenum.  heðene lifgeað.]
330 þþu ána eart.  ece drihten.
weroda waldend.| woruld gesceafta.
sigora settend.  soð fæst| metod.

E *habban* is plural present subjunctive; J *hab|bað* is plural present indicative. The indicative would be the expected form in both versions; indeed E is one of only two examples known to Mitchell of the subjunctive in a clause of “actual or accepted cause.” If it is not a mistake, the use of the subjunctive in E may reflect an awareness that the cause being suggested by Azarias for the Chaldean’s actions is not strictly accurate: Nebuchadnezzar orders the children thrown into the fire not because he wants to test their God, but because they refuse to worship his idol (see Daniel 3:8-23). In J, 327b-329 is best construed as an adjective clause modifying *cræft ȝ| miht.* See below, p. 382.

**Az/Dan, E 52a/J 336a**

**E(Az)**

δa ofroderum wearð| enge| ælbeorhta  ufon onsended|
white scyne wer  inhis wuldor homan.
Cwomhimþa toare| ṣto ealdor nere
55 þurh lufan  þurh lisse

**J(Dan)**

δaof roderum was.  enge| ælbeorht|  ufan onsended.
white scyne wer.  onhiswul|dorhaman.
sehim cwó|m tofrofe.  ṣtō| feorh nere.
335b mid lufan  ṣmid lisse.

E *ælbeorhta* is a weak-declension nominative singular masculine adjective modifying *engel.* J *ælbeorht* is the strong-declension form of the adjective. The variation has no effect on sense or syntax. Metrically, E 52a is Type D*1; in J, the equivalent verse is Type A-2b.

---

729 Mitchell, *OES*, § 3105. He describes the second example, Blickling Homilies 163.3, as “probably corrupt.”
Az/Dan, E 59b/J 341b

E(Az)

Tosweop ||| toswen,de þurh swiðes meaht
60 liges leoman swa hyra lice nescod.]
acwæs inpam þofne þase engel cwom
windig þwynsum wedeþre onlicust
þön onsumeres tid sended weorþeð
dropena dreorung mid dæges hwile.

J(Dan)
tosweop hine ȝoswende. þurh þa swiðlan miht.
ligges leoma. þyre lice newæs.
owiht ge egled. ácheon andan sloh.
fyron feondas for fyren ðedum.
345 þawæs onpam ofne. þær se engel becwóm.
windig þwynsum. wedere gelicost.
þön hit onsumeres tid. sended weorþeð.
dropena drearung. ondæges hwile.
wearmþic wolcna scûr.

E swiðes is a strong genitive singular masculine or neuter adjective, in this case used substantively for the angel or God: ‘might of the Great [One].’ In J, swiðlan is a weak accusative singular feminine adjective. It agrees with pa and miht: ‘great might’. The two forms are metrically indistinguishable. For a further discussion of the line, see p. 412, below.

Az/Dan, E 60a/J 342a

E(Az)

55b seþone lig tosceaf
halig þeofonbeorht hatan fyres
þse bittra bryne beorþgan sceolde
forþæs engles ége æfæstum þrim.
Tosweop ||| toswen,de þurh swiðes meaht
60 liges leoman swa hyra lice nescod.]
acwæs inpam þofne þase engel cwom
windig þwynsum wedeþre onlicust
þön onsumeres tid sended weorþeð
dropena dreorung mid dæges hwile.

J(Dan)

340 halig þeofon beorht. hatan|| fyres.
tosweop hine ȝoswende. þurh þa swiðlan miht.
ligges leoma. þyre lice newæs.
owiht ge egled. ácheon andan sloh.
fyron feondas for fyren ðedum.
345 þawæs onpam ofne. þær se engel becwóm.
windig þwynsum. wedere gelicost.
þön hit onsumeres tid. sended weorþeð.
dropena drearung. ondæges hwile.
wearmþic wolcna scûr.

E leoman is accusative singular, object of Tosweop and toswen,de in line 59a: ‘He swept back and brushed aside the light of the flame through the might of the Great One’. In J, leoma is ostensibly nominative singular, but is perhaps best understood as an example of the loss of final n. This usually described as a Northumbrian feature, but Farrell reports such loss to be “very frequent in the Hatton MS. of the Pastoral Care.”

---

730 Farrell, Daniel and Azarias, pp. 17 and 68. Farrell cites heredo for expected heredon (3 plural preterite) as a further example. But cf. S-B §188.2: “In den übrigen Mundarten [i.e. excluding Northumbrian] fällt n im allgemeinen nur in der 1. 2. Pl. vor dem Pron. wē, jē ab.”
A second possibility, however, is that leoma was understood by a scribe in J tradition as the subject of the verbs in line 341a, referring either to the angel who comes to save the children, or the power by which the flames are “swept back” and “brushed aside”: the addition of hine to line 341a (with lig, line 339b, as antecedent) provides the main verbs of the sentence in J with an accusative object, while ligges leoma ‘brightness of flame’ recalls the description of the angel in E 56a/J 340a as heofon beorht: ‘That one, holy and bright from heaven, shoved the flame of the hot fire; Brightness of Flame, [he] swept it [hine, referring to lig, line 339b] back and brushed [it] aside by his great might...’.’ That this is not the original sense of the passage is suggested by the fact that “leoma never refers to a human (or divine) being” elsewhere in Old English literature.\(^\text{731}\) See also below, p. 411.

**Az/Dan, E 70a/J 359a**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E(Az)</th>
<th>J(Dan)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bædon bletsunge</td>
<td>bædon bletsian. bear[ ] israela.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ealle gesceafte</td>
<td>eall länd gesceafte. écne drihten.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>þeoda waldend</td>
<td>360 þeoda waldend.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E ealle is an instrumental singular adjective ‘agreeing’ with the neuter dative gesceafte: ‘for all creation’.\(^\text{732}\) J eall is an accusative singular neuter adjective agreeing with länd gesceafte, the direct object of bædon: ‘all terrestrial creation’. The difference in inflection is linked to that of the following noun and to the variation E bletsunge J bletsian, E 69/J 358. Its syntactic and metrical significance is discussed below, p. 398.

---

\(^{731}\) Fred C. Robinson, personal communication.

\(^{732}\) On the gender of gesceafte see B.-T. and B.-T.(S), gesceafte. While the expected form of the adjective would be eullum (neuter dative singular), Mitchell reports that the intrusion of instrumental forms “into the realm of the ‘dative proper’” is of “no syntactical importance” (Mitchell, *OES*, § 1345). A close parallel to E is found in Mark 16.15, where the Northumbrian text of the Rushworth Gospels (Ru) reads bodigap godspel elce gesceafte for Lindisfarne (Li) alle 1 egheucum sceafte” (texts cited from Mitchell, *OES*, § 1345).
Together with the variation in the case of *gesceaf*th- and the addition or omission of the stressed element *land*-, the difference in the inflection of *eall*- has a significant effect on metre. In *E*, line 70 is Type A-1; the equivalent line in *J* is Type D-4.

### Az/Dan, E 70a/J 359a

**E(Az)**

- `bædon bletsunge`  
- `bearn Inworulde`  
- `ealle gesceafte`  
- `ecline dryhten`  
- `þeoda waldend`

**J(Dan)**

- `bædon blestian`  
- `bearn[ ] israela.`  
- `eall länd gesceafte`  
- `écline drihten.]`  
- `360 þeoda waldend.`

*E gesceafte* is dative singular, modified by the instrumental adjective *ealle*. In *J* *lánd gesceafte* is accusative singular, agreeing with *eall*. In addition to being linked to the case of the preceding adjective, the variants are linked to the difference in the part of speech of *E* *bletsunge* and *J* *bletsian* in 69a/358a. See below, p. 398.

Together with the variation in the case of *eall*- and the addition or omission of the stressed element *land*-, the difference in the inflection of *gesceaf*th- has a significant effect on metre. In *E*, line 70 is Type A-1; the equivalent line in *J* is Type D-4.

### Substitution Of Unstressed Words and Elements (31 examples)

**Az/Dan, E 4b/J 284b**

**E(Az)**

- `Himþa azarias`  
- `ingeþoncum`  
- `hleoþrede halig`  
- `purh hatne lig`  
- `dregædum georn`  
- `dryhten herede`  
- `wis| inweorcum`  
- `þhas word acwæð`

**J(Dan)**

- `dæl azarias`  
- `inge þancum.`  
- `þæfe! hleoðrade halig.|`  
- `purh hatne lig.`  
- `dæda georn.`  
- `dryhten herede.|`  
- `wer womma leas.`  
- `þa word ácwæð.`

*E þhas* is the neuter accusative plural form of the demonstrative pronoun *þis*; *J þa* is the neuter accusative plural form of the demonstrative pronoun *þæt*. In both witnesses, the form agrees with *word*. Both are very common in formulae introducing speeches and are metrically indistinguishable.

---

733 See above, fn. 732.

734 Jabbour, diss., p. 120.
Az/Dan, E 8b/J 286b

E(Az)

sindon þine domas| ondæda gehwam
sode geswiðde  ðgesige fæste.
10 eac| þinne willan  inworuld spedum
ryhte mid ræde

J(Dan)

siendon þine dó|mas. indaga gehwam.
sode  þgeswiðde.  ðge|sige fæste.
swa þu eac sylfa eart.
syndon| þine willan. onworuld spedum.
290 rihte  þge|rume.

The substitution has no significant effect on sense, metre, or syntax.

Az/Dan, E 10a/J 289a

E(Az)

sindon þine domas| ondæda gehwam
sode geswiðde  ðgesige fæste.
10 eac| þinne willan  inworuld spedum
ryhte mid ræde

J(Dan)

siendon þine dó|mas. indaga gehwam.
sode  þgeswiðde.  ðge|sige fæste.
swa þu eac sylfa eart.
syndon| þine willan. onworuld spedum.
290 rihte  þge|rume.

In J, syndon is the main verb of the clause syndon| þine willan…rihte  þge|rume: ‘your
wishes are just and generous in the abundance of the world’. In E, eac is best interpreted as a
conjunction, ‘and, also’. In this case, the main verb of the resulting clause eac| þinne
willan… ryhte mid ræde (lines 10b-11a) is same as that of the preceding clause (sindon, line
8a) and is not expressed; pinne willan is to be understood as a nominative plural with
graphic doubling of the medial n in pinne: ‘your decrees are truly established... and secured
of their triumph; also your wishes [are] just with wisdom.’

The substitution is metrically insignificant. The line is Type A-3 in both manuscripts.

---

735 Mitchell, OES, § 1740

736 On the non-expression of “a simple verb or periphrasis... in a clause or sentence which requires the same
form as that which precedes,” see Mitchell, OES, § 1532. Farrell’s implicit interpretation of E ryhte as a
form of the weak verb “ryhtan” is syntactically unlikely (glossary, p. 123). As a verb, ryhte could only be
imperative or second person singular subjunctive, neither of which fits the immediate context.

737 Campbell, OEG, § 65. Such doubling is primarily a Northumbrian feature, however. See also Farrell, p.
90, note to line 10, and ASPR 3, p. 269.
The substitution has no significant metrical, semantic, or syntactic effect.

The variation is metrically, syntactically and semantically insignificant. Both prepositions can be used causatively to mean ‘because, for’ and both witnesses use for in the preceding, syntactically parallel, phrase, E pec forpear|fum  ḥfor ḫrea nydum J for ḫreaum ḥfor ḫeo nydum (E 14/J 293). As the extra syllable in E falls in the initial dip of a Type C-1 line, the variation has no significant effect on metre.
**Az/Dan, E 17a/J 296a**

**E(Az)**  
weðæs lifgende  
worhton inworulde eacþon wom dydon.  
yldran use inofer hygdūj  
þinbibodu bræcon burg sit tende  
20 had ofer hogedon| halgan lifes

**J(Dan)**  
295 weðæs lifgende.  
worhton onworulde.| eac dôn wóm dyde.  
user yldan. for ofer|hygdum.  
bræcon bebodo. burhsittendūj  
had ofer hogedon. halgan lifes.

The variants are metrically, syntactically, and semantically indistinguishable.

**Az/Dan, E 18b/J 297b**

**E(Az)**  
weðæs lifgende  
worhton inworulde eacþon wom dydon.  
yldran use inofer hygdūj  
þinbibodu bræcon burg sit tende  
20 had ofer hogedon| halgan lifes

**J(Dan)**  
295 weðæs lifgende.  
worhton onworulde.| eac dôn wóm dyde.  
user yldan. for ofer|hygdum.  
bræcon bebodo. burhsittendūj  
had ofer hogedon. halgan lifes.

The substitution has a minor effect on sense (E in ofer hygdū ‘in pride’, J for ofer|hygdum ‘on account of pride’) but none on syntax or metre. The two prepositions are appropriate to context, take the same case, and are metrically identical.

**Az/Dan, E 21a/J 300a**

**E(Az)**  
wurdon weto wrecene geond widne grund|  
heapum to¹worfne hylda lease  
wæs ure lif geond lon|da fela  
fracoð gefræge folca manegum  
25 nuþu usic bewræcon. toþæs wyrrestan  
eorð cyninges æhta gewealda  
in| hæft heoro grimmes  
sceolon wæþe hæþenra  
þrea nyd || [strip of c. 4 ll. missing from MS]

**J(Dan)**  
300 siendon we|| towrecene. geond widne grund.  
heapum tohorrow|ene. hylda lease.  
is user lif. geond landafela.|  
fracoð gefræge. folca manegum.  
þaus éc bewræcon. tolæs wyrestan.  
305 eorð cyninga.| æhta gewealda.  
onhæft heoru grimra ýwe| nu hæðenra.  
þeow ned þoliað.

E wurdon is the plural preterite indicative of weordan ‘become’: J siendon is the plural present indicative of bðon ‘to be’. The variants are the first of a number of linked differences in tense and number in E 21-28/J 300-307a. Their effect on the passage as a whole is discussed above, pp. 228 ff. The two forms are metrically identical.
Az/Dan, E 23a/J 302a

E(Az)

wurdon weto wrecene  geond widne grund
heapum tô'worfne  hylda lease
wæs ure lif  geond lonďa fela
fracuď  gefræge  fold buendď

25  nuþu usic beþwæce  inþas wyrestan
eorď cyninges  æht gewealda
in| hæft heoro grimmes
sceolon weþer haþenra
þrea nyd || [strip of c. 4 ll. missing from MS]

J(Dan)

300 siendonwe|| towrecene.  geond widne grund.
heapum tohworfjene.  hyldy lease.
is user lif .  geond landafela.]
fracoď  gefræge.  folca manegum.
þaus éc| bewræcon.  topþæs wyrestan.

305 eorď cyninga.|  æhtæa gewaelde.
onhæft heoru grimra  þwe| nu hæðenra.
þeow ned þoliaď.

E ure is the normal form of the possessive adjective; J user is the genitive form of the first person plural pronoun. The substitution has no effect on metre. A similar variant occurs in E 18a/J 297a, p. 391.

Az/Dan, E 25a/J 304a

E(Az)

wurdon weto wrecene  geond widne grund
heapum tô'worfne  hylda lease
wæs ure lif  geond lonďa fela
fracuď  gefræge  fold buendď

25  nuþu usic beþwæce  inþas wyrestan
eorď cyninges  æht gewealda
in| hæft heoro grimmes
sceolon weþer haþenra
þrea nyd || [strip of c. 4 ll. missing from MS]

J(Dan)

300 siendonwe|| towrecene.  geond widne grund.
heapum tohworfjene.  hyldy lease.
is user lif .  geond landafela.]
fracoď  gefræge.  folca manegum.
þaus éc| bewræcon.  topþæs wyrestan.

305 eorď cyninga.|  æhtæa gewaelde.
onhæft heoru grimra  þwe| nu hæðenra.
þeow ned þoliaď.

E nu is a temporal adverb; J pa a third-person plural demonstrative pronoun. The substitution has a significant effect on sense and syntax and is one of a number of linked variants in tense and number in E 21-28/J 300-307. In E, nu marks the point at which Azarias turns from his general discussion of the past suffering of the Jewish people to his current predicament inside Nebuchadnezzar’s oven. In this version of the text, E 25-27a is an independent clause:

We were exiled throughout the wide earth, scattered in flocks, lacking protection. In many lands our way of life was held in contempt and notoriety by many peoples. Now you have exiled us into the power of this most terrible earth-king, into the bondage of the savage one.
In J, lines 304-306a are an adjective clause modifying *folca manegum*, the antecedent of *þa*. This is in keeping with the general focus of lines 304-306a in this version of the poem, in which Azarias’s principal focus is on the sufferings of his people as a whole:

We are exiled throughout the wide earth, scattered in flocks, lacking protection. In many lands our way of life is held in contempt and notoriety by many peoples who have exiled us as chattels into the power of this most terrible of earth-kings, into the bondage of savages.

The substitution falls on the preliminary dip of a Type A-3 line in both witnesses and is metrically insignificant.

**Az/Dan, E 25b/J 304b**

**E(Az)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>wurdon weto wrecene</th>
<th>geond widne grund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>heapum to{worfne}</td>
<td>hylda lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wæs ure lif</td>
<td>geond lon[da] fela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fracuð ʒgefærge</td>
<td>fold buendū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 nuþu usic beþwrece</td>
<td>inþas wyrrestan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eorð cyninges</td>
<td>æhta gewealda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in[ ] hæft heoro grimmes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sceolon weiþer hæþenra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>þrea nyd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**J(Dan)**

| 300 siendonwe|| towrecene. | geond widne grund. |
|----------------|----------------|
| 305 eorð cyninga. | æhta gewealde. |
| onhæft heoru grimra  | þwe[ ] nu hæðenra. |
| þeow ned þoliað. |

**E in** and **J to** both make good sense, metre, and syntax. There is a subtle difference between the two witnesses, however. While both prepositions are appropriate, *in* reminds the reader that the *æhta gewealda* ‘power’ being referred to in E includes Nebuchadnezzar’s furnace. **J to** has no sense ‘inside’.

**Az/Dan, E 27a/J 306a**

**E(Az)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>wurdon weto wrecene</th>
<th>geond widne grund</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>heapum to{worfne}</td>
<td>hylda lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wæs ure lif</td>
<td>geond lon[da] fela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fracuð ʒgefærge</td>
<td>fold buendū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 nuþu usic beþwrece</td>
<td>inþas wyrrestan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eorð cyninges</td>
<td>æhta gewealda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in[ ] hæft heoro grimmes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sceolon weiþer hæþenra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>þrea nyd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**J(Dan)**

| 300 siendonwe|| towrecene. | geond widne grund. |
|----------------|----------------|
| 305 eorð cyninga. | æhta gewealde. |
| onhæft heoru grimra  | þwe[ ] nu hæðenra. |
| þeow ned þoliað. |

The substitution has no effect on sense, syntax, or metre.
Az/Dan, E 27b/J 306b

E(Az)

wurdon weto wrecene  geond widne grund
heapum to wofrne  hylda lease
wæs ure lif  geond lond fæla
fracuð gefræge  fold buendū
dan
25
nuþu usic bewræce  inþas wyrrestan
eorð cyninges  æht gewealda
in  hæft heoro grimmes
sceolon weðer heðena
þrea nyd || [strip of c. 4 ll. missing from MS]

J(Dan)

wurdon weto wrecene  geond widne grund.
heapum to wofrne  hylda lease.
is user lif  geond londafela,
fracuð gefræge  folca manegum.
þaus éc bewræcon.  toþæs wyrrestan.
onheft heoro grimra  þwe nu heðena.
þeow ned þoliað.

E þær is a locative adverb; J nu a temporal. The substitution affects sense, but is not obviously related to the more thoroughgoing differences in tense and number throughout the passage. The substitution falls on the preliminary dip of a Type C-1 line and has no significant metrical effect.

Az/Dan, E 34b/J 317b

E(Az)

þuhime gehete  þurh hleoðor cwidas
þæt þu hyra fromcynn  onfyn dagum
ycan wolde  þhit æfter him
35
oncyneryce  cenned were
yced oneorðan  þæt swa unrimne
had to hebban  swa heofon steorran
bugað bradne hwearft  oðbrimflodas.
swa waroþa sond  ymb sealt wæter
40
yþe geond eargrund  þæt swa unrimne
ymþ wintra hwearft  weordan sceolde

J(Dan)

þuhime gehête.  þurh hleoðor cynde.
þu hyra from cyn.  infyn̂ dagum.
îcan wolde.  þte æfter him.
oncyneryssum.  cenned were.
þeo meniæo  þæo ware.
320
hat to hebbanne.  swa heofon steorran.
bebugað bradne hwearft.  oð þ brimfaro.  þæs
sæ faroða sand.  geond sealne ðæg.
me ðæo gryndeð.  þ his únrima.
inwintra| worn.  wurðan sceolde.

E þe J þe are syntactically equivalent conjunctions introducing the subordinate clause

E 34b-36/J 316b-319. As Mitchell points out, this can be a noun clause governed by gehete, an adjective clause modifying E fromcynn J frum cyn, “a final clause (God’s purpose), or a consecutive clause (an undoubted happening in the future).” See also p. 407, below.

---

738 Mitchell, OES, § 2808.
Az/Dan, E 38b/J 321b

E(Az)
þuhimge hete þurh hleoþor cwidas
þæt þu hyra fromcynn onfyrn dagum
ycan wolde þhit æfter him
35 oncyne|ryce cenned wurde
yced oneorþan þæt swa unrire
had to| hebban swa heofon steorran
bugað bradne hwearft of|brimflodas.
swa waroþa sond ymb seal| water
40 yþe geond ear| grund þæt swa unrire
ymb wintra hwearft weordan sceol| de

J(Dan)
315 þu him þgehète. þurh| hleoðor cwide.
þ þu hyra from cyn. infyrn| dagum.
ican wolde. þe æfter him.
oncyne|rissum. cenned wurde.
þse manigeo märe| waere.
320 hat to hebbanne. swa heofon steorf| ran.
bebugað bradne hwyrft of| brim|faro. þæs
sæ faroða sand. geond seal| ne| waeg.
me áre gryndeð. þ his unrima.
inwintra| worn. wurdan sceolde.

The substitution E oð J oð f has a significant effect on sense and syntax of lines 32-41/315-324, although neither version is without difficulty. In E, oð is a preposition meaning ‘as far as, to’ and expresses the limits of the area surrounded or occupied by the heofon steorran (this reading assumes the loss [or non-expression] of a relative particle before E bugað in 38a): ‘...as uncountable as the stars of heaven [which] encompass the broad horizon as far as the seas...’\(^{739}\) In J, oð f, a temporal conjunction meaning ‘until’, is usually taken as an error for oðpe ‘or’\(^ {740} \) – a not unreasonable assumption given the evident difficulty the J scribe has with 315-324. Of f is not impossible to construe, however. Assuming that J brim|faro. þæs is an error for brimfarøpes, that me áre is an error for in eare, and that gryndeð is for gryndað, J 320-323a can be translated as an adverb clause modifying to hebbanne (line 320a): ‘you promised them... to raise a race as the stars of heaven enclose the wide heaven, until the sand of the seas, the seacoasts throughout the salt way, settle in the waves...’

The substitution falls on the preliminary dip of a Type C-1 line in both witnesses and is metrically insignificant. For further discussion of this passage, see pp. 392 and 425, below.

\(^{739}\) See Farrell, Daniel and Azarias, p. 91. Also, Krapp and Dobbie, ASPR 3, p. 270.

\(^{740}\) See Mitchell, OES, § 1930; Farrell, p. 67; Krapp, ASPR 3, p. xxii.
The substitution has no effect on metre or syntax. Both prepositions are semantically appropriate to the context in which they appear.

The substitution **E swa J his** is linked to the substitution of stressed words **E unrime J unrim** immediately following (see above, p. 369). In **E**, where *unrime* is an adjective, *swa* is an adverb modifying it: ‘as uncountable’; in **J**, where *unrim* is a neuter noun, *his* is a genitive of specification ‘an uncountable number of it’. Its antecedent is probably *hat*, line 320a. The substitution has no effect on metre.
The two prepositions are syntactically and metrically equivalent. The substitution does not have a significant effect on sense. For the temporal sense of *ymb(e) ‘after’ see Mitchell, *OES*, § 1219.

In E, Azarias speaks as one who is sharing in the predicament of his people: ‘fulfill now your promise, although few of us survive...’ With *heora* in J, Azarias speaks of the Jews in the third person: ‘Fulfill now your promise, though few of them survive’... This is the opposite of the distinction in E 21-28/J 300-307a, in which Azarias speaks as a representative of the Jewish people in J and on his own behalf and that of the Children in E. See above, pp. 228 ff.. The two pronouns are metrically identical.
Az/Dan, E 44b/J 327b

E(Az)  J(Dan)

gecyð craeft þneahht nu þec caldeas
45 þæt þu ana| eart ece dryhten
sige rof set tend þsoð meo tod
wuldes| waldend þworuld scealta
gecyð craeft þ miht. þp caldeas.
þfolca fela. gefrigen hab|bað.
ðafe under heofenum. heðene lifigeæð.]
330 þþu ána eart. ece drihten.
weroda waldend. woruld gesceafa.
sigora settend. soð fæst| metod.

In E, nu 'now' introduces a causal clause explaining why God is being asked to show his skill and might: 'show your skill and might now the Chaldeans and also many peoples
tshould have asked†741 you...'

Jþþ is more problematic. The most likely explanation is that the first þæt is an example of the neuter demonstrative pronoun being used to introduce an adjective clause without regard to gender or number (craeft and miht are respectively masculine and feminine). The second þæt is almost certainly a scribal error. Suggested emendations have included pa and pe.742

The substitution falls on the preliminary dip of a Type C-2 line in both manuscripts and is metrically insignificant.

Az/Dan, E 53b/J 337b

E(Az)  J(Dan)

ða ofroderum wearð engel ælbeorhta  ufon onsended|
wlite scyne wer inhís wuldor homan.
Cwomhimþa toare| þto ealdor nere
55 þurh lufan þurh lisse
dao of roderum wasæ. engel ælbeorht.| ufan onsended.
white scyne wer. onhiswul|dorhaman.
sehim cwóm tofrofé. þto| feorh nere.
mid lufan þmid lisse.

The substitution E in J on has no significant effect on sense, metre, or syntax.

---

741 The use of the subjunctive habban (i.e. habben) is unusual in this context. For details, see above, p. 370.
742 See Farrell, p. 67; Krapp, ASPR 3, p. xxii; and Mitchell, OES, § 1930.
Az/Dan, E 55a/J 339a

In E, *purh* is used to indicate the causes which led to the angel being dispatched to the Children: he comes *through* love (*purh lufan*) and *through* grace (*purh lisse*). In J, *mid* indicates accompaniment. In this case the angel brings love and grace *with* him. The variation is repeated once more in the same line (see the following variant)

The two prepositions are metrically identical.

Az/Dan, E 55a/J 339a

*In E, *swa* is a sentence adverb and refers back to the preceding clause: ‘He swept back and brushed aside the light of the flame through the might of the Great One. Thus it did not
harm their body’.\(^743\) In J, \(\textit{j}\) introduces a result clause: ‘[he]\(^744\) swept it back and brushed [it] aside by his great might so that not a whit was harmed on their body…’.

Metrically, the two forms are identical.

\textbf{Az/Dan, E 61a/J 345a}

\textbf{E(Az)}

\textit{Tosweop} \(\textit{toswen}, \textit{de} \) \textit{þurh} \textit{swiðes} \textit{meaht}

\textit{liges leoman} \textit{swa} \textit{hyra} \textit{lice} \textit{nescod.\(\textit{j}\)}

\textit{acwæs} \textit{in} \textit{bam} \textit{þofne} \textit{þase} \textit{engel} \textit{cwom}

\textit{windig} \textit{\(\text{\textipa{yw}n\text{\textipa{s}}}\)} \textit{wedêr} \textit{onlicust}

\textit{þôn} \textit{onsumeres} \textit{tid} \textit{sended} \textit{weor\(\text{\textipa{p}}\text{\textipa{e}}\)}

\textit{dropena} \textit{drearung} \textit{mid} \textit{dæges} \textit{hwile.}

\textbf{J(Dan)}

\textit{tosweop} \textit{hine} \textit{\(\text{\textipa{t}osw\text{\textipa{en}}}\)} \textit{\(\text{\textipa{h}}\)} \textit{\(\text{\textipa{lla}n} \textit{miht.}

\textit{ligges} \textit{leoma}. \textit{\(\text{\textipa{þy}r\text{\textipa{e}} \textit{lice} \textit{newæs.}

\textit{owhi\(\text{\textipa{t}}\text{\textipa{h}}\) \textit{ge} \textit{egled.} \textit{\(\text{\textipa{á}ch\text{\textipa{e}}on} \textit{andan sloh.

\textit{fyron} \textit{feondas\(\text{\textipa{d}\text{\textipa{g}}}\text{\textipa{r}}} \textit{\(\text{\textipa{f}}\text{\textipa{y}r\text{\textipa{e}}} \textit{dædum.}

\textit{\(\text{\textipa{n}wæs} \textit{on} \textit{bam} \textit{ofne.} \textit{\(\text{\textipa{h}}\text{\textipa{e}}} \textit{se} \textit{engel} \textit{becw\(\text{\textipa{w}}}\text{\textipa{m}}\).

\textit{windig} \textit{\(\text{\textipa{yw}n\text{\textipa{s}}}\)} \textit{wedere} \textit{gelicost}

\textit{þôn} \textit{hit} \textit{onsumeres} \textit{tid.} \textit{sended} \textit{weor\(\text{\textipa{p}}\text{\textipa{e}}\)}

\textit{dropena} \textit{drearung.} \textit{ondæges} \textit{hwile.}

\textit{wearm\(\text{\textipa{r}}}\text{\textipa{li}c} \textit{wolcna} \textit{sc\(\text{\textipa{r}}}\).

\textit{E ac} is a conjunction connecting lines 61-64 to the preceding half line, \textit{swa} \textit{hira} \textit{lice nescod}: ‘Thus it did not harm their body, but it was breezy and pleasant in the furnace when the angel came…’ In J, lines 345-349a are a new sentence, and \(\textit{j}\) is a temporal adverb ‘then’: ‘Then when the angel had come it was breezy and pleasant in the furnace…’ The substitution follows the addition or omission of two lines (J 343-344). See below, p. 420.

The substitution has no effect on metre.

\textbf{Az/Dan, E 61a/J 345a}

\textbf{E(Az)}

\textit{Tosweop} \|\| \textit{toswen}, \textit{de} \textit{þurh} \textit{swiðes} \textit{meaht}

\textit{liges} \textit{leoman} \textit{swa} \textit{hyra} \textit{lice} \textit{nescod.\(\textit{j}\)}

\textit{acwæs} \textit{in} \textit{bam} \textit{þofne} \textit{þase} \textit{engel} \textit{cwom}

\textit{windig} \textit{\(\text{\textipa{yw}n\text{\textipa{s}}}\)} \textit{wedêr} \textit{onlicust}

\textit{þôn} \textit{onsumeres} \textit{tid} \textit{sended} \textit{weor\(\text{\textipa{p}}\text{\textipa{e}}\)}

\textit{dropena} \textit{drearung} \textit{mid} \textit{dæges} \textit{hwile.}

\textbf{J(Dan)}

\textit{tosweop} \textit{hine} \textit{\(\text{\textipa{t}osw\text{\textipa{en}}}\)} \textit{\(\text{\textipa{h}}\text{\textipa{lla}n} \textit{miht.}

\textit{ligges} \textit{leoma}. \textit{\(\text{\textipa{þy}r\text{\textipa{e}} \textit{lice} \textit{newæs.}

\textit{owhi\(\text{\textipa{t}}\text{\textipa{h}}\) \textit{ge} \textit{egled.} \textit{\(\text{\textipa{á}ch\text{\textipa{e}}on} \textit{andan sloh.

\textit{fyron} \textit{feondas\(\text{\textipa{d}\text{\textipa{g}}}\text{\textipa{r}}} \textit{\(\text{\textipa{f}}\text{\textipa{y}r\text{\textipa{e}}} \textit{dædum.}

\textit{\(\text{\textipa{n}wæs} \textit{on} \textit{bam} \textit{ofne.} \textit{\(\text{\textipa{h}}\text{\textipa{e}}} \textit{se} \textit{engel} \textit{becw\(\text{\textipa{w}}}\text{\textipa{m}}\).

\textit{windig} \textit{\(\text{\textipa{yw}n\text{\textipa{s}}}\)} \textit{wedere} \textit{gelicost}

\textit{þôn} \textit{hit} \textit{onsumeres} \textit{tid.} \textit{sended} \textit{weor\(\text{\textipa{p}}\text{\textipa{e}}\)}

\textit{dropena} \textit{drearung.} \textit{ondæges} \textit{hwile.}

\textit{wearm\(\text{\textipa{r}}}\text{\textipa{li}c} \textit{wolcna} \textit{sc\(\text{\textipa{r}}}\).

The substitution \textit{E in J on} has no effect on sense, metre, or syntax.

\(^743\)This use of \textit{swa} is mentioned in Mitchell, \textit{OES}, § 1862.

\(^744\)This translation ignores the problem of J \textit{ligges leoma}. For a discussion, see above, p. 371.
In **E**, *ha* introduces an adverbial clause of time: ‘but it was breezy and pleasant in the furnace when the angel came…’ In **J**, *þær* can be interpreted temporally or locally\(^\text{745}\): ‘Then when [or where] the angel had come it was breezy and pleasant in the furnace …’ The substitution has no metrical effect.

The substitution **E** *mid J on* does not appear to affect sense, metre, or syntax. A similar substitution occurs in **E** 68a/ **J** 357a. See p. 387, below.

---

\(^\text{745}\)See Mitchell, *OES*, § 2460-2462.
one was in the furnace through the powers of the Lord as an aid to the holy men.’ In J, *swylc*
line 350a is an indefinite pronoun correlative to *swylce* in line 349b. In this version, lines
350-351a refer not to the Angel but to the nature of the weather within the furnace: ‘As is the
finest weather, such was it in that fire through the powers of the Lord as an aid to the holy
men.’ Metrically, the two words are identical. The linked addition of line J 349b is discussed
below, p. 420.

_Az/Dan, E 68a/J 357a_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E(Az)</th>
<th>J(Dan)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66b</td>
<td>351b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to drifen</td>
<td>to drifen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ý todwæscæd</td>
<td>ý todwæscæd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>þæra dæd hwatan</td>
<td>þæra dæd hwatan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>þry midegþoncum</td>
<td>þodegþoncum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>þeoden heredon</td>
<td>þeoden heredon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wearð se hæta lig.</td>
<td>wearð se hæta lig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>todrifen</td>
<td>todrifen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>þæra dæd hwatan</td>
<td>þæra dæd hwatan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geond bone</td>
<td>geond bone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ofen eodon.</td>
<td>ofen eodon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fœzh neringend</td>
<td>fœzh neringend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seðær feorða wæs.</td>
<td>seðær feorða wæs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>355 annaniæ</td>
<td>355 annaniæ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>þazarias.</td>
<td>þazarias.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ð</td>
<td>misael.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>þepamód hwatan.</td>
<td>þepamód hwatan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>þry ongeðænæcum</td>
<td>þry ongeðænæcum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>þodeæn here don.</td>
<td>þodeæn here don.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The substitution _E mid J on_ has no significant effect on sense, metre, or syntax. A
similar substitution occurs in line _E 64b/J 348b_. See p. 386, above.

**Substitution Of Prefixes (1 example)**

_Az/Dan, E 62b/J 346b_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E(Az)</th>
<th>J(Dan)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ðwæs inpam þofne</td>
<td>Ðwæs onþam ofne.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>æcwæs leoman</td>
<td>þære swiðæs leoman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swa hyra lice nescod.</td>
<td>þære swiðæs leoman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wæs geþoncum</td>
<td>þære swiðæs leoman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>þærlið</td>
<td>þære swiðæs leoman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>þeoden here don.</td>
<td>þeoden here don.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ðurh swiðæs meaht</td>
<td>ðurh swiðæs meaht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liggæs leoman</td>
<td>liggæs leoman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swa hyra lice nescod.</td>
<td>swa hyra lice nescod.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>æcwæs inpam þofne</td>
<td>æcwæs inpam þofne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wæs geþoncum</td>
<td>wæs geþoncum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>þærlið</td>
<td>þærlið</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>þeoden here don.</td>
<td>þeoden here don.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ðurh swiðæs meaht</td>
<td>ðurh swiðæs meaht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liggæs leoman</td>
<td>liggæs leoman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swa hyra lice nescod.</td>
<td>swa hyra lice nescod.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>æcwæs inpam þofne</td>
<td>æcwæs inpam þofne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wæs geþoncum</td>
<td>wæs geþoncum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>þærlið</td>
<td>þærlið</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>þeoden here don.</td>
<td>þeoden here don.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The substitution has no significant effect on sense, syntax, or metre. _J gelicost_ and _E
onlicust_ both can be translated ‘most like’ and the two words are metrically and syntactically
identical.

---

Substitution Of Stressed Words and Elements (22 examples)

Az/Dan, E 8b/J 286b

E(Az)  J(Dan)

sindon þine domas| ondæda gehwam  siendon þine dómás. indaga gehwam.
söðe geswiððe  gesige fæste.  söðe geswiððe. gegilsige fæste.
10 eac þinne willan  inworuld spedum  syndon þine willan. onworuld spedum.
  ryhte mid ræde  290 rihte þgelrume.

The substitution E dæda ‘of deeds’ J daga ‘of days’ has a significant effect on sense.

In E, Azarias praises the practical effect of God’s domas: ‘your decrees are truly established, and secured of their triumph in every action’. In J, he praises their eternal nature: ‘your decrees are true and established, and secured of their triumph every day.’

Farrell suggests that the E reading is farther from the Vulgate than J:

It appears that the Azarias poet (or reciter) had become fixed on certain words and repeated them, where the Daniel poet has used other wording. In addition, the Daniel poet’s wording is closer to the Latin in several of these instances. The first such case is Azarias 3a and 8b, dreag dædum georn and on dæda gehwam. Daniel in the parallel passages has respectively dæda georn (281a) and in daga gehwam (286b). The latter passage corresponds to Dan 3:26: ‘Benedicite opera omnia Domini Domino, laudate et superexaltate eum in sæcula,’ and the Daniel version is thus closer to the original.747

747 Farrell, p. 43. It is important to note, however, that neither version of the text is so close to the Biblical Latin at this point as to allow a precise determination of the correspondences between the Old English translation and the Latin original. Indeed, the text of Azarias from line 5 could as easily be seen as a closer translation of the equivalent part of the biblical Daniel, given the emphasis in both texts on God’s acts:

3:27 Quia iustus es in omnibus quae fecisti nobis,  
Et universa opera tua vera, et via tuae rectae,  
Et omnia iudicia tua vera.

3:28 Iudicia enim vera fecisti  
Uxta omnia quae induxisti super nos  
Et super civitatem sanctam patrum nostrorum, Ierusalem,  
Quia in veritate et in iudicio induxisti omnia haec,  
Propter peccata nostra.

Correspondences between Azarias and the Biblical Daniel are as follows: super nos (3:27): ofer wer peode (E 7; the sentence in Azarias lines 5-7, combines the sections of the Biblical Daniel in praise of God’s name [3:28] and his works [3:27]); iustus... quae fecisti... opera tua... iudicia tua vera (3:27): domas ondæda gehwam... söðe... (E, 8a-9).

See also Jabbour, diss., pp. 119-148, who argues that Azarias contains an inferior version of the text.
But it is also possible that the variation reflects a larger thematic difference between the two texts. As the substitution of half-lines E 4a \textit{wis| inweorcum} J 282a \textit{wer womma leas} (see below, p. 400) in the opening description of Azarias suggests, the \textit{Azarias}-poet places a particular emphasis on the practical nature of his characters’ wisdom.

As genitive plurals modifying \textit{gehwam}, the two words are syntactically equivalent. Metrically, E 8b is Type B-2; in J, the equivalent line in Type B-1 with a resolved first lift.

\underline{Az/Dan, E 11a/J 290a}

\begin{tabular}{l}
\textbf{E(Az)} & \textbf{J(Dan)} \\
\text{siendon þine domas| ondæda gehwam} & \text{siendon þine domas. indaga gehwam.} \\
\text{soðe geswiðde  ðgesige fæste.} & \text{soðe ðgeswiðde. ðge|sige fæste.} \\
10\text{ eac| þinne willan} & \text{swa þu eac sylfa eart.} \\
\text{inworuld spedum ryhte mid} & \text{syndon| þine willan. onworuld spedum.} \\
\text{ræde} & \text{rihte} ðge|rum e.
\end{tabular}

In \textit{E ræde} is the object of \textit{mid}. Together the two words form a prepositional phrase modifying \textit{ryhte}: ‘also your desires in worldly prosperity [are] correct with counsel’. In \textit{J}, \textit{ge|rum e} is an adjective, syntactically parallel to \textit{rihte}: ‘your desires in worldly prosperity are correct and generous’. The substitution adds or subtracts a metrically insignificant unstressed syllable (the prefix \textit{ge-}) from the medial dip of a Type A-1 line. For the substitution \textit{E mid J 7}, see above, p. 375.
Az/Dan, E 14a/J 293a

E(Az)  
roðera waldend  
geoca us georne  gesta scyppend  
þurh hjordo help  halig dryhten  
nuwe þec for þearfum  þfor þrea naëdum  
15  þfor eað medum  arena| biddaþ  
lege bilegde  

J(Dan)  
290  rodora waldend.  
geoca causer georne.] nu  gesta scyppend.  
þurh help  halig drihten.  
nu* þec for þreaum.  þfor þeo nydum.]  
þfor eaðmedum.  arna biddaþ.  
295  líge beleg[d].  

The substitution E þearfum J þreaum has no significant effect on sense, syntax, or metre. The two words are approximately synonymous (þearf, ‘trouble, hardship, distress’; þræa, ‘calamity’), and are syntactically and metrically equivalent.  

Az/Dan, E 14b/J 293b

E(Az)  
roðera waldend  
geoca us georne  gesta scyppend  
þurh hjordo help  halig dryhten  
nuwe þec for þreaum  þfor þrea naëdum  
15  þfor eað medum  arena| biddaþ  
lege bilegde  

J(Dan)  
290  rodora waldend.  
geoca causer georne.] nu  gesta scyppend.  
þurh help  halig drihten.  
nu* þec for þreaum.  þfor þeo nydum.]  
þfor eaðmedum.  arna biddaþ.  
295  líge beleg[d].  

The substitution E þrea naëdum J þeo nydum affects sense, but not syntax or metre. 

þræanide ‘affliction’ and þœownide, ‘slavery’ are both contextually appropriate, as both ideas provide a sufficient motivation for Azarias’s petition to God. At the same time, the variants, which are repeated in E 28a/J 307a, may be linked to subsequent differences in the interpretation of lines E 21-28a J 300-307a. As mentioned above, in the E version of these lines, Azarias’s principal subject is the danger faced by himself, Annanias and Misael in Nebuchadnezzar’s furnace. In this context, þræanide is more appropriate than þœownide. In J, the focus of the equivalent lines is the oppression suffered by the Jews in their Babylonian captivity and þœownide is the more appropriate lexical choice. See also pp. 228 ff. above and 391, below.

The two words are metrically identical.

748 Jabbour, diss., p. 125.
Az/Dan, E 18a/J 297a

E(Az)  
weðæs lifgende  
worhton inwo[rule]  
yldran usu[ ]  
þinbibodu bræcon  
20 had ofer hogedon]

J(Dan)  
weðæs lifgende.  
worhton onworulde. |  
user yldran.  
þinbibodu bræcon  
had ofer hogedon. 

E usse is the nominative plural of the poetic possessive adjective *user,749 J user is the genitve of second person plural personal pronoun.750 The substitution has no significant effect on sense, and the two lines are metrically equivalent. The rearrangement of elements is discussed below, p. 423.

Az/Dan, E 28a/J 307a

E(Az)  
wurdon weto wrecene  
heapum to[wofne]  
wa[ ] ure lif  
fracoð ge[ ]efrae  
25 nuþu usic bej[wrece]  
eorð cyninges  
in| hæft heoro grimmes

J(Dan)  
siendonwe|| towrecene.  
heapum toh[wofene]  
is user lif .  
fracoð ge[ ]efrae.  
305 eorð cyninga.|  
| hæft heoro grimmes

The same substitution occurs in line E 14b/J 293b. As in the previous example, the variation in E 28a/307a is in keeping with thoroughgoing differences in the focus of Azarias’s petition in E 21-28a/J 300-307a. See above, p. 390.

The two words are metrically identical.

749 Campbell, OEG, § 706; Sievers-Brunner § 335.
750 Campbell, OEG, § 705.
The substitution E *cyne/ryece* J *cneol/rissum* affects Azarias’s interpretation of God’s promise to Isaac and Abraham: in E, Azarias argues that God promised that the descendants of Abraham would be born in ‘sovereignty’; in J, the promise is understood as being that there would be future ‘generations’. Both make good sense in context, although the E reading is perhaps preferable in as much as it creates a rhetorically effective contrast to the Children’s current lack of sovereignty as Jews in captivity and victims of Nebuchadnezzar’s wrath.

The variation is of little metrical significance. Both versions are Type C-1. In J, both lifts are long by nature or position. In E, both lifts are resolved.

The substitution E *brim/floclada* J *brim/faro. pæs* has a minor effect on sense and metre. Semantically, *brimflôd* and *brimfaroð* have comparable meanings, and both can be translated approximately as ‘sea-water(s)’. Both lines are Type C-1, although the second lift is resolved in J.
Because of changes elsewhere in the line, the two forms are not syntactically equivalent. In E, *brimflodas* is accusative plural, object of the preposition *oð* ‘as far as’. If *oþ* is not a mistake (see above, p. 380), then J *brimfaro. pæs* (for *brimfaropas*) is most likely to be construed as the nominative plural masculine subject of *gryndeð*.

As Jabbour suggests, the J reading may be an anticipation of *sæ faroða* in the following line.

**Az/Dan, E 39b/J 322b**

\[ E(Az) \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>line</th>
<th>text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>þuhimge hete þurh hleoðor cwidas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>þæt þu hyra from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ycan wolde þhit æfter him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>oncynë</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yced oneorðan þæt swa unrime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>had to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bugað bradne hwearft oðbrimflodas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>swa waroða sond ymb sealt water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>yþe geond ear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ymb wintra hwearft  weordan sceol</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ J(Dan) \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>line</th>
<th>text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>þu him þgehéte. þurh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>þu hyra from cyn. infyrn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ycan wolde. þe æfter him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>oncynë</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>þse me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>hat to hebbenе. swa heofon steor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bebugað bradne hwyrft. oð þ brim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sæ faroða sand. geond sealtne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>me áre gryndeð. þ his únrima.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inwintra</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ E \] *wæter* ‘water’ and \[ J \] *wæg* ‘path’ make good sense and metre and are syntactically identical. The collocations *sealt wæter* and *sealtne wæg* occur elsewhere in the sense ‘sea’ in Old English poetry. As mentioned above, the substitution is linked to the inflectional difference in the preceding adjective. See above, p. 368.

In E, line 39b line is Type C-2; in J, Type B-1.

---

751 As this is the only example of (-)faroð in a possibly nominative or accusative plural context, it is impossible to be absolutely certain of the word’s gender. B.-T(S). gives *brimfarod* as m.; Campbell cites it as “n.” (OEG, § 574.4); Farrell cites it as neuter, but describes *sefarod* as “mn?” Since the genitive singular (the only possible form if *brimfarod* is neuter) is nonsensical here, it seems more likely that the form is to be interpreted as nominative or accusative plural masculine.

752 Jabbour, diss., p. 132.

753 See Bessinger-Smith, *sealt*.
Az/Dan, E 41a/J 324a

E(Az)  
þu himge heth þurh hleóðor cwidas
þæt þu hyra fromþcynn onfyrn dagum
ycan wolde þhit æfter him
35  oncynërcyce cenned wurde
yced oneoðran þæt swa unrire
had to hebban swa heofon steorran
bugad bradne hwearft oðbrimflodas.
swa waroða sond ymb sealt water
40  þye geond eargrund þæt swa unrim
ymb wintra hwearft weorðan sceolde

J(Dan)  
315 þu him þgehête. þurh| hleóðor cwýde.
þ þu hyra frum cyn. infyrn| dagum.
þcan wolde. þe æfter him.
oncynërcyce cenned wurde.
320 þæt þu hyra fromþcynn
þæt þu him
gecyð cræft meaht nu þec caldeas
45  þæc fela fólca gefregen habban
þæt þu ana| eart ece dryhten
sige rof set tend þeoð meo tod
wuldres| waldend þworuld sceafte

E wintra hwearft ‘circuit of years’ and J wintra| worn ‘number of years’ are lexically appropriate to the context in which they appear and syntactically identical. While the two texts have the same metrical type (B-1), J has double alliteration.

Az/Dan, E 47a/J 332b

E(Az)  
gecyð cræft þmeaht nu þec caldeas
þæc fela fólca gefregen habban
þæt þu ana| eart ece dryhten
sige rof set tend þeoð meo tod
wuldres| waldend þworuld sceafte
45  

J(Dan)  
gecyð cræft þmiht. þþcaldeas.
þfolca fela. gefregen habþbað.
þæpe under heofenum. heðene lifþgeðað.
330 þþu ánæ eart. éce drihten.
weroda waldend.| woruld gesceafte.
sigora setend. þoð fæst| metod.

E sige rof is a nominative singular strong adjective modifying set tend: ‘victorious creator’; in J, sigora is a genitive plural noun modifying setend: ‘creator of victories’.

Despite their syntactical differences, the two epithets mean essentially the same thing.754

Metricaly, E is Type A-2ab; in J, the line is a Type A-2b.

754 Both epithets are nonce occurrences.
Az/Dan, E 47b/J 332b

E(Az)  
gecyð craeft þmeahth  nu| þec caldeas  
45 þæc fela fólca  gefrigen habban  
þæt þu ana| eart  ece dryhten  
sige rof set tend  þsoð meo tod  
wuldres| waldend  þworuld sceaftra  

J(Dan)  
gecyð craeft þ| miht.  þþcaldeas.  
þfolca fela.  gefrigen habbað.  
ðæþ under heofenum.  heðene lifigeað.]  
330 þþu ána eart.  éce drihten.  
weroda waldend.]  woruld gesceaftra.  
sigora settend.  soð fæst| metod.

Both E soð and J soð fæst are adjectives meaning ‘true; just, righteous’, and both modify the following noun me(o)tod, ‘creator’. In J, the addition of -fæst supplies a metrically necessary half-stressed syllable in the medial dip of a Type A-4(2a) line. In E the equivalent line is Type C-2. As is the case with the prefix ge- in line 48b/331b, the absence of -fæst from E 47b requires and is linked to the presence of γ in the preliminary dip (see p. 414).755

Az/Dan, E 48a/J 331a

E(Az)  
gecyð craeft þmeahth  nu| þec caldeas  
45 þæc fela fólca  gefrigen habban  
þæt þu ana| eart  ece dryhten  
sige rof set tend  þsoð meo tod  
wuldres| waldend  þworuld sceaftra  

J(Dan)  
gecyð craeft þ| miht.  þþcaldeas.  
þfolca fela.  gefrigen habbað.  
ðæþ under heofenum.  heðene lifigeað.]  
330 þþu ána eart.  éce drihten.  
weroda waldend.]  woruld gesceaftra.  
sigora settend.  soð fæst| metod.

E wuldres is genitive singular, ‘of wonder’; J weroda is genitive plural, ‘of companies’. In both versions, the noun qualifies the follow noun, waldend, and both epithets can be paralleled elsewhere in the corpus.756 The substitution has no significant effect on metre. In E, line 48 is Type A-1 with the first stress falling on a closed syllable; in J, the line is Type A-1 with a resolved first stress.

755See also Jabbour, diss., p. 139.
756Jabbour, diss., pp. 138-9. Parallel to the E reading are: Beowulf, ll. 17a, 183a, 1752a; Andreas, 193a, 539a. Parallels to J are found in: Andreas, 388a, Guðlac, 594a; Christ and Satan, 563a.
Az/Dan, E 50b/J 334b

E(Az)  
swase halga wer hergende wæs|  
50 meotudes miltse his mod sefan  
rehte þurh reorde|  

J(Dan)  
swa se halgawer. hergende wæs.  
meþodes miltse. ðis mihta sped.  
335 rehte þurh reorde.  

E mod sefan is an accusative masculine noun, ‘heart’, object of rehte, E 51a. In J, mihta sped is the accusative feminine noun sped ‘grace; abundance’ and either a qualifying adjective (for expected mihte, due to the falling together of unstressed a and e) or a dependent genitive plural feminine noun ‘of strengths, abilities’. Both the E and J readings can be paralleled elsewhere in the Old English poetic corpus.757

Metrical, E þhis mod sefan is Type C-2; J þhis mihta sped is Type B-1.

Az/Dan, E 51b/J 335b

E(Az)  
ða ofroderum wearð  
engel ælbeorhta ufon onsended|  
white scyne wer inhis wuldor homan.  
Cwomhimþa toare| þto ealdor nere  
55 þurh lufan þurh lisse  

J(Dan)  
ða of roderum wæs.  
engel ælbeorht| ufan onsended.  
white scyne wer. onhiswul|dorhaman.  
sehim cwóm tofrofre. þto| eorh nere.  
335b mid lufan þmid lisse.  

The substitution E wearð J wæs has no significant effect on sense, metre, or syntax.

Az/Dan, E 54a/J 338a

E(Az)  
ða ofroderum wearð  
engel ælbeorhta ufon onsended|  
white scyne wer inhis wuldor homan.  
Cwomhimþa toare| þto ealdor nere  
55 þurh lufan þurh lisse  

J(Dan)  
ða of roderum wæs.  
engel ælbeorht| ufan onsended.  
white scyne wer. onhiswul|dorhaman.  
sehim cwóm tofrofre. þto| eorh nere.  
335b mid lufan þmid lisse.  

E are is the dative singular of ær, ‘messenger’, and refers to the function of the angel: ‘[he] came to them then as a messenger’; in J, frofre, the dative singular of frāfor, ‘consolation’, supplies the reason why the angel came to the Children: ‘[he] came to them... as a comfort...’. In both witnesses, the noun is the dative object of the preposition to.

757Jabbour, diss., p. 140. Parallel to the E reading are found in: Andreas, line 1209a; Beowulf, lines 349a, and 1853b. The J reading can be paralleled by forms in: Phoenix, line 640b; Genesis, line 1696a.
The variants are metrically linked to the substitution \textit{E} \textit{ealdor nere} \textit{J} \textit{feorh nere} in the following half-line. In \textit{E}, \textit{are} provides a necessary vocalic alliteration; in \textit{J}, \textit{frofre} alliterates with \textit{feorh nere}. The two words are otherwise metrically identical. The substitution in line 54b is discussed in the following entry.

\textit{Az/Dan, E 54b/J 338b}

\textit{E(Az)} \hspace{1cm} \textit{J(Dan)}

\begin{align*}
\delta \alpha \text{ ofroderum wearð} & \quad 335b \quad \delta \alpha \text{of roderum was.} \\
\text{engel ælbeorhta } & \quad \text{engel ælbeorht.} \\
\text{ufon onsended[} & \quad \text{ufan onsended.} \\
\text{white scyne wer in his wuldor homan.} & \quad \text{white scyne wer onhis wuldor homan.} \\
\text{Cwomhimþa toare|} & \quad \text{sehim cwóm tofrofre.} \quad 335b \quad \gamma \text{to} \quad \text{eftor nere} \\
\text{prüf lufan } & \quad \text{prüf lufan.} \\
55 \hspace{0.5cm} & \quad \text{prüf lisse.} \\
\text{truth lufan } & \quad \text{truth lisse.} \\
\text{and} & \quad \text{and.} \\
\end{align*}

\textit{E ealdor nere} and \textit{J feorh nere} can both be translated as ‘life-preserver’, although Jabbour reports \textit{feorhnere} to be the more common word in Old English poetry.\textsuperscript{758} The principal effect of the substitution is metrical, however. In \textit{E}, line 54b is Type B-1 with resolution of the second lift and vocalic alliteration. In \textit{J}, the equivalent line is Type C-2 with alliteration on \textit{f}. This is linked metrically to corresponding changes in the alliterating word of the on-verse, \textit{E are J frofre}. See also the preceding entry.

\textit{Az/Dan, E 60b/J 342b}

\textit{E(Az)} \hspace{1cm} \textit{J(Dan)}

\begin{align*}
\text{Tosweop } & \quad \text{toswende.} \\
& \quad \text{prüf swiðes meaht}.
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{liges leoman } & \quad \text{liges leoma.} \\
\text{swa hya lice ne scod |} & \quad \text{hye lice ne newes.} \\
\text{acwæs inham } & \quad \text{wæse engel cwm.} \\
\text{holfne } & \quad \text{þæse engel cwm.} \\
\text{windig } & \quad \text{þwynsum.} \\
\text{wede[re onlicust} & \quad \text{wede[re gelicost.} \\
\text{þon onsumeres tid} & \quad \text{þon hit onsumeres tíid} \\
\text{dropena| dreorung} & \quad \text{sended weor[de} \\
\text{mid dæges hwile.} & \quad \text{on[erse} \\
60 & \quad \text{dæges hwile.}
\end{align*}

The substitution \textit{E scod J wæs} affects sense and syntax, and is linked to other changes throughout \textit{E 59-64/J 341-344}. In \textit{E}, \textit{scod} ‘harmed’ has an unexpressed subject which is to be inferred from \textit{liges leoman}: ‘He swept back and brushed aside the light of the flame through
the might of the Great One. Thus it did not harm their body…’. In J, a similar idea is expressed more expansively through a combination of *wæs* and two lines unique to J (343-4):

‘[he]750 swept it back and brushed [it] aside by his great might so that not a whit was harmed on their body – but he flung the fire in anger upon their adversaries, for their wicked actions’.

Metrically, the two forms are identical. J lines 343-4 are discussed further below, p. 420.

**Az/Dan, E 69a/J 358a**

*E*(Az)  

bædon *bletsunge* bearn Inworulde  

70 ealle gesceafte  ecne dryhten  

þeoda waldend  

*J*(Dan)  

bædon *bletsian*. bearn| israela.  

eall lánd gesceaf.  écne drihten.]  

360 ðeoda waldend.

*E* *bletsunge* is an accusative (or genitive) form of the feminine noun ‘blessing’. It specifies the thing for which the subjects of *bædon* ‘asked’. As mentioned above, *ealle gesceafte* is a dative phrase760 expressing the person for whom the blessing is requested: ‘the children in the world asked the eternal lord, ruler of peoples, for a blessing for all creation’.

*J* *bletsian* is an infinitive verb ‘to bless’. Its ‘subject’ in an accusative-infinitive construction is one or both of *bearn| israela* and *eall lánd gesceaf*: ‘…they asked the children of the Israelites, all earthly creatures to bless the everlasting Lord, ruler of peoples...’

The substitution has no effect on metre. Although, as Farrell notes, J is closer to the Latin canticle,761 both versions of the text make good sense in context.

---

750 Jabbour, diss., p. 141. Jabbour records six parallels to J: *Panther*, line 72a; *Christ*, lines 620a and 1596b; *Elene* 897a; and *Guðlac*, line 917b. The only other occurrence of *ealdornere* is in *Genesis*, line 2521b

759 This translation ignores the problem of *J* *ligges leoma*. For a discussion, see above, p. 371.

760 *Ealle* is instrumental, *gesceafte* dative. For a discussion of the forms, see above, p. 372, fn. 732.

761 Farrell, p. 93, note to line 69a. See also Jabbour, diss., p. 146; and *ASPR* 3, p. 270.
Az/Dan, E 69b/J 358b

E(Az)
- bædon blestunge: bear Inworulde  bædon blestian: bear| israela.
- ealle gesceafte: ecne dryhten  eall lánd gesceaf. ecne drihten.
- þeoda waldend

J(Dan)

E Inworulde is a prepositional phrase, ‘in the world’; J israela is a genitive plural noun modifying bear: ‘children of the Israelites’. Both readings make good sense, although Jabbour, pointing to similar collocations in E 17a/J 296a (E inworulde J onworulde) and E 36a (oneorþan),\(^{762}\) suggests that in worulde may be an “all-purpose half-verse tag” used without thought by the E scribe.\(^{763}\)

Metrically, E, line 69b, is Type A-1 with resolution of the second lift. In J, the equivalent half-line is Type D-1.

Az/Dan, E 74a/J 363a

E(Az)
- 75 heofonas ðenglas: ðhluttor| wæter

J(Dan)

E woruld sceafa and J woruld|craefta are metrically and syntactically identical.

Although different in meaning – E woruld sceafa, ‘of earthly creatures’ J woruld|craefta ‘of worldly arts’ – both words make good sense in context.

Az/Dan, E 74a/J 363a

E(Az)
- 75 heofonas ðenglas: ðhluttor| wæter

J(Dan)

The substitution E wuldor J wlit affects sense and metre. Of the two readings, E woruld sceafa wuldor ‘wonder of earthly creatures’ perhaps makes slightly better sense than J woruld|craefta wlit ‘splendor of worldly arts,’ but neither reading is obviously incorrect. As

\(^{762}\) J has a different half-line here; see below, p. 401.

\(^{763}\) Jabbour, diss., p. 146.
written, *wuldor* adds a lift and final drop to E 74a, a Type A-2a half-verse; it is likely, however, that the word was scanned as a monosyllable, in which case the line is Type E. In J *wlite* contributes the (resolved) final stress to a Type E verse.

**Substitution Of Metrical Units (3 examples)**

**Az/Dan, E 4a/J 282a**

**E(Az)**

1  Himþa azarias  ingeþoncum  
  hleoþrede halig  þurh hatne lig  
  dreaþ dædum georn  dryhten herede  
  *wis/inweorcum*  þæs word acwæð

**J(Dan)**

280  ðæ|azarias  inge þancum.  
  hleoðræde halig| þurh hatne líg.  
  dæ|ða georn.  drihten herede.|  
  *wer womma leas.*  þæ word ácwæð.

Both verses make good sense, metre, and syntax. While they differ significantly in sense (E *wis/inweorcum*, ‘wise in works’; J *wer womma leas*, ‘a man devoid of faults’), both serve as positive epithets for Azarias.

Jabbour notes that “both [verses] have the appearance of being formulas,” although only the E reading can be paralleled from elsewhere in the poetic corpus (*Menologium*, line 209a). While he adds that “it is hard to imagine one being substituted for the other by choice” and suggests that “a memorial slip best explains the variant,” it seems equally possible that the variation was introduced for *literary* reasons by a transmitter who felt that one or the other reading was thematically more appropriate to the immediate context. In the case of Azarias, for example, the substitutions here and in line 8b appear to be part of a consistent emphasis on the value of wisdom demonstrated in one’s *works*. See also p. 388 above.

---

64 Jabbour, diss., p. 120.

65 Jabbour, diss., p. 120.
Both E fold buendu 'by the earth-dwellers' and J folca manegum 'by multitudes of peoples' are metrically, sensically, and syntactically appropriate to the context in which they occur. In E, fold buendu further emphasises the contrast between the Jews – described as the burg sit tende 'city-dwellers' in E 19b/J 298b – and the surrounding peoples. Otherwise the variation has little effect on the over all sense of the passage as a whole.

Metrically, J line 303b is Type A-1; in E, the equivalent line is Type D-1.

J 319 is a noun clause parallel to J 317b-318, without repetition of the subordinating conjunction (\textit{þæt}): 'you promised them... that [it, i.e. hyra from cyn, line 316a] would be born after them in generations and [that] the multitude would be famous'. In E, lines 36a and b each belong to a different clause. E 36a is a continuation of 34-35b ('you promised them... that it [i.e. hyra from|cynn, line 33a] would be born to them in sovereignty, increased on earth'). E 36b is best understood with lines 37b-40a, \textit{þæt} being used to anticipate line 40b and
swa as an adverb correlative with the conjunctions in lines 37b and 39a: ‘you promised them... [l. 37a:] to raise a race [l. 36b:] that, as uncountable [l. 37b:] as the stars of heaven [ll. 38-40a: which] inhabit the broad horizon as far as the seas, as the sands of the beaches about the seawater, the waves of the bottom of the sea, [ll. 40b-41:] that it should be so uncountable in the course of winters’.

**Addition/Omission Of Unstressed Words and Elements (24 examples)**

**Az/Dan, E 1a/J 279a**

**E(Az)**

1. *Himþa azarias ingeþoncum*
   - hleoþrede halig  þurh hatne lig
   - dreag dædum georn  dryhten herede
   - wis| inweorcum  þas word acwæð

**J(Dan)**

- δα| azarias  inge þancum.
- 280 hleoðrade halig|  þurh hatne líg.
- dæda georn.|  drihten herede.|  wer womma leas.  þa word ácwæð.

In *E*, *him* is a reflexive pronoun referring to Azarias: ‘then holy Azarias himself gave voice to his inner thoughts…’. In *J*, the verb is used without a reflexive pronoun. Both readings make good sense and syntax, and have approximate metrical parallels elsewhere in the two poems.\(^{766}\)

**Az/Dan, E 3a/J 281a**

**E(Az)**

1. *Himþa azarias ingeþoncum*
   - hleoþrede halig  þurh hatne lig
   - dreag dædum georn  dryhten herede
   - wis| inweorcum  þas word acwæð

**J(Dan)**

- δα| azarias  inge þancum.
- 280 hleoðrade halig|  þurh hatne líg.
- dæda georn.|  drihten herede.|  wer womma leas.  þa word ácwæð.

In *J*, *dæda georn* is an epithet for Azarias, and, with *wer womma leas*, line 282a, is appositive to the subject of *herede*, line 281b: ‘A man zealous in good deeds and devoid of faults,\(^{767}\) he praised the Lord.’ With the addition of *dreag*, the preterite singular of *drêogan*, ‘to labour, suffer’, the equivalent line in *E* becomes a complete clause in its own right, parallel to lines 3b-4a: ‘[he] suffered, zealous in deeds; wise in works, he praised the Lord’.

---

\(^{766}\) For *E*, cf. *J oðer azarias*, line 91b; for *J*, cf. *J ʒazarias*, line 355b; *E ʒazarias*, line 153b.

\(^{767}\) For a discussion of the substitution *E wis| in weorcum J wer womma leas*, see p. 400.
The addition of *dreag* has a significant effect on metre. In E, line 3a is Type D-4, with *dreag* occupying the first lift. The equivalent half line in J is unmetrical, although Jabbour argues on the basis of this and three examples from *Soul and Body*, that three syllable half-lines were acceptable in some cases in “post-classical Old English.”\(^{768}\) It is also possible, however, that an exemplar to J had *georna*, the masculine singular weak form of the adjective.\(^{769}\) This would provide good metre and – as weak forms are permissible in such contexts in verse – acceptable syntax.

**Az/Dan, E 5b/J 283b**

\begin{align*}
\text{E(Az)} & \quad \text{J(Dan)} \\
5 \text{ meotud allwihta} & \quad 283 \text{ metod al}|wihta. \\
& \quad \text{hwæt} \quad \text{þu eart mihtum swið.} \\
& \quad \text{niðas tonerganne} & \quad \text{niðas to|}n er genne.
\end{align*}

The addition or omission of *hwæt* in 5b/283b has no significant metrical, semantic, or syntactic effect. As *hwæt* is frequently used to introduce long speeches and poems in Old English, its addition may give Daniel a more “poetic” feel.

The addition or omission falls in the preliminary drop of a Type B-1 line and is metrically insignificant.\(^{770}\)

\(^{768}\) Jabbour, diss., pp. 89-90, 119-120.

\(^{769}\) I am grateful to Fred C. Robinson for this suggestion.

\(^{770}\) In *ASPR* 3, Krapp punctuated and divides J line 283 as follows: “Metod alwihta, hwæt! Þu eart mihtum swið...” (p. 119). As Jabbour suggests, this division is contrary to usual Old English style, which places *Hwæt* as an unstressed syllable at the beginning of the half-line in which it appears (diss., p. 121; Jabbour’s suggestion that Krapp was “influenced by the punctuation of the Junius MS” is unlikely, however. In facsimile, a point clearly precedes *hwæt*).
Az/Dan, E 9a/J 287a

\[ E(Az) \]
\[
\text{sindon þine domas| ondæda gehwam
soðe geswiðde ðgesige fæste.
10 eac| þinne willan | inworuld spedum
ryhte mid ræde
\]

\[ J(Dan) \]
\[
\text{siendon þine dó|mas. indaga gehwam.
soðe ðgeswiðde. ðgesigē fæste.
swa þu eac sylfa eart.
syndon þine willan. onworuld spedum.
290 rihte ðgelrume.
\]

The addition or omission of \( ð \) affects our interpretation of the preceding word in both witnesses, soðe. In J, soðe is a nominative plural adjective agreeing with \( dó|mas \), line 286a, and syntactically parallel to geswiðde, line 287a, and gesige fæste, line 287b: ‘your decrees are true and established, and secured of their triumph.’ Without \( ð \), E soðe would be more likely interpreted as an adverb qualifying geswiðde: ‘your decrees are truly established, and secured of their triumph.’

As \( ð \) falls on the medial dip of a Type A-1 line, the addition or omission has no significant metrical effect.

Az/Dan, E 19a/J 298a

\[ E(Az) \]
\[
\text{weðæs lifgende
worhton inworulde | eacþon wom dydon.
yldran usse | inofer hygdú]
\text{bin} | bibodu bræcon | burg sit tende
20 had ofer hogedon| | halgan lifes
\]

\[ J(Dan) \]
\[
\text{weðæs lifgende.
worhton onworulde.| eac ðon wom dyde.
user yldran. for ofer|hygdum.
bræcon bebodo. burhsittendú]
\text{had ofer hogedon. halgan lifes.
295
\]

The addition or omission of \textit{bin} has a minor effect on sense, syntax, and metre. Its inclusion in E is in keeping with the nature of Azarias’s prayer as a direct address to God, but is not necessary for sense: the context is presumably sufficient for a reader to recognise that it is God’s commandments that are being spoken of.

In E, \textit{bin} supplies and anacrustic syllable for a Type A-1 line. With a different word order, the equivalent line in J is also Type A-1. See also p. 423, below.
Az/Dan, E 27b/J 306b

E(Az)

wurdon weto wrecene  geond widne grund|
heapum to\worfne  hylde lease
wæs ure lif  geond lon\da fela
fræcuð  \gefærege  fold buendū

25  nuþu usic be\wræce  in\bas wyrræstan
eorð cyninges  æht gewealda
in\ hæft heoro grimmes
sceolon we\pær haðenna
þrea nyd || [strip of c. 4 ll. missing from MS]

J(Dan)

300 siendonwe|| towrecene.  geond widne grund.
heapum tohworfene.  hylde lease.
is user lif .  geond landafela.|
fracoð \gefærege.  folca manegum.
þaus éc| bewraæcon.  toþæs wyrræstan.
305 eorð cyninga.|  æhta gewealde.
onhæft heoru grimra  ðwe| nu haðenna.
þeow ned þoliað.

J lines 306b-307a are an independent clause joined syndetically (by γ) to the preceding material: ‘and we now endure slavery of heathens’. In E, the equivalent lines are a locative clause: ‘where we must... oppression of heathens’. The conjunction alls in the preliminary drop of a Type C-1 line and has no effect on metre.

Az/Dan, E 27b/J 306b

E(Az)

wurdon weto wrecene  geond widne grund|
heapum to\worfne  hylde lease
wæs ure lif  geond lon\da fela
fræcuð  \gefærege  fold buendū

25  nuþu usic be\wræce  in\bas wyrræstan
eorð cyninges  æht gewealda
in\ hæft heoro grimmes
sceolon we\pær haðenna
þrea nyd || [strip of c. 4 ll. missing from MS]

Sceolon is the main verb of E 27b-28a; an infinitive was presumably amongst material removed from the manuscript after þrea nyd. This is quite different syntax from J, where þoliað is the sole verb in the clause.
Az/Dan, E 31a/J 314a

J(Dan)  
\[\text{J(toacobe) is a prepositional phrase, syntactically parallel to to abra hame and to isaace in the preceding half-lines. In E, iacobe is an example of the dative singular being used alone to express interest. Because of the missing text in E, it is impossible to know whether genumen was the complement of E hæfdes as in J.}\]

Az/Dan, E 32a/J 315a

J(Dan)  
\[\text{J(þ) is a pronoun anticipating the subsequent noun clauses in lines 316-324. The presence of such a pronoun is common but not syntactically necessary in Old English. As it falls on the preliminary drop of a Type A-3 verse, the addition or omission has no significant effect on metre.}\]

\[\text{771 The danger of assuming the missing text is the same can be illustrated by the text preceding the gap in E: E 27b-28a/J 306b-7a. See the preceding variant.}\]

\[\text{772 B.T(S). geniman, senses XVII and XVIIa.}\]
Az/Dan, E 34b/J 317b

E(Az)  
þuhimge hete  þurh hleoðor cwidas  
þæt þu hyra from|cynn  onfyrn dagum  
ycan wolde  þhit æfter him

J(Dan)  
315 þu him þgehéte.  þurh| hleoðor cwyde.  
þ þu hyra from|cynn.  onfyrn dagum.  
ican wolde.  þe æfter him.

35  oncyn|ryce  cenned wurde  
yced oneorþan  þæt swa unrime  
had to| hebban  swa heofon steorran  
bugað bradne hwearft  oðbrim|flodas.  
swa waroþa sond  ymb sealt wæter  
40  yþe geond ear|grund  þæt swa unrime  
ymb wintra hwearft  weorðan seol|de

E hit is the third person singular nominative form of the neuter personal pronoun. It is the subject of cenned wurde and has from|cynn as antecedent. In J, the subject of cenned wurde is not expressed, but is to be understood from frum cyn. Both usages can be paralleled in Old English. See also p. 379, above.

The addition or omission of hit falls on the preliminary drop of an extremely weak Type B-1 verse. It has no significant effect on metre.

Az/Dan, E 42a/J 325a

E(Az)  
fyl nuþa from spræce  þeahþe user fea lifgen  
wlitega| þine word cwidas  þÞín wuldor us.

J(Dan)  
325 fyl nu frum spræce.|  ðeah heora féa lifigen.  
wlitiga þinne word| cwyde.  þþín wuldor on us.

In E, þa is the accusative singular feminine form of the demonstrative pronoun, agreeing with frum spræce. It falls on the preliminary dip of a Type C-1 line and is necessary neither syntactically nor metrically.

Az/Dan, E 42b/J 325b

E(Az)  
fyl nuþa from spræce  þeahþe user fea lifgen  
wlitega| þine word cwidas  þÞín wuldor us.

J(Dan)  
325 fyl nu frum spræce.|  ðeah heora féa lifigen.  
wlitiga þinne word| cwyde.  þþín wuldor on us.

E þeahþe and J ðeah are semantically and syntactically equivalent. As þe falls in the preliminary dip of Type C-1 line, its addition or omission is metrically insignificant.

773 See Farrell, Daniel and Azarias, p. 22.
Az/Dan, E 43b/J 326b

E(Az)
42  fyl nuþa frum spræce   þehþe user fea lifgen
    wlitiga| þine word cwidas  þhinwuldor us.

J(Dan)
325 fyl nu frum spræce.|  ðeh heora féa lifgen.
    wlitiga þinne word| cwye.  þhin wuldor on us.

E us is a dative of advantage. In J, the prepositional phrase on us expresses location.

Metrically, the addition or omission of the preposition adds or subtracts an unstressed syllable from the medial drop of a Type B line. In E, line 42b is Type B-1; in J the equivalent verse is Type B-2.

Az/Dan, E 44b/J 327b

E(Az)
gecyð cræft  ꞏmeaht  nu| þec caldeas
45  ðec fela folca  gefregen habban
    þæt þu ana| eart  ece dryhten
    sige rof set tend  þsoð meo tod
    wuldres| waldend  þworuld scealta

J(Dan)
gecyð cræft  ꞏmiht.  þppcaldeas.
730  ðfolca fela.  gefregen habþbað.
    þæpe under heofenum.  þæðene lifigeað.|
    þþu án a eart.  éce drihten.
    weroda waldend.|  woruld gesceafa.
    sigora settend.  soð fæst| metod.

The addition or omission of þec in E 44b/ J 327b is linked to variation in the immediately preceding word(s). In E, nu introduces a causal clause, and þec is necessary as an object for gefregen. In J, the equivalent lines are most likely an adjective clause modifying cræft and miht; in this case the relative particle þæt provides an object for gefregen. The addition or omission of þec adds or subtracts an unstressed syllable from the preliminary dip of a Type C-2 line. It is metrically insignificant. For further discussion of these variants, see above, pp. 370 and 382.

Az/Dan, E 45a/J 328a

E(Az)
gecyð cræft  ꞏmeaht  nu| þec caldeas
45  þec fela folca  gefregen habban
    þæt þu ana| eart  ece dryhten
    sige rof set tend  þsoð meo tod
    wuldres| waldend  þworuld scealta

J(Dan)
gecyð cræft  ꞏmiht.  þppcaldeas.
730  ðfolca fela.  gefregen habþbað.
    þæpe under heofenum.  þæðene lifigeað.|
    þþu án a eart.  éce drihten.
    weroda waldend.|  woruld gesceafa.
    sigora settend.  soð fæst| metod.

The addition or omission of eac ‘also’ has no significant effect on sense or syntax. In E, eac falls on the preliminary dip of a Type C-1 line. In J, it would occupy the equivalent
position of a Type B-1 line (the difference in metre is caused by the rearrangement of
elements: E fela folca J folca fela). See also below, p. 424.

Az/Dan, E 46a/J 330a

The addition or omission of \( \gamma \) in E 46a/J 330a has a minor effect on syntax and metre.

In both versions, E 46-48/J 330-2 is a noun clause, direct object of gecyð, and syntactically
parallel to \( \textit{craeft} \ \gamma \textit{meaht} \) in E 44a/J 327a. With \( \gamma \) in J, the parallelism is explicit; without the
conjunction in E, it is implicit. The addition of the conjunction is acceptable Old English, but
not necessary. Metrically the addition or omission adds or subtracts an unstressed syllable
from the beginning of a Type B-1 line.

Az/Dan, E 47b/J 332b

The addition or omission of \( \gamma \) in 47b/332b has a minor effect on syntax and (together
with changes elsewhere in the line) a significant effect on metre.

The line forms part of a series of epithets for God in lines E 46b-48b J 336b-332b. In
E, \( \gamma \) joins the epithet \( \textit{sod} \ \textit{meo tod} \ ‘true Creator’ syndetically to the preceding epithets. With
the omission of \( \gamma \) in J, the juxtaposition is asyndetic. A similar variant occurs at the beginning
of E 48b/J 332b. See the following variant.
The addition or omission of \( \gamma \) is linked to the substitution \( \text{E} \ sod \ J \ sod \ faest \) discussed above, p. 395. In \( \text{E} \) \( \gamma \) adds a metrically necessary syllable to the preliminary drop of a Type C-2 line. In \( \text{J} \), the equivalent line in \( \text{J} \) is Type A-4(2a).

**Az/Dan, E 48b/J 331b**

As in the preceding variant, the addition or omission of \( \gamma \) in \( \text{E} \ 48b/\text{J} \ 331b \) affects metre and syntax. In both manuscripts, *woruld (ge)sceaftra* is an epithet for God, syntactically parallel to those in the half-lines \( \text{E} \ 46b/\text{J} \ 330b, \text{E} \ 47b/\text{J} \ 332a, \text{E} \ 47b/\text{J} \ 332b, \) and \( \text{E} \ 48a/\text{J} \ 331a \). In \( \text{J} \), the epithet is joined asyndetically to the preceding half-line; in \( \text{E} \), the juxtaposition is syndetic.

Together with the addition or omission of the prefix *ge-* the addition or omission of \( \gamma \) has an important effect on metre. In \( \text{E} \), \( \gamma \text{woruld sceaftra} \) is Type C-1; in \( \text{J} \), \( \text{woruld gesceaftra} \) is Type A-1. The conjunction is metrically necessary in \( \text{E} \), and is linked to the addition or omission of the prefix. See also below, p. 415.

**Az/Dan, E 54a/J 338a**

\( J \) *se* is a nominative singular neuter demonstrative pronoun, the subject of *cwóm*. Its antecedent is *engel ælbeorht*, line 336a. In \( \text{E} \), the subject of *Cwom* is unexpressed, but the
same (engel ælbeorhta) as that of the preceding clause, 51b-53b. Both versions are acceptable Old English syntax.

The addition or omission of se occurs on the preliminary dip of a Type A-3 line and is metrically insignificant.

Az/Dan, E 54a/J 338a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Az (E)</th>
<th>Dan (J)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>δa ofroderum wearð</td>
<td>335b δa of roderum was.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engel ælbeorhta ufon onsended</td>
<td>engel ælbeorht. ufon onsended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wite scyne wer inhis wuldor homan.</td>
<td>white scyne wer. onhis wuldor homan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cwomhim ba toare</td>
<td>þo ealdor nere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 þurh lufan þurh lisse</td>
<td>mid lufan þmid lisse.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In E, þa is a sentence adverb used to establish the time at which the angel came to the fire: ‘he came then to them through love and grace as a messenger and life-preservation.’ Its absence from J has no significant effect on sense, syntax or metre.

Az/Dan, E 59a/J 341a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Az (E)</th>
<th>Dan (J)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tosweop þi</td>
<td>toswagen de þurh swiðes meaht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liges leoman swa hyra lice nescod.</td>
<td>liges leoma. phyre lice newæs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acwas in pam hofne þase engel cwom</td>
<td>owiht ge egled. acheon andan sloh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>windig þwynsum wedere onlicust</td>
<td>fyrón feondas for fyren dám.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>þen onsumeres tid sended weorfðod</td>
<td>þen hit onsumeres tid. sended weorðeð.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dropena dreorung mid dæges hwile.</td>
<td>dropena dreorung. ondæges hwile.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In E, the object of Tosweop and toswagen,de is leoman, 60a, ‘light’: ‘[he] swept back and brushed aside the light of the flame through the might of the Great One...’ The addition of hine to J provides a pronominal object (agreeing in gender with lig, line 339b) for the two verbs: ‘[he] swept it back and brushed [it] aside by his great might...’ As J leoma, line

---

774 Krapp and Dobbie’s punctuation joins ll. 54a-55a to 51b-53b as part of the same sentence. In the manuscript, however, line 54a begins with a large C.

775 This translation ignores the problem of J ligges leoma. For a discussion, see above, p. 371.
342a, is ostensibly nominative singular, *hine* is syntactically necessary and linked to the difference in case. For a further discussion, see p. 371.

The addition or omission of *hine* adds or removes two unstressed syllables to the preliminary dip of a Type A-1 line and is metrically insignificant. It has no significant metrical effect.

**Az/Dan, E 59b/J 341b**

**E(Az)**

Tosweop ʒ|| toswen,de  þurh swiðes meaht
60  liges leoman  swa hyra lice nescod.ʃ
acwæs inpam ʃhofe  þase engel cwom
windig ʃwynsum  wedeʃre onlicust
þon onsumeres tid  sended weorʃeð
dropenʃ dreorung  mid dæges hvile.

**J(Dan)**

tosweop hine ʃtoswende.  þurh ba  swiðan miht.
ligges leoma.  þhyre lice newæs.
owihtʃ ge egled.  ácheon andan sloh.
fyron feondasʃ for fyren dądum.
þawæs onʃam ofne.  þærʃ se engel becwóm.
windig ʃwynsum.  wedere gelicost.
þon hit onsumeres tid.  sended weorʃeð.
dropena drearung.  ondæges hvile.
wearmʃlic wolcna scúr.

*J ba* is the accusative singular feminine form of the demonstrative pronoun. It agrees with *miht* and is followed by what is best construed as the weak accusative singular feminine form of the adjective *swið*: ‘through great might’. In **E**, *swiðes* is the strong genitive singular masculine form of the adjective, and is used substantively and without a demonstrative pronoun for God: ‘through the might of the Great One’.

The addition or omission adds or subtracts an unstressed syllable in the preliminary drop of a Type B-1 line. It has no significant metrical effect.
Az/Dan, E 63a/J 347a

E(Az)
Tosweop þ|l|toswen,de þurh swiðes meaht
60 ligeres leoman swa hyra lice nescod.| aCWæs intam þofne þase engel cWom
windig þwynsum wedeðre onlicust
þôn onsumeres tid sended weorþ|ð
dropena| dreorung mid deges hwile.

J(Dan)
tosweop hine þtoswende. þurh þa swið|an miht.
ligges leoma. þhyre lice newæs.
owiht| ge egled. ácheon andan sloh.
fyron feondas| for fyren dædum.
þawæs onþam ofne. þær| se engel becwóm.
windig þwynsum. wedere gelicost.
þôn hit onsumeres tid. sended weorþ|ð.
dropena drearung. ondæges hwile.
wearm|lic wolcna scúr.

The addition or omission of hit in 63a/347a has a minor effect on syntax. In E, the
subject of sended weorþ|ð, line 63b, is dreorung, line 64b: ‘…when a sprinkling of raindrops
is sent during the day…’ In J, hit anticipates drearung as the subject of weorþ|ð: ‘…when it,
a sprinkling of raindrops, is sent during the day…’ The addition or omission has no significant
metrical effect. The line is Type B-1 in both witnesses.

Az/Dan, E 65b/J 350b

E(Az)
65 sewæs intam fire forfrean| meahtum
halgum tohelpe

J(Dan)
350 swyle| wæs on þam fyre. fréan mihtum.
halgum| to helpe.

In E, forfrean| meahtum is a prepositional phrase expressing cause: ‘on account of the
might of the Lord’; in J, the case ending alone is used. The variation has no significant effect
on sense, 776 but does affect metre. In J, fréan must be scanned disyllabically and the line is
Type A-1. In E, frean is best scanned as a monosyllable, producing a Type C-1 verse. Farrell
reports that frēa (i.e. the nominative singular) “is monosyllabic in Dan. 185 and 377, Az. 65,
92,” but frēan “disyllabic in Dan. 159 and 350, as is freos 66.” 777

776 See also, Jabbour, diss., p. 144.
777 Farrell, Daniel and Azarias, p. 20.
Addition/Omission Of Prefixes (4 examples)

Az/Dan, E 38a/J 321a

**E(Az)**

þuhimge hete þurh hleoðor cwidas
þæt þu hyra fromcynn onfyrn dagum
ycan wolde þe æfter him

35 oncynþryce cenned wurde
yced oneorþan þæt swa unrime
had to hebban swa heofon steorran

**J(Dan)**

ican wolde. þe æfter him.
oncynþryce cenned wurde.
þæt swa unrime.

320 hat to hebbanne. swa heofon steor[1]ran.

**J bebugað**

is the present indicative third person plural of *bebūgan*, ‘flow round, surround, enclose’. It is the main verb of a clause of comparison beginning with *swa*, and has *heofon steor[1]ran* as its subject: ‘you promised them... to raise a race as the stars of heaven enclose the wide heaven, until the sands of the seas, the seacoasts throughout the salt way, settle in the waves...’

**E bugað**

is third person plural present indicative of *būgan*, ‘bow, bow down, join’ or the uncontracted third person plural present indicative of *būan*, ‘to inhabit, dwell’. Either understanding appears to require the insertion of a relative pronoun between *heofon steorran* and *bugað*, however: ‘you promised them... to raise a race that, as uncountable as the stars of heaven [which] inhabit the broad horizon as far as the seas, as the sands of the beaches about the sea-water, the waves of the bottom of the sea, that it should be so uncountable in the course of winters’.

---

778 *Būan* is the implicit reading in ASPR 3, pp. 269-70, where Krapp and Dobbie translate lines 36b-41: “that as innumerable, to exalt their race, as the stars of heaven occupy the broad circuit down to the water-floods, as the sand of the shores by the salt water, the waves across the ocean, that so innumerable after the course of years should be their race.”

In his note to Azarias 32a-b, Farrell translates *bugað* as ‘encompass’, apparently by mistake (Daniel and Azarias, p. 91): in his glossary he translates it as “BOW, bow down, join.” ‘Encompass’ is the translation used by Bradley for **J bebugað** (Anglo-Saxon Poetry, p. 75) and appears as a gloss for *bebugan* (and not *bugan*) in Clark-Hall and B.-T.

779 See Farrell, Daniel and Azarias, p. 91. Also, Krapp and Dobbie, ASPR 3, p. 270.
Without the prefix, E 38a is Type D*4. The prefix adds an anacrustic syllable to J.

**Az/Dan, E 48b/J 331b**

**E(Az)**

gecyð craeft ≥meaht ṛul ṛec caldeas
geac fela folca gefregen habban
ḥet ḍu anaļ eart ece dryhdan
sige rof set tend ṛsoð meo tod
wuldres| waldend ṛworuld sceafa

**J(Dan)**

gecyð craeft ≤miht. ṛp caldeas.
geolca fela. gefregen ṛbað. ṛap under heofenum. ṛaeðene lifigeað.|

The addition or omission of *ge-* to or from the second element of the compound *woruld (ge)sceafa* has no significant effect on sense or syntax. Of the two readings, the J form is the more common. As Jabbour notes, *woruld sceafa* occurs only once more in verse, in Azarias line 74a; *woruldgsceafa* and grammatical variants are found nine times more.²³⁸⁰

On the basis of the simplices, it seems likely that the two words are near or identical synonyms.

The addition or omission of *ge-* is metrically significant and linked to the addition or omission of 严格 at the beginning of the off-verse. In J, the line is a Type A-1 with a resolved first stress. With the omission of *ge-* (and the metrically necessary addition of 严格 to the preliminary drop), E is a Type C-1.

**Az/Dan, E 61b/J 345b**

**E(Az)**

Tosweop ṛ|| toswen,de ṛurh swiðes meaht
liges leoman swa hyra lice nescod.|
æcæs inpm han φofne pase engel cwom
windig φynsum wedeļre onliecust
þän onsumeres tid sended weorþed
dropena| dreorung mid dages hwile.

**J(Dan)**

tosweop hine |toswende. ṛurh ṛa swið|jan miht.
ligges leoma. ṛhyre lice newæs.
owiht ge egled. ácheon andan sloh.
fyron feondas| for fyren dėdum.

³³⁵ þawæs onpm ofne. þær| se engel becwóm.
windiq φynsum. wedere gelicost.
þän hit onsumeres tid. sended weorþed.
dropena drearung. ondaæes hwile.
wearm|lic wolcen scür.

The addition or omission of *be-* in line 61b/345b has no obvious semantic effect. Both *cuman* and *becuman* are frequently found in the sense ‘come’. The prefix falls in the medial
dip of a Type B line and has a minor effect on metre. In E, *pase engel cwom* is Type B-1; in J, *þær| se engel becwóm* is Type B-2.

**Az/Dan, E 73a/J 362a**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E(Az)</th>
<th>J(Dan)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B *Letse</td>
<td>e bec bilwit fæder*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>woruld sceafa wuldor</td>
<td>*w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 *heofonas ȝeþlas ȝhluttur</td>
<td>wæter*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The addition or omission of *ge-* has no effect on sense or syntax. In J, the prefix falls in the preliminary dip of a Type C-2 line, and is not metrically necessary. With a different word order, the equivalent line in E is Type E-1. It would be unmetrical with the prefix.

**Addition/Omission Of Stressed Words and Elements (4 examples)**

**Az/Dan, E 12a/J 291a**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E(Az)</th>
<th>J(Dan)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ro</td>
<td>dera waldend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geoca us georne gæsta scyppend</td>
<td>*geo cauer georne,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*ȝ</td>
<td>burh hyldo help halig dryhten*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nuwe þec forþear</td>
<td>fum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>for þrea nydum</em></td>
<td><em>for ðeo nydum.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 *fore eað medum arna</td>
<td>bidda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lege bilegde weþæs lifgende</td>
<td><em>lege bilegde weþæs lifgende.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The addition or omission of *nu* in E 12a/J 291a has a significant effect on metre. In E, *geoca us georne* is Type A-1; with the addition of *nu* at the end of the half-line in J, the equivalent verse is Type B-1. A sentence adverb, *nu* has little significant effect on sense or syntax.

---

780 Jabbour, diss., p. 139. See Bessinger-Smith woruldgesceaf, woruldgesceafa, woruldgesceafte.

781 As Krapp's punctuation suggests, *rodora waldend* is best taken with the preceding clause in J. See ASPR 1, p. 119, and cf. ASPR 3, pp. 88-89.
The addition or omission of the adverb *a* has no significant effect on sense or syntax, but, together with the inflectional difference E *unrime* J *ünrim*, has a significant effect on metre. In E, line 40b is Type C-1; in J, the same line is Type B-1.

See also pp. 369 and 381, above.

---

782 Jabbour, diss., p. 124.
Az/Dan, E 70a/J 359a

E(Az)
- bædon bletsunge  bearn Inworulde
- ealle gesceafte  ecne dryhten  þeoda waldend

J(Dan)
- bædon bletsian.  bearn| israela.
- eall länd gesceafte.  ecne drihten.
- 360 ðeoda waldend.

Semantically, E ealle gesceafte refers to ‘all creatures’ generally; in J, the reference is more specifically to all terrestrial creatures. Metrically, E line 70a is a Type A-1 verse; in J, the verse is D-4.

While both readings make good sense and metre, Jabbour reports that the E reading is the more common. Ealle gesceafte is a common tag in Old English poetry; J contains the only occurrence of eall landgesceafte.783

Addition/Omission Of Metrical Units (5 examples)

Dan, J 288

E(Az)
- isþin noma mære| 26 wlitig  t̟wulf dor fæst  ofer wer ðeode
- sindon þine domas| 285 siendon þine dō|mas.  indaga gehwam
- soðe geswiðde  gesige fæste.
- 10 eac| þinne willan  inworuld spedum  ryhte mid ræde

J(Dan)
- isþin nama mære.
- 285 wlitig  twuldor fæst.  ofer wer ðeode.
- siendon þine domas.  indaga gehwam.
- soðe  geswiðde.  gesige fæste.
- swa þu eac sylfa eart.
- syndon þine willan.  onworuld spedum.
- 290 rihte  gesi|rume.

The addition or omission of the half-line has a minor effect on sense and syntax. In E, lines 8-11a occur as part of a series of clauses in which Azarias praises God’s name (lines 6b-7), his judgements (lines 8-9), and his desires (line 10-11a) before beginning his petition:

‘Your name is famous, radiant and glorious over the human-race; your judgements are truly strengthened and victorious in each of deeds; likewise your desires in worldly weal [are] just with counsel’. In J, line 288 interrupts the orderly progression of this praise by turning to praise God’s person between the second and third elements in the litany: ‘Your name is famous, radiant and glorious over the human-race; your judgements are true and strengthened

783 See Jabbour, diss., p. 146.
and victorious in every day – as are you yourself also; your desires in worldly weal are just and generous’. While E is rhetorically smoother, there is an equally attractive emotional quality to the disruption in J. It is impossible to choose between the two.

Farrell notes that the additional line in J is one of seven single “half-lines” in Daniel. There are no similarly short lines in Azarias.\(^784\)

**Az, E 57-58**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E(Az)</th>
<th>J(Dan)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>55b seþone lig tosceaf</td>
<td>340 seðone lig tosceaf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>halig -heofonbeorht</td>
<td>halig -heofon beorht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hatai fyres</td>
<td>hatai fyres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hæ tu bryne</td>
<td>heor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forþæs engles ége</td>
<td>aefæstum prim.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In E, lines 57-58 are a purpose or result clause describing the effect of the angel’s actions on the flames: ‘Holy and heaven-bright, he thrust aside the hot flame of the fire, that the bitter conflagration, for dread of the angel, should avoid the pious threesome’.\(^785\) Jabbour notes that this is the only example in which E contains complete metrical lines that are not found in J (apart from E 36/J 319 where the two manuscripts have a different reading).\(^786\) While they are more than “essentially an elaboration of a foregoing idea,”\(^787\) the lines are not necessary to the over all sense of the poem.

---

\(^{784}\) Farrell, *Daniel and Azarias*, p. 20.

\(^{785}\) Jabbour, diss., p. 142.

\(^{786}\) Jabbour, diss., p. 142; cf. Farrell, *Daniel and Azarias*, pp. 92 (note to line 58b) and 42, who sees these lines as evidence of the importance of Æ, “the concept of a law common to all men,” in the author’s original text of *Daniel*.

\(^{787}\) Jabbour, diss., p. 142.
The addition or omission of J 343-345 is linked to the verbal substitution E *scod* J

was in 60b/342b (see above, p. 397). In E, the central idea of the clause – that the flames did not hurt the bodies of the Children – is conveyed lexically through *scod* ‘harmed’. In J, similar information is presented in the form of a participle phrase *newæs / owiht| ge egled* ‘not a whit was harmed’ – to which is added additional material on what the angel did next: ‘[he] swept it back and brushed [it] aside by his great might so that not a whit was harmed on their body – but he flung the fire in anger upon their adversaries, for their wicked actions’.

The addition or omission of J 349, when taken with other variants in the surrounding lines, affects both syntax and sense. The on-verse, J 349a, adds a further variant to the description in J 345-348 of the type of weather the Angel brings with him to the furnace. It is appositive to *hit*, line 347a, and *dropena drearung*, line 348a. The off-verse, J 349b, marks
the beginning of the next sentence, and refers to the effect of the Angel’s presence through a simile: ‘As is the finest of weathers, so it was in that fire...’. The addition or omission is linked to the substitution E se J swylec in line 65a/350a. See above, p. 386.

**Dan, E 353-356**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E(Az)</th>
<th>J(Dan)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66b</td>
<td>351b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wearð sehata lig to drifen</td>
<td>wearð se háta lig. todrifen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>þæra dæd hwatan</td>
<td>þær þa dæd hwatan. geond þone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>þry migeþoncum</td>
<td>þeoden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>se engel mid. forh nerigende</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>355</td>
<td>annanias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>þærael. þærþamód hwatan. þærþamód hwatan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>þry ongeðanc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**J** 353-356a describe the effect of the movement of the Children in the flames of the furnace:

The hot flame was driven back and quenched wherever those men of courageous conduct, Hananiah and Azariah and Mishael, walked through the furnace, and the angel with them, preserving their lives, who was the fourth one there.

Line 356a begins a new clause, in which the subsequent Song of the Three Children is introduced: ‘There the courageous-hearted three praised the Prince in their contemplations.’

In E, the description of the flame being driven back is combined with that of the Children praising God into a single sentence (lines 66b-68b): ‘The hot flame was driven back and quenched wherever [or when] the courageous-hearted three praised the Prince in their contemplations.’ Jabbour and Jones suggest that the omission of an equivalent for **J** 353-356 in **E** is the result of “memorial skip triggered by the parallel verses D352b (A67b) þær þa daedhwatan and D356b þær þa modhwatan, the nouns of which are practically synonymous as

---

788 This translation ignores the problem of **J** ligges leoma. For a discussion, see above, p. 371.

789 In the punctuation of **ASPR** 1 and 3, and of Jabbour, diss., **J** 356b-360a, and **E** 66b-71a, are treated as a single sentence. The sentence division followed here is that of Farrell, who places a period at the end of **J** 357b (although he follows the other editors in punctuating **E** 66b-71a as a single sentence). The difference is irrelevant for the argument presented here.
well as similar in sound and structure.” It could equally well be the result of eyeskip. Both versions make good sense as written, however, and, as Jabbour notes, “little is lost in the omission.”

Reinterpretation of Existing Text (1 example)

Az/Dan, E 39a/J 322a

E(Az)  
þuhimge hete þurh hleóðor cwidas  
þæt þu hyra from|cynn onfyrn dagum  
ycan wolde þhit æfter him  
35 oncyne|rýce cenned wurde  
yced oneorþan þæt swa unrime  
had to|hebban swa heofon steorran  
bugað bradne hwearft ðoðbrímflodas.  
swa waroþa sond ymb sealt wæter  
40 yþe geond ear|grund þæt swa unrime  
ymb wintra hwearft weorðan sceol|de  

J(Dan)  
315 þu him þgehéte. þurh hleóðor cwye|de.  
þ þu hyra frum cyn. infyrn|dagum.  
ican wolde. þte æfter him.  
oncéne|ríssum. cenned wurde.  
Γseo mrêne|go mårê|wære.  
320 hat to hebbanne. swa heofon steor|fran.  
bebugað bradne hwyrft. ðoð brím|floro. þæs  
sæ faroða sand. geond sealt|ne|wæ.  
me áre gryn|de. þ his únrima.  
inwintra|worn. wurðan sceol|de.

The reinterpretation E swa waroþa J sæ faroða has a significant effect on sense, syntax, and metre. E waroþa and J -faroð can be used in the sense ‘shore, bank’, and both words are genitive plurals modifying sond|sand. Syntactically, J sæ faroða is parallel to and a variation on brím|faro. þæs from the preceding line: ‘you promised them... to raise a race as the stars of heaven enclose the wide heaven, until the sands of the seashores, the seacoasts throughout the salt way, settle in the waves...’ In E, swa is a conjunction used correlatively with the adverb swa in line 36b to introduce a comparative clause parallel to lines 37b-38: ‘you promised them... to raise a race that, as uncountable as the stars of heaven [which] inhabit the broad horizon as far as the seas, as the sands of the beaches about the sea-water, the waves of the bottom of the sea, that it should be so uncountable in the course of winters’.  

---

791 Jabbour, diss., p. 145.  
792 See Farrell, Daniel and Azarias, p. 91. Also, Krapp and Dobbie, ASPR 3, p. 270.
With *sæ faroða*, J line 322a is Type E-1 with alliteration on the first and last lifts.

With *swa waroþa*, E line 39a is Type B-1 with alliteration on the second lift only.

**Rearrangement Within The Line (5 examples)**

**Az/Dan, E 18a/J 297a**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E(Az)</th>
<th>J(Dan)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>weðæs lifgende</td>
<td>weðæs lifgende.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>worhton in woesulde</td>
<td>worhton onworulde.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 had ofer hogodon</td>
<td>had ofer hogodon.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The rearrangement has no effect on metre, sense, or syntax. In both witnesses, the line is Type A-1.

For a discussion of the substitution, E *usse* J *user*, see p. 391.

**Az/Dan, E 19a/J 298a**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E(Az)</th>
<th>J(Dan)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>weðæs lifgende</td>
<td>weðæs lifgende.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yldran usse</td>
<td>user yldran.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bræcon beðbod</td>
<td>burhsittendu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 had ofer hogodon</td>
<td>had ofer hogodon.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In E, line 19a is Type A-1 (with anacrusis and resolution of the first lift); the equivalent line in J is Type A-1 with a resolved second lift. See also above, p. 404.
Az/Dan, E 45a/J 328a

E(Az)

gecyð craeft þmeaht nu þec caldeas
45 þeac fela folca gefregen habban
þæt þu ana| eart ece dryhten
sige rof set tend þsoð meo tod
wuldres| waldend þworuld sceafhta

J(Dan)
gecyð craeft þ miht. þpcaldeas.
þfolca fela. gefregen habbað.
ðæþ under heofenum. hæðene lifigeað.]
330 þþu ána eart. ece drihten.
weroda waldend.[ woruld gesceafhta.
sigora settend. soð fast[ metod.

The rearrangement E fela folca J folca fela has no effect on sense or syntax but a significant effect on metre. In E, þeac fela folca is a Type C-1 line with principal lifts on fela (resolved) and folca793; in J, the equivalent line is Type B-1.

Az/Dan, E 54a/J 338a

E(Az)
ða ofroderum wearð
engel ælbeorhta ufon onsended|
white scyne wer inhis wuldor homan.

J(Dan)
335b ðaof roderum wæs.
engel ælbeorht. ufan onsended.
white scyne wer. onhiswul|dorhaman.

Cwomhim|a toarer| þeo ealdor nere

him cwóm
tofrofre.
mid lufan. mid lisse.

The rearrangement of him and cwom in 54a/338a has no effect on sense, syntax or metre.

Az/Dan, E 73a/J 362a

E(Az)
B Letsige þec bilwit fæder
woruld sceafhta wuldor| þweorca gehwylc
75 heofonas ðenglas ðhlutter| wæter

J(Dan)
362 DE Gebletsige. bylywit fæder.
woruld|craeft white. þweorca gehwilec.
heofon|nas ðenglas. ðhlutter wæter.

The rearrangement of (ge)bletsige and þec in E 73a/J 362a has an important effect on metre. J 362a is a Type C-2 line with alliteration on the first lift. In E þec takes a full stress as the last syllable in the half-verse, producing a line which is best scanned as a Type E-1 with a short half-lift and alliteration on the first syllable of the inflected verb. The rearrangement is linked to the addition or omission of the verbal prefix ge-.. See above, p. 416.

793 For parallels, cf. Precepts 67 Nis nu fela folca þætte fyrgewritu; Daniel 15 þæt hie oft fela folca feore gesceodon; and Deor 38 Ahte ic fela wintra folgad tilne.
Rearrangement Of Metrical Units (1 example)

Az/Dan, E 47-48/J 331-332

E(Az)  J(Dan)
gecyð crafالت  j| miht.  ﬂcaldeas.
45 jæc fela folca  gefrengen habban
gæt þu an| eart  ece dryhten
þæt þu ana| eart  ece dryhten
sige rof set tend  þoð moe tod
gæcyð crafالت  j| miht.
wuldres| waldend  þworuld sceafa
tæþe under heofenum.  ðæt ðu ana eart.  ece dryhten.
þæt þu ana| eart  ece dryhten
wuldres| waldend  þworuld sceafa
jæc fela folca  gefrengen habban
þæt þu ana| eart  ece dryhten
sige rof set tend  þoð moe tod
gæcyð crafالت  j| miht.
wuldres| waldend  þworuld sceafa
jæc fela folca  gefrengen habban
þæt þu ana| eart  ece dryhten
sige rof set tend  þoð moe tod
gæcyð crafالت  j| miht.
wuldres| waldend  þworuld sceafa

As Jabbour notes, the transposition of these lines has no effect on sense or syntax as
“the verses consist of a series of appositive epithets for the deity.”

Recomposition (1 example)

Az/Dan, E 40a/J 323a

E(Az)  J(Dan)
þuhimge hete  þurh hloðor cwidas
þæt þu hyra from|lynn  onfyrn dagum
ycan wolde  þhit æfter him
ycey|ryce  cened wurde
yced oneor|pan  þæt swa unrimite
had to| hebban  swa heofon steorran
bugað| bradne hwearft  oðbrimﬂodas.
swa waroða sond  ymb sealt wæter
35 þæt swa unrimite
þæt swa unrimite
ycey|rlyce  cened wurde
yced oneor|pan  þæt swa unrimite
had to| hebban  swa heofon steorran
bugað| bradne hwearft  oðbrimﬂodas.
swa waroða sond  ymb sealt wæter
yæc fela folca  gefrengen habban
þæt þu ana| eart  ece dryhten
sige rof set tend  þoð moe tod
gæcyð crafالت  j| miht.
wuldres| waldend  þworuld sceafa
jæc fela folca  gefrengen habban
þæt þu ana| eart  ece dryhten
sige rof set tend  þoð moe tod
gæcyð crafالت  j| miht.
wuldres| waldend  þworuld sceafa

The most significant variation in the line is syntactic: J contains a main verb and
prepositional phrase, E a noun and prepositional phrase. The two lines are obviously related,
however: ear|grund : in eare 795  gryndeð. With the possible exception of the conjunction in
1.321b (oð:oð ﬁ), the variation requires no alteration to the surrounding text: brim|ﬂodas and
brim|faro, þæs (for brimfardoðas) can be accusative plural (the case required by E) or
nominative plural as required by J. Similarly, sand can be either accusative singular (as in E),
or nominative singular as required by J.

795 Assuming me áre is a minim error for in eare.
Conclusion

The poems discussed in this chapter differ from those discussed in Chapters Two and Three in both the contexts in which they are found and the nature of the variation they exhibit. Unlike the poems of the previous chapters – but like the majority of poems found in the corpus of Old English poetry as a whole – five of the six “Anthologised and Excerpted” poems survive with at least one witness in the major “poetic” codices. The ‘exception’, Solomon and Saturn I, survives in one copy as part of a comparable collection of prose and verse dialogues between its two main characters. In addition, the Anthologised and Excerpted poems exhibit both far more and far more significant textual variation. Where the variation exhibited by the poems discussed in Chapters Two and Three tended – even at its most profligate – to have a relatively insignificant effect on the sense and syntax of the passages in which it occurred, that separating the witnesses to the Anthologised and Excerpted poems is often far more significant. Syntactically significant differences of inflection, substitutions of graphically and lexically dissimilar forms, and the rearrangement in the order of elements within the line or across line boundaries are common to all six poems discussed in this chapter – but occur only sporadically among the “minor” poems discussed Chapters Two and Three. Five of the six poems exhibit examples of the addition, omission, substitution, or rearrangement of metrical units; all but Exeter Riddle 30 and the witnesses to the common text of the Dream of the Rood/Ruthwell Cross Inscription show “linked variants” involving necessary and coordinated changes to two or more elements in the common text.

This suggests in turn that the Anthologised and Excerpted poems were transmitted to a standard of accuracy different from those observed by the scribes of the poems discussed in Chapters Two and Three. Where the scribes of the Glossing, Translating, and Occasional poems showed themselves to be reluctant to intervene in the substantive details of their
received texts, those responsible for preserving the Anthologised and Excerpted poems appear to have been much more willing to edit and recompose their exemplars. Where the scribes of the Fixed Context poems showed themselves – with one exception – unwilling to move their verse texts outside of the prose frame in which they are characteristically found, the persons for responsible for transmitting the Anthologised and Excerpted poems appear to have felt free to excerpt, interpolate, and adapt their texts as necessary to suit the different (artistic and conceptual) ends to which they were to be put.

The evidence that the Anthologised and Excerpted poems were copied to a different standard of accuracy than poems found in Fixed or Glossing, Translating, and Occasional contexts has some important implications for our understanding of Anglo-Saxon scribal practice and the nature and reception of Old English verse in Anglo-Saxon England. These are discussed in the following, concluding, chapter.
Chapter 5
Conclusion

This study has argued that Anglo-Saxon scribes copied Old English verse to different standards of accuracy depending on the nature of the context in which they were working. Taking as its sample all metrically regular Old English poems known to have survived in more than one twelfth-century or earlier witness, it divides this corpus into three main contextual groups, each of which exhibits a characteristic pattern of substantive textual variation.

Chapter Two examines “Glossing, Translating, and Occasional” poems. These texts are generally short, are found in primarily non-poetic contexts, and appear to have been transmitted independently of their surrounding context. They also all show a high level of substantive textual accuracy. At their most accurate, the scribes responsible for copying the surviving witnesses to these poems show themselves to have been able to reproduce their common texts with little or no variation in vocabulary, word order, or syntax – and preserve this accuracy even in the face of a corrupt common exemplar or thoroughgoing dialectal translation. The substantive variants the witnesses to these texts do show tend either to be obvious mistakes or to have a relatively insignificant effect on sense, syntax, and metre. Apparently significant inflectional differences more often than not can be attributed to graphic error, orthographic difference, or phonological change. Verbal substitutions are rare and almost invariably involve words which look alike and have similar meanings. Examples of the addition or omission of words and elements either destroy the sense of the passage in which they occur, or involve unstressed and syntactically unimportant sentence particles.
Chapter Three looks at the poems preserved in “Fixed Contexts”—as constituents of larger vernacular prose framing texts such as the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, the Old English translation of the *Pastoral Care*, and the Old English translation of Bede’s *Historia ecclesiastica*. With the exception of a single, late witness to the Old English *Historia*, these poems are found in exactly the same contextual position in each surviving witness. The *Battle of Brunanburh* is always found in manuscripts of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*; the Metrical Preface to the Old English *Pastoral Care* survives only in manuscripts of Alfred’s translation.

In contrast to the Glossing, Translating, and Occasional poems discussed in Chapter Two, the Fixed Context poems differ greatly in the amount and types of textual variation they exhibit. At their most conservative, the scribes of the surviving witnesses to these texts produce copies as accurate as the least variable Glossing, Translating, and Occasional poems; the scribes of other witnesses, however, show themselves to be far more willing to introduce substantive changes of vocabulary and inflection. In either case the amount and nature of the variation introduced is directly comparable to the substantive textual variation found in the surrounding prose. Scribes who show themselves to have been innovative copyists of the prose texts in which these poems are found, also invariably produce innovative copies of the poems themselves; scribes who produce conservative copies of the poetic texts, on the other hand, are responsible for the most conservative texts of the surrounding frame.

The third standard of accuracy is exhibited by the “Anthologised and Excerpted” poems discussed in Chapter Four. These poems differ from the Glossing, Translating, and Occasional poems of Chapter Two and the Fixed Context poems of Chapter Three in both the nature of the contexts in which they are found and the amount and significance of the substantive variation they exhibit. Unlike the texts discussed in the preceding chapters, the Anthologised and Excerpted poems show evidence of the intelligent involvement of the
persons first responsible for collecting or excerpting them in their surviving witnesses. Like
the greater part of the corpus of Old English poetry as a whole – but unlike the poems
discussed in Chapters Two and Three – these texts all survive with at least one witness in a
compilation or anthology. In four out of the six cases, their common text shows signs of
having been excerpted from, inserted into, or joined with other prose or verse texts in one or
another witness. Where the variation exhibited by the poems discussed in Chapters Two and
Three was to be explained only on the grounds of the personal interests, abilities, or difficulties
of the scribes responsible for the tradition leading up to each of the surviving witnesses, that
exhibited by the witnesses to the Anthologised and Excerpted poems frequently can be
explained on contextual grounds – and often involves the introduction of metrically, lexically
or syntactically coordinated variants at different places in the common text.

This argument has some important implications for our understanding of the
transmission of Old English poetry. In the first place, it suggests that there was no single style
of Old English poetic transmission. Since Sisam first asked “Was the poetry accurately
transmitted?” scholars examining variation in the transmission of Old English verse texts have
tended to assume they were investigating a single phenomenon – that is to say, have assumed
that, a few late, early, or otherwise exceptional examples aside, all Old English poems showed
pretty much the same kinds of textual variation, whether this variation be the result of “error,”
or the application of “oral” or “formulaic” ways of thinking. The evidence presented here,
however, suggests that the scribes themselves worked far less deterministically. Rather than
copying “the poetry” to any single standard of substantive accuracy, the scribes seem instead
to have adjusted their standards to suit the demands of the context in which the specific poem
they were copying was to appear. When the wording of their text was important – as it was
when the poem was being copied as a gloss or translation – the scribes reproduced their
exemplars more or less word-for-word. When the relationship between their text and its surrounding context was paramount – as it appears to have been in the case of the Anthologised and Excerpted poems – the evidence of the surviving witnesses suggests that the persons responsible for transmitting these texts were more willing to adjust sense, syntax, and metre. When other factors appear to have played a role – incompetence in the case of the scribe of the London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. i (ChronD) version of the Chronicle poems, editorial adventurousness in that of the Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 41 (B1) version of the Old English Bede – the similarity between the verse and prose variation these manuscripts exhibit suggests the scribes did not take any specifically “poetic” approach to the constituent verse.

In the second place, the evidence presented here that scribes copied to a different standard of accuracy depending on the nature of the context in which they were working suggests that the scribes themselves recognised the existence of different types of manuscript collections. The fact that the scribes responsible for copying the (marginal) West-Saxon ylda- and the (fixed, main-text) West-Saxon eordan-recensions of “Cædmon’s Hymn” worked to such different standards of accuracy, for example, tells us that they collectively recognised a functional difference between the margins of a Latin manuscript and the main text of a vernacular prose history. Just as significantly, the fact that the Anthologised and Excerpted poems differ so greatly from the “minor poems” discussed in Chapters Two and Three in both context and variation suggests that these poems and collections were also regarded as a different class of text or manuscript – in this case, perhaps, a more “literary” class, suitable for collection, recomposition, or excerption as the need arose.

This is not an insignificant observation. In contrast to our knowledge of the poetry of most other periods of English literature, our knowledge of Old English vernacular verse is almost
entirely deductive. Most Old English poems are undateable, anonymous, and of uncertain origins.
The Anglo-Saxons themselves left no accounts of the metrical basis of their verse, the manner in which they composed the texts, the generic classifications (if any) they recognised. In this light, the distinctions maintained by the scribes of the multiply attested poems between different poems and contexts can be seen as an implicit source of contemporary literary criticism, providing us with an opportunity to establish how Anglo-Saxon readers saw their poetry both as an art-form in its own right and as part of the wider cultural and literary environment in Anglo-Saxon England.

For practical and historical reasons, this study has concentrated on the substantive variation found among the witnesses to poetic texts. Practical in the sense that the number of multiply-attested poetic texts is relatively small, and that the preservation of metre provides a valuable means of distinguishing between otherwise syntactically and lexically acceptable readings. Historical in the sense that the “authority” of Anglo-Saxon manuscripts always has been seen as a primarily poetic problem. For it is only in the poetry that the relative lack of multiply attested texts presents critics with such important questions about the reliability of the scribes responsible for the preservation of the surviving witnesses. The most important prose works of the period generally survive in enough copies to allow for the relatively easy isolation of what Dorothy Horgan has called the “Scribal Contribution.” As a result, research into prose variation has tended to concentrate on explicating the motives and techniques of individual scribes or revisers, rather than examining the basic reliability of their profession as a whole. Thus, in the same volume of collected essays in which Sisam uses the variation between the surviving manuscripts of poetic texts to question the reliability of the scribes responsible for copying Old English verse, appears an essay in which the variation between surviving manuscripts of Ælfric’s Catholic Homilies is used in part to reconstruct Ælfric’s habits as a
 reviser of his own work. Likewise, the “thousands of (mostly) minor modifications” in the text of Wærferð’s translation of Gregory’s Dialogues in Oxford Bodleian Hatton 76, ff. 1-54 has led to the frequent discussion of the syntactic and lexical differences between the original and revision – but not of the competency of the scribe(s) responsible for the revised text.

Future work will need to look at the prose. Perhaps because the reliability of the scribes of prose texts has not been an important issue in the study of Old English literature, there are to my knowledge no comparative studies of Anglo-Saxon prose transmission. While current work with multiply attested prose works often gives us a very good idea of the type of variation introduced by the scribes of different manuscripts within a single tradition or text, I know of no study which examines whether certain types of prose texts or whether prose texts preserved in certain types of manuscript contexts are more liable to textual revision and innovation than others. This is of obvious importance in the case of the anthologies containing both prose and verse. If I am right in suggesting that the anthologies formed a special class of manuscripts in which collectors were more willing to intervene in the verse texts they transmit, then similar amounts and types of variation ought also to appear in their prose as well. But

---


799 That the multiply attested homilies of the Vercelli Book contain many unique readings has been reported by Donald Scragg – although he suggests that these “can often be shown by comparison with the [Latin] sources to be original” (The Vercelli Homilies and Related Texts, EETS o.s. 300 [Oxford: EETS, 1992], p. xx).
a similar approach may also yield fruit in other, uniquely prosaic, contexts. For example, are homilies more or less accurately transmitted when they are copied as fixed constituents of homiliaries, or as individual texts assembled in collections like the Vercelli Book? Do different prose genres – historical writing, *vita*, homilies – provoke different scribal responses towards the substantive details of their texts? Regardless of the results of this research, the approach – in which scribal performance is seen as a practical response to the demands of the text or context in which the scribe is working rather than as a result of a culturally determined reflex – seems certain to offer us a more reasonable, and it may be hoped, a more living, view of Anglo-Saxon literary life.
Appendix 1
The Multiply Attested Poems

“Bede’s Death Song”*800
35 manuscripts, mostly post twelfth-century or continental.801

“Cædmon’s Hymn”

**Northumbrian eordu-recension**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Br</td>
<td>Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale</td>
<td>8245-57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Di</td>
<td>Dijon, Bibliothèque Municipale</td>
<td>574</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale</td>
<td>Lat. 5237</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Northumbrian aeldu-recension**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>St. Petersburg, M.E. Saltykov-Schedrin Public Library</td>
<td>Lat. Q. I. 18 (Leningrad Bede)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Cambridge, University Library</td>
<td>Kk. 5. 16 (Moore Bede)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**West-Saxon eordan-recension**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>Cambridge, Corpus Christi College</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>†London, British Library, Cotton Otho B. xi (=N)</td>
<td>279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ca</td>
<td>Cambridge, University Library</td>
<td>Kk. 3. 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Oxford, Corpus Christi College</td>
<td>279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Tanner</td>
<td>134</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To</td>
<td>†Tournai, Bibliothèque Municipale</td>
<td>134</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>London, British Library, Additional</td>
<td>43703</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**West-Saxon ylda-recension**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bd</td>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library</td>
<td>163</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ln</td>
<td>Oxford, Lincoln College</td>
<td>Lat. 31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mg</td>
<td>Oxford, Magdalen College</td>
<td>Lat. 105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SanM</td>
<td>San Marino, CA. Huntington Library</td>
<td>HM 35300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr1</td>
<td>Cambridge, Trinity College</td>
<td>R. 5. 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>Winchester, Cathedral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
800 Poems marked with an asterisk are omitted from this study (for an explanation, see Chapter 1, p. 13, fn. 30). Manuscripts and sigla in parentheses are modern transcriptions. An explanation of the other symbols on this page can be found in Appendix 2, “Manuscripts and Sigla.”

801 A list of the known witnesses can be found (with facsimiles) in Fred C. Robinson and E. G. Stanley, eds., *Old English Verse Texts from Many Sources: A Comprehensive Collection*, EEMF 23 (Copenhagen: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1991).
Charm 5/10*
   Charm 5
   Har585  London, British Library, Harley 585
   Charm 10
   B1  Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 41

Daniel/Azarias
   Daniel, ll. 279-364
     J  Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 11 (Junius Manuscript)
   Azarias, ll. 1-75
     E  Exeter, Cathedral 3501, ff. 8-130 (Exeter Book)

“Durham”
   CULFfi27  Cambridge, University Library, Ff. i. 27
   VitDxx  †London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius D. xx (=Hickes)
   (Hickes) George Hickes, Linguarum Veterum. Septentrionalium Thesaurus

Exeter Riddle 30 a/b
   E  Exeter, Cathedral 3501, ff. 8-130 (Exeter Book)

Exeter Riddle 35/Leiden Riddle
   E  Exeter, Cathedral 3501, ff. 8-130 (Exeter Book)
   Leid  Leiden, Rijksbibliotheek, Vossianus Lat. Quarto 106

Dream of the Rood/Ruthwell Cross Inscription
   R  Ruthwell Cross, Ruthwell Parish, Dumfriesshire
   V  Vercelli, Biblioteca Capitolare CXVII (Vercelli Book)

“Gloria I”
   CC201  Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 201
   Jn121  Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 121

Latin-English Proverbs*
   FaustAx  London, British Library, Cotton Faustina A. x
   RPs  London, British Library, Royal 2B. v (Regius Psalter)

Metrical Preface and Epilogue to Alfred’s Translation of the Pastoral Care
   Preface
     CC12  Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 12
     CULi24  Cambridge, University Library, li. 2. 4
     Hat20  Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 20
     TibBxi  †London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. xi (=Jn53)
     Tr1  Cambridge, Trinity College, R. 5. 22
     (Jn53) Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 53
   Epilogue
     CC12  Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 12
     Hat20  Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 20

Metrical Translation of the Psalms
   Psalm 90:16.1-95:2.1
     EPs  Cambridge, Trinity College, R. 17. 1 (Eadwine’s Psalter; Canterbury Psalter)
PPs  Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Lat. 8824 (Paris Psalter)

Psalm 142
EPs  Cambridge, Trinity College, R. 17. 1 (Eadwine’s Psalter; Canterbury Psalter)
PPs  Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Lat. 8824 (Paris Psalter)

Psalm 117:22/“Menologium,” ll. 60-3
PPs  Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Lat. 8824 (Paris Psalter)

“Fragments of Psalms”
Jn121  Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 121
PPs  Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Lat. 8824 (Paris Psalter)

Poems of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle

Battle of Brunanburh (937)
ChronA  Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 173
ChronB  London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. vi
ChronC  London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. i
ChronD  London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. iv
ChronG  London, British Library, Cotton Otho B. xi

Capture of the Five Boroughs (942)
ChronA  Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 173
ChronB  London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. vi
ChronC  London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. i
ChronD  London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. iv
ChronG  London, British Library, Cotton Otho B. xi

Coronation of Edgar (973)
ChronA  Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 173
ChronB  London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. vi
ChronC  London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. i
ChronG  London, British Library, Cotton Otho B. xi

Death of Edgar (975)
ChronA  Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 173
ChronB  London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. vi
ChronC  London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. i
ChronG  London, British Library, Cotton Otho B. xi

Death of Alfred (1036)*
ChronC  London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. i
ChronD  London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. iv

Death of Edward (1065)*
ChronC  London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. i
ChronD  London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. iv

“Prayer”
JulAii  London, British Library, Cotton Julius A. ii, ff.136-144
LPs  London, Lambeth Palace 427, ff. 1-209 (Lambeth Psalter)

Solomon and Saturn I
B1  Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 41
CC422  Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 422
Soul and Body I/II

Soul and Body I
   V Vercelli, Biblioteca Capitolare CXVII (Vercelli Book)

Soul and Body II
   E Exeter, Cathedral 3501, ff. 8-130 (Exeter Book)
Appendix 2
Manuscripts and Sigla

In citing manuscripts in this study, the following conventions have been followed:

1. The sigla used by Dobbie in *The Manuscripts of Cædmon’s Hymn* have been retained.\(^{802}\)

2. For the Chronicle Manuscripts, I have used the standard sigla with the prefix *Chron*. Thus the siglum for Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 173 (the A Chronicle) is *ChronA*; London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. vi (the B Chronicle) is *ChronB* and so on.

3. For the remaining manuscripts, I have either based my siglum on the popular name for the manuscript (when this exists), or on an abbreviated form of the Library, name and/or shelf-number. Hence Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale Fonds Lat. 8824 (“The Paris Psalter”) is *PPs*; Cambridge, Trinity College, R.17.1 (“The Eadwine Psalter”) is *EPs*; but Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 201 is *CC\(^{201}\)*.

4. Shelf numbers are given as a subscript; superscript is used for information about the scribe. Thus *ChronA\(^{3}\)* is used for the third hand in *ChronA*; *ChronA\(^{5}\)* is used for the fifth. Likewise *O\(^{corr}\)* is used for the post-correction text of *O*; *O\(^{uncorr}\)* is used for the uncorrected version of the text when this differs from the corrected version. At times when confusion might otherwise arise, poem short-titles are given in brackets after the siglum. Thus *E(Rid\(^{30a}\))* is used for Exeter Riddle 30a; *E(Rid\(^{30b}\))* for Exeter Riddle 30b.

5. The symbol † is used before manuscripts in which the multiply attested poem no longer survives.

\(^{802}\) See particularly Dobbie, *Manuscripts*, pp. 8-9.
### Sigla Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sigla</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bd</td>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, 163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Br</td>
<td>Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale, 8245-57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>†London, British Library, Cotton Otho B. xi (transcribed in N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ca</td>
<td>Cambridge, University Library, Kk. 3. 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CArms</td>
<td>London, College of Arms, M. 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC&lt;sub&gt;12&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC&lt;sub&gt;201&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC&lt;sub&gt;422&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChronA</td>
<td>Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChronB</td>
<td>London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. vi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChronC</td>
<td>London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChronD</td>
<td>London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChronE</td>
<td>London, British Library, Laud Misc. 636 (Peterborough Chronicle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChronG</td>
<td>†London, British Library, Cotton Otho B. xi (various transcripts survive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUL&lt;sub&gt;Ffi27&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Cambridge, University Library, Fr. i. 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUL&lt;sub&gt;Hi24&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Cambridge, University Library, II. 2. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Di</td>
<td>Dijon, Bibliothèque Municipale, 574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Exeter, Cathedral 3501, ff. 8-130 (Exeter Book)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPs</td>
<td>Cambridge, Trinity College, R. 17. 1 (Eadwine’s Psalter; Canterbury Psalter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faust&lt;sub&gt;Ab&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>London, British Library, Cotton Faustina A. x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Har&lt;sub&gt;585&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>London, British Library, Harley 585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hat&lt;sub&gt;20&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hr</td>
<td>Hereford, Cathedral Library, P. 5. i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 11 (Junius Manuscript)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jn&lt;sub&gt;121&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jn&lt;sub&gt;53&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 53 (transcript of *Tib&lt;sub&gt;Bai&lt;/sub&gt;; Otho&lt;sub&gt;Bii&lt;/sub&gt; [partial])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul&lt;sub&gt;Ali&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>London, British Library, Cotton Julius A. ii, ff.136-144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>St. Petersburg, M.E. Saltykov-Schedrin Public Library, Lat. Q. I. 18 (Leningrad Bede)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ld</td>
<td>Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud Misc. 243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leid</td>
<td>Leiden, Rijksbibliotheek, Vossianus Lat. Quarto 106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ln</td>
<td>Oxford, Lincoln College, Lat. 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPs</td>
<td>London, Lambeth Palace 427, ff. 1-209 (Lambeth Psalter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Cambridge, University Library, Kk. 5. 16 (Moore Bede)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mg</td>
<td>Oxford, Magdalen College, Lat. 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>London, British Library, Additional 43703 (transcript of C and ChronG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Oxford, Corpus Christi College, 279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otho&lt;sub&gt;Bii&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>†London, British Library, Cotton Otho B. ii (partial transcript in Jn&lt;sub&gt;53&lt;/sub&gt;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Lat. 5237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPs</td>
<td>Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Lat. 8824 (Paris Psalter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Ruthwell Cross, Ruthwell Parish, Dumfriesshire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Manuscript Index**

Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale, 8245-57  Br
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 12  CC12
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 173  ChronA
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 201  CC201
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 41  B1
Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 422  CC422
Cambridge, Trinity College, R. 5. 22  Tr1
Cambridge, Trinity College, R. 17. 1 (Eadwine’s Psalter; Canterbury Psalter)  EPs
Cambridge, University Library, Ff. i. 27  CULFf127
Cambridge, University Library, Li. 2. 4  CULLi24
Cambridge, University Library, Kk. 3. 18  Ca
Cambridge, University Library, Kk. 5. 16 (Moore Bede)  M
Dijon, Bibliothèque Municipale 574  Di
Exeter, Cathedral 3501, ff. 8-130 (Exeter Book)  E
Hereford, Cathedral Library, P. 5. i  Hr
Leiden, Rijksbibliotheek, Vossianus Lat. Quarto 106  Leid
London, British Library, Additional 43703 (transcript of C and ChronG)  N
London, British Library, Cotton Faustina A. x  FaustaX
London, British Library, Cotton Julius A. ii, ff.136-144  JulAii
London, British Library, Cotton Otho B. ii  OthoBii
†London, British Library, Cotton Otho B. xi  C, ChronG
London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius A. vi  ChronB
London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. i  ChronC
London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. iv  ChronD
†London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B. xi  TibBxi
†London, British Library, Cotton Vitellius D. xx  VitDxx
London, British Library, Harley 585  Har585
London, British Library, Royal 2B. v (Regius Psalter)  RPs
London, College of Arms, M. 6  CArms
London, Lambeth Palace 427, ff. 1-209 (Lambeth Psalter)  LPs
Oxford, Bodleian Library, 163  Bd
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 20  Hat20
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Hatton 43  H
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 11 (Junius Manuscript)  J
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 121  Jn121
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Junius 53 (transcript of TibBxi; OthoBii [partial])  Jn53
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Laud Misc. 243  LD
Oxford, Bodleian Library, Tanner 10  T1
Oxford, Corpus Christi College, 279  O
Oxford, Lincoln College, Lat. 31  Ln
Oxford, Magdalen College, Lat. 105  Mg
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Lat. 5237  P1
Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Lat. 8824 (Paris Psalter)  PPs
Ruthwell Cross, Ruthwell Parish, Dumfriesshire  R
San Marino, CA. Huntington Library, HM 35300  SanM
St. Petersburg, M.E. Saltykov-Schedrin Public Library, Lat. Q. I. 18 (Leningrad Bede)  L
†Tournai, Bibliothèque Municipale 134  To
Vercelli, Biblioteca Capitolare CXVII (Vercelli Book)  V
Winchester, Cathedral I  W
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