continental works, manuscripts of which would have accompanied Norman clerics into England.

In addition, it should be remembered that the only other Old English text to contain a similar account of the fall of the angels, Genesis B, is a c.900 Old English translation of a late ninth-century Old Saxon original, and thus also has strong connections to continental traditions. This fact, along with the clear parallels between the Vespasian D. xiv text of ‘De Initio Creaturae’ and vernacular works in Old French and Middle High German, suggests that Genesis B and our homily represent independent Old English adaptations of a continental hexameral tradition regarding the fall of Lucifer and his angels. A form of this idea seems to have first found its way to Anglo-Saxon England around 900 through the Old Saxon poem which became Genesis B. Over two hundred years later, the idea was picked up again by a reviser or scribe who inserted it into the Vespasian D. xiv version of Ælfric’s ‘De Initio Creaturae’, and who took his information perhaps from continental texts or scholars arriving in England in the wake of the Norman Conquest.

It has been my intention in this study of the Vespasian D. xiv version of ‘De Initio Creaturae’ to find and explain examples of late Old English modifications to an earlier Ælfrican text. In this instance, such modifications include a severe abbreviation of the text and a resultant change of its purpose in the collection; the introduction and modification of compounds of the word red, which seem to serve as a commentary on Lucifer’s actions; and the addition of an image of the fall of the rebel angels which may derive from continental sources, perhaps transmitted to England after the Norman Conquest. I hope that the presence of so many interesting modifications in a piece which represents only the first quarter of the first homily in Ælfric’s First Series of Catholic Homilies will encourage further study into late modifications of Ælfrician texts and into the possible motivations behind such changes. If the current examination of Vespasian D. xiv and the ongoing work of other scholars on late manuscripts of Ælfric’s works are any indication, there is still much to discover.
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RE-EVALUATING EMMENDATIONS TO THE OLD ENGLISH RIMING POEM LL. 17–18

LINES 17–18 of the Old English Rimming Poem appear in the manuscript beginning in the third to last line of folio 94r as follows:

Þe insele sæge sinc ge þæge · þegnů geþyhte þenden þære æge

37 I leave aside the complicated question of an ultimate source for the idea of angels falling like rain for three days and nights. However, the fact that this motif also appears in Slavonic, Russian, Swedish, and Armenian texts suggests that the Wiener Genesis, although the earliest work that contains the full motif, is not the source for all later manifestations of it. I reproduce Eßer’s comment: ‘Die weite geo-graphische und zeitliche Streuung der Belege läßt wohl kaum die Vermutung zu, daß alle zitierten Textstellen auf der Wij[ener]G[enesis]—das älteste Zeugnis—zurückgehen. Dunstan [A. C. Dunstan, ‘Sources and Text of the Middle High German Poem “Die Hochzeit”’, Modern Language Review, xx (1926), 310–16; xxi (1927), 178–86.] und Jagić [Vatroslav Jagić, Slavische Beiträge zu den biblischen Apokryphen, (Wien, Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaft, 1893).] denken für die von ihnen genannten Belege als Vorlage an einen verlorenen griechischen oder lateinischen Text, vielleicht ein apokryphes Adam-und-Eva-Buch. Von hier aus könnte der Vergleich der fallenden Engel mit Hagel, Regen oder Schnee eher diese erstaunliche Verbreitung in den verschiedensten Volkssprachen erfahren haben. Allerdings scheinen Vergleiche mit fallenden Niederschlägen in den europäischen Literaturen auch in anderen Kontexten häufig zu sein, so daß direkte Abhängigkeiten für diese Metaphorik mit letzter Sicherheit kaum zu beweisen sind.’ [‘The wide geographical and temporal diffusion of these texts hardly allows the supposition that all the passages here cited derive from the Wiener Genesis—the oldest witness. Dunstan and Jagić believe the source of the texts discussed by them to be a lost Greek or Latin text, perhaps an apocryphal book on Adam and Eve. From there the comparison of the falling angels with hail, rain, or snow could have experienced this quite striking distribution into the various vernaculars. Nevertheless, comparisons with falling precipitation are so common in European literature even in other contexts, that direct lines of descent for this metaphor can scarcely be proven with complete certainty.’] Eßer, Die Schöpfungsgeschichte in der ‘altideutschen Genesis’, 160–2.
A conservative translation of this passage might be ‘such that he might see a heap of treasure in the hall, of use to thanes. At that time I was a power…” A reading without emendation is possible, provided one reads *pyhte* as a variant of *pyhtig* ‘good, advantageous’ or ‘pleasing’;¹ though the particulars of *pyhte*’s morphology and phonology are troublesome. Moreover the verse is unmetrical and is unusually phrased. Editors have put forth a number of possible emendations in hopes of making sense of these verses. The most recent edition of the poem (Muir, 2000) maintains Macrae-Gibson’s emendation.²

However, I would argue that emendations put forth by E. Sievers and F. Kluge should be reviewed. These nineteenth-century emendations are preferable because they restore grammar, sense, meter, and rhyme to the text. Furthermore, emendations suggested by Sievers and Kluge are more plausible than competing emendations, from a graphemic standpoint, and thus provide explanation for the errors present in the manuscript copy.

**Previous emendations to 18a**

Most editors have retained the manuscript reading of 18a. Those who have altered 18a have presented one of two types of rhyming solutions. The first emendation of verse 18a for the sake of rhyme is that put forth by Sievers in 1884, who used the rhyme-scheme in line 17 as the basis for emendation of 18a and 18b. His emendation employs the hypothesized Angl. forms of *pêge* ‘pleasing’;³

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{pëgnum pëge} & \quad \text{‘pleasing for service’}
\end{align*}
\]

Although Sievers lays the foundation for Kluge’s, Imelmann’s, and Holthausen’s readings of the same passage, we are tempted to disregard Sievers’ treatment of 18a, as the replacement of *pëgni ge* with *pëgnume* further complicates the reading of a clearly identifiable and sensible word.⁴ Whether one should reconstruct with an Angl. *pêge* or W-S *pæge*, as Kluge does so as to rhyme with line 17, is of secondary importance, as the copyist seems to have been very conscious of this particular dialectal difference:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{pëgnum gepæge} & \quad \text{Lh}
\end{align*}
\]

Lehmann reads *gepæge* as well, though as the 3rd sg. pret. subj. of *pícgan* ‘that he might receive it for the thanes’, a reading of some awkwardness. Klinck’s suggestion of altering *gepyhte* to *gepwaré* ‘mild’ so as to reintroduce rhyme into line 18 and assonance between lines 17 and 18 is problematic, since the rhyming has tended to proceed in groupings of four up to this point (arguing against assonance as an equivalent).⁵ That the copyist would have read a *wynn* as a *y* is certainly plausible; however, the misreading then of an *aesc* as an *h* and a *t* for an *r* begin to stretch the limits of plausibility.

**Previous emendations to 18b**

The treatment of verse 18b, *pêden was ic magen*, has produced a greater number of suggested emendations than 18a. These emendations fall into three groups: which do not emend, those which emend for sense but not rhyme, and those which emend so as to

---


restore rhyme. Krapp and Dobbie alter \textit{ic} to \textit{me} ‘as long as power was to me’. Despite the fact that this emendation ‘gives an appropriate reading’, it fails to correct a metrically deficient line and does not explain how the misreading or miscopying could have occurred.\footnote{G.P. Krapp and E.V.K. Dobbie (eds), \textit{The Exeter Book} (New York, 1936), 312.}

Macrae-Gibson attempts to salvage 18b by inserting \textit{in} between \textit{ic} and \textit{mægen}:

\textit{Penden wæs ic in mægen}

He states that:

if the text is left with no emodation sense is difficult: ‘then I was a power’ is hardly possible, for elsewhere when persons are \textit{mægen} is [sic] collectively, as an armed force. Loss of \textit{in} from \textit{ic in} is scribally plausible, producing a four-minim sequence with the following \textit{m}. Certainly then in \textit{mæg(e)ne} would be more regular, but the accusative is not so improbable as to justify further emodation.\footnote{L. Ettmüller, \textit{Engla and Seaxna Scópas and Bóceras. Anglosaxonum poëtae atque scriptores prosaici, quorum partim integra opera, partim loca selecta collegit, correxit} (Quedlinburg and Leipzig, 1850).}

Reading Macrae-Gibson’s emodation with known rules of Old English grammar, one might understand it as ‘then I was into power’(?), since the locatival sense is carried by \textit{in} + dative. Macrae-Gibson’s emodation asks us to alter the grammar of Old English instead of a line of text.

The remaining emodations of 18b take rhyme into consideration. Of these, there are two groupings: emodations which rhyme with \textit{hyhte} (with either the word \textit{myhte} or \textit{hyhte}) and those which rhyme with an emodation to 18a. Ettmüller’s \textit{þenden wæs ic mægenhyhte} may be disregarded outright as breaking the alliteration of the line.\footnote{L. Ettmüller, \textit{Angla and Seaxna Scópas and Bóceras. Anglosaxonum poëtae atque scriptores prosaici, quorum partim integra opera, partim loca selecta collegit, correxit} (Quedlinburg and Leipzig, 1850).} Ettmüller’s \textit{þenden wæs ic mægenhyhte} may be disregarded outright as breaking the alliteration of the line.\footnote{L. Ettmüller, \textit{Engla and Seaxna Scópas and Bóceras. Anglosaxonum poëtae atque scriptores prosaici, quorum partim integra opera, partim loca selecta collegit, correxit} (Quedlinburg and Leipzig, 1850).} Schücking emends to \textit{þenden wæs ic on hyhte} and Sedgefield to \textit{þenden ic wæs on hyhte}.\footnote{L. L. Schücking, \textit{Kleines angelsächsisches Dichterbuch} (Cothen, 1919) and W. J. Sedgefield, \textit{An Anglo-Saxon Verse Book} (Manchester, 1922).} All these troubles aside, the meaning ‘When I was a kinsman’, though grammatical, is questionable for the context.

Klinek’s emodation of \textit{þœoden wæs ic mære} ‘I was a renowned prince’, so as to rhyme with \textit{gebwære}, is also problematic. In addition to the difficulties of how a scribe viewed a \textit{g} as an \textit{r} (though a vague similarity exists), we have the added difficulty of explaining the change of \textit{o} to \textit{n}. It is safe to assume that \textit{þenden} appears here syntactically well-formed as an adverb, rather than as a conjunction, and means ‘at that time, back then’.

The final grouping of possible emodations are those based on Sievers’ 1884 mention of line 18 in his ‘Miscellen zur angelsächsischen Grammatik’. There he pairs his emodation of 18a with \textit{þœode} as ic \textit{wège} ‘I was important to/as the king’. His alteration of \textit{þenden} was returned to the manuscript reading in 1886.\footnote{C. W. M. Grein, \textit{Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Poesie} (Göttingen, 1858), II; E. Sieper, \textit{Die altenglische Elegie} (Strassburg, 1915); W. S. Mackie (ed.), ‘The Old English Rhymed Poem’, \textit{JEGP} 21 (1922), 307–19; W. A. Craigie, \textit{Specimens of Anglo-Saxon Poetry.} (Edinburgh, 1931), III; K. Wentrersdorf, ‘The Old English Rhyming Poem: A Ruler’s Lament’, \textit{Studies in Philology} lxxxii (1985), 265–94, at 270–2.} Kluge balances out Sievers’ more altered emodation by changing only the rhyming \textit{on} and suffer from the same difficulty faced by emodations rhyming with -\textit{yhte}. Grein’s reading (subsequently taken up by Sieper, Mackie, and Craigie) of \textit{hunden wæs ic myhte} ‘I was swollen with power’ begs the question of how a scribe might mistake -\textit{yhte} for -\textit{agen}, though one might suppose a synonymous exchange of \textit{mægen} for \textit{mihte}. Wentersdorf suggests that a scribe, due to eye skip, missed nearly an entire line, and posits the lengthy conjectural emodation \textit{þenden wæs ic [on myhte, folgods wæs fege, fysede ic mægen]} ‘So long as I was [in power, my retainers rejoiced; I made ready] the army’.\footnote{E. Sievers, ‘Zum angelsächsischen Reimlied’, \textit{Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur}, xi (1886), 345–54, at 347.}
words. However, unlike Sievers, Kluge replaces the Angl. \textit{wēge} with the W-S \textit{wāge}.

In choosing the most preferable of these three emendations, one might say that Kluge (1897) as well as Holthausen (1913 and 1931) are superior to those of Sievers, if only for the sake that they alter the least. The emendations \textit{þege} and \textit{wāge} in line 18 not only restore sense and rhyme to the passage, but the errors in manuscript transmission are more easily explained. That is to say, there is a reasonable progression of dialectal correspondences and orthographic variants which led the scribe to alter what we might hypothesize stood in the original composition into what we find recorded in the extant manuscript.

**Supporting the readings of \textit{þege} and \textit{wege}**

It stands to reason that an emendation is more supportable if there is a reasonable explanation for the introduction of the error, and that, conversely, it is less supportable if a reasonable explanation is lacking. A switch to \textit{m} from \textit{w} is quite likely, provided the exemplar made use of a true double \textit{u}, rather than the \textit{wynn} typical for most Old English texts, through the misanalysis of minims: \textit{m} \sim \textit{uu}.

\textit{Æsc} is in no way problematic, as Angl. \textit{meg(e)n} (as evidenced, for example, in the \textit{Vespasian Psalter}) corresponds to W-S \textit{mægen}. As \textit{g} is present in both \textit{mægen} and \textit{uwege}, nothing needs to be explained here. Finally, the \textit{n} of \textit{mægen} can be explained through the scribe’s assuming a missing nasal stroke. The most probable hypothesis, then, for what stood in verse 18b as it was first composed was \textit{uwege}. This reconstruction has advantages over those by Lehmann (1970) and Klinck (1992, 1988) in that a meaningful reading is clearly present and the rhyme scheme in groups of four is restored.

The explanation of \textit{þepehite} is slightly more complicated. Both \textit{þege} and the base of \textit{þepehite} begin with \textit{þ}, and they both end with \textit{e}, which leaves the correspondence of -\textit{yhte} from -\textit{eg} as the only explanandum. Here we face a number of dialectal and orthographic differences, set into motion perhaps by the misanalysis of one letter. Let us assume that \textit{gepege} stood in the exemplar. For some unknown reason, though neither improbable nor impossible, the copyist read the \textit{g} as a series of two letters: \textit{gt}. This is all the more possible given that there is only a one-stroke difference between the two, to be found in the tail of the \textit{g}. Had the copyist thought he had read \textit{gepegte}, he might have tried to correct for spelling, where \textit{g} is a common allograph of \textit{h}, thus producing \textit{gepehite}. As a scribe copied the text, he might have equated \textit{gepehite} with the \textit{biht} ‘tight, firm, strong’ on analogical basis with the correspondences between words such as Angl. \textit{reht} and W-S \textit{riht} ‘right’. We can understand the ending -\textit{e} perhaps as either a fem.acc.sg. strong adjectival ending or as an i-stem version of the same adjective. Perhaps the scribe in making these alterations understood the passage as meaning ‘that he might see in the hall a heap of treasure, strong for thanes’ or ‘firm with thanes’ or the like.

The introduction of the \textit{y}, then, is a matter attributable to the \textit{Exeter Book} scribe’s orthography. In spelling the word \textit{riht}, for example, the \textit{Exeter Book} scribe shows a strong tendency to spell with a \textit{y} rather than an \textit{i}. Of the 54 occurrences of the lexeme \textit{riht}, alone or in compounds or derivatives, only once does the scribe spell it with an \textit{i}. Again, in analogy with Angl. \textit{reht} = late W-S \textit{ryht}, a West Saxonized spelling of presumed Angl. \textit{gepehite} could be \textit{gepyhte}.

Kluge’s reading has much to speak for it: it restores a good sense to the passage and it restores rhyme. Note, however, that the rhyme pattern restored is not only that in line 18 or between lines 17 and 18, but also in the patterning of rhymes from lines one to 26. Finally, Kluge’s emendations enable us to reconstruct logically the process of the misreading and to present arguments with clear phonological and orthographic bases. One detraction from these

\footnotesize{13} Unattested in OE in this sense, it would be related to OE \textit{wēge} ‘weight’, and cognate with OHG \textit{wāgi} ‘important’ and ON \textit{vægr} ‘important’, both \textless PGmc. \textit{*wēg-j–} \textless PIE \textit{*wēg–j–}. Cf. Rush. \textit{giwege} = Lat. \textit{mensura} (Bosworth–Toller, s.v. \textit{gewēge}).

\footnotesize{14} s.v. \textit{biht} (Bosworth–Toller).


\footnotesize{16} Christ A 18b.
emendations, however, is that we produce words that are hapax legomena, which by lectio difficilior would lend to their being 'corrected' or replaced. Sievers' and Kluge's mistake was not necessarily in emending the text, but rather in basing their emendation of these words solely on the restoration of rhyme.
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THE ANTWERP-LONDON GLOSSARY AND ÆLFRIC’S GLOSSARY: A RECORD OF THE EARLIEST ENGLISH SCHOLARSHIP

SOME ninety years ago W. M. Lindsay corrected scholars who found in the early English glossaries what they believed to be glossae collectae from Aldhelm’s prose De Virginitate (Pdv). Tracing the glosses to other sources, Lindsay demonstrated that the lines of dependence ran in the exact opposite direction, that Aldhelm had borrowed from the glossaries, incorporating glossarial items sometimes in their original order.¹ Let me adduce a further example of Aldhelm’s glossarial borrowing. In Chapter 34 of the Pdv, the saintly twins Cosmas and Damianus are able to heal a range of disabilities:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{scilicet caecis et malagma monoptalmis} \\
\text{imertiendo, mutis taciturnitis ualuam}
\end{align*}
\]

We may be sure that the batch did not originate in the Pdv since it comes from the very same text that supplied almost 1,000 of the 1,250 or so entries in Ælfric’s Glossary, namely Isidore of Seville’s Etymologiae.⁴ If the source is the expected one, the batch is nonetheless remarkably idiosyncratic, for it comes from the alphabetically arranged Book 10 of Isidore’s encyclopedic work. Whereas the Etymologiae as a whole is ordered by semantic field—for example, trees, stones, tools, ships, etc., the entries of Book 10, uniquely, follow the letters of the alphabet. Thus the Latin headwords above are distantly spaced, a b-word like balbus far separated from an s-word like surdus. Clearly, a careful editor has read Chapter 10 through and grouped widely scattered entries semantically, so gathering together the disabilities we see above. Ælfric’s Glossary is generally dated to the tenth century, but the careful editing and compilation that produced the list of disabilities can have occurred no later than the late seventh century, when the Pdv was issued: the incorporation of the same unusual constellation of vocabulary betrays Aldhelm’s knowledge of the glossarial compilation.


2 S. Gwara (ed.), Aldhelmi Malmesbiriensis Prosa de virginitate (Turnhout, 2001), CCSL 124 and 124A. 446.18–447.22. ‘…the blind,… the one-eyed,… the mute,… the deaf,… the stutterser,… the stammerers,… those crippled in the hand,… the mad…’ For Aldhelm’s prose in translation see M. Lapidge and M. Herren, Aldhelm: The Prose Works (Cambridge, 1979).

3 J. Zupitza, Ælfriks Grammatik und Glossar (Berlin, 1880).