

On the Text of the Junius Manuscript

Author(s): J. R. Hulbert

Source: *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, Vol. 37, No. 4 (Oct., 1938), pp. 533-536

Published by: [University of Illinois Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27704436>

Accessed: 17/09/2010 07:56

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=illinois>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



University of Illinois Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology*.

ON THE TEXT OF THE JUNIUS MANUSCRIPT

Thirty years ago the late Professor F. A. Blackburn was accustomed in his classes at the University of Chicago to insist on the necessity in editions of early English texts of keeping the manuscript reading if it were in any way possible to do so. He went even so far as to urge that Anglo-Saxon poems should be published without emendations in the text but with record of suggested emendations and any new ones in the notes. In 1907 he published an edition of *Exodus and Daniel* (Belles Lettres Series) in this manner which met with violent disapprobation from at least one reviewer. Later he prepared an edition of *Genesis* of the same character, but because of the objections of the editors of the series for which it was designed, this never appeared. No similar edition of any Old English text has been published since. Yet though his attitude may have been extreme, time has justified his general thesis. This fact appears best in the changes that have been made in the editions of *Beowulf* in recent years. The tendency has been increasingly to restore manuscript readings which had been emended in earlier texts of the poem. It has always seemed inadvisable, however, for a student of Blackburn to urge restoration of manuscript readings, but now that Professor Hoops has published his *Beowulfstudien* (Heidelberg, 1932), perhaps one may venture to do so. In it, Hoops has argued that still more manuscript readings should be restored, holding that emendation should not be made for the sake of metre alone, that forms which are true of the language at about 1000 when the manuscript was written should be retained and that only undoubted errors should be corrected.

Clearly the text of all of the main Old English poems should be studied in this way. Chiefly because of a long interest in the so-called Cadmonian poems, I have been scanning the edition of the late Professor G. P. Krapp (*The Junius Manuscript*, New York, 1931). Admirable as this edition is, any careful reading of part of it shows that it contains many unnecessary emendations, even alterations of kinds no longer made in Chambers' and Klaeber's editions of *Beowulf*. In discussing the matter, I shall present first certain classes of alterations which fall within categories laid down by Hoops as objectionable.

Before doing so, however, it may be of interest to note the

fact that some readings of the Beowulf manuscript which Hoops would retain are not paralleled in the Junius manuscript. These are assimilations of a final *n* to *m* before a labial beginning the next word, and the use of *se þe* instead of *seo þe*. Other variations from normal Anglo-Saxon are less frequent in Junius than in the *Beowulf* manuscript. These include: *ea* for *eo*, *Genesis* 2038, 2369; *eo* for *ea*, *Daniel* 9, 266; *æ* for *e* *Gen.* 222, 1398; *dg* for *ðg* (perhaps comparable to *Beowulf* *dl* for *ðl*); *Gen.* 1986.¹ Hoops notes the disappearance of *d* from the combination *ndr* and of *g* from *ngd*. Similar omissions of medial consonants in three-consonant groups are in *Gen.* 610, 1579 (both corrected by the scribe or a reviser), 1011, 1492, 2774, *Christ and Satan* 42, 85. In two instances, also, the second consonant is omitted when the third consonant begins a new word: *Gen.* 1148, *Dan.* 681.

Of all Hoops' classes, those most common in Junius are weakening of vowels in final syllables and alterations (chiefly additions) made for metrical improvement. Vowel weakening appears in *Gen.* 52, 221, 1219, 1428, 1522, 1795, 1853, 2097, 2419, 2662, 2921; *Exodus* 326, 535; *Dan.* 34, 77, 119, 142, 304, 309, 342, *C and S.* 220, 360. Alterations for metre are of two main kinds: those made to normalize a half line as one of the "five types," and those made in order to provide alliteration. Hoops discusses only the first kind. To these belong: *Gen.* 357, 1111-12, 1232, 1515, 1638, the insertion of *folc* in 1718, 2191, 2255, 2290, 2559, 2615, 2629, 2668; *Ex.* 118, 248, 334, 487, 514; *Dan.* 25, 527; *C and S.* 17, 80, 309, 370, 488, 504, 526, *gestod* for *stod* in 528, 552, 638. Though perhaps Hoops would approve of alterations for alliteration, the following list may be of interest: *Gen.* 1022, 1056, 2149, 2416, 2658, 2935; *Ex.* 277, 340, 503; *Dan.* 208, 703; *C and S.* 364, 375, 433, 526, 570, 593.

In a few instances Krapp emends spellings which may represent correct Northumbrian forms: *Gen.* 184, 1191, 1234, 1492, 2439, 2861; *Ex.* 15; *Dan.* 342, *C and S.* 319. In the following his emendations obscure evidence of elision of a final vowel before an initial one: *Gen.* 63, 656, 1957, 2577; *Ex.* 145; *Dan.* 491; *C and S.* 540. In other instances emendations perhaps

¹ To save space, I give merely line numbers. A glance at the foot-notes in Krapp's edition will show what the manuscript reading is. Further, I have made no attempt at absolute completeness in the lists.

obscure evidence of actual phonetic conditions in late Old English. For instance, the scribe's difficulties with double consonants may mean that popular speech did not differentiate between single and double consonants so precisely as it had done. In *Gen.* 503, 506, 1694 a single letter appears instead of a double; in *C and S.* 538 a double instead of a single; and in *Gen.* 1676 a double letter appears in a wrong place. If one should include cases like *Ex.* 168, *C and S.* 29, 502, in which the scribe originally wrote one letter but later a second was added or *C and S.* 90, 208, 641, where erroneous double letters have been corrected (by scribe or reviser) one would have further evidence of this confusion. Similarly there is some indication that *h* in initial *hl*, *hn*, *hr* had already begun to disappear: In *Gen.* 1491 (emended by Krapp), and *C and S.* 498 (not emended by Krapp!) the scribe wrote *hl* and *hr* for *l* and *r*; in *C and S.* the scribe originally omitted *h* in 207, 266, 339, 715, but later it was inserted. Still more striking is the uncertainty concerning initial *hw*. In *Gen.* 959, 2251, *w* is omitted; in *Gen.* 667, it was omitted but added later; in *Ex.* 371, 538 it is omitted; in *Dan.* 107, it was omitted but added later. Conversely in *Ex.* 176 initial *w* is erroneously written *hw*. Another phonetic detail is the appearance of *t* instead of final *d*: *gesetet* (*Gen.* 100), *metot* (*Gen.* 459), *geneawot* (*Gen.* 2604). Since in all those cases the next word begins with a voiced sound, evidently these are instances not of assimilation but of unvoicing of final voiced consonant, evidence of which appears elsewhere. Finally correction of *wordun* to *wordum* (*C and S.* 48) and of *mire* to *minre* (*C and S.* 437—the same error in *C and S.* 249 was corrected scribally) obscures evidence of early changes in the direction of Middle English.

To take up another general practice, one wonders why Krapp changed *ond* to *and* in *Gen.* 625, 1140, 1195 but retained it in 1335. Another inconsistency is evident in his treatment of the manuscript corrections in *Christ and Satan* and the first part of *Genesis*. It would have been best, surely, to follow a definite policy there, either accepting always the original readings unless they were unintelligible (the preferable course) or accepting always the corrections. Probably Krapp meant to discriminate between corrections made by the original scribe and alterations made by the "improver," but the attempt to do so gives too much play to the editor's opinions; and I doubt whether any-

one studying Krapp's text could tell in many cases why he chose the correction instead of the original reading or vice versa.

Finally some notes on particular emendations. In *Gen.* 23 *dæl* should be retained, and *weard* should be emended to *wearð* (with Holthausen and Grein-Kohler). Confusion of *d* and *ð* is common in Old English manuscripts (in this one, *Gen.* 1118, 2758, *Ex.* 113, *Dan.* 615). In *Gen.* 65 *sceop* and *scyreðe*, since it appears in *Fortunes of Men* 95, should be retained though it does not read so easily as *sceof* etc. In *Gen.* 82, it is unnecessary to emend *buan* (presumably a variant of *buen*) to *buað*; the uses of the indicative and optative in Old English are not sharply differentiated (thus Seyfarth is willing to accept *buað*, though it does not agree with the rule: *Der syntakt. Gebrauch des Verbums in . . . Genesis*, p. 23) In *Gen.* 702 it is unnecessary to emend *hire* to *him*, though the changed meaning may be more attractive: Eve certainly did help the devil in deceiving Adam. Similarly in *Gen.* 1307 *þær* need not be changed to *þæt*; it is quite intelligible in the context. In *Gen.* 1447, it is unnecessary to emend *feond*; the raven was unfriendly to the Israelites in not returning to them. Likewise in *Gen.* 1664 *bearn* makes satisfactory sense. In *Gen.* 1693, it seems rather absurd to change *tohlodan* to a verb not actually known to have existed. *Ahred* in *Gen.* 2032, need not be emended to *ahreded* as syncopation is correct there. In *Ex.* 17 since *magoræswum* may be in apposition with *sunum* (18) emendation is inadvisable. In *Dan.* 536 *eft* seems to be as pertinent as *oft*.

J. R. HULBERT

University of Chicago