INTRODUCTION

1. Franciscus Junius (1591-1677): his Life

1.1 Franciscus Junius, or Franyois du Jon, was born on 29 January 1591 at Heidelberg. To distinguish him from his father, also Franciscus Junius (1545–1602), sometimes called ‘the Elder’ and a protestant theologian of considerable distinction, Junius is sometimes called ‘the Younger’. He himself added the letters F.F. (= Francisci Filius) to his name to clarify his identity. In Junius’s first year two events which were to have a profound influence on his life occurred. Later in 1591, after his birth, his mother died, and in 1592 his father took up a professorship at the University of Leiden. Hence, although his grandfather and father were French and the latter had worked primarily in Heidelberg for nearly twenty years before the younger Junius’s birth, he regarded the Netherlands as his homeland.

1.2 Leiden University, founded in 1575, was a centre for the study of the Reformed Religion and attracted many scholars of the Calvinist school. Amongst Junius’s father’s colleagues was Joseph Justus Scaliger (1540–1609), who helped to make Leiden a European centre of philo-

---

1The earliest account of Junius’s career is that by Graevius (1694: sig. +4-2+2). Much detail is given by de Crane (1821; 1835). The best known account is probably that by von Raumer (1870: 107–29), much of which appears in revised form in Hetherington (1980: 222–36). For a brief notice see DNB, s.n. Junius, Francis, and Biografisch Lexikon (1978–: II, 278–79). The account here draws on all of these, but also on more recent work, especially that by Aldrich, Fehl and Fehl (1991: I, xxvi–xlx), and Breuker (1990).

2For Junius’s birth occurring in 1591 rather than, as was formerly thought, 1589, see Kerling (1984: 93), confirmed by Breuker (1990: 46). The date of birth was correctly reported by Graevius (1694: sig. +4), who also gives Junius’s age at death (in 1677) correctly as 86 (sig. 2+1); the error seems to stem from Isaac Vossius, as reported in a postscript attributable to Regnerus Leers (1654–1714), the publisher of Graevius (1694: sig. 2+2); on Leers, see Lankhorst (1983). Cf. Aldrich, Fehl & Fehl (1991: I, xxvi, n.6).

3For some account of whom see Müller (1793–1806: II, 179–256), and, for a brief notice, Hauck (1896–1913: IX, 636–37), and Biografisch Lexikon (1978–: II, 275–78), but the fullest account is by Cuno (1891).
logy. His father's pupils included Hugo Grotius (1583–1645) and Gerardus Joannes Vossius (1577–1649), who married Junius's sister Elisabeth in 1607, and who, as rector of Dordrecht Latin school, became responsible for Junius's education after his father's death of the plague in 1602. At school Junius was taught Latin and Greek grammar and literature, and Christian doctrine. At Leiden University, beginning in 1608, he studied mathematics and theology. See further Rademaker (1998: 5–9).

1.3 While Junius was growing up there was much debate in the Dutch Reformed Church as to its precise articles of faith. In particular a narrow interpretation of the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination was opposed by Jacobus Arminius (1560–1609) who refined his views partly through correspondence with Junius's father (Cuno 1891: 170–80), whom he succeeded in 1602. He was supported by Grotius. On Arminius's death his teaching was formally set out in the Remonstrance of 1610 issued at Gouda. The Remonstrants, as his followers were known, were bitterly opposed by the Contra-Remonstrants (led by Franciscus Gomarus (1563–1644), a colleague of Arminius's at Leiden, and Junius's uncle, his wife, Maria l'Hermite, being the sister of Junius Sr's third wife), who had the support of Prince Maurits of Orange (1567–1625). In this hotbed of religious (and political) controversy in 1617 Junius became minister of the parish of Hillegersberg near Rotterdam. But the dispute soon came to a head at the Synod of Dordrecht (Dort), 1618–19, at which the Contra-Remonstrants won an absolute victory, some 200 Arminian clergy and other dignitaries being deprived or forced to resign, including Junius and Vossius (who, though not a clergyman, was then regent of the College of the States-General, Leiden), and Grotius was sentenced to life imprisonment.

1.4 Junius went to France, and then on to England in 1621 to become librarian to Thomas Howard (1585–1646), Earl of Arundel from 1604 (Cokayne 1910–40: I, 255–57), and tutor to his son. He was based at Arundel House in London. Howard, whose wife Aletheia Talbot was heiress of the Earl of Shrewsbury, was a collector of objets d'art and books on a scale unprecedented in England outside the royal family, so

---

4 The tradition of philology inherited at Leiden reached back to antiquity (cf. Smalley 1952: 329–55) and achieved a high point of sophistication there following the foundation of the university. See also Scheurleer and Posthumus Meyjes (1975).
5 Three years later Vossius became Professor of Rhetoric and Chronology at Leiden. On this period in Junius's life and on Vossius's dismissal, see Rademaker (1998: 12–15).
much so that he was dubbed the ‘Father of Vertu in England’. Under Howard’s auspices Junius compiled his *De Pictura Veterum* (1637), an account, based on classical artists and their works and on ancient rhetoric, of the origin and conception of the visual arts, the conditions appropriate for their promotion, and their aesthetics. The work was designed to enlighten Howard on his expeditions to purchase new acquisitions for his collection, and was the first of a two-part exercise, the second being a *Catalogus Architectorum*, an annotated index of artists and their work, which was not published until after Junius’s death (Junius 1694). An English translation, entitled *The Painting of the Ancients*, appeared in 1638, and a Dutch one, *De Schilder-Konst der Oude*, in 1641. Shortly afterwards, in 1642, the Howards removed to the Netherlands (the earl continuing to Padua) and Junius went with them, being appointed as tutor to the earl of Arundel’s nephew and ward, Aubrey de Vere (1627–1703), Earl of Oxford, for whom he wrote some guiding precepts (in Vossius 1654; see Heesakkers 1998), and whom he served for about six years until he brought him back to England in 1647. Altogether Junius was apparently in the employ of the Howards for some thirty-three years. But, perhaps following the seizure of Arundel Castle by the Roundheads in 1643 and the earl’s death in 1646, Junius seems to have been poorly remunerated, and, following the death of Lady Howard in 1654, there was a court case to resolve the matter against William Howard, Viscount Stafford (1614–80), the Howard’s fifth and (after 1652) only surviving son (whom Junius had earlier, in 1653, had released from prison in Germany where he was held on account of a sexual misdemeanour), in which judgment was given in Junius’s favour in 1660 (Breuker 1990: 68). By 1662 Junius seems to have been living more comfortably (von Raumer 1870: 119).

1.5 From 1642, then, Junius lived in the Netherlands. His interest in the Germanic languages seems to have begun in earnest shortly after this time, c.1645. In March 1646 he was living with his widowed sister Johanna, but in 1647–48 he went to Friesland where he was based for about two years in order to learn Frisian (Graevius 1694; Timmer 1957a; Breuker 1990: 50, 68), and during this period up to 1651 he must have spent substantial periods in England. From 1651 he went to live with his

---


sister Elisabeth, widow of Gerardus Vossius, in Amsterdam and The Hague. The Vossius’s had a large house in Amsterdam on the Oudezijds Achterburgwal, where lived also the Mennonite preacher Cornelis Claeszoon Anslo and his wife Aeltje Gerritsdochter Schouten who were the subject of a famous double portrait by Rembrandt (Brown, Kelch & van Thiel 1991: 59, 222–25, no. 33), but after Vossius’s death in 1649 his widow moved to a house on the Oude Singel, and Junius went to live there too, though not permanently until late summer 1651. She moved with her brother to The Hague in 1655. Through Elisabeth and Gerardus’s son, Isaac Vossius (1618–89), in 1654 Junius obtained the Codex Argenteus, containing Bishop Wulfila’s translation of the gospels into Gothic. From 1663 to 1665 he lived in Dordrecht, convenient no doubt for his collaboration with his erstwhile pupil Thomas Marshall (1621–85) and for the presses producing the edition of the Gothic Gospels. During this period in the Netherlands Junius was a frequent visitor to England, staying in Oxford some eight times up to 1659 (Wood 1813–20: III, col. 1140; 1815–20: II, cols 357–58), when he also visited London. Finally, in 1674/5 Junius returned to England to reside in Oxford, where he was close to Marshall, who had become Rector of Lincoln College. He died in 1677 in the house of his nephew, Isaac Vossius, who was then a canon of Windsor, and was buried in St George’s Chapel. His ‘bookes, writings and printing utensils’ he bequeathed by deed of gift dated 20 July 1677 to Oxford University, where they are still kept (Macray 1890: 145–47; Madan 1895–1931: III, xliii; Philip 1983: 57–58). Amongst them was a portrait of Junius by van Dyck (Howarth 1985: 79, pl. 48; Aldrich, Fehl & Fehl 1991: I, fig. 1; Rogers 1991: pl. 106 on p. 144; Nativel 1996: fig. 10 on p. 77).

9Isaac Vossius was Swedish royal librarian but left Sweden in 1654 (when Queen Christina abdicated) to supervise her library in Antwerp and Brussels. In the upheaval he was allowed to compensate losses from his own library by taking some from the royal library (Rademaker 1981: 346). On Vossius see further DNB, s.n.

2. Junius's Work and the Place of the Cædmon within it

2.1 It was widely believed at the time that all words in the known European languages descended ultimately from Greek, and this belief Junius is reported still to have upheld in 1654 (Breuker 1990: 56). His progress towards becoming as he is now widely regarded 'in many respects the founding father of comparative Germanic philology' (Bremmer 1990: 179) was gradual. Apparently, because of his exposure to both languages, Junius became interested in the similarities and differences between English and Dutch, and went to learn Frisian as a potential key to the historical connection between them. In Friesland he received instruction from Gysbert Japicx (1603–66), 'Friesland's celebrated Renaissance poet' (Bremmer 1990: 179). His approach was evidently historical, as he collected Old Frisian legal texts, which still survive in the collection of Junius manuscripts in Oxford – for example, Bodleian Library MSS Junius 49 (SC 5161), 78 (SC 5189), 109 (SC 5220), 122 (SC 5232*) – and London, Lambeth Palace, MS 783 (Todd 1812: 191; Campbell 1937; Feitsma 1956). His method was to transcribe the texts, make annotations and comments, and to compile word-lists and glossaries with references to the examples in the texts.

2.2 Whether Junius was seriously interested in Anglo-Saxon before his stay in Friesland it is difficult to say on the evidence available. As librarian to the earl of Arundel he had access to his collection of manuscripts, many of which are now in the Arundel collection of the British Library (Young 1829, Forshall 1834). Amongst these at least two manuscripts contained Anglo-Saxon.11 London, British Library, MS Arundel 60 (= Ker 1957: no. 134) includes a Latin Psalter with Anglo-Saxon gloss of s. xi2 (printed by Oess 1910), and MS Arundel 155 (= Ker 1957: no. 135) contains a continuous interlinear gloss of s. xi med. to some Latin prayers and forms of confession (fol. 171–92: some printed by Holthausen 1941).12 These are precisely the kind of manuscripts from which Junius could have first learnt Old English, as he would have been very familiar with the Latin texts. However that may be, his interest must have been sufficiently aroused and well known for 'that prodigy of learning and industry' James Ussher (1581–1656),13 archbishop of Armagh, who in the

---


[12] I have checked both these manuscripts but found no annotations by Junius. Although he sometimes annotated even heavily he did not always do so. In MS Junius 11, for example, he wrote page numbers (which he needed for the Cædmon edition) but nothing else.

first half of the century, collected books for the library of Trinity College, Dublin (O'Sullivan 1956), to give Junius what is now Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Junius 11, containing the so-called 'Cædmonian' biblical poems; this is the manuscript upon which Junius based the edition here reproduced in facsimile. The crucial contact is likely to have been Sir Simonds D'Ewes (1602–1650), the Anglo-Saxon antiquarian (Watson 1966), in whose possession the manuscript was seen by Johannes de Laet (1582–1649), the earlier Dutch scholar (Bekkers 1970), probably during de Laet's visit to London in 1637 (Gollancz 1927: xv; Timmer 1948: 5–8).\(^1\) Junius worked with D'Ewes in 1648/9 (Timmer 1957b: 200; Breuker 1990: 53–54) and assisted him in collating Ælfric's Grammar and Glossary (Hetherington 1980: 107). One of the manuscripts containing this work which Junius worked on was London, British Library, Cotton MS Julius A ii, the Prayer also from which he printed as an Appendix to his text of the 'Cædmon' poems.\(^2\) Junius would have connected these works the more readily by working on them together at the same time. Presumably Ussher obtained what is now MS Junius 11 from D'Ewes before the latter's death in 1650 and gave it to his friend Junius shortly afterwards.

2.3 During the next few years, when not distracted on visits to Germany (1653) and by seeing some of the late Gerardus Joannes Vossius's unpublished work through the press (Vossius 1656), Junius worked on Germanic languages. At the end of what may be termed the first period of such study there appeared the two books published at Amsterdam in 1655 at his own expense. Junius's Observationes in Willeramii Abbatis Franciscam Paraphrasin Cantici canticorum (1655a; Voorwinden 1992) offers a text and commentary (together with an annotated directory of Germanic and Welsh monosyllabic words) of the paraphrase of the Song of Songs by Williram, abbot of Ebersberg in the mid eleventh century. This work, which was quite popular in its time, was arranged in the manuscripts with the Vulgate text down the central column of the page, a paraphrase (including allegorical interpretation) in Latin hexameters down the left-hand column, and a similar exegetical paraphrase in German prose (with Latin elements intermixed) in the East Franconian dialect down the right-hand column. Junius, however, did not work from a manuscript but from the printed text in Merula (1598). This text is based on Leiden University Library, MS BPL 130, a copy probably from


\[^2\] Junius's transcript of Ælfric's Glossary from Cotton Julius A ii is now Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Junius 72 (SC 5183). He also transcribed the prose dialogue Adrian and Ritheus twice from Julius A ii in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MSS Junius 45 (SC 5157) and 61 (SC 5172).
Egmond in Holland, and showing an admixture of dialect forms from that area (Gumbert 1975). It is this vernacular version that Junius focussed his 'observations' on. Under the entry for *ord* on p. 248 he notes that he had received what is now MS Junius 11 from Ussher, the entry being referred to in Junius’s preliminary remarks *Ad Lectorem* in the Cædmon. Because the contents of MS Junius 11 partly match the subjects upon which, according to Bede (*Historia Ecclesiastica* iv.24), Cædmon composed verses in Old English, Junius thought the manuscript to contain these works by Cædmon. Hence the manuscript became known as ‘The Cædmon Manuscript’ and Junius’s edition as his ‘Cædmon’, even though the attribution was doubted before the end of the seventeenth century and is now thought to be without foundation. There is no known connection between the manuscript and Cædmon, nor is it thought that he was the author of the poems contained in it. Indeed the variation in style and treatment between the four poems is so great that they are not thought to be the work even of a single author and they may not have been composed even at the same time. Nevertheless, the manuscript is still the most elaborately planned of the four surviving major codices of Old English poetry (Lucas 1981), and well merited the prominence Junius gave it by producing from it the first printed edition of Old English poetry.

2.4 Although Junius’s interest was drawn to texts with religious subject-matter, his primary interest was in etymology and this preoccupation grew in the second phase of Junius’s work on the Germanic languages. In order to improve his explanations of word origins he gradually acquired materials relating to, and knowledge of, other Germanic languages. In particular, through his acquisition in 1654 of the sixth-century *Codex Argenteus*, now Uppsala, Universitetsbiblioteket, MS DG 1 (von Friesen and Grape 1928a and 1928b), containing the Gospels in Gothic written on purple parchment in silver and gold ink (hence the name *Argenteus*), Junius acquired a knowledge of the earliest recorded Germanic language. According to the testimony of Junius’s collaborator, Jan van Vliet (1622–66), in van Vliet (1664: A4'), the text was printed in 1663, the Gothic Glossary in 1664, and the whole brought together with the Anglo-Saxon Gospels and Marshall’s annotations thereon in the full edition of 1665. During this period, c.1655–c.1666, Junius also studied other Germanic languages, notably Old High German and Old Frisian. He came to know with more and more assurance that the Germanic languages were closely related to each other as in a family, and that the relationship with Latin and Greek was more distant.

---


17A stray leaf has since (1970) been discovered in Speyer Dombibliothek.
2.5 The third and last phase of Junius's work on the Germanic languages belongs to his last years, c.1667–77. He continued to transcribe manuscripts and compile word-lists and glossaries, but, according to Breuker (1990: 63), 'his linguistic studies had lost their former acumen'. However, it is possible that it was during this period that Junius completed his etymological dictionary of English subsequently published in his name by Edward Lye in 1743. Much of Junius's work still remains in manuscript form; cf. Stanley (1998).

3. The Book

3.1 Junius's edition consists of 14 gatherings of eight pages each, to which a title leaf and preface/errata leaf were added at the front, signed ':

The gatherings bear the signatures A–O as appropriate. The first leaf has the signature 'A', etc., the second 'A2' etc., the third 'A3' etc. (except Gathering O, where there is no signature), and the fourth leaf has no signature. The paper on which it is printed carries a watermark of the fleur-de-lis design very similar to nos. 1730 and 1772 in Heawood (1950: 103–04, plates 233, 239), both of which are assigned to Amsterdam 1646. The watermark appears over the spine fold of either leaves 2/3 or leaves 1/4 in each gathering.18

3.2 Each gathering of 4 leaves (8 pages) is composed of a single foolscap sheet, approx. 43 x 32 cm (=17" x 12¼"), printed in standard quarto format as indicated in Gaskell 1972: fig. 47 on p. 89. Each sheet was then folded horizontally in the middle and then vertically in the middle, this second fold being the spine fold. The fold at the top of the leaves (i.e. leaves 1/2, 3/4) then had to be cut; in the Bristol copy (University Library, Special Collections, HDa) they are still uncut (except for Gathering O). When the sheet was printed the watermark was positioned either top centre or bottom centre and so, depending on which way up the sheet was when printed, the watermark appears at the spine fold either between leaves 2 and 3 or between leaves 1 and 4.

3.3 As already noted a title leaf and preface/errata leaf, i.e. a half-sheet, were added at the front to the basic structure of the book. Some copies evidently lacked this prefatory 'furniture', even those known to emanate from Junius himself. William Nicolson (1655–1727), born the year the Caedmon was published, and a student at Queen's College Oxford in the 1670s, came to know 'good Mr. Junius' in Junius's last years and received his copy from the author in the year before Junius's death. In 1697 he wrote to Edward Thwaites:

18Clubb (1966: 58) reports a different watermark in the title/preface half-sheet, visible, according to him, only in the Oxford, Magdalen College copy, a book which I was unable to see when I visited Oxford.
I had that book given me, twenty years ago, by its worthy publisher; but mine wants the title, preface, and index. If the other printed copies have any such furniture, an account of them would be very acceptable.

My acquaintance with that worthy person was very short, and in his last days .... I was indeed frequently with him, during his stay there [Oxford, 1676–77]: but, alas! I can remember little more of him than that he was very kind and communicative, very good, and very old.19

Nicolson went on to become bishop of Carlisle and then of Derry (and finally archbishop of Cashel)20 and his copy of the Cædmon went to Trinity College Dublin, where it is still kept (class-mark A.k.4). It does indeed lack the title page and preface/errata, though not the index in Gathering O, and it is an interleaved copy. Attached to the front is a slip with the note:


There are some handwritten corrections (not by Junius) which would suggest that Nicolson or another reader did receive information on, or have access to, the Errata page, sig. :. 2°, in another copy. Other copies survive without the prefatory ‘furniture’, notably at Berkeley (U. of California, Bancroft Lib., PR 1611 1655), Bristol (Univ. Lib., Spec. Coll., HDA), Copenhagen (Kongelige Bibl., 75, 94 - 4°, and Hielmstierne 1046 - 4°), Geneva (Bibliothèque publique et universitaire, Bb 803), Leeuwarden (Provinciale Bibliotheek van Friesland, 1565 TL), Leiden (Universiteitsbibliotheek, Bibliotheek van de Maatschappij der Nederlandse Letterkunde, 1213 B 39), Munich ( Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, 4° P.o.rel. 718), and Paris (Bibl. Nat., Réserve A 2503).

3.4 The standard title page reproduced in this facsimile has an ornamental vignette featuring a tudor-style rose. Many copies of the book have


21Cited in Clubb (1962: 203), who reports a mistaken conjecture that the book contains Junius’s handwriting. Nicolson’s hand is preserved in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MSS Fell 8–18, an 11-volume transcript of Junius’s Etymologicum Anglicanum. I have compared a sample photograph with the hand of corrections in Dublin, Trinity College, A.k.4, and the hands appear to be different, though the writing in the Fell manuscripts is more current in style.
this title page, for example, Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Junius 73 (Junius’s own copy), Mar 125(2) (Marshall’s copy), Queen’s College, ZZ.b.1418(7), Trinity College, G.1.13; Cambridge, University Library, U*.5.60 and F.9.74, Emmanuel College, S1.4.26; Hanover, Niedersächsische Landesbibliothek, Theologie; Leiden, Bibliotheek der Rijksuniversiteit, 499 F 20 (Isaac Vossius’s copy). However, perhaps because of a lack of prefatory ‘furniture’, some copies have a title page which is set out differently and which does not match that of the later Mores re-issue either (on which see below, § 5 and Appendix 2.1). One such copy, Oxford, Bodleian Library, Gough Sax.Lit. 7, uses larger type for CAEDMONIS MONACHI, has no hyphen after ‘Anglo’ at the end of line 5, and has a full stop (not a comma) after CUNRADI. The ornamental vignette with a rose design has been traced in in pencil. In the copy in the Society of Antiquaries, London, MS 823/2, Edward Lye’s copy, the spacing of the words and letters is different from the standard version, there is a full stop after POETICA, the type size of AMSTELODAMI is larger, as also in Gough Sax.Lit. 7, the ornament is completely different, and the rounded italic capital V in ADRIANVM VLACQ is like that in no other copy I have seen.

3.5 As the title page states, the book was printed ‘Typis & sumptibus Editoris’. Junius had his own punches ‘cut, matriculated and cast’ at Amsterdam in 1654 in anticipation of printing the Caedmon and the Willeram (Junius 1655a/b; see also Hickes 1705: xliii; Morison & Carter 1967: 244 and pl.18, no.14 for a photograph of one of Junius’s punches; Hart 1970: 40, with reproduction of Specimen 1693; Carter 1975: 124–26; Barker 1978: 26–27 and, for a photograph of Junius’s matrices, pl.105). He was therefore in a position to take them to whichever printer he chose and that printer would use them in conjunction with his own supplies for large capitals, ornament, etc. As stated on the title pages the printer/publisher of both books was Christoffel Cunrad, who was active in Amsterdam 1650–84 (Gruys & de Wolf 1989: 48; Kleerkooper & van Stockum 1914–16: I, 155–56); Cunrad’s mark appears in the Willeram on p. 311 and at the end, on the last page of the Corrigenda (cf. Bibliotheca Belgica 1979: IV, 67, no. 1). The other person mentioned on the title page,
Adriaen Vlack, was one of the most important Dutch booksellers of the period. He lived in London 1633-42, so it is quite likely that Junius knew him there; as far as I know Junius dealt with no other printer, publisher, or bookseller in The Hague. Vlack was active there 1651–66 (van Eeghen 1960–78: V, 81–82 and n.263 on p. 116, 366; Gruys & de Wolf 1989: 187). See further Lucas (1998a) and Lane (1993: 57, commentary on Kleine Text Curcyf no. 2).

3.6 In the Preface ‘Ad Lectorem’ Junius draws attention to the statement in his Observationes in Willerami (Junius 1655a: 248, also Voorwinden 1992: 248) that he obtained the manuscript on which the text is based (now Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Junius 11) from James Ussher, archbishop of Armagh, and that the contents match those attributed by Bede to Cædmon (see above, § 2.3). He also hoped that other manuscripts would be found so that the readings could be corrected, and notes his practice of putting in the MS page numbers in brackets and numbering the lines in his own edition for ease of reference, not least for the observationes or commentary that he hoped to write (see below, § 3.15).

3.7 Junius printed the text of the poems as they occur in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Junius 11. He apparently made no distinction between Genesis, Exodus, and Daniel, printing them as one continuous text, but he did indicate (p. 91), as does the manuscript, that Christ and Satan comprised ‘Liber II’. In the course of the text(s) he indicated the manuscript pagination (which he himself wrote in the manuscript) in round brackets as it occurred. He did not reproduce MS display capitals, as, for example, on p. 143 at the beginning of Exodus (Junius’s p. 63), thus reinforcing the sense of textual continuity even against MS evidence (the significance of which Junius perhaps did not realize); the only ornamental capital is a U at the beginning of the text on p. 1. His index of 41 items on pp. 107–09 includes 31 items from Genesis, 2 from Exodus, 8 from Daniel, and none from Christ and Satan, again without any indication that Genesis, Exodus, and Daniel are separate from each other. The poems therefore occur in the gatherings as follows:

A, pp. 1–8,  
B, pp. 9–16,  
C, pp. 17–24,  
D, pp. 25–32,  
E, pp. 33–40,  
F, pp. 41–48,  
G, pp. 49–56,  

\begin{equation} 
\begin{align*} 
\text{A,} &\quad \text{pp. 1–8,} & \text{Genesis 1–342;} 
\text{B,} &\quad \text{pp. 9–16,} & \text{Genesis 342–667;} 
\text{C,} &\quad \text{pp. 17–24,} & \text{Genesis 667–1024;} 
\text{D,} &\quad \text{pp. 25–32,} & \text{Genesis 1024–1429;} 
\text{E,} &\quad \text{pp. 33–40,} & \text{Genesis 1429–1833;} 
\text{F,} &\quad \text{pp. 41–48,} & \text{Genesis 1833–2235;} 
\text{G,} &\quad \text{pp. 49–56,} & \text{Genesis 2235–2632;} 
\end{align*} 
\end{equation}
3.8 In MS Junius 11, as in all other Old English poetical manuscripts, the verse was written out like prose, using the whole width of the written space. Junius retained this practice in his edition, except that the MS lineation was altered to suit the printed page. Some Old English poetical manuscripts, of which MS Junius 11 is the most notable, indicate verse divisions by means of metrical pointing (Lucas 1994: 21–24; O’Keeffe 1990: 179–86; Lucas 1993). This practice too Junius retains, except that he occasionally corrects an apparent error (cf. Lucas 1998b: 375–83). For example, at 63/19 after *worhte* (*Ex* 25a) he correctly inserted a point which is lacking in the MS (Gollancz 1927: 143/21). Not all Junius’s alterations, however, were entirely for the better. For example, at 63/11 he correctly diagnosed a point missing in the manuscript (Gollancz 1927: 143/8-9) but placed it at the MS line division after *sylfes* instead of after the next word *miht* (*Ex* 9b). This mistake probably reflects a knowledge of the practice in some other manuscripts containing Old English verse where a point was sometimes omitted (i.e. taken as read) at a line division (cf. Lucas 1998b: 377 and nn.38-39).

3.9 In the manuscript the poems are divided into sectional divisions numbered in a continuous series. Junius omitted these numbers but did mark the end of the sectional divisions with a triple period. However, he also used the triple period to mark the end of modern paragraphs, as at 63/10 (*Ex* 7b). The sectional divisions therefore effectively disappear. Although Junius does reproduce some MS accents, most of these too are not reproduced.

3.10 In the Old English manuscript compound nouns and adjectives were usually written with spaces between the elements as if they were separate words, as *bealu siOe* (Gollancz 1927: 143/5). Although in this instance Junius made no modification (63/8 = *Ex* 5) he usually introduced a hyphen to join compounds together, as *sod-faest, folc-toga, folc-riht* (63/10, 63/13, 63/17 = *Ex* 9, 14, 22). Sometimes he separated words...
joined together in the manuscript, as *he was* \((63/12 = \text{Ex 12} = \text{Gollancz 1927: 143/10})\).

3.11 Other deliberate modifications by Junius were the initial capitalization of names, as *Moyses* \((63/7 = \text{Ex 2})\), *Abrahames* \((63/15 = \text{Ex 18})\), and the silent expansion of abbreviations, as MS ‘haeleðū’ \((\text{Gollancz 1927: 143/6})\) becomes *haeleðum* \((63/9 = \text{Ex 7})\).

3.12 On the whole Junius was an accurate transcriber of Old English \((\text{Lucas 1995})\) and this edition shows a reasonably high standard of accuracy, especially for work produced at this early period of Anglo-Saxon studies. However, there are errors, as a collation of the edition with the manuscript \((\text{facsimile})\) reveals; those in *Christ and Satan* are chronicled by Clubb \((1925)\) in his textual notes, and for partial analysis and some discussion see van der Werf \((1978)\). To illustrate this point I have collated Junius’s edition \((\text{pp. 110–11})\) of the poem known as *Prayer* from London, British Library, Cotton MS Julius A ii, fols 136–37, a facsimile of which is now available in Robinson and Stanley \((1991: 31.2)\).\(^{24}\) In the following list the line number in the poem as now edited \((\text{Dobbie 1953: 94–96})\) is given first, followed by the form in Junius’s edition, then the page and line reference therein, followed by the MS form.

\[
\begin{align*}
4 \text{ðu} & \quad 110/8 & \text{þu} \\
5 \text{ðu} & \quad 110/9 & \text{þu} \\
9 \text{ðin} & \quad 110/11 & \text{þyn} \\
10 \text{ðyne} & \quad 110/13 & \text{þyne} \\
12 \text{ðæges} & \quad 110/14 & \text{ðæiges} \\
14 \text{þa} & \quad 110/15 & \text{ða} \\
15 \text{þfeles} & \quad 110/15 & \text{þfeles.} \\
17 \text{ðæges} & \quad 110/16 & \text{ðæiges} \\
18 \text{geweorces} & \quad 110/17 & \text{geweorkes} \\
22 \text{getiða} & \quad 110/20 & \text{getiða} \\
24 \text{ðu} & \quad 110/21 & \text{þu} \\
30 \text{ðe} & \quad 110/24 & \text{þe} \\
33 \text{mæge} & \quad 111/2 & \text{mage} \\
34 \text{ðu} & \quad 111/2 & \text{þu} \\
37 \text{hy.} & \quad 111/4 & \text{hy} \\
37 \text{witan} & \quad 111/4–5 & \text{wytan} \\
38 \text{ðu} & \quad 111/5 & \text{þu}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^{24}\) I checked all the readings, including punctuation marks, against the MS itself in July 1984.
3.13 By far the most serious error is the omission of the equivalent of two whole lines (52b–54a). In five lines (37, 47, 58, 61, 73) points are added unnecessarily, and in two lines (15, 66) punctuation is omitted. There are also 26 instances of spelling being altered, 73% of them (19) involving <p/o>. Initial <0> for <p> occurs 16 times, capital initial <D> for <p> once, intervocalic <0> for <p> once, and initial <p> for <Δ> once. Other errors involve <i> for <y>, <c> for <k> (2x), <æg-> for <-æg-> (2x), <-æg-> for <-ag->, <fæm-> for <-fem->. Most, if not all, of these involve spelling distinctions where there would have been no corresponding differentiation in pronunciation; hence it was easier to make slips in transcription.

3.14 Against these shortcomings must be set Junius’s success in providing emendations. In Exodus, for example, there are seven emendations (now generally accepted) adopted in the text. In the following list the line number is given first, then the emended reading first adopted by Junius with his page and line number, followed by a square bracket, then the MS reading.

- 63 Heht 64/14] eht with space for large initial capital
- 142 þa] Junius ða 66/4] a with space for large initial capital
- 146 heo 66/6] heo heo
- 371 gehwæs 70/21] gehæs
- 471 asæled 71/21] æsæled
In the other poems a quick check revealed the following emendations (since generally accepted) adopted for the first time by Junius.

**Genesis**
- 100 geseted 3/9] gesetet
- 255 væstm 6/17] væwtm
- 506 hearan 13/3] hearan
- 959 gehilcre 23/16] gehilcre
- 1148 þurh 27/12] þur
- 1630 swa 36/25] wwa
- 1924 neoxna wange 42/20] neoxna wange
- 2197 æsæled 48/7] æsæled
- 2758 weard 59/14] wearð

**Daniel**
- 138 geçwædon 78/4] geçwædon
- 500 hlifode 86/2] hlifode

**Christ and Satan**
- 7 ymblyt 91/16] ybmlyt
- 17 heanne 91/21] henne
- 34 Cleopad 92/9] cleopad
- 48 wordun 92/16] wordun
- 437 minre 100/21] mire
- 557 þa 103/5] a with space for large initial capital

Most of these emendations involve the correction of apparent errors by the scribes in spelling or form. 3.15 Junius's statement in the preface 'Ad Lectorem' indicates that he probably hoped one day to publish a commentary on the *Cædmon*. This expectation is confirmed by the statement in [van Vliet 1664] quoted below in § 4.3 that publication of such a commentary was to be held back until the explanations might be completed. Unfortunately, Junius never did complete them. But his unfinished commentary survives as Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Junius 73* (SC 5184*), a slim volume of some 10 pages, with much blank space between the entries (see Appendix 1). Evidently Junius set out his commentary leaving spaces in which he could add more later. Sometimes space was not available in the required place, so, for example, the entry for 79/13 appears below that for 79/16. A good
instance of an entry added later than the first draft of the commentary is
that for 17/10 [= Genesis 682], which occurs after that for 17/12, as it
includes a citation from the Codex Argenteus (Gothic Gospels), a source
Junius may not have worked on in detail until the 1660’s. It follows that
the commentary was probably begun earlier, probably in the later 1650’s,
after the publication of the edition. Since the contents of the commentary
have hitherto never been published, nor even reported, as far as I am
aware, I have reproduced this commentary as Appendix 1 to this edition.
One of the features of the commentary is that Junius offered conjectural
emendations for the first time. Those now generally adopted are as
follows:\textsuperscript{25}

\begin{center}
\textit{Genesis}
\begin{align*}
1211 & \text{feran 28/18] frean} \\
1314 & \text{fremede 30/19] freme} \\
1664 & \text{bearn 37/17] bear} \\
1938 & \text{loht 43/2] leoh} \\
2251 & \text{geham 49/9] geh} \\
2368 & \text{gelæstan 51/16] gelætan} \\
2577 & \text{he eft 55/23] heft} \\
2645 & \text{beheowan 57/7] beheopan} \\
2784 & \text{siodan 60/2] siödan} \\
\end{align*}
\textit{Exodus}
\begin{align*}
55 & \text{magode 64/9] mago ra} \\
128 & \text{ledmægne 65/22] leo mægne over line division} \\
162 & \text{hreopon 66/14] hwreopon with 2nd o above a expuncted} \\
442 & \text{sund 72/6] sund} \\
\end{align*}
\textit{Daniel}
\begin{align*}
152 & \text{wæs 78/10] ðæs} \\
226 & \text{gelæded 80/2] ge} \\
265 & \text{we 81/1] we} \\
\end{align*}
\textit{Christ and Satan}
\begin{align*}
24 & \text{wise 92/4] wise} \\
\end{align*}
\end{center}

A number of these emendations anticipate those otherwise attributed to
later scholars, as Thorpe (\textit{Genesis} 1938, 2251, 2368, 2577, 2784, \textit{Exodus}
55, \textit{Daniel} 152, 265), Grein (\textit{Genesis} 1211, \textit{Daniel} 226, \textit{Christ and Satan}
24), Bouterwek (\textit{Genesis} 1314, \textit{Exodus} 442), and Cosijn (\textit{Genesis} 2645).

\textsuperscript{25}Those at \textit{Genesis} 1211, 1664, 2368 and 2784 are rejected by Doane (1978).
At *Genesis* 1829 (40/23) Junius noted what the sense required but did not propose the emendation that would give that sense. Thorpe did, proposing *onegan* 'fear' for MS *on agen*. It is possible that Thorpe saw MS Junius 73*. Two of the emendations were noted by Lye (1772): *Genesis* 1664, and *Exodus* 128 (as noted by Hall 1987: 403, n.52). Many of these textual amendments are palmary emendations for which Junius should now receive due credit.

3.16 Another manuscript of relevance to Junius’s *Cædmon* is Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Junius 113 (SC 5224), containing ‘Conjecturae etc. on Cædmonis Paraphrasin’ by Junius. This manuscript was inadvertently retained at Queen’s College Oxford by Edward Thwaites (1667–1711), as described by Edward Rowe Mores (1730–78) in a letter dated 13 January 1753 to Andrew Coltee Ducarel (1713–85):

> What we have lately discovered at our College is an index drawn up by Junius to his edition of Cædmon, which in the Bodleian Catalogue [1697, p.255] is said to have been stolen; but we suppose that, as Junius’s MSS. were formerly kept in a closet in the School-gallery, Mr. Thwaites might borrow it from thence; and, it being afterwards found in his study, was, with his other papers, inadvertently reposited in our archives. The Dean of Exeter [Charles Lyttleton (1714–68)] is very desirous that this index should be printed, and annexed to the drawings; which he says he proposed to the Antiquarian Society, to be engraved at their expence; but without success.²⁶

It was subsequently restored to the Bodleian later in 1753. To describe it as ‘an index’ reflects Junius’s intention to produce a glossary rather than his achievement. The manuscript comprises sheets organized for the extrapolation of vocabulary listed alphabetically from the *Cædmon*. Where entries have been put in they have been provided with citations to locate the examples. But the glossary is very far from complete and it contains no comment on the contents of the book as such.

4. The Reception of Junius’s Work

4.1 In the sixteenth century there was a revival of interest in Anglo-Saxon materials chiefly, in the first place, for the light that they might shed on the Church in England, which Henry VIII had separated from Rome. In the seventeenth century churchmen of a Protestant persuasion

²⁶Nichols (1812–15: V, 403), repr. Mores (1778/1961: xxii); see also below, § 5.3 and notes 29, 34, 40, 41.
sought to use the evidence to authenticate their theory that Church corruption was instigated by the conquest of 1066 (Hill 1958: 57–67), but the focus of this antiquarian interest shifted somewhat towards the political, since it was felt that Anglo-Saxon materials might provide evidence of ‘free’ Anglo-Saxon institutions to substantiate the myth of the Norman Yoke of dictatorial kingship. As the myth of the Arthurian legend had been taken up by Royalists, anxious to adorn their chivalric background, and ‘the Stuarts claimed descent from Arthur through the Scottish line as well as through the Tudors’ (Hill 1958: 60, citing Brinkley 1932: ch. 1; cf. also Kendrick 1950: ch. III), promoting the virtues of the Saxon past had a distinctly political edge in the run-up to the period of the Commonwealth, and Junius must have been acutely conscious of the delicacy of his position. He based himself on the continent between 1642 and 1674. But he emerged apparently unscathed, this time having been on the winning side.

4.2 Although his *Cædmon* was only a text, without commentary, it was the first edition of an Old English poetical manuscript and Junius’s influence on Anglo-Saxon studies was profound. This influence made itself felt in two ways, through scholarly successors and through their publications. Thomas Marshall (1621–85) was thirty years younger than Junius. From 1650 he was Preacher to the Company of English Merchant Adventurers at Rotterdam and (from 1656) Dordrecht. In the Netherlands he came to know Junius and effectively became his pupil and fellow-scholar in Anglo-Saxon and Gothic. They collaborated on the edition of the Gothic Gospels (Junius 1665). This book was much admired and Marshall’s scholarly reputation resulting from it such that he was made a Fellow of Lincoln College Oxford in 1668 and subsequently in 1672 became its Rector. At this college another Fellow was George Hickes (1642–1715) and there he learnt the love of Anglo-Saxon that was to result in his Anglo-Saxon Grammar (Hickes 1689) and the great *Thesaurus* (Hickes 1705), dedicated to William Sancroft, archbishop of Canterbury, who also owned a copy of Junius’s *Cædmon*. From 1696 Hickes, a non-juror who would not take the oath to King William, went to live at Gloucester Green, Oxford, and there Edward Thwaites (1667–1711), a student at Queen’s College (where an interest in Anglo-Saxon was already established, particularly in the person of William Nicolson), became his pupil, rising in 1698 to be Preceptor in Anglo-Saxon at the college.

---

28 Cambridge, Emmanuel College, S1.4.262.
Thwaites published a revised version of Hickes’s Anglo-Saxon Grammar in 1711. All three books, both of Hickes’s as well as Thwaites’s, were printed using Junius’s types. Thwaites had as a pupil Christopher Rawlinson (1677–1733), whose edition of Boethius, based on Junius’s transcripts, is adorned with the bust of Junius as its frontispiece (Rawlinson 1698; Tashjian, Tashjian & Enright 1990: 193–99). This book too is printed using Junius’s types. The reverence with which Junius was regarded and the importance of his contribution shine out from the work of these (and other) successors.29

4.3 Although not received with the kind of plaudits bestowed upon his art-historical work (cf. Aldrich, Fehl & Fehl 1991: I, lxv–lxvi; Nativel 1998: 28), which had a wider appeal, Junius’s Cædmon evidently aroused considerable interest and was cited from time to time. The earliest notice is in William Somner’s Dictionarium Saxonico-Latino-Anglicum (1659), which cites the Cædmon as a source used in the collection of words and examples (b1’). Somner refers to ‘F Junio viro quidem bonarum artium & linguarum peritissimo’ (b2’). Another early and authoritative notice is in [van Vliet 1664]: A4, a book printed with Junius’s types and which therefore Junius must have had direct input into; van Vliet (1622–66) was, like Marshall, his pupil and fellow-scholar. It contains a bibliographical note of Junius’s printed works and those in preparation in the field of Germanic/English studies, headed Lijste der Boecken van d’Heer JUNIUS, als andere in desen aengetogen (A4). The notice of Cædmon is as follows (see also above, § 3.15):


For his Anglo-Saxon grammar of 1689, entitled Institutiones Grammaticae Anglo-Saxonicae ..., George Hickes used Junius’s Cædmon, to which he refers in the ‘Praefatio’ (C2v–3’). In his monumental Thesaurus (1705) Hickes quotes large portions from the Cædmon (p. 180 = Cædmon, p. 72;...

29On this period of the development of Anglo-Saxon studies particularly in Oxford, see also Nicolson (1776: 34–36); Adams (1917: 70–76) and Douglas (1939: esp. 77–83). Sisam (1953: 260) was perhaps a little grudging when he pronounced that Junius ‘left Oxford ... hardly a living school’. On Hickes, Sancroft, Thwaites and Rawlinson, see DNB, s.n.n. On Hickes’s Thesaurus, see Bennett (1948) and Harris (1992). See also Fairer (1986).
p. 182 = Caedmon, p. 61) and cites a letter from Sir Symonds D’Ewes to John Selden (1584–1654) of 31 January 1649 referring to Junius as ‘vir eruditione modestiæque eximius’ (p. xliii). The Caedmon was also noticed on the continent outside the Netherlands by Johan Georg von Eckhart in his Historia Studii Etymologici Linguæ Germanicae of 1711 as follows (pp. 94–95):


Eckhart is also notable for restoring to the Bodleian in 1720 some leaves from MSS Junius 4 and 5 (Macray 1890: 146–47).

4.4 Junius’s major interest was in etymology and after the publication of his Etymologicum Anglicanum by Edward Lye in 1743 it was for this aspect of his work that he was chiefly noticed, particularly by Dr Samuel Johnson in the Preface to his Dictionary (b1r) published a century after the Caedmon.

For the Teutonick etymologies I am commonly indebted to Junius and Skinner, the only names which I have forborn to quote when I copied their books; not that I might appropriate their labours or usurp their honours, but that I might spare a perpetual repetition by one general acknowledgement. Of these, whom I ought not to mention but with the reverence due to instuctors and benefactors, Junius appears to have excelled in extent of learning, and Skinner in rectitude of understanding. Junius was accurately skilled in all the northern languages, Skinner probably examined the ancient and remoter dialects only by occasional inspection into dictionaries; but the learning of Junius is often to no other use than to show him a track by which he may deviate from his purpose, to which Skinner always presses forward by the shortest way. Skinner is often ignorant, but never ridiculous: Junius is always full of knowledge; but his variety distracts his judgment ....

In fact, as has been noted, Johnson was indebted to Junius far more than to Skinner (1671), not just for specific etymologies, but for his methodo-

---

30 On Selden, see DNB, s.n., also Bodleian Library (1951: 43–47).
logy as well. Without a basis in Anglo-Saxon, English etymology had been rudimentary.  

5. The *Cædmon* in the Eighteenth Century up to the 1752 and 1754 Re-issues by Edward Rowe Mores

5.1 Interest in augmenting the *Cædmon* did not abate after Junius's death. In 1705 Nicolson wrote to Humfrey Wanley:

I have long wished for an accurate translation of Cædmon; and Mr. Dean only is able (glad am I to hear that he is willing) to undertake that part. Honest Mr. Junius told me, there were three or four words in that poem which he did not understand. This perhaps hindered him from attempting a complete translation; though I believe most of it is rendered piecemeal in the quotations he has made thence in his Saxon Dictionary. I hope your translator will oblige us with the reasons for his opinion (if he still continues in it) that a good part of Milton's Paradise was borrowed from Cædmon's. I can hardly think these two Poets under the direction of the same spirit; and I never could find (I think his Introduction to our English History rather evinces the contrary) that Oliver's Secretary was so great a master of the Saxon Language as to be able to make Cædmon's Paraphrase his own.

Despite these plans Mr Dean's translation did not transpire any more than one by Junius (if he ever intended it).

5.2 But interest in the *Cædmon* still continued, especially amongst graduates of Queen's College Oxford, whose interest Junius had initially fostered by giving copies to Gerard Langbaine the elder (1609–58), and his successor as Provost, Thomas Barlow (1607–91). Midway through the eighteenth century the standard was taken up by Edward Rowe Mores

---


32 Nicolson (1809: II, 651–52); on Wanley, see *DNB*, s.n., Sisam (1953: 259–77), Wright (1960), Wright & Wright (1966), and Heyworth (1989). The question of Milton and Cædmon (specifically *Genesis B*) has become something of a *cause célèbre*: for discussion, see, e.g., Timmer (1948/54: 60–66); Evans (1968); Murdoch (1974).


34 Now Oxford, Magdalen College Library, d.9.18. There is an inscription on the title page: 'Lib Th. Barlow e Coll. Reg. Oxon ex dono Authoris Jul V mdcxv'. Barlow was also Bodley's Librarian 1652–60; on him, see *DNB*, s.n., and *Bodleian Library* (1951: 17–18; plates VIII–IX).
(pronounced Morris) (1730–78), ‘a learned, ingenious, and industrious Young Gentleman of Queens College in Oxford’, 35 whose interest was also fostered by the Society of Antiquaries (which had been revived in 1717), 36 of which he became a member in 1752. On St Patrick’s day of that year (17 March 1752) Mores re-issued Junius’s Cædmon using un-bound sheets already printed for Junius, but not used by him. The main part of this edition, therefore, Gatherings A–O, is exactly as it was for Junius, printed on the same paper with the same watermark attributed to ‘Amsterdam 1646’. Mores furnished the edition with a new title page (Appendix 2.1), which is distinctive in its lay-out and has an ornamental vignette featuring a bird (rather than Junius’s with a rose design), and with a re-printed preface ‘Ad Lectorem’ (Appendix 2.2), the content of which is exactly as Junius had it, except for some minor typographical variations; 37 on the verso are Junius’s errata re-set using Junius’s types (Appendix 2.3). 38 At the end of the book Mores again used Junius’s types to provide two leaves headed ‘Notae in Cædmonis Paraphrasin’ (Appendix 2.4). These leaves contain Junius’s notes on the edition, taken, as Mores claims in his prefatory remarks headed Lectori, from Junius’s own copy of the edition [MS Junius 73] now in Bodley. According to Carter and Ricks, referring to these ‘Notae’, 39 Mores added a transcript of Junius’s notes and corrections to his own copy of his 1655 edition [MS Junius 73]. These Notae were not impeccably copied by Mores; for example, he omits Junius’s correction on p. 47.

35 Cited from George Ballard’s Orosius (1751) by Carter and Ricks in Mores (1778/1961: xxi). On Ballard (1706–55), see DNB, s.n. On Mores, see also Nichols (1812–15: V, 389–405), and DNB, s.n.


37 Mores corrects the extra-large space before the comma following observationes (line 18), but omits the comma after distinx (16) and the accent in commodiūs (19).

38 Differences between Junius’s 1655 version and Mores’s are as follows: the heading ‘ERRATA.’ is in larger type in Mores; the printed space is 4 mm. wider in Mores, with consequent adjustments in spacing; the lack of space after ‘P.8.’ in Junius is rectified in Mores; Junius’s ‘7’ has a longer descender than Mores’s (e.g., ‘P.17’); Junius’s ‘9’ has a longer descender than Mores’s, which is more sharply angled towards the bottom left (e.g., ‘P.92’, but compare ‘P.98’ where the 9s are identical); at P.36.14 Junius has ‘ā’, but Mores ‘à’; at the end of the catchword ‘Pag.1,’ Mores’s comma has a fuller hook.

39 Mores (1778/1961: xxi). Since Mores apparently did not use Junius’s commentary in MS Junius 73* it is in keeping that Carter and Ricks do not refer to it either.
In compiling these ‘Notae’ Mores took no notice of the Errata page in Junius’s copy of the edition, amended in Junius’s own hand (see Plate), nor of Junius’s embryonic commentary, reproduced as Appendix 1 (see above, § 3.15), the contents of which are of much greater importance than Junius’s annotations in his copy of the edition. The ‘Notae’ are closed by the same ornamental vignette or tailpiece featuring a bird as Mores used on his reprinted title page. A number of copies of this edition survive, for example, Oxford (Bodleian Library, Douce C 312, Gough Sax. Lit. 158), Oxford (Exeter College, YBP 47 [lacks ‘Notae’]), Amsterdam (Universiteitsbibliotheek, 2007 E 17), Göttingen (Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, 8° Poet. Angl. Sax. 1920), the copy used by Jacob Grimm (Clubb 1965: 167), The Hague (Koninklijke Bibliotheek, 522 D. 9), Leeuwarden (Provinciale Bibliotheek van Friesland, 1785 TL), and Harvard (Houghton Library, 12413.36.15*), one of the copies used by Benjamin Thorpe.

5.3 In the mean time there were larger plans to print MS Junius 11 with engravings of the illustrations therein. This ambitious project eventually became impaled on the hook of committee disagreement in the Society of Antiquaries.40 Mores’s plan involved

republishing Cædmon entire, with a translation, and adorned with all the drawings in the Bodleian copy. Mr. Lye seems inclined to undertake the translation; and Fletcher is willing to pay all expenses of printing, if we will engrave the drawings.41

This plan too came to nothing, but Mores did have engravings made of fifteen of the illustrations in MS Junius 11, which he collected together as Moreş (1754), Figurae Quae dam Antique ex Cædmonis Monachi Paraphraseos in Genesim ‘Certain Ancient Illustrations from the Monk Cædmon’s Paraphrase on Genesis’, with the following prefatory remarks (p. [ii]):

Ad Antiquitatis Studiosos Admonitio.
Codicem manuscriptum, unde desumptae sunt icones quae sequuntur, primus è tenebris eruit reverendissimus Usserius. Membranaceus est, lingua Saxonica seculo decimo exeunte scriptus, Wanleio judice. Somnerus a se descriptum sub

---

40The story is well told by Carter and Ricks (Mores 1778/1961: xxi–xxiv).
41Letter of 13 Jan. 1753 to Andrew Coltee Ducarel (1713–85) in Nichols (1812–15: V, 404). On Ducarel see DNB, s.n. On James Fletcher, the Oxford bookseller, see Plomer et al. (1932: 94).

‘Notice to Those Studious of Antiquity.
The manuscript book, from which the plates that follow are taken, the Most Reverend [James] Ussher [(1581–1656), archbishop of Armagh] first snatched from obscurity. It is membrane, written in the [Anglo-]Saxon language at the end of the tenth century, according to Wanley [in Hickes (1705)]. Somner very frequently gives a citation from it copied by himself under the name of ‘[Anglo-]Saxon paraphrase’ in his [Anglo-]Saxon–Latin–English Dictionary [1659]. Afterwards, acknowledging that it had been received from the eminent Primate, Fr[anciscus] Junius Fr[ancisci] fil[ius] made it public property [by printing it] at Amsterdam in 1655. A small number of these printed books lately found are for sale from James Fletcher, bookseller at Oxford, certain observations of the editor [i.e. the ‘Notae’] having been added which were discovered in his own copy.

Each plate was numbered with the page it was to face in Junius’s edition, which was then re-issued again as in 1752 but with the plates added (1754). Several copies of this 1754 re-issue survive, for example, Cambridge (Trinity College, A.8.70), London (British Library, 219.f.15), London (University College Library, Librarian’s Room 6.a.17), Oxford (Brasenose College Library, Sigma.DD 3.3), Princeton (University Library, Spec. Coll. Ex 3516.1655). The copy at Manchester (University Library, 8533) has the plates bound in at the end of the volume with a separate title page dated 1754 and bears the signatures of Charles Lyttelton (1714–68), who had been heavily involved in the consideration of the original project by the Society of Antiquaries, and Edward Rowe Mores.

6. The First Modern Scholarly Edition

6.1 But the Society of Antiquaries was not finished yet. Following considerable interest in the Cædmon in the early nineteenth century (Clubb 1966: 64–67; Hall 1987: 385–94), in 1831 the Society issued a Prospectus

42On Lyttelton, see DNB, s.n.; he was dean of Exeter cathedral (1748–62), bishop of Carlisle (1762–68), elected FSA 1746, and president of the Society (1765–68). See also Nichols (1812–15: V, 378–81; IX, 695–96).
of a Series of Publications of Anglo-Saxon and Early English Literary Remains, in which it resolved to publish some of the many Anglo-Saxon works not then published.

For the small portion of Anglo-Saxon learning already rendered accessible to the student, we are in some measure indebted to foreign scholars; and it has been deemed a subject of national reproach, that numerous Works of equal or greater importance ... should have still remained unpublished.... The ... first Work ... for publication [is], Cædmon's Scriptural Paraphrase, edited from the Bodleian MS., by Benjamin Thorpe, Esq. F.S.A. with an English Translation, Preface, and Notes. The Illuminations, fifty in number, have been engraved by Mr. Basire, accompanied by fac-simile Specimens of the MS., and given to the Fellows of the Society in the twenty-fourth volume of the Archaeologia, with a Descriptive Notice of the MS. by Henry Ellis, Esq., which had been previously read at the Society’s Meetings. Separate copies of the Engravings and Descriptive Notice have been struck off for sale. [Thorpe 1832: iii–iv]

6.2 Evidently the plan for the so-called Cædmon poems was much the same as that mooted the previous century, except that the illustrations were published separately (Ellis 1832); the original plates are still in the possession of the Society of Antiquaries (MS 823/1). Thorpe (1782–1870) was one of the foremost Anglo-Saxonists of his time (DNB, s.n.) and had studied at Copenhagen with Rasmus Rask, whose Anglo-Saxon grammar he translated into English (Thorpe 1830). He was, nevertheless, much influenced by Junius’s edition (even reprinting Junius’s preface ‘Ad Lectorem’ on p. xvii), which he collated ‘with the Bodleian MS’ (p. vii). For this purpose he drew on the collation by Frederic Madden, using Marshall’s copy in Bodley (Mar 125(2)). Subsequently he used the copy in which William Conybeare had already drafted a considerable portion of translation, and this copy survives at Harvard (Clubb 1966: 68–70; Hall 1987).

6.3 Despite Hickes’s and Wanley’s reservations, Thorpe persisted in the view that what we now know as Genesis, Exodus, and Daniel were one poem constituting, as the title insists, Cædmon’s Metrical Paraphrase .... His text, therefore, like Junius’s, shows no particular break between poems, as, for example, at the beginning of Exodus on p. 177; like Junius, Thorpe does not indicate the presence of MS display capitals. As he argued (p. viii),

I feel inclined to regard the work as the production of the good Monk of Whitby; due allowance being made for such interpolations, omissions, and
corruptions of the original text, as Cædmon, in common with the classic authors of antiquity, and still more with the vernacular writers of the middle ages, may be supposed to have suffered at the hands of ignorant transcribers.

Hickes's observation of what he called a 'Dano-Saxon' dialect in the Old Testament poems of the Junius Manuscript was, of course, unsubstantiated, but his strictures on the differences in wording between Bede's Cædmon and the Junius poems, which Thorpe very fairly quotes in full (pp. viii–x), were of much greater weight.

6.4 As is an editor's wont, Thorpe was critical of his predecessor's text, citing for particular condemnation the misplacing of the metrical points (pp. xiii–xiv), a criticism which served to focus attention on Thorpe's innovation of printing the text in half-lines, a considerable improvement on Junius's practice, though still without the merit of printing the poem in alliterating verse lines each with its own sequential number. Another innovation of Thorpe's was to include the first part of Azarias (from the Exeter Book), 'which, being evidently an extract from a more correct MS. of Cædmon than the one preserved to us [so it seemed to Thorpe], is both valuable and interesting, as throwing considerable light on the text of the latter' (p. xv). This practice is rightly continued (including the whole of Azarias) in the most recent edition of Daniel (Farrell 1974).

6.5 Thorpe was a careful editor, who sought to present 'a faithful text' (p. xiv). 'In a few places', though,

where the latter [MS Junius 11] is manifestly corrupt, recourse has been had to conjectural emendation; this, however, has been very rarely ventured upon, and in no case without giving the reading of the MS. at the foot of the page.

[p. vii]

Able to draw on both grammars and dictionaries unavailable to the pioneering Junius, Thorpe proposed a number of emendations which have become generally accepted by subsequent editors. In Exodus, for example,

---

43 This criticism met with disapproval from Frederic Madden in his journal, as noted by Hall (1987: 402). For Thorpe's use of Madden's collation, see Clubb (1966: 68–70), and Hall (1987: 396–98).

44 This was done by Jacob Grimm in his transcript of the Göttingen copy of Junius's Cædmon in 1817, see Clubb (1965: 156, 159, 161). Grimm also seems to have recognised that what we now know as Genesis, Exodus, and Daniel were the work of more than one poet (Clubb 1965: 156).
some sixteen emendations first proposed by Thorpe are now generally adopted (Lucas 1977, 2nd edn 1994). As noted by Hall (1987: 402), where he credits Thorpe with fifteen new emendations, 'the number is impressive'. But so in their way are Junius's eleven (see above, §§ 3.14–15). Thorpe's edition has rightly been hailed as a major achievement marking the transition from antiquarianism to philological professionalism. Yet he was dependent on an even more impressive achievement, the provision by Franciscus Junius, with no aids other than what he had taught himself from reading original sources, of the first edition ever of a volume of Old English poetry.

45 At lines 15, 22, 45, 81, 113, 216, 307 (Thorpe hi), 313, 368, 413, 432, 502, 510, 517, 540, 587.