

Leeds Studies in English

Article:

Christine E. Fell, 'Richard Cleasby's Notes on the Vercelli Codex', *Leeds Studies in English*, n.s. 12, (1981), 13-42

Permanent URL:

https://ludos.leeds.ac.uk:443/R/-?func=dbin-jump-full&object_id=121526&silos_library=GEN01



Leeds Studies in English
School of English
University of Leeds
<http://www.leeds.ac.uk/lse>

RICHARD CLEASBY'S NOTES ON THE VERCELLI CODEX

By CHRISTINE E. FELL

Nineteenth-century scholars suffer as do others from the vagaries of fashion. Some reputations come under attack, perhaps deservedly, some flourish, some vanish without trace. Richard Cleasby's reputation, high in his life-time, reached a peak in 1874, the year in which the Cleasby-Vigfusson *Icelandic-English Dictionary*¹ was published. The dictionary contains some forty pages devoted to a *Life* of Richard Cleasby, written by G.W. Dasent, and an invaluable source since Dasent drew heavily on Cleasby's own diaries and correspondence. The same year saw a long article in praise of Cleasby in *The Edinburgh Review*.² The occasion of this article was clearly the appearance of the dictionary, but the author had independent information to add to Dasent's *Life*. Further in 1874 *A Biographical Memoir of Richard Cleasby Lexicographer* was read before the Kendal Literary and Scientific Institute by Cornelius Nicholson.³ This offers no information on Cleasby that is not drawn from either Dasent's *Life* or the article in *The Edinburgh Review*, but it is instructive to note how far the author's enthusiasm took him by way of analogy:

[Cleasby] lived to see an experimental proof of the first printed sheet, and then was suddenly snatched away! Our great naval hero, Nelson, after he had received his fatal wound at the battle of Trafalgar, had his dying body raised up on deck to see the Union Jack float on French masts, and hear the shouts of British tars for a glorious victory. So Richard Cleasby died with the literary trophies of his great victory surrounding his death bed.⁴

Thereafter the reputation of Cleasby has declined. In the 1874 edition of the dictionary the title-page assured us that it was "based on the MS collections of the late Richard Cleasby, enlarged and completed by Gudbrand Vigfusson". The title-page of the 1957 second edition modified this statement to "initiated by Richard Cleasby, subsequently revised, enlarged and completed by Gudbrand Vigfusson". If one reads the unhappy history of the dictionary, noting the fate of Cleasby's own papers, the second title-page is undoubtedly fairer to Vigfússon's responsibility for the dictionary that actually appeared in print. But the word 'initiated' hardly does justice to the amount of work that Cleasby had actually done on this project. In the first edition Dasent's *Life* is followed by "a specimen of Mr. Cleasby's MS. worked out by himself". The purpose

of this specimen is to demonstrate the contrast between Cleasby's own comprehensive and competent notes and the inadequate transcripts of those notes available for Vigfússon's use. It is an impressive demonstration. But in the second edition the *Life* of Cleasby and the specimens of his work are omitted by Craigie who was responsible for the revised version. He left a couple of paragraphs on Cleasby from Dean Liddell's original Preface, and goes on to explain: "The Introduction, the life of Richard Cleasby, and the Specimens, occupying sixty-four pages in the first edition, are omitted in this one and the space added to the more essential supplement".⁵

It is clear that Vigfússon himself had developed a dislike of, possibly a prejudice against, the name of Cleasby. A copy of the first edition of the dictionary containing annotations in Vigfússon's own hand has just been brought to our attention by Elizabeth Knowles.⁶ Most of these annotations demonstrate Vigfússon's irritation at any part of the finished dictionary being attributed to Cleasby, or even at any favourable mention of him. He says of the *Life*: "This life of R. Cl. was in Oct. 73 written by Mr. Dasent, in spite of my remonstrances; I had to submit. I wish it had never been written."⁷ The unkindest cut of all, however, occurs on p.xlv of the annotated edition:

Mr. Jon Sigurdsson said to me (Copenhagen 1874 summer), he knew Mr. Cleasby well - 'Eg gat aldrei séð hann vas annað enn hreinn dilettanti' I could never see he was anything but a sheer dilettanty. He also told me how he entirely depended from his Icelandic clerks, otherwise he spoke favourably him. No swindler, honest (though dull) enough. G.V.⁸

Vigfússon's own English, never too reliable, had perhaps slipped a little in the excitement of criticising Cleasby's Icelandic. Without disregarding Jón Sigurðsson's testimony we can bear in mind that a casual comment from private conversation does not necessarily represent considered judgement, and we can set alongside it the warm admiration of such contemporaries as Jacob Grimm and John Kemble:

Jacob Grimm told the writer, in the year 1844, that no one knew the dialects of Germany, as a whole, more profoundly than Cleasby. "Some of us," he said, "know one or two dialects better, but Richard Cleasby knows them all, as his leisure and means have allowed him to traverse the country in every direction and make them his own."⁹

In 1842 Kemble, in a letter to Grimm, writes: "There is no man whom I love and honour more than *Richard Cleasby*", and in an earlier letter that year laments that "*Cleasby* is killing himself over his dictionary: he works frightfully hard at it, reads and writes incessantly, and has seriously injured his health by overapplication".¹⁰

Cleasby's mastery of languages included Gothic and he spent some time in Sweden on the "inspection and collation of the Codex

Argenteus" (p.lxxv and ff.). His Latin was good enough for him to follow lectures delivered in that language, he received instruction in Greek and German philology, and he wrote letters as readily in German or Danish as in English. Italian also he wrote "with fluency and elegance" (p.lxxii). It is hard to imagine a man with such an appetite for the study of languages being entirely dependent on his Icelandic clerks for his mastery of Old Norse. Jón Sigurðsson's strictures, however, may have their origin in the astonishing fact that Cleasby had begun to learn Icelandic a mere eight years before his death. He died in 1847, and it was on the 5th November 1839 that his diary tells us: "began to read Icelandic" (p.lxxviii). Having begun to learn it he realised immediately the need for scholarly apparatus in this field, more than in those other branches of research which had previously taken his interest. With characteristic energy he threw himself at once into providing it. In February 1840 he wrote to John Kemble:

I am up to my chin in *Islandicis*, and doing what I can to promote the preparation of a good sound old Northern Lexicon, and so get this, for so late in the 19th century, unaccountable and most scandalous blank filled up in this grand branch of Teutonic development. (p.lxxix).

It is clear from the material that survives that a fantastic amount of work did get done in the few years before Cleasby died. It is curious that this was apparently the first publication Cleasby envisaged, considering that most of his contemporaries and friends in the world of scholarship are well-known for their range of publications. One has only to think of Jacob Grimm, John Kemble or Benjamin Thorpe. Yet it was not until Cleasby was in his early forties that he paused in the process of acquiring knowledge to contemplate publication. It is idle to speculate on the reasons for this, but worth observing that he goes on to consider publishing translations of sagas with commentaries, though fully aware that he cannot tackle this project while working on his dictionary.

It is not impossible that a transcript of Cleasby's translation of *Hrafnkels Saga* into English, with which he amused himself in August 1840 while convalescing in Carlsbad, is still somewhere extant, but I do not know how much of Cleasby's writing survives. The *Life* is largely based on Cleasby's diaries, but I have not been able to discover any trace of these. He was a voluminous correspondent and Dasent quotes from an immense range of letters to most of the eminent Germanic philologists of his day, but there is no bibliography attached to his name, no record of any printed text or paper delivered to a learned society. The only context in which we know his name is in the accepted shorthand for the dictionary he "initiated", *Cleasby-Vigfusson*. The Cleasby papers now housed in libraries in Copenhagen and Oxford relate to this dictionary. The Arnarnagmænan Institute has two volumes of material for Cleasby's dictionary, though not in his hand.¹¹ The Bodleian has among the papers of Vigfússon donated in 1924 a volume of material for the dictionary in Cleasby's own hand.¹²

To this meagre collection should be added two further items.¹³

Codex Vercellensis.

The cover page of Richard Cleasby's notes on the Vercelli Codex with George Stephens's comments and signature.

In the summer of 1969 (the year of the Sixth Viking Congress held in Sweden) I chanced to be introduced by the late Professor Dag Strömbäck to Miss Florence Stephens, and to have the opportunity of looking through her library at Huseby Slot, inherited from George Stephens, "Professor of Old-English and of the English Language and Literature in the University of Cheapinghaven, Denmark".¹⁴ Inside the hard covers of a facsimile of the Vercelli Codex was a small paper pamphlet measuring approximately eight inches by nine and a half. On the front cover in ink in an elegant script is the inscription *Codex Verzellensis*. Underneath in a crude pencil scrawl is added "RICHARD CLEASBY died in 1847". Below the same hand continues, "Sold as waste paper in Cheapinghaven, March 1875, and given to me". Below this again is a signature in the same crude scrawl "George Stephens". In the top right-hand corner in pencil so faint as to be barely legible, but in the first hand not the second, is the note "Dec 1837 RC" and below this "Vercell" is legible. The information is repeated with additions and more clearly on the first page, "Cod Vercell. Dec. 1837. Append. B. to Cooper's Report.", but Cleasby's initials do not occur again. The contents appeared to be about twenty pages of close-written notes on the poems of the Vercelli manuscript. As far as we could see this pamphlet was not noted in the library's catalogue.

I thought this a discovery of some interest, not having then any idea that Cleasby had ever worked on Old English material, and with the permission of Miss Stephens and the encouragement of Professor Strömbäck I brought the pamphlet away in order to examine it more closely, and to discover whether it merited publication. I offer below a preliminary description of the material. Its interest is in some ways more for the antiquarian than for the scholar of Old English, but since even recent editors of the Vercelli poems are still quoting the readings and interpretations of Kemble or Grein, and since Cleasby shows himself to be an Old English philologist of some distinction, it seems proper that his unpublished contribution to nineteenth-century Anglo-Saxon studies should not go unnoticed.

The first question to be asked of the material is whether Stephens attributed it correctly. Cleasby's full signature does not appear, and there is only the faint RC on the cover to suggest authorship. But the script is certainly identical with that of the Bodleian manuscript known to be in Cleasby's own hand. Moreover it seems likely that Stephens had accurate information on the origins of his "waste paper". He himself knew Cleasby, even asking him for assistance with his own researches: "Mr. Stephens gave me a memorandum, begging me to make inquiry among Icelanders at Copenhagen as to any Folk-Sagor, Barn-Sagor, Folk-Visor, Barn-Visor . . ." (p.xciv). It can be assumed too that Stephens would recognise Cleasby's distinctive hand. Dasent gives us unusually little information on Cleasby's activities in December 1837, noting merely, "On the 5th of December he was back at Munich. The winter of 1837-38 now passed away and the spring found him still at work." (p.lxxiv). If the diaries did refer to a winter's work on the Vercelli Codex Dasent evidently did not find it quotable. But earlier on Dasent quoted the diaries on Cleasby's introduction to Old English: "We began to-day with Professor Schmeller to read the Anglo-Saxon version of

mid marian ·
 þe on gemýnb nime ·
 þæne deoþertan ·
 bæz-þeopðunga ·

node under nodeþum ·
 þa þe riceþ ða ·
 ealles oþer-pealþend ·
 earne beþealhte. Finit. 2178

XV.

þur ic froð 7 fur ·
 þurh þæt fæcne hur · 2480
 þonð-eræft þæf ·
 7 þunþrum læf ·
 þragum þneodube ·
 7 geþanc neodobe ·
 nihter nearfe ·
 nýrre ic gearpe ·
 be ðære niht ærme ·
 numþan geþealh ·
 þurh ða mæran niht ·
 on modeþ þealh · 2490
 þurðóm onþreah ·
 ic þæf þeorcum fáh ·
 rýnnú aræled ·
 forzú gepæled ·
 bitnum gebunden ·
 biþzum beþnunzen ·
 ær me lape onlag ·
 þurh leolhtne had ·
 gamelú to geoce ·
 zife unrcýnde · 2500
 mægen-cýningz ámaet ·
 7 on gemýnb bezeat ·
 toþht ontýnde ·
 tidum zenýmbe ·
 bán-coþan onþand ·
 þneort-locan onþand ·
 leoðu-eræft onleac ·
 þæf ic lurzú þneac ·
 pillum in þonlde ·
 ic þæf pulþner tneopeþ · 2510
 oþt naleþ æne ·
 hæfþe in gemýnb ·

ær ic þæt þunþon ·
 onþriþen hæfþe ·
 ýmb þone beoþhtan beam ·
 rra ic on bocum þand ·
 þýnþa ganzú ·
 on geþritú cýðan ·
 be ðam rize-beacne ·
 a þæf ræc oððæt · 2520
 cnýrred cean-pelmum ·
H · þnurende ·
 þeah he in meoðo-healle ·
 maðmar þege ·
 æpleþe zolþ ·
H · znornode ·
F · zereþa ·
 nearn forze þneah ·
 enge nune ·
 þær him **M** · forþe · 2530
 mil paðar maet ·
 moþiz þnæzþe ·
 þinum zeþlenceþ ·
F · 7r geþriðþad ·
 zomen æfter gearnum ·
 zeozoð 7r zecýrþeþ ·
 alb onmebla ·
D · þæf geara ·
 zeozoð-haþer glæm ·
 nu rýnt gear-bazar · 2540
 æfter þýrre-meance ·
 forð zeþitene ·
 lif-þýnne zelþen ·
 rra **F** · toghþeð ·
 flodaþ zefýrþe ·

the Gospel of St. Matthew belonging to the 7th century, to be continued every Wednesday." (p.lxviii). That was in 1831. By 1839 his proficiency was such that he felt able to advise editors: "We immediately got on to the subject of his [Professor Leo's] Anglo-Saxon Lesebuch, when he quite agreed to my suggestions as to certain passages." (p.lxxiv).

If we accept Stephens's attribution of these notes to Cleasby, which on the evidence of the handwriting I think we must do, and the pencilled date 1837 as the year in which the notes were made, the next step is to probe the significance of the date. The heading to the first page of notes, 3r in my pagination, "Appendix B to Mr. Cooper's Report", gives us the information we need. Appendix B was the work of Benjamin Thorpe, appended to *Mr. Cooper's Report on Rymer's Foedera*. It was printed in London in 1836, but not published until 1869. Copies were not readily available between these dates, and Jacob Grimm complained, in July 1840, that John Kemble failed to get one for him. Interestingly, Grimm's complaint confirms that Cleasby already had this text: "Lappenburg and Cleasby also acted very stealthily with their copies",¹⁵ and the date on Cleasby's notes indicates that a copy was in his possession shortly after the date of printing. It is possible that Thorpe sent it to him, but since he was in London for a fortnight in the late autumn of 1837, back in Munich on 5th December, it is at least a pleasing speculation that he left London with Appendix B under his arm, and that the date on his notes "Dec. 1837" reflects his immediate absorption in it.

Appendix B contains a number of Old English texts transcribed from manuscripts in foreign libraries, though the text of the Vercelli poems is from a copy of the manuscript by Dr Maier, not from the original.¹⁶ The order of the texts printed in Appendix B which relate to Cleasby's selection is as follows:

- (i) Poenitentialis Ecgberti Archiepiscopi Eboracensis, Liber IVtus. [pp.13-35]
- (ii) Glossarium Latino Anglo-Saxonicum, E Cod. Brux. [pp.36-43]
- (iii) From the Anglo-Saxon Psalter in the Royal Library at Paris. [pp.45-46]
- (iv) The Legend of St. Andrew, E Cod. Vercell. [pp.47-89]
- (v) The Fates of the Twelve Apostles, A Fragment, E Cod. Vercell. [pp.90-92]
- (vi) The Departed Soul's Address to the Body; E Cod. Vercell. [pp.93-97]
- (vii) A Fragment, Moral and Religious; E Cod. Vercell. [pp.98-99]
- (viii) The Holy Rood, A Dream; E Cod. Vercell. [pp.100-104]
- (ix) The Invention of the Cross. E Cod. Vercell. [pp.105-138]

- (x) Anglo-Saxon Gloss to Prudentius, From A MS.
At Boulogne. [pp.139 ff.]

Cleasby makes notes on item (i), ignores the next two items, and then makes notes on all the poems¹⁷ from the *Vercelli Codex*. Appendix B, apparently on Thorpe's personal decision, includes all the poems from the *Vercelli* manuscript but none of the prose, and Cleasby makes no comment that shows he knew about the other contents of the manuscript. He probably knew more than his notes indicate, for the excitement of the entire world of Germanic scholarship was centered in that decade on the discovery of this manuscript, and two of Cleasby's close friends were working on it at roughly the same time that he was. Jacob Grimm produced his *Andreas und Elene* in 1840, and based this edition, as Cleasby did his notes, on the printed text in Appendix B.¹⁸ John Kemble edited and translated all the poems of the *Vercelli Codex*, also using the Appendix B text, but basing his work partly on Grimm's. He published Part I of his material in 1843, Part II in 1856,¹⁹ but earlier than this, in his 1840 article "On Anglo-Saxon Runes", he had commented on the runic section of *Elene* and provided a translation of the relevant passage.²⁰ The bibliography for the *Vercelli Codex* listed in the appropriate volume of *The Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records*²¹ suggests several points of interest. Apart from the largely unannotated text of Appendix B itself no publication on the *Vercelli* material antedates Cleasby's notes. Indeed apart from two fairly minor contributions²² nothing except the work of Grimm and Kemble was to appear in Cleasby's lifetime. Grimm confines his work to two poems. Kemble, apart from fairly brief comment on the runes, is largely content to translate, not discussing any of the real problems of the material. In this absence of detailed critical comment, Cleasby's contribution acquires a greater interest.

There is no other date on Cleasby's notes than "Dec. 1837" but they were not all made at exactly the same time. Bound within the main pamphlet are some pages of a smaller format. These include a separate set of notes on *Andreas* plus one complete page listing occurrences of geniðla in *Andreas* and *Elene*. He adds to his collection of compounds one from *Judith*, citing Thorpe's *Analecta*²³ as his source. Six of these smaller pages are virtually blank, though one contains at the bottom the faint and plaintive pencil query, "wheres the þing gehegan with Grendel in Beow?" A seventh of these pages contains a pencilled set of examples of "on with accusative", all drawn from the *Vercelli* poems.

Throughout the text there are marginal notes in red ink and it seems likely that these were added on a single occasion of comparison and cross-reference. If Cleasby really had no knowledge of Icelandic before November 1839 when he started reading Sæmund's *Edda* this must be the earliest date at which he could have added his red ink annotation to his comments on *Andreas* 3329 [1665b]²⁴ geohðo mænað: "it is the icelandic geð = animus indoles Vafthrudn l(ine) 76".²⁵ He makes the point again more briefly at *Elene* 644 [322a] gehðum geomre "Icel:^c geð". Another red marginal annotation draws attention to an Old Saxon parallel quoting an example from the *Heliand*.

The references to Icelandic are in the marginalia only, but in the main body of his text Cleasby draws attention to forms or usages in Gothic, Old Frisian, Old Saxon or to Swedish, or to contemporary German dialects. For the Gothic he may simply quote the word, but more often gives a precise textual reference to *Ulfilas*. He frequently clarifies his notes by giving Latin as well as modern English equivalents. He knew a fair range of other Old English texts, referring occasionally to Thorpe's *Analecta*, regularly to *Beowulf* where he is using Kemble's first edition,²⁶ but he does not hesitate to disagree with Kemble. At *Elene* 1988 [991b] on gad in burgum he comments "Gad = lack . . . see *Beow*: 1314 [660b], 1892 [949b] where K translates erroneously 'goad'". Less frequently he refers to the *Cædmonian* poems, and I suppose his text here to be Thorpe's *Cædmon's Metrical Paraphrase of Parts of the Holy Scriptures, in Anglo-Saxon*, published in 1832. His dictionary is Lye's *Dictionarium Saxonico- et Gothico-Latinum* of 1772, and perhaps the most regularly repeated phrase throughout his notes is "not in Lye".

A second item in the corpus of unpublished Cleasby material has been drawn to my attention by Professor F.C. Robinson, who has also most generously furnished me with his own notes on the contents. The following description is based on these notes. The manuscript, now in Cornell University, *Beowulf* MSS E5 is *Richard Cleasby's Notes on Beowulf*, apparently in a slightly larger format than the notes on the Vercelli Codex and much shorter. The initial inscription is closely parallel to the one on the cover of the Vercelli notes: "Richard Cleasby died Oct. 6 1847. Sold as waste paper in Cheaping Haven, March 1875 and given to me - George Stephens." A second inscription explains the divergent locations of these two sets of notes: "Given to me by George Stephens in summer of 1895 in Copenhagen shortly before his death. J.M. Hart". In the *Beowulf* notes we find Cleasby struggling to make sense of the Finnsburh episode and worrying about the identity of the eotenas, not to mention the precise status of Hengest. For line 1137 he translates wrecca as "wanderer" and comments: "Properly the Exile we don't know what bro't Hengest to Friesland". Cleasby anticipates Grundtvig and others in some of his emendations. At 1107 he translates, "the funeral pile was laid and heavy gold brought" and comments, "I read here ad for að", thus being the first to suggest a reading which most editors have chosen to adopt. On the other hand his suggestion that in line 1118 we should read guðrec astah for guðrinc astah, and translate, "the hostile smoke ascended", a suggestion to be put forward again by other philologists, is not one that has found favour with recent editors. But the degree of thought and expertise that has gone into the making of these notes is evident enough.

I offer below an edited version of Cleasby's notes on all the shorter Vercelli poems, on the Epilogue to *Elene* and on the *Pseudo-Ecgbert Penitential*. I omit *Andreas* and most of *Elene* partly for reasons of space, partly because for these two we have the early work of Jacob Grimm, but I include the last section of *Elene* because it is possible that Cleasby should have the credit (disputed in a friendly way between Grimm and Kemble) of first thinking through

Appendix B to Mr. Cooper's Report

Penitentialia Egberti Archiepiscopi Eboracensis. Liber quartus

- Pa 16
art. 1) hwaetunga - hwaetung signifies "divi-
natio"
- 17) ^{art. 3} } Jif hwa bread etc oððe stypfig fleasc. "bread"
is not in life, but probably signifies something
gone into corruption - stypfig fleasc is "flesh of
a dead animal dying a natural death." of this
singular that the A. Saxons do not seem to
have adopted the word "bread" so universal
in the other german tongues shows an use in
English they seem to have been satisfied with
"leaf" both for leaf & bread.)
- 22) ^{art. 11} } his gastlican cunendran - do not find this
word in Lye. from the context think it must
mean "relative" i.e. his spiritual relatives
= god-father or god-sister. (This singular
that this word "godi" still exists in the North German
dialects - "godin" signifies the female sponsor
either at Baptism or confirmation). -
- 23) ^{art. 2} } feah he geþwes sigie - þane aiges inigan =
"to marry?"
- 24) ^{art. 6} } in craete faran - craete is our "cart".
- 25) ^{art. 7} } hweal hurguon = aliquantum. Originally
written "hweal hurgu"
- 24) ^{art. 4} } ac hy kyfad þa, that is, they allowed her to
fel to secon - the mode of the fell. & is so
skin, horns & of the dead
animals (but have died a natural death),
but do not even allow their skins to be eat
of the flesh.
- 25) ^{art. 8} } weahte - a break? out "aus-schlag" -
in werce - is probably an ^{inward} swelling, or
humor or perhaps suffer, in gen. I Swedish
verb "werk" signifies pain.
- 25) ^{art. 7} } feah þe forþeo - I find no word for weas in
Lye. nor can I see as to the sense here can
it mean "be weak, infirm"?
- 26) ^{art. 2} } his out. seems to be a sort of complaint of the
formas one's contract, as "wage" - so that þe
þeo weas to underþan if a person that
promised his child to a convent, if it is neef-
þary he may redeem it, like other cattle? "
- 28) ^{art. 6} } Jif badling and boedlinge hœma - Lye
has "badling" - homo delicatus - but think it
must have had a more proper signification?
- 31) ^{art. 4} } on wealan - I cannot make this out, we-
"la" signifies humiditas liquor - can it mean
"in a wet, moist state"? - or word about think
it had to be "moat" corruption, without follow.

the significance of the runes.²⁷ I include his notes on the *Penitential* merely because I find them amusing.²⁸

CLEASBY'S NOTES

3r

Appendix B to Mr. Cooper's Report

Penitentialis Ecgberti Archiepiscopi Eboracensis. Liber quartus.

page 16, article 4

hwatunga: hwatung signifies *divinatio*.

page 17, article 3

Gyf hwa brod ete oððe styrfig flæsc: brod is not in Lye but probably signifies something gone into corruption. Styrfig flæsc is "flesh of a dead animal dying a natural death". It is singular that the Anglo-Saxons do not seem to have adopted the word "bread" so universal in the other German tongues and now in use in English. They seem to have been satisfied with hlaf both for "loaf" and "bread".

page 22, article 4

his gastlican cumendran: I do not find this word [cumendran] in Lye. From the context I think it must mean "relatives" i.e. "his spiritual relatives" as godfather or godmother etc. (It is singular that this word god still exists in the south German dialects - godn signifies the female sponsor either at baptism or confirmation.)

page 23, article 2

beah he gesynsigie: same as gesinigan, "to marry"?

page 23, article 6

in cræte faran: cræte is our "cart".

article 7

hwat hwugon: *aliquantum*. It is generally written hwæt hugu.

page 24, article 4

ac hy lyfað þa fel to sceon: that is they allow shoes to be made of the fell, and use skin, horns etc. of the dead animals (which have died a natural death), but do not even allow their swine to eat of the flesh.

article 8

utsihðe: "a breaking out", *aus-schlag*.

inwerce: is probably an inward swelling or tumor or perhaps suffering in general. In Swedish *wærk* signifies "pain".

page 25, article 7

beah heo forbeo: I find no word forwesan in Lye, nor am I certain as to the sense here. Can it mean "be weak, infirm"?

page 26, article 2

This article seems to be a sort of completion of the former one embracing its reverse so that I suppose we are to understand "if a person has promised his child to a convent, if it is necessary he may redeem it, like other cattle"?

page 28, article 6

Gyf bædling mid bædling hæme: Lye has bædling, *homo delicatus* but I think it must here have a more pregnant signification.

page 31, article 4

on wætan: I cannot make this out: wæta signifies *humiditas*, "liquor". Can it mean "in a wet, moist state"? One would almost think it should be mæte corresponding with what follows.

3v

page 32, article 10

liðe: this seems here to mean "spirituous liquor"; "beer" being mentioned just before. Lye has lið, *poculum*, but it perhaps signifies the "liquor" in the *poculum*. The word still exists in the southern dialect, the *Leuthaus* at Berchtesgaden. See also lides anbitan, "to taste of drink, fermented liquor" *Heliand*, page 4, 12.

page 34, article 2

swefn-hrace: "interpretation of dreams": the "h" is unusual in hrace. The verb is reccan, reccean "narrate".

page 34, article 8

VII siðon: for siðum, ie seven years.

page 34, article 10

Ðreo æ festenne: ie great or legal fasts, but in the explanation four appear to be mentioned; 40 days before Easter (Lent); 40 nights (days) before the nativity (Advent); and ofer pentecosten þær bið 50 nihta. and ofer eastron thonne 40. What are these 2 last periods?

17r

The fates of the twelve Apostles

a Fragment.

E cod. Vercell:

v.19 [10a]

þær: *idem quod hwær*, so *der* in Swedish signifies both "there" and "where".

- v.35 [18a]
ne preodode he: preodan (preodian) in *Lye cogitare, deliberare*;
 here it means he did not hesitate on account of any king's power,
 but went forward in his work.
- v.40 [20b]
leoht unhwilen: "permanent unchanging light" ie eternal, = the
 other world; see *Legend of St Andrew* v.2307 [1154a] and *Invention*
of the Cross v.2469 [1231a].
- v.42 [21b]
heriges bryhtme [rectius, byrhtme]: see *Legend of St Andrew* v.1736
 [867a] "in the crash" or "rush"?
- v.63 [32a]
siðe gesohte: siðe = postea.
- v.83 [42a]
weard: for wearð.
- 17v
- v.86 [43b]
aldre gelæððe: I think this gelæððe must be the same verb as
lædan; "he led his life to" ie he went, betook himself to the
 Jews. (Lye has læððan = odisse). [Cleasby has read *Indeum* as
Iudeum]
- v.98 [49b]
þoñ þæs leasan godu: "than the gods of the wicked one" ie *Astria*s.
 There is something very *naïf* in these old Christian writers making
 the heathen gods neuter - hence the plural termination in "u".
- v.107 [54a]
collen-ferð: *audax*, "lofty-minded" as supposed by Thorpe, *Analecta*,
 page 135, v.25, and confirmed in *Beowulf* 3608 [1806a] K[emblem].
- v.117 [59a]
sin: perpetuo.
- v.127 [64a]
Sigelwarum: among the *Æthiopians*.
- v.131 [66a]
 the genitive leofes [rectius, lechtes] geleafan as well as dægs
 in the preceding line, result from or.
- v.143 [72a]
ðurg stenges sweng: "by blows with a stick". Steng is the German
stange "a pole".
- v.169 [85a]
Ðys þa æþelingas Ðys is I suppose for Ðus = "thus".

v.184-190 [92b-95b]

þonne ic sceal langne ham
 eard-wic uncuð
 ana gesece
 læt me on laste
 lic eorþan dæl
 wæl raf wunigean
 weormum to hropre.

gesece v.186 and læt v.187 instead of being first persons singular, present indicative, should be *infinitives* depending on ic sceal v.184 unless something is left out but which the alliteration does not indicate. From v.187

leave behind me
 my body, the earthy part, (or, part of the earth)
 the spoil of death, to dwell
 for the benefit of worms.

[v.83 weard, v.86 gelæððe, v.169 Ðys are errors in Appendix B. The MS readings wearð, gelædde and Ðus agree with Cleasby's conjectures. V.186 gesece and 187 læt are manuscript errors, emended *ASPR* II, 53, to the infinitive forms as Cleasby rightly suggested. A comparison with Kemble's text and translation is interesting. Kemble keeps Thorpe's weard, gelæððe, Ðys and læt, though silently emending gesece to gesecan. His translation suggests however that he is mentally using an emended text rather than the one he actually prints, making the same conjectural emendations as Cleasby does but not troubling his reader with them. His version of the last four lines can be compared with Cleasby's: "leave behind me / my body, a portion of earth, / my spoils remain / for a possession to the worm". I say "last lines" advisedly for neither Cleasby nor Kemble had access to the last part of this poem containing the runic signature. It was not printed in Thorpe, since a disfiguring blot on the relevant folio prevented an accurate transcript from being made.]

18r

The departed Soul's address to the Body

e Cod. Vercell.

Part 1. The condemned Soul.

v.18 [9b]

geohðum hremig: in possession as it were of its mind, mental qualities? see the *Legend of St. Andrew* v.136 [66b]

v.20 [10b]

sawle findan: the nominative is sawl, is this the dative "with the soul"? The subject is gast, v.11 [*rectius* v.17 ie. the reference to gast in 9a not in 6a]

v.33 [17a]

Hwæt druh ðu dreorega: "what didst thou, thou dreary, sad one?"

- v.34 [17b]
to hwan: this masculine form leads me to think that ende must be understood; *ad quem finem* = "to what end didst thou torment me?", or hwan must be for the dative hwam.
- v.35 [18a]
fulness: = "foulness". "Fullness" would require two ls as in English. See also v.47 [24a].
- v.37 [19a]
lames: lam = our "loam", "earth".
- v.39 [20a]
to hwan pinre sawle ping: to hwan see v.34 above. I suppose pinre sawle ping is not much more than pine sawl.
- v.44 [22b]
hwæt is here interjection, also v.50 [25b]. gyfl: "meal". (æfen-gyfl "evening meal": Lye).
- v.47 [24a]
geodest: is this for ge-eodest? The alliteration speaks for its being so, as it would then alliterate with eorþan in the next line whereas now there is no alliteration. "dum turpis versabatis in omnibus horrendis libidinibus" literally "libidinosus horroribus".
- v.48 [24b]
on eorþan scealt: the infinitive wesan or weorðan is understood, as often also in Old Saxon.
- v.52 & 3 [26b & 27a]
hu þis is þus lang hider / hwæt þe la engel: I do not exactly understand the connexion of the sense here. Does it allude to the present coming of the soul (spirit) to the body to plague it, or an earlier original emanation of the soul from God?
- v.77-82 [39a-41b]
"when thou wert elate from good living and full of wine, thou didst not act nobly and wert thirsty (that is had not partaken of) as regards the body of the Lord and spiritual drink." sæd, v.78 is the German *sat*, *plenus*, *refertus*. In the north of England "sad" is used of things very closely compressed as for instance of hay in the stack.
- v.93 [47a]
næfre þu etc: here is an evident ellipsis. We must understand gif þu hæfdest ge-hoged, "thou wouldst never have" etc.
- 18v
- v.95 [48a]
generedest: generian = *eripere*, *liberare*, *redimere*. This does

not apply here. I think it should be genepredest from genebrian, geneoðrian = *dammare, humiliare*.

v.97 [49a]

minra gesynta: this seems here placed in opposition to binra nieda in the foregoing line: "by reason of the lust of thy desires shalt thou be ashamed on seeing my pure healthy state on the great day etc". gesynto = *sanitas, prosperitas* etc.

v.114 [57b]

hyrsta by readan: this is poetical for reade hyrsta = "red (golden) ornaments". (All these things have no power to (adon) remove thee from thy grave.)

v.117 [59a]

binre bryde-beag: this should doubtless be binre bryde beag "the ring of thy bride": beag is masculine so that binre cannot apply to it.

v.122 [61b]

ban is a neuter plural but bereafod and besliten are not inflected as is very common after this gender.

v.125 [63a]

minum unwillu: "against my wish"? [MS unwillu, noted by Thorpe in Appendix B, emended in text to "unwillum". Cleasby had both readings in front of him.]

v.139-142 [70a-71b]

"the hateful, impious abode which thou, through thy conduct in life hast inflicted upon me."

v.157 [79a]

þær: this should possibly be þæt, though it may perhaps mean "there, on earth" see v.168 [83b].

v.160-161 [80b-81a]

ates tilode: "didst till (labor) for thy food etc. as an ox in the fields".

v.177-180 [90a-91b]

wunda onwrigene etc: does this relate to the wounds inflicted on our Saviour? [there is a pencilled addition here which I cannot read.]

v.187 [95a]

wunde wiper-lean: if this is the substantive wiper-lean = "retribution", I cannot see how it is connected with what precedes. If the verb wiper-leanian = *repondere, retribuere* were used it would give a good sense, taking wunda as accusative singular: lean as a verb signifies *reprehendere, vituperare*; might it in this sense signify "he will reproach the wounds" mentioned v.177?

v.190-1 [*rectius* 191-2; 97ff.]

"there is not then ever so small a joint which grows on a limb, which thou shalt not then separately etc." [A faint pencil addition *Muspili* presumably implies a comparison with the Old High German poem.]

v.203 [103a]

fyrnað þus þæt flæsc-hord: does this mean "so wird sich der Leib entfernen"?

v.215 [109a]

geaglas: *fauces* or *manibula*. This word seems to be written geagl, geafl and ceaf1.

v.217 [110a]

sina beoð asocene: this asocene should doubtless be asolcene from asealcan = *flaccescere*; "the sinews are withered, become flaccid".

v.218 [110b]

swyra = *collum*.

v.222 [113a]

Hitherto he speaks in the singular of the particular person to whom the soul addresses itself (from 208) [105b] but here he speaks in the plural generally: "their tongues (those of persons in the grave in general) are etc."; unless the tongues of the worms are meant: totogenne = *auseinandergezogen*, see v.234 [119a].

v.228 [116a]

gifer hatte se wurm: gifer is an adjective meaning "greedy", *avidus*; what is hatte? (*vocatus*): can it be for hæfde? see gifel v.245 [124b].

v.231 [117b]

se genyðde to me: I cannot understand this; genyðde signifies *coegit*, *nothigte*, "forced".

19r

v.244 [124a]

werede: if a participle it should be wered, lic being neuter; and as an imperfect it should be transitive but it has no accusative; hit as a pronoun reflective is perhaps left out.

v.247 [125b]

þæt mæg etc: wesan I suppose is here left out and to be understood.

Part 2. *The Blessed Soul*.

v.36 [144b]

sealdeþ me wilna geniht: wilna geniht = "enough of what I desired" seems the opposite of wilna gæd or gæd = "lack of what I desire" which often occurs.

- v.49 [151a]
bygdest: "thou bowed thyself" in opposition to the ahofe in the next line.
- v.57 [155a]
æfre: æfre does not here mean "for ever", but "ever" in the sense of "at all" at any time, for a while. [sic]
- v.64 [158b]
syððan brucan: a subject is wanting to brucan, and indeed at least two lines as there is no alliteration between this and the foregoing.
- v.74-5 [163b-164a]
dædum agilpan: "be proud of our deeds, of what we have earned / deserved".

A Fragment

moral and religious

e Cod. Vercell.

- v.29 [16a]
siofa: ie. sefa.
- v.37 [20a]
anleofan: "food", *victus, idem quod leofen* v.2245 [Andreas 1123a]
- v.66 [34b]
getryweð: joins confederates through his power, *mit gewalt*.
 If miltse mid mane could be governed by drefeð in v.63 [33a] = *conturbat*, I should think mægene getryweð meant "he confides in his strength".
- v.67 [35a]
ehteð æfestra: ehtian governs genitive; "he persecutes the pious".
- v.69 [36a]
geneahe: this probably signifies (enough) "abundance" = "prosperity" in contradistinction to nið: (see *Beowulf*, v.1599). [rectius 1559 ie 783a].
- v.71 [37a]
freoð: "loves", *amat*.

19v

- v.77-8 [40]
forþan eallunge / hyht geceoseð: there seems something wanting here as these lines do not alliterate, which makes the sense uncertain down to v.82 [42b].

v.83 [43a]

ham is probably wanting here, which would alliterate with the next line, which is at present not the case.

The holy Rood

a *Dream*

e *Cod: Vercell:*

v.3 [2a]

hæt: I imagine this should be þæt: me gemætte = *es träumte mir* ie "I dreamed".

v.8 [4b]

sillicre treow: sillicre is a comparative neuter: "a more wondrous [sic] tree".

v.15 [8a]

æt foldan sceatum: "over the regions of the earth" = "the earth"? foldan sceatas seems a sort of standard expression for *terra, orbis, (regiones terrae)*. Anglo-Saxon sceat is after the laws of mutation the German *schoos* "lap", "bosom" etc. [marginal addition] see v.73 & 85 [37a and 43a].

v.16-17 [8b-9a]

Swylce þær fife wæron / uppe on þam eaxle gespanne: are these five gems which were up on a sort of bracelet or chain on the shoulder? Gespannan signifies *jungere*; gespann may I think either signify "a yoke" eg. of oxen etc. or a row* of anything, beads, gems, joined together into an armlet, necklace etc. Eaxle-gespann if written in one word and with a different context might perhaps mean a companion "comrade" like eaxl-gesteald (*rectius: gestealla*) in *Beowulf*.

* as it clearly does v.2274 [*Elene* 1134a]

v.18-24 [9b-12b]

Is engel v.18 for engelas agreeing with ealle, nominative plural, or is engel accusative singular to beheoldon and ealle the nominative, which ealle is then repeated in an expletive manner by verses 22, 23 and 24? v.19 fægere þurh forð-gesceaft = "fair by reason of their future condition"? fægere is plural. v.20 "nor was there any gallows of a malefactor". v.21: to what does hine belong? Is it the "tree" of v.11 [6a] or the "angel" of v.18 [9b]?

20r

v.43 [22a]

bleom: bleoh = *color*; also *Invention of the Cross* v.1520 [758b].

v.61 [31a]

wæfer-syne: = *spectaculum*.

v.93 [47a]

opene inwid-hlemmas: hlem = *sonus, fragor*. It occurs in *Beowulf* (hlemmum) v.4397 [2201a]; also in the *Codex Exoniensis* apparently in the same sense and from hlimman = *sonare*: but here it must I think have some other signification, or something must be left out; indeed the alliteration of inwid with ic in the next line is not very sufficient. (According to Kemble in the glossary to *Beowulf* hilde-hlemma = *fragor belli*, may be also taken personally as *heros*. A personal signification would in our case be very desirable.) Is the alliterating letter (*alliterans principalis*) in the second line (94) the æ in n(e) ænigum, or is it possibly the i in ic which alliterates with o and i in line 93? I think not the latter.

[marginal addition] Can hlem mean "a blow"?

v.107 [54a]

scirne sciman: = "bright with rays": scirne, accusative agreeing with hræw.

v.118 [59b]

þam secgum: to the men who took our Saviour down from the cross.

v.119 [60a]

eadmod elne micle: This is a curious combination: eadmod = *humilis* and elen or ellen = *fortitudo*, "valour", "courage"; but it must here mean "intenseness of feeling" or the like; see also v.242 [123a] where it seems to have the same signification in connexion with prayer: micle is one of those remains of an ablative which we sometimes meet with, as sine; Cædmon: pa. 53, 1.

v.123 [62a]

steame bedrifenne: bedrifan = "to drive" "pursue" etc. I think it must be an error for bedripenne: driopan, dripan signifies "to drip" = *stillare*, and the signification is wetted = dripping with (steam = vapour) perspiration as it were "reeking sweat" from the labour of taking him down, see v.137 [69a].

v.139 [70a]

reotende: "weeping" (O.H.Ger. *riozan*), see *Legend of St Andrew* v.3421 [1712b]. In this verse the plural we is used which must therefore allude to the three crosses of our Saviour and the two malefactors.

v.138 [69b]

reste he þær mæte weorode: I cannot make out what is the meaning of mæte weorode. It occurs again v.245 [124a]. Mæte signifies *mediocris* and weorod = "a host, company, troop". Can it mean "with a moderate company, number of persons"? But then it should be mætum unless this is another remain of an ablative, see above v.119. V.245 the person is "alone" = ana to whom it applies. Can mæte be a sort of adverb signifying *privatus, sine* or the like?

v.140 [70b; marginal addition]

something wanting in this line, because there should always be at

least two syllables after the alliterating one; or else two or more lines are left out.

v.150 [75b]

after speaking in the plural from v.139, the cross in this verse speaks again in the singular.

v.179 [91a]

ofer holm-wudu: holm in Anglo-Saxon signifies "the sea", in Old Saxon it signifies "a mountain". Can the meaning here be "above (all) mountain wood or trees"? Sea-wood does not seem to apply. [Marginal addition] See *Beowulf* v.2841 [1421a].

20v

v.248 [125b]

feala ealra gebad / langung hwila: is it feala langung gebad ealra hwila "much longing attended every delay"?

v.258 [130b]

min mundbyrd is / geriht to bare rode: ie "I look for protection to the cross - as regards a protector I am turned (my direction is) to the cross or rood".

v.262 [132b]

heoron: should this be heonon for heonan?

22r

The invention of the Cross

e cod: vercell:

The middle age term *inventio Crucis* is the cause of this title. It is in fact the "finding" or discovery of the cross; if one could not attribute the title to the above cause it would be a very equivocal one!

[22r-26r contain detailed notes on *Elene* 1-1235]

26v

The affair of the finding of the cross terminates with verse 2478 [1235] and *Finit* is placed at the bottom, but in the succeeding chapter or canto, the author gives a sort of epilogue, speaking in and of his own person, and seems, in order to acquaint the reader with his name, to have inserted promiscuously the letters of the same in Runes; we have in

The affair of the find of the Cross terminates with verse 2478 & 'Eint' is placed at the bottom, under the second of the two, the author gives a sort of epilogue speaking in & of his own person, & some, in order to acquaint the reader with his name, to have inserted promiscuously by the letters of the same in runes, - we have in v. 2522. D. v. 2526. H. v. 2527. F. v. 2530. M. v. 2534. N. v. 2538. O. v. 2544. P. v. 2548. F.

c n e u l f

the first part of the chapter down to 2491 is obscure & in an affected style. Runes chiefly in line-rhyme of which another specimen occurs f. v. 2501 c. 2508

v. 2480 *þat þæne hus* - does this mean his own body - deceitful - not yet possessed of the truth?

2482 *3 wundrum lœs*

2484 *reddose* - should this perhaps be recorded as *spoke* - *redraun* - signifies to reddow, thank.

2488 - is there a slip here - what f. 2489 c. 2491 signify "through glorious might or power, in the thought of my mind I discovered, because acquainted with wisdom"?

2494 *geuæter* - tormented - i.e. bewitched. See f. v. 2721.

2497. *onlag* - from *onlagan* - existere.

2503 *tohtle* - is this here a substant? - light - bright. *nepi?*

2504 *tidum gerymde* - *geryma* - signifies dilatare - can this mean an extent of the limits of time as it were carrying his views into futurity

v. 2505 *þan ofan onband* - how doeth he apply to a living person? - surely the next line, *þat þan erin* in a moral sense is not intelligible.

2508 *breac* - part of *brœaw* - fruit - construed as usual with the gen.

2517 *soyda ganga* - is this as it were in the course of words - i.e. in words - word for word? or is *soyd* - *futu* - *geschick*?

2520 - a full slip seems to precede this, & runs past to begin, but the sense of which is again vocal for the circumstance of four not understood. What the rune *D* signifies, it's name in the rune alphabet, is *caer* of a *c* is accepted by the dilatorate - but what does *caer* mean? W. Grimm has conjectured *Kien* - the ruin of the pine - but this does not seem to apply here; - the context would lead one to suppose that the name of some person was denoted by this rune; moreover a finite verb is wanted. It should perhaps be *caer*; if *pranting*, by *caer* is not perhaps *caer* of *caer* - *caer* - *caer* to *caer* - *caer*.

v.2522 [1257b]	v.2526 [1259b]	v.2527 [1260a]	v.2530 [1261b]	v.2534 [1263b]	v.2538 [1265b]	v.2544 [1268b]	v.2546 [1269b]
h	h	f	M	P	n	r	F
c	y	n	e	w	u	l	f

the first part of the chapter down to 2491 [1242a] is obscure and in an affected style, and seems chiefly in line-rhyme of which another specimen occurs from v.2501-2508 [1247a-1250b].

v.2480 [1236b]

pæt fæcne hus: Does this mean his own body - deceitful - not yet possessed of the truth?

v.2482 [1237b]

wundrum læs: [blank space left for comment.]

v.2484 [1238b]

reodode: Should this perhaps be reordode = "spoke"? Reodian signifies "to redden", "plush".

v.2488 [1240b]

Is there a stop here, so that from 2489-2491 [1241a-1242a] signify "through glorious might or power, in the thought of my mind I discovered, became acquainted with wisdom"?

v.2494 [1243b]

gewæled: = "tormented" cf. bewæled, *Legend of St. Andrew* v.2721 [1361a].

v.2497 [1245a]

onlag: from onlegan = *excitare*.

v.2503 [1248a]

torht: Is this here a substantive - "light", "brightness"?

v.2504 [1248b]

tidum gerymde: geryman signifies *dilatare*. Can this mean an extension of the limits of time, as it were carrying his views into futurity?

v.2505 [1249a]

ban-cofan onband: How does this apply to a living person? See also the next line, which however in a moral sense is more intelligible.

v.2508 [1250b]

breac: preterite of brucan; *frui*; construed as usual with the genitive.

v.2517 [1255a]

wyrda gangum: Is this, as it were, "in the course of words" ie "in words" - wyrd for word? Or is wyrd "fate", *geschick*?

2526. the Runo **A** called *gi* translated by *ginn*
togen = *bins* is likewise here not applicable
 but the name of a person seems probably concealed
 under it: the person in the post line is called
ead-safard - the name of being called *ead*
 or *nead* "this a complaint in necessity"

slight touch of punishment, these are the
hid-felle men v. 2584. who were oppressed
 on the pile & only got a very bearable warning,
 the 2^d division (the whole race are divided into
 three portions) the *win-falle* men v. 2596 but not
 so, like beyond forgiveness, are in the middle
 of the pile & get a good scolding; but as appears
 from v. 2608 & 2609. are punished by the fire of
 hell, & really see God; the third division, are the
 dreadfully wicked, for whom there is no for-
 giveness, they are from the fire cast down
 into the depth of hell v. 2604 & 6

where the two
 first divisions
 are made in
 of which the
 the third is
 created of

2529. *enge* = *runo*

2530 the runo **M** is called *ahi* = a horse, which ap-
 pears decided to be its signification here.

2534. the runo **P** is called *wien* = hope, which
 it seems here could refer to signification.

2578 = the subj. to this line is no doubt *dryfken*
 which must be cut down for v. 2585 - per-
 haps *he* is left out.

2538. the runo **D** is called *ies* (translated as *faen*
oets) but which does not appear its signification
 here, nor do I know what it is

2582 on *widam feore* - does this mean 'during
 along life' - or 'during or through great
 dist. of time' - or 'the *feore* akin to *feor*
 "far" - or to *feorh* = life?

2541 *fyrst* = *meare* - the marked or allotted period.

2583 *ofer hidne grund* = over the wide earth.

2544. the runo **P** is called *logu* - signifies 'the
 sea, water' which is no doubt its meaning here.

2600 in *hatne ~~gama~~ ^{wyrm}* - this accus. is for *gomenode*
 v. 2607 - "strangled into the hot ~~at~~ ^{at} *gwaln*."

2546 the runo **F** is called *feoh* = *feow* = *pecunia* &
 has that signification here.

2617 - *toorn goddclan* - may here either be nom. plur.
 (for *goddclan*) = "the wrathful enemies" - or it may be
 dat. sing. = "with enraged hate".

2552 *iged* - no doubt for *ge godd* = *geod*.

2648. to *widam feore* - see above v. 2582 - it would almost
 appear that its signification above men **P** was here
 meant.

2557 in *med. cleofan* - in his cave, or rock below -
 this almost fits our mind of the ancient
 Colus in his cave

2564 *leorn* = *leg* - as it were *accusatory* or *blaming* or
punish[ing] *find* "embraces all who are born
 in the world when the dead sits in judgment on the
 last day - so that the belief of this world was
 that not even the good go to heaven without

v.2520 [1257b]

A full stop seems to precede this, and a new passage to begin, but the sense of which is equivocal from the circumstance of our not understanding what the rune }l * signifies; its name in the rune alphabets is cen and a c is necessary to the alliteration, but what does cen mean? W. Grimm has conjectured *kien* "the resin of the pine" but this does not seem to apply here. The context would lead one to suppose that the name of some person was denoted by this rune. Moreover a finite verb is wanting . . . or was is wanting to cnyssed or to drusende.

* [pencilled addition] In Icelandic kæn [*rectius* kaun] = "wound", *vulnus*. Would this apply?

27r

v.2526 [1259b]

The Rune h called yr and translated by W. Grimm *bogen*, "bow", is likewise here not applicable but the name of a person seems probably concealed under it; which person in the next line is called nead-gefera, the rune F being called nead or neod, thus "a companion in necessity". [pencilled addition] Yr in Icelandic is "small fine rain". Would this apply?

v.2529 [1261a]

enge rune: What does rune here convey - *consilium*?

v.2530 [1261b]

The rune M is called eh "a horse", which appears decidedly to be its signification here.

v.2534 [1263b]

The rune P is called wen "hope", which it seems here doubtless to signify.

v.2538 [1265b]

The rune D is called ur and translated "ox" (aurochs) but which does not appear its signification here, nor do I know what is.

v.2541 [1267a]

fyrst-mearce: "the marked or allotted period".

v.2544 [1268b]

The rune P is called lagu and signifies "the sea", "water", which is no doubt its meaning here.

v.2546 [1269b]

The rune F is called feoh = *pecus*, *pecunia* and has that signification here.

v.2552 [1272b]

igeð: no doubt for ge-gæð "goes".

v.2557 [1275a]

in ned-cleofan: "in his cave or rock below". This almost puts one in mind of the ancient Eolus in *his* cave.

v.2564 [1279b]

tion-leg: as it were "accusatory" or "blaming" or "punishing" fire embraces all who are born in the world when the Lord sits in judgement on the last day - so that the belief of this writer was that not even the good got to heaven without a slight touch of purgatory, and these are the soðfaste mentioned v.2584 [1289b] who were uppermost on the pile and only got a very bearable warming. The second division (the whole race are divided into three portions) the sinful, mentioned v.2596 [1295b], but not so as to be beyond forgiveness, are in the middle of the pile and get a good scorching, but as appears from v.*2618 *et seqq.* [1306b] are purified by the fire and finally see God. The third division are the dreadfully wicked, for whom there is no forgiveness, and they are from the fire cast down into the depth of hell v.2604 etc. [1299b].

* here the two first divisions are mentioned in opposition to the third last treated of.

v.2578 [1286b]

The subject to this line is no doubt dryhten which must be brought down from v.2565 [1280a]. Perhaps he is left out.

v.2582 [1288b]

on widan feore: Does this mean "during a long life" or "during or through great distance of time". Is the feore akin to feor = "far" or to feorh = "life"?

v.2583 [1289a]

ofer sidne grund: "over the wide earth".

v.2600 [1297b]

in hatne wylm: This accusative is from gemengde v.2597 [1296a] "mingled into the hot qualm".

v.2617 [1306a]

torn-geniðlan: may here either be nominative plural (from geniðla) = "the wrathful enemies" or it may be dative singular "with enraged hate".

v.2648 [1321b]

to widan feore: see above v.2582 [1288b]. It would almost appear the second signification above mentioned was here meant.

[Cleasby notes above difficulties that Kemble glosses over in his *Archaeologia* article, particularly the difficulty of finding an acceptable translation for three of the runes. Cleasby anticipates Sisam²⁹ in thinking that these runes cannot carry the function of an ordinary word in the sentence, but must be used instead of a name.

Sisam takes his argument a stage further, suggesting that they stood for the name of the poet himself, but Sisam of course is presenting a fully thought out case, Cleasby merely asking questions of the material in a document not designed for publication. Cleasby's references to Grimm in the runic material are to Wilhelm Grimm's *Ueber Deutsche Runen*, published in 1821.]

NOTES

- 1 *An Icelandic-English Dictionary* based on the MS. collections of the late Richard Cleasby enlarged and completed by Gudbrand Vigfusson, M.A. with an Introduction and Life of Richard Cleasby by George Webbe Dasent, D.C.L., (Oxford, 1874).
- 2 "The Cleasby-Vigfusson Icelandic Dictionary", *The Edinburgh Review or Critical Journal* 140 (1874), 228-58. The *DNB* attributes this article to Henry Reeve. The article itself refers to Reeve's friendship with Cleasby: "By this time [1830] Richard Cleasby was, as may be supposed, a very good German scholar, and here, in company with his friend Henry Reeve, who, with Sir John Lefevre, is almost the last survivor of those who knew him at that early time, he faced German Philosophy in earnest . . ." (p.233).
- 3 Nicholson's paper was printed in pamphlet form, Kendal, 1874.
- 4 Nicholson, p.15.
- 5 *An Icelandic-English Dictionary*, (2nd ed., Oxford, 1957), p.vii.
- 6 Elizabeth Knowles, "Notes on a first edition of 'Cleasby-Vigfússon'", *Saga-Book of the Viking Society for Northern Research*, 20 (1980), 165-78.
- 7 Knowles, p.172.
- 8 Knowles, p.169. Jón Sigurðsson was Vigfússon's co-editor for *Biskupa Sögur* (Copenhagen, 1858-78).
- 9 *An Icelandic-English Dictionary*, 1st ed. p.lxii. All subsequent references to Cleasby when accompanied by page numbers are from Dasent's *Life* in this edition of the dictionary.
- 10 Raymond A. Wiley, *John Mitchell Kemble and Jakob Grimm: a correspondence 1832-1852*, (Leiden, 1971), pp.247 and 234. I should like to thank Miss Mary Barham Johnson for her great kindness in examining her collection of Kemble's letters in the hope of locating further Cleasby references.
- 11 MS Access 2. The entry in the *Katalog over den Arnarnagmænske Håndskriftsamling* reads "Artikler af R. Cleasby's Icelandic-English Dictionary, efter den oprindelig plan". The entry seems to have been suggested by Konráð Gíslason whose letter, in Danish, is preserved inside the first volume of the manuscript: "Dear Friend, 'Articles' - or 'Some Articles' - 'from R. Cleasby's Icelandic-English Dictionary' is probably adequate, when the edition is called (and may be called) '*Cleasby-Vigfússon's Icelandic. English Dictionary*'. One could - 'Superflua non nocent' - add in parenthesis 'according to the original plan'." There is irony here, especially in the subtle variations of underlining. It is salutary to remind ourselves that Konráð Gíslason was Cleasby's first Icelandic teacher in 1839 (p.lxxviii). The slighting references in the published dictionary to Cleasby's Copenhagen helpers roused a good deal of defensive - perhaps justified - anger, see Björn M. Ólsen's Introduction to Konráð Gíslason, *Efterladte Skrifter*, (Copenhagen, 1897), pp.ix-xxii.
- 12 Bodleian MS Icelandic c.8. There are also nine letters written by Cleasby between 1841 and 1844 in the collection of Brynjólfur Pétursson's papers in Landsarkivet for Sjælland (Skiftedokumenter Part I 147 A and B 1850-51).

- ¹³ Knowledge of the second item, Cleasby's *Notes on Beowulf*, see below p.21, I owe entirely to Professor F.C. Robinson of Yale University.
- ¹⁴ I quote Professor Stephens's title as it appears in his corpus of *Runic Monuments*, mainly to demonstrate his habitual and idiosyncratic use of the form *Cheapinghaven*, used in his superscript on both sets of notes by Cleasby. It must be of some significance that the year in which Stephens claims that these notes were sold as waste paper, 1875, is the year after the publication of the dictionary.
- ¹⁵ Wiley, p.205: "auch Lappenberg und Cleasby thaten ganz verstolen mit ihren exemplaren". Marvin C. Dilkey and Heinrich Schneider, "John Mitchell Kemble and the Brothers Grimm", *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 40 (1941), 471.
- ¹⁶ The situation is lucidly and briefly summarised by P.O.E. Gradon in her introduction to *Cynewulf's Elene* (London, 1958), pp.6-9. For detailed comment see N.R. Ker, "C. Maier's Transcript of the Vercelli Book", *Medium Evum* 19 (1950), 17-25.
- ¹⁷ Appendix B and Cleasby use the titles *The Legend of St Andrew* and *The Invention of the Cross*, but ever since the publication of *Andreas und Elene* Grimm's names seem to have been generally adopted. I have kept Cleasby's usage whenever quoting directly, but preferred the shorter and more familiar titles elsewhere.
- ¹⁸ Jacob Grimm, *Andreas und Elene*, (Cassel, 1840). On Grimm's transcription from printed texts see Merrel D. Clubb, "Grimm's Transcript of *Cædmon*", *Philological Quarterly* 44 (1965), 152-72.
- ¹⁹ J.M. Kemble, *The Poetry of the Codex Vercellensis with an English Translation* (London, 1843 and 1856). Part I contains *The Legend of St Andrew*, Part II everything else. Mostly Kemble keeps the Appendix B titles but adapts Grimm's usage in his *Elene or the Recovery of the Cross*, doubtless finding, like Cleasby, the word "invention" too equivocal.
- ²⁰ *Archæologia* 28 (1840), 327-72. His discussion of the *Elene* runes is from p.360.
- ²¹ *The Vercelli Book*, ed. G.P. Krapp, *The Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records II* (subsequently abbreviated *ASPR*) (New York, 1932), pp.lxxxii ff.
- ²² The *ASPR* bibliography includes a "Note on Vercelli and Cardinal Guala" in the 1845 *Quarterly Review* and sections from *Andreas* and *Elene* in Ebeling's *Angelsächsisches Lesebuch* of 1847.
- ²³ Benjamin Thorpe, *Analecta Anglo-Saxonica* (London, 1834).
- ²⁴ Appendix B numbers its text by half-lines, a practice which Cleasby inevitably follows. This makes cross-reference so maddening that I have invariably supplied the line numbers according to modern editions, enclosing them in square brackets.
- ²⁵ I do not know what text Cleasby was using of *Vafþrúðnismál* and other Eddic poems, but the *Íslandica* bibliography indicates a choice of editions.
- ²⁶ J.M. Kemble, *The Anglo-Saxon Poems of Beowulf, The Travellers Song and the Battle of Finnesburh* (London, 1833). Reeve, in the *Edinburgh Review*

article cited note 2 above, says (p.237), "His [Cleasby's] copies of 'Kemble's Beowulf', which are before us as we write, show by the number and searching character of the notes which they contain, how far he had entered into the realms of Teutonic philology . . .".

27 Wiley, pp.199 and 203-4.

28 In the introductory part of this article I have attempted diplomatic presentation of Cleasby's notes, but in the main body of transcription I impose my own system of presentation and punctuation, silently expanding Cleasby's abbreviations. I use square brackets to indicate my own additions and comments.

29 Kenneth Sisam, *Studies in the History of Old English Literature* (Oxford, 1953), pp.21-8.