NOTES ON TWO OE POETIC TEXTS

Joseph MacGowan
University of Pennsylvania

i. Waldere

For *Waldere* II.23 Arne Zettersten, following Ute Schwab, read:

þon*ne* [w]ifle[e] unmægas   eft ongynnaðʒ.[1]

Much debate has centered around what was between *þonne* and *unmægas* in the second of the two leaves from Copenhagen, Royal Library MS Ny Kgl. saml. 167b, which preserves what little we have of *Waldere*.[2] An early proposal suggested the adverb *yfle*,[3] while Ferdinand Holthausen proposed reading *ongun* (for *ongum*),[4] that is, "when enemies attack again with arrows."[5] Holthausen later opted for the reading *mec*, while Moritz Trautmann first read *nu*, then *me*; Herman Möller proffered *oþre*.[6] Frederick Norman marked a lacuna in his edition[7] after *þonne* and commented: "There are certainly letters behind *þoñ*. *The last seems to be an s. The reading could probably be established by ultra-violet light.*"[8] Zettersten did precisely this and remarked: "The word seems to contain five letters. The three middle ones are probably *ifl*. Scwab, 209, suggests the reading *(w)ifl(e)* 'with the javelin': which is definitely the best suggestion so far... The last letter of the word looks, however, like an *s* rather than an *e*."[9] Reading *me* supplies an object to *ongynnað*, which is just what we would want. Mention of a weapon is not absolutely necessary here, especially so from what follows:

>   [N]e bið fah wið me,
> þon*ne* [w]ifl[*e*] unmægas   eft ongynnað,
> mecum gemetað,   swa ge me dydon.

As before, so Waldere tells Guðhere, swords shall meet; perhaps we do not need the instrumental *wifle*. For this passage Friedrich Klaeber read:

þonne (me) unmægas   eft ongynnað.[10]

I would suggest, in light of Zettersten's discoveries, that we ought perhaps read:

þonne [...] unmægas   eft ongynnað.[11]

Reading *me* would not only supply an object to *ongynnað*, but would give the passage a chiasmic structure (*me* [...] *unmægas... ongynnað... gemetað... me dydon*). A similar need for an object confronts the reader at II.28:

> Se· ðe· hi*m* to ðam halgan   helpe gelifeð,
> to gode gioce,   he þær gearo findeð,
> gif ða earnunga   ær geðenceð (11. 27-29).

The expected object to *findeð* led E.V.K. Dobbie to mark a lacuna after II.28:

> to gode gioce,   he þær gearo findeð
> * * *
> gif ða earnunga   ær geðenceð.[12]

If we translate II.28b as "he there readily finds [it]," the "it" referring to *gioce* of 28a, there is no need to break up the text. II.28 may support the idea of reading *gifeðe to geoce* for I.25a; that is, the two lines would have a similar alliterative pattern (II.28 *to gode gioce   he þær gearo findeð*; Klaeber's reading for I.25, *gifeðe to [g]eoce   mid ðy ðu Guðhere scealt*).Klaeber's reading for I.25 brings up another problem. Norman read:

> gifeðe to eoce unc;   ðy ðu Guðhere scealt.

Zettersten deciphered *un* as *mi*, and placed *mit* in the b-verse reading:

> gife[ð]e to eoce,   [mit] ðy ðu Guðhere scealt,

with the comment: "The form *mit* is certainly possible before *ð* in OE, although there is an example of *mid ði* in *Waldere* II:6" (p. 26). I think the unambiguous *mid ði* of II.6a (*maðma mid ði mece*) pleads for *mid* in I.25 and that we ought, after Klaeber, read:

> gifeðe to geoce,   mid ðy ðu Guðhere scealt.

Klaeber produced no edition proper of *Waldere*. The text appeared along with *Deor* and *Widsið* in one of the appendices to his *Beowulf*. Klaeber's *Waldere*, even without a full apparatus and the valuable information gleaned from the necessary examination of the leaves under ultra-violet light, is, nonetheless, superior to many others, and for one simple reason: good critical sense. For I.4 Klaeber read *hear[d]ne* while Norman and Zettersten retained the MS' *hearne* (for the acc. masc. sing. of *heard*). For II.18 he read *standeð* for the MS' *standað*, where again Norman and Zettersten adhere to the MS reading. There are plausible reasons for retaining the latter reading. Norman believed that the MS' *standað* for the expected third pres. sing. *standeð* was a "Northumbrian peculiarity."[13] This would be in accord

with his view that, "The dialect of the manuscript is probably that of a Northumbrian scribe attempting to write 'Standard' Old English round about 1000."[14] Zettersten concurred, noting that *hafa* of II.2, *hworfan* of I.30, and *standað* were evidence of the Northumbrian dialect in the poem, and he concluded: "The above-mentioned Northumbrian features may be due to an intervening scribe just as well as the scribe responsible for the present fragment. It therefore seems to me that —with our present knowledge of the history of the poem —we can only state that the manuscript of *Waldere*, like most Old English poems extant, is a West-Saxon copy with a non-West-Saxon element. This element is definitely Northumbrian."[15] Zettersten had cautioned before in his edition that "the material is far too small for definite conclusions."[16] The advice is quite good; the small specimen we possess yields very little evidence for anything conclusive about non-West-Saxon elements, which dialectal investigations generally yield little certainty and, almost without fail, rely solely upon Alistair Campbell's venerable *Old English Grammar* for their arguments. I think, however, that enough evidence does exist in the poem to argue that *standað* is no more than a mistake for *standeð*. A brief list of scribal errors in *Waldere* would include: I.5 MS *sec* for *secg*, I.10 *lange* for *langne*, I.13 *sweordwlegan* for *sweordplegan*, II.4 *ic* for *hit*, II.12 *hildefrore* for *hildefrofre*, II.21 *had* for *hand*, II.22 *he* for *ne*, II.30 *mtoten* for *moten*; in II.14 the *e* of *Hanegan* is written above the line, while the *æ* of *getwæmde* in II.16 was written over a *u*, and the *f* of *Ælfheres* in II.18 was corrected from a *t*. In a codex such as that to which the two extant leaves of *Waldere* belonged, a mistake of *standað* for *standeð* is not terribly unusual. It is perhaps better, once again, to follow Klaeber, and read *standeð*.

ii. Durham

The *ASPR* text for *Durham*, lines 18-21, reads:

Eardiæð æt ðem eadige   in in ðem minstre
unarimeda   reliquia
ðær monia wundrum gewurðað,   ðes ðe writ seggeð,
midd ðener drihnes wer   domes bideð.[17]

In 1920 Fernandi Holthausen proposed reading:

eardiað æt ðem eadiga[n]   in ðem [æðelan] minstre
unarimeda   reliquia monige,
wundrum gewurðað,   ðæs ðe writ segeð,
[ðe] mid ðene drih[t]nes wer   domes bidað.[18]

In these four lines alone, Holthausen departed from the MS [Cambridge, University Library Ff. i.27][19] five times (*eardiað* for *eardiæð, eadiga*[n] for *eadige, monige* for

monia, gewurðad for *gewurðað, segeð* for *seggeð,* and *bidað* for *bideð*). While the MS has *unarimeda reliquia ðe monia wundrum gewurðað,* Holthausen transferred *monia* from *wundrum* to *reliquia.* Holthausen no doubt emended too frequently for modern editorial tastes; nonetheless, that Holthausen attempted to diagnose the textual ills of this passage is worth noting —the text *is* problematic here. The line *unarimeda   reliquia* just meets the requirement of the meter, though it does not alliterate; still, if we read the passage as does Dobbie, the sense does not seem to be wanting anything. It is probably better to follow Dobbie and resist normalizing *eadige, monia,* etc.; however, *in in ðem minstre* seems troubling. Dobbie commented: "The appearance of two *in's* in 1. 18b suggests the likelihood of an unconscious scribal repetition, and Wülker omits one *in.*"[20] Perhaps, instead, we may read *in on ðem minstre;* compare *Elene* 845b: *in on þa ceastre.*[21] While the MS has *ðe monia wundrum gewurðað,* Dobbie replaced *ðe* with *ðær* an emendation as appropriate as it is simple. It gives the sense that there [at Durham] dwell a great many relics with the holy man [St. Cuthbert], within the monastery, where many things occur by miracles —so the writings tell— and which [relics] await the judgement with the man of God. We may however wish to follow Holthausen and read *bidað* for *bideð,* to balance *eardiæð* of 18a. And so for this passage we might read:

Eardiæð æt ðem eadige   in on ðem minstre
unarimeda   reliquia,
ðær monia wundrum gewurðað,   ðes ðe writ seggeð,
midd ðene drihnes wer   domes bidað.

Notes

1. *Waldere,* ed. Arne Zettersten (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1979), p. 21.
2. About the leaves Zettersten remarked: "The two vellum fragments of the *Waldere* poem are of approximately the same size, both approximately 210 × 144 mm. Each manuscript fragment is actually one fold, consisting of one leaf with fifteen long lines on each page and one framentary leaf, the greater part of which has been cut off" (p. 7). Zettersten places the MS in either "the second half of the tenth century or the first half of the eleventh" (p. 9), which estimate agrees more or less with N.R. Ker's assessment [cf. his *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957), item 101, pp. 141-142].
3. Compare also Karl Müllenhoff, "Zeugnisse und Excurse zur deutschen Heldensage,"

Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsch Literatur 12 (1865), pp. 265-273. Müllenhoff reads for II.23: *þonne yfle unmægas eft onginnað* (p. 269).

4. Sophus Bugge, in "Spredte iagttagelser vedkommende de oldengelske digte om Béowulf og Waldere," *Tidskrift för Philologi og Paedagogik* 8 (1867), pp. 41-78, suggested that the *un* of *unmægas* was a variant for *um* and belonged to a preceding noun (p. 78). Ferdinand Holthausen, in *Beowulf, Nebst den kleineren Denkmälern der Heldensage* (Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1912), printed: *þonne ongun mæ[c]gas eft ongynnað* (Band III. i, p. 107).

5. For a discussion of *unmægas* as "enemies" cf. Friedrich Klaeber, "Zu den Waldere-Bruchstücken," *Anglia* 51 (1927), p. 123. Compare also the Paris Psalter, Ps. 68:8,

> Forþon ic edwit for þe   oft aræfnade
> and me hleorsceame   hearde becwoman,
> and ic framþe wearð   fæderenbroðrum,
> wæs unmæge gyst   modorcildum.

[*The Paris Psalter and the Meters of Boethius*, ed. George Philip Krapp, *ASPR* 5 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1932), p. 24].

6. Cf. *Waldere*, ed. F. Norman (London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1933), pp. 42-43.
7. Norman, p. 42.
8. Norman, p. 42n.
9. Zettersten, p. 28.
10. Friedrich Klaeber, *Beowulf and the Fight at Finnsburg*, Third ed. (Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath and Company, 1950), p. 285.
11. *The Anglo-Saxon Minor Poems*, ed. E. V. K. Dobbie, *ASPR* 6 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1942), p. 6.
12. Cf. Norman, p. 6.
13. Norman, p. 7.
14. Zettersten, p. 12.
15. Zettersten, p. 12.
16. Dobbie, p. 27.
17. Ferdinand Holthausen, "Zu altenglischen Dichtungen," *Anglia Beiblatt* 31 (1920), pp. 25-32. This article has (p. 29) *eardiarð* for *eardiað*, a typographical error which I have silently corrected.
18. Cf. Ker, item 14, p. 12. George Hickes printed another text of the poem in his *Thesaurus* ("Hujusmodi est elegans illud carmen in bibl. *Cott. Vitellius* D. 20," [178]) which reads:

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

Hicke's text was printe don pp. 178-179 of this *Grammaticæ Anglo-Saxonicæ et Mæso-Gothicæ*, Capitula XXIII *De Poetica Anglo-Saxonum* [=pt. 1, *Linguarum Veterum Septentrionalium Thesaurus Grammatico-Criticus et Achrælogicus* (Oxford, 1705)]. Only fragments of British Library, Cotton Vitellius D. XX survived the 1731 fire at Ashburnham House, and not those leaves containing the other copy of *Durham* (cf. Ker, item 223, p. 298).

19. Dobbie's suggestion that *reliquia* is "perhaps intented as the plural of a neuter *reliquium*" (p. xliv) is quite possible; perhaps *reliquiæ* is what is meant here, taken as "relics".
    The Latin has:
    > Repositæ cum his sanctis,
    > In interiori monasterio,
    > Innumerare reliquiæ;
    > Quæ plurima edunt miracula,
    > Quæ historici tantisper memorabunt,
    > Dum Domini judicium veridicium expectant (Hickes, p. 179).

20. Dobbie, p. 152.
21. *Cynewulf's Elene*, ed. P.O.E. Gradon (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1966), p. 58.