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ABSTRACT

The aim of this thesis is to offer an interpretation and edition of the Old English Waldere fragments in which an account is taken of all known versions of and allusions to the Walther story and of clearly related literature. The principal independent contribution of the study is its demonstration that the story of Viðga's first adventure, preserved in the Old Norse Thidriksaga, is in considerable part derivative from the Walther story and suggests a reconstruction for the Waldere narrative into which the extant fragments fit with complete propriety.

Among the Walther legends apart from the story of Viðga, Waldere is unique in that the hero is shown in possession of the named sword Miming, the most famous of weapons in medieval Germanic literature and one manifestly of high significance in the Waldere narrative. In other literature in which the sword figures, Miming is characteristically viewed as the most excellent of swords. In several instances its role is that of the second and superior of two blades wielded by a hero to whom it brings ultimate victory. Such is the pattern of action in Viðga's first adventure, which besides Miming, has other elements in common with members of the group of Walther legends, particularly its role of the liegemen torn between loyalties to lord and friend respectively.

Collation of the Viðga story with that of Thidrik's journey home, a portion of Thidriksaga which has long been accepted as modeled largely upon a Walther-lay, shows the two to have shared a common model, and
comparison of the Vööga story with a shorter but almost identical account of Heimr (also in Thidrikssaga), in which however all elements suggestive of the Walther legend are missing, establishes the Walther-lay influence on the Vööga tale.

For interpretation of the Waldera fragments, the two most important questions are those as to the identity of the speaker opening Fragment Xw (comprising two speeches, the second of them by Waldera) and as to the proper order of the two non-contiguous leaves of text. The crux in each case is the nature of the sword action.

Aside from the Latin poem Waltherius, the Vööga story is the only member of the Walther group which has a detailed account of the sword action and which is likely to preserve an action approximating that of the original Walther story. In the Vööga tale and several other Mimming legends and allusions, Mimming is conceived as the paragon of swords. Accordingly, when the X-speaker of Waldera claims to have in possession, though it is idle and hidden away, the best of swords, then describes a sword which is associated with Theodoric and the latter's battle-companion Widia (the Old Norse Viööga), familiar from numerous sources as owner of Mimming, only Mimming is likely to be intended. From Fragment H (a speech by general consent ascribed to Hildegyð) Waldera is known to use that sword. Since Waldera, however, cannot plausibly be the X-speaker (a speech of his immediately follows), X must be the other member of Waldera's faction, i.e., Hildegyð.

The Vööga story and Waltherius both know the hero as having to resort to a second sword at the climax of the fighting, and within Waldera there are hints of a similar pattern. Since in
the Vidga story and elsewhere when it is one of alternate swords
Mimming is always the later resort, it is extremely probable that the
action of Fragment H, in which obviously Mimming is no longer idly
hidden away, is later than that of Fragment XIV.

Specific passages in the fragments are examined in the
combined light of the Vidga story, other members of the Walther group,
and related literature, and solutions are suggested for a number of
difficulties in interpretation, particularly of portions of the
X-speech. The bases for some earlier critical objections to the
Waldere text are removed.

An edition of the fragments is accompanied by comprehensive
notes and glossary. The bibliography is the fullest which has been
compiled to date relating specifically to Waldere. In appendices are
a genealogical chart of the Walther legend and a translation of
Vidga's First Adventure.
In the study of John Mather, positive and negative solutions are given in a series of "counter-conjectures."

The manuscript contains a list of two yellow folders, each of which has been used as a book-cover. And there are other elements inconsistent with the leaves having been used as a book-cover.

Stephane also guessed that the leaves had been some papers or sheets of the volume. It is believed that the leaves had been taken from a volume by the printer, some of which had been lost.

Stephane was told that the leaves had been lost in a counter-conjecture to that sent in Denmark, no one has offered a counter-conjecture to that sent in England. As to the presence of the old English men...

The manuscripts were uncovered in the Royal Library at the Kensington, February 10th, and were published by the printer, in the same year. Since the discovery, the leaves...

I. PROBLEMS FOR A MATURE STUDY

I. INTRODUCTION
tive lines, are in substance parts of three speeches delivered at or about the climactic point of the action. Beginning with K. Mollenhoff in 1860, the more usual view has been that only the four main characters remain on the scene, all other—probably eleven in number—having been killed by the warrior-hero. The leaves have by common consent been designated I and II (occasionally A and B), but since the ordering of leaves is a matter of conjecture, the numeral designations have been used with opposite applications. As being less ambiguous, the designations H and XW will be used in this study, H for the fragment comprised almost wholly of a speech ascribed to Hildegyrf (except by Heinzel, who thinks rather of Hagen), XW for that containing the end of a speech variously assigned to Guthere, Hagen, Waldere, and Hildegyrf and the beginning of a speech known to be Waldere's from the explicit directive expression introducing it.

Most editors and commentators have said relatively little of the language of the fragments, but an adequate critical summary has been offered by Norman, who points out hyrda, H 1, syllan, XW 25, -scype (edwitscype, H 14), gelifet, XW 27, forbigan, H 25, and swurde, H 28, as exhibiting late West Saxon peculiarities, hworfan, H 30 (to which, Dobbie points out, should be added worg, H 2), hafa, XW 2, and perhaps also standa (3rd sing. pres. ind.), XW 18, as late North-

3 Mollenhoff, "Zeugnisse und Excurse zur deutschen Heldensage," ZfdA, XII (1865), 275 f.
4 Heinzel, Über die Walthersage, p. 11.
5 Norman, op. cit., pp. 5-7.
umbrian. Other forms betray no unmistakable affinity of dialect or period. By the testimony of T. D. Kendrick, a decorative sketch in the form of acanthus sprays footing the second side of Fragment H is to be dated "about A.D. 1000" and is to be ascribed to a Northern English artist. Norman concludes that "the date cannot be determined from linguistic considerations; nor can the original dialect of the poem be established, though there are no valid reasons for assuming it to have been "Sax. The dialect of the manuscript is probably that of a Northumbrian scribe attempting to write 'Standard' Old English round about 1000".

As the variety of assignments of speaker would indicate, the leads within the X-speech are not unmistakable, either as to who utters the words or as to what, for the narrative, the passage signifies. Yet it is this very passage which is of the most general interest: it is a web of allusions to Théodor, Widia, Nithad, and Æland, all colorful figures in Germanic legend. From other saga remains, notably from Völundarkviða, from a section of Thidriksæla and from Deor 1-13, the WidiaÆland-Nithad-Beadhilt story is known and the allusion is clear. Likewise in the main for the Théodor-Widia relationship, which

---

7 Norman, op. cit., pp 4 f.


9 Bertelsen, I, 63-133.
is a heavily contributory subject in a number of medieval poems, among them Habenschlacht, Dietrichs Flucht, the Rosengarten group, Lauria, and the compilation called Thidrikssaga. But quite unsettled is the question of what part Theodoric and his relations with Widia may have had in the Waldere situation. An answer to the question would probably help to explain much more about Waldere than merely the immediate passage.

Since the speech shows an intimate knowledge of Theodoric and Widia, the Theodoric legends might be expected to suggest the identity of the speaker. But Hagenma, Waldere, and Hildegyf all about equally well can be acquainted with Theodoric, since, as is known from Waltharius and other sources, all three have been hostages at Attila's court, where Theodoric spent thirty years in exile. The only one of the principal Waldere figures who would be excluded is Guthhere, for whom there seems to have been no opportunity for intimacy with Theodoric. To exclude others than Guthhere, consideration of specific content of the Old English poem beside parallel references or motives in extant Theodoric-Widia lore is necessary.

The most striking fact about the X-speech is its echoes—or foreshadowings—of a sword drama of which yet stronger traces are preserved in Fragment H. One of the weapons figuring in the drama is the sword Mimming, properly Widia's: in other literature Mimming figures repeatedly in relationships between Widia and Theodoric. No one would suppose that either of these heroes had in person more than an atmospheric role in the Waldere-Hildegyf story, but in a Theodoric tale ostensibly unconnected with Walthher the action which the Old English
fragments have suggested to some former students of the Waldere legend is strikingly paralleled\(^\text{10}\) and the nature of the part assumed for the sword Mimming by the same scholars is also suggested in several other narratives and allusions.

In the body of legends in which it appears, Mimming assumes about as much of character and predictability as the human figures appearing in the same literature. Oddly, however, no previous Waldere study has made more than cursory reference to the Mimming legends as of possible importance for an understanding of the Waldere action, in which the sword plays a manifestly heavy role. A principal purpose of this study will be to relate Waldere to this body of parallel matter and to provide somewhat better grounding than has formerly been possible for solving a cluster of problems usually raised in discussions of the form of the Old English poem—the problems of determining 1) the role of Eagna in the climactic battle, 2) the identity of the speaker opening Fragment X\(^\text{II}\), 3) the proper order of the two leaves of text, 4) the immediate narrative context for each of the fragments, and 5) the preferable interpretation of a number of words and phrases which, because of the uncertainty as to the action, have been either variously interpreted, or else given over as ambiguous. The problems of course overlap, and the solutions are in degree reciprocal.

The considerations to find place in a Waldere study have been multiplied by the many scholarly conjectures which have already been

---

\(^{10}\) The tale referred to is Vidga's First Adventure, which is discussed below.
offered on the problems mentioned above, for a number of the conjectures are of such substance or of such prestige that no further—or contrary—conjectures can ignore them. In any case, however, the starting point must be a review of the materials which themselves present the problems and upon which the conjectures are based.

In the following sections of this study, the names of those who figure in the legends are used in as few forms as are consistent with clarity and convenience of reference. For designating the ideal or composite figures, the following forms, as being familiar in English for such general reference, are used without regard to schematic consistency: Walther, Hildegund, Hagen, Gunther, Attila, Theodoric, Wiidia, Hildebrand, and Heime.11

11 The variant forms under which these names appear in the study are as follows: Walthari—walther—Walter—Valltari—Waldere, Hiltgunt—Hildegund—Helgund—Hildigund—Hildagut, Hagan—Hagen—Högni—Hagena, Gunthari—Gunther—Gunnar—Gunther, Attila—Etzel—Aetla, Dietrich—Thiörek—Theodoric, Wiitege—Vigna—Wiidia, Hildebrand—Hildibrand, Heime—Heimir. The names have been adapted to this extent: 1) initially, þ and þ are transliterated as Th, but elsewhere þ and þ are retained in distinction from original th; 2) except in Heimir, declensional terminations such as the Latin -us and the Norse -r are dropped. The context to which each variant belongs will appear from summaries and discussion in the following sections.
2. The literary context: survey of the Walther legend

Though Walther and his adventures are remembered in a number of other writings, only three non-fragmentary versions of the story are extant. The only detailed version (1456 hexameters) is the Medieval Latin *Waltharius*, \(^{12}\) composed c. 930 and traditionally ascribed to the monk Ekehard I of the Swiss cloister St. Gall. Fortunately comparison with other versions of and allusions to the legend attests Ekehard's approximation to a standard or mean form. Another version, extremely compressed, is included as an episode in the Old Norse *Thidrekssaga* (of the mid-thirteenth century), where it comprises only perhaps seven hundred words. \(^{13}\) The third is a Polish version, in slightly variant forms preserved in Latin and Polish chronicles probably not earlier than the fourteenth century. \(^{14}\) This version is very

\(^{12}\) All versions of and identifiable allusions to legends of Walther are printed in the original languages by H. D. Learned, *The Saga of Walther of Aquitaine*. Preferred editions of *Waltharius* are those of H. Althof and K. Strecker (see Bibliography). The only full English translation of the Latin poem is that of H. E. Smyser and F. P. Magoon, Jr., in their *Survivals in Old Norwegian of Medieval English, French, and German Literature, Together with the Latin Versions of the Heroic Legend of Walter of Aquitaine*, pp. 112-45.

\(^{13}\) Old Norse text, Bertelsen, II, 106-9; English translation, Magoon in Smyser and Magoon, op. cit., pp. 75-7.

\(^{14}\) The materials of the Polish version are assembled and discussed by Heinzel, op. cit., pp. 27-59. The fullest account, that in a Latin chronicle of Boguphalus, is translated into English by Smyser and Magoon, op. cit., pp. 146-50.
likely itself derivative, though much altered, either from the Middle High German epic poem Walther, of which only fragments are independently preserved, or from a source fairly close in content and time to Walther. 15

A further Latin source for the Walther legend is that provided by an eleventh-century Italian monastic chronicler in Book II, chapters 7-9, of the Chronicon Novaliciense, 16 but this source scarcely deserves consideration separately from Waltharius. After an account of a certain (presumably real-life) Walthari's entry into the monastery of Novalesa, the chronicler presents ostensibly as an account of the monk's earlier life a redaction of the first 577 lines of Waltharius partly by prose paraphrase, partly by direct quotation, then very briefly summarizes Ekkehard's story up to about line 1345, where Gunthari and Hagano are tired after long fighting with Walthari. The chronicler apparently does not know the conclusion, for he leaves the story dangling.

Besides the more-or-less complete accounts, there are two sets of fragments dealing directly with the Walther story. These are the Old English Waldere 17 (frequently ascribed to the eighth century but actually uncertain as to date beyond the fact that the MS. is not later

15 See H. Schneider, Germanische Heldensage, I, 340.


17 Most recent edition is that of E. V. K. Dobbie, op. cit., pp. 4-6 (discussion, pp. xix-xxvi; notes, pp. 136-42). Most comprehensive and compact study is that of Norman, op. cit.
than the early eleventh century and cannot be much earlier) and the Middle High German Walther\textsuperscript{18} (composed by 1250—probably about 1230).

The main collateral sources so far recognized for the Walther legend are, in Middle High German, the Nibelungenlied (end of the twelfth century)\textsuperscript{19} and Biterolf und Dietleib (after Walther in the thirteenth century),\textsuperscript{20} and, in Thidriksaga, an account of Theodoric and Hildebrand's return from exile.\textsuperscript{21}

In the summary of Waltherius which follows, brackets are used to enclose all matter for which no other version offers unmistakable support. The bracketed elements, it should be noted, are nearly all points which only the missing portions of the fragmentary versions could pertinently have treated.

By their respective three kings, Walthari, Hiltgunt, and Hagano are sent as hostages to the Hunnish court of King Attila. Walthari and Hiltgunt have already been betrothed, even in childhood. Walthari and Hagano, friends and companions-at-arms, distinguish themselves with Attila as warrior-heroes, while Hiltgunt becomes a court functionary and confidante to Attila's queen, having access (as

\begin{itemize}
\item Text and discussion in Heinzela, \emph{op. cit.}, pp. 13-20. Most important discussion of Walther—and of Biterolf und Dietleib as modeled after Walther—is that of H. Schneider, "Das Epos von Walther und Hildegunde," \textit{Grim.} XIII (1925), 14-32 and 119-30.
\item For a study of the relationship between the Nibelung and Walther legends, see Karl Broege, "Nibelungenlied und Waltherius," \textit{ZfdA.} LII (1910), 193-231.
\item Text in O. Janicke, \textit{Deutsches Heldenbuch} (Berlin, 1866), pp. 1 ff. See also footnote 18 above.
\item Bertelsen, II, 323-42. For discussion of the story, see W. Haupt, \textit{Zur niederdeutschen Dietrichsage} (Palaestra CXXIX), pp. 190 ff. and 273 ff., and Schneider, "Das Epos von Walther und Hildegunde."
\end{itemize}
custodian) to the queen’s (and other Hunnish) treasures. Haganono
escapes and leaves Attila to join his proper lord, Gunthari.
(Walthari tactfully declines Attila’s offer of a Hunnish bride and
wealth and soon afterwards performs super-heroically in a successful
campaign of Attila’s which leaves Walthari strangely cold and preoccupied.)
He suggests to Hiltgunt that they two take flight from Attila, but sus-
peeting mockery, Hiltgunt has to be reassured; then she declares
Walthari’s will to be hers and is ready to share his fortunes. They
plot the escape together, and Walthari directs her to provide herself
with (two chests of) Hunnish treasures (and Walthari with fine armor
and accoutrements, as well as extra shoes and fishing equipment).
He and Hiltgunt flee together on a single horse following a banquet
(at which Walthari plies the Huns with wine until all are in a stupor)
and head for the realm of Alphari, Walthari’s king-father. (Walthari
and his fiancee travel by night and rest during the day.) Attila wants
to apprehend the pillaging refugees (and offers extravagant rewards,
but no Hun dares pursue Walthari). Throught the lovers cross the Rhine
and the ferryman conveys news of them to [Gunthari, who is] the ruling
prince. Soon afterward the two are accosted by King Gunthari bent on
plunder with a band of his retainers, including Haganon (who has come
unwillingly, after an attempt to dissuade Gunthari from his purpose
to attack and despoil Walthari). Hiltgunt is fearful, but Walthari
reassures her. Walthari’s offer to give over part of his treasure to
Gunthari is refused. From the following battles (in which Gunthari’s
men must attack singly because Walthari is stationed in a narrow pass
in the Vosges), Haganon holds himself aloof (for the double reason that
Gunthari has insultingly refused a second plea against the attack and
that Walthari is an old and tried friend). After day-long fighting,
during which Walthari kills eleven men (including one of Haganon’s
kinsmen) and leaves only Gunthari and Haganon alive, the leader of that
attack (with his second) ostensibly departs the scene—a ruse conceived
by Haganon (who is now reconciled with Gunthari and means to fight at
his side). After (an overnight) respite, Walthari (when he leaves the
protection of the narrow ravine) is the victim of an attack by Haganon
(and Gunthari together). After terrific fighting, Walthari finally
cuts off Gunthari’s leg and is about to deliver the mortal blow, but
Haganon receives the blow on his own helmet, against which the sword
is shattered. When Walthari in anger hurles away the useless hilt,
Haganon cuts off the incautiously outstretched hand. Walthari with
his left hand then draws a second blade, a short sword with which he
has girded himself before leaving Attila’s court. With a final blow
Walthari slashes Haganon’s chin and cuts out one eye (and some teeth).
The fight is ended in reconciliation (and banter between Haganon and
Walthari), Walthari victorious. Walthari and Hiltgunt continue their
journey. The former succeeds his father as king and lives to do other
heroic fighting.

The Thitrikasaga version is much different, mainly in the
direction of compression, but the version is too late, as well as in
too summary a form, to be taken as reflection of an original much different from *Waltherianus*.

The hero is called Valltari of Vaskastein (*Wasgenstein*). His father is never alluded to, but the hero is Ermanrik's nephew, hence also a kinsman to Thiudrek. The spoil Hildigund brings away is the gold she can carry with one hand. Högni is mentioned neither as a hostage nor as Valltari's friend, but leads a band of Attila's men to overtake the escaping lovers. When the pursuers appear, Hildigund is afraid for Valltari, but he reassures her. In day-long fighting, Valltari kills Högni's eleven supporters and is wounded himself. Högni has ostensibly fled, but reappears in a lone surprise attack just as Valltari and Hildigund, during the respite, have finished a meal of wild boar. Hildigund gives warning, and Valltari hurls a bone at Högni with such force as to cut his chin, remove one eye, and throw him to the ground. Högni flees back to Attila, and the lovers continue their journey to Ermanrik, who sends rich gifts to propitiate Attila.

The simplification in this version has been accounted for as due to a process of tailoring generally operative on legends which escape the protection of an aristocratic audience. However, to the time of the lovers' flight, the narrative is generally very similar to that represented in the Latin poem, with the principal difference

---

22 It is possible that the appellation "walther of the Wasgenstein," which appears in *Rosengarten* as well as in the Old Norse source, represents a confusion by which the site of the refugee Walther's famous battle has become his place of origin. The *Hibelungenlied* represents the fight as taking place at the Wasgenstein. In a more general term, *Waltherianus* places the battle in the Vosges (of which the Wagenstein is probably a region). Spain (*Waltherianus*: Aquitaine) is most frequently designated as Walther's home, and it is also sometimes Langara, sometimes Kerlingen. For further discussion see Norman, *op. cit.*, p. 21, and A. Heusler, "Die Sage von Walther und Hildegund," *ZfdS*, XI (1935), 76.


24 Struck by the relative closeness of the parallel with *Waltherianus* to the time of the flight and by the divergences thereafter, Joseph Seemiller ("Lieder von Walther und Hildegund," *Melanges Codex Kurth*, II, 365-71) offered the hypothesis that the Walther legend had been originally two separate but related lays, one (till the flight) essentially a love story, the other a tale of fighting.
that Högni has not yet been mentioned. That Högni then appears as Attila's henchman and that King Gunnar is entirely missing from the story are alterations perhaps made easier from the fact that the Huns are the hero's first and more natural enemies. Högni has no apparent conflict of loyalties and his role has become wholly mechanical, but the associated drama of weapons is still preserved in a more primitive form: Valltari's alternate weapon has become the bone of the wild boar, itself a transmutation of the fish and fowl which the lovers of Waltharius sustained themselves. The propitiation of Attila seems the one feature of the account which could with much plausibility be taken as reflection of an old feature not elsewhere preserved.

The Polish version is so altered from the Germanic legend as to constitute substantially a quite different story.

Helgund, in the court of her father, King of the Franks, is the betrothed of a prince, son of the Alamanian king. But Walter, a Polish count, courts Helgund by nocturnal serenading and wins her to elope with him. The jilted prince commandeers all craft on the Rhine and decrees that no one be permitted to cross the river with a maiden without paying a mark of gold for passage—an exorbitant fee, since a mark is about eight ounces. Walter pays the fee to some boatmen, who however will not row across until the prince comes. Walter and Helgund mount Walter's horse Bucephalus, jump into the river, and cross more swiftly than an arrow. The prince pursues and catches them, and he and Walter fight for possession of horse, weapons, and maiden. While he is facing Helgund, the prince is so inspired as to hold the advantage, but when Walter is forced to retreat and Helgund comes into his view, he gains the advantage, quickly kills his adversary, and proceeds in triumph to Poland.


26 Thus also Seeßläller, op. cit., p. 369.
The rest of the Polish narrative is of little pertinence for the present study but may be partly derived from Walther’s adventures which in the Germanic legend preceded the flight from Attila. 27

Helgund proves unfaithful. She and her lover, Walter’s captive, conspire against Walter. Prince Wyslav, the lover, has Walter chained in such a position that he is forced to witness Helgund’s acts of adultery with the prince. Hoping to win a husband for herself, Wyslav’s ugly sister cuts Walter’s bonds and gives him Wyslav’s sword, with which Walter falls upon his unfaithful wife and her lover as they lie in bed and cuts them both through the middle at one blow.

Of Walther there are two fragments, representing widely separated portions of the story.

The extremely dilapidated Graz Fragment presents Hagen, still at Etzel’s court, in conversation with Walther and Hildegund, telling them what Walther seems not to have known: that Walther had been betrothed to Hildegund in childhood. As in the Nibelungenlied, Hagen seems to have been formally released by Etzel. He distributes presents to his Hunnish companions before departure.

The Vienna Fragment opens with Walther and Hildegund being escorted homeward by Volker and sixty followers, apparently from the scene of the fights with Gunther’s men. In Metz, Ortwin had had a thousand brave men, against whom Walther’s party must now beware (presumably because Walther has killed Ortwin, and the latter’s men want to take vengeance). But the perilous territory is safely passed through, and messengers are sent ahead to King Alker of Spain, Walther’s father. They tell Alker that Walther parted from the Huns in such a way that the Huns must ever lament it: he had slain many of their dear kinsmen (Hunnish outposts?) on his journey. The king is overjoyed at the prospect of reunion with his son. Later Gunther and his men, as well as other kings, are invited to Walther and Hildegund’s wedding celebration—as are also Etzel and Heloisa, after some hesitancy on Walther’s part. Gunther would like to accept the invitation if Hagen agrees to his doing so.

The Nibelungenlied has three significant references to content of the Walther story.

27 Schneider, "Das Epos von Walther und Hildegund," pp. 29-32. Comparing Hiterolf und Dietleib, Schneider would derive the Polish narrative from the epic Walther.
Btelal says that Hagen and Walther grew from boyhood to manhood as hostages with him: he sent Hagen home again; Walther ran away with Hildegund (strophe 1756 f.). Hagen and the one from Spain (i.e., Walther) fought many battles together when they were with Btelal (1796 f.). In answer to a taunt of Hagen's, Hildebrand mocks: "Who was it who sat on his shield before the Waakenstein when Walther of Spain was killing so many of his friends?" (2344 f.).

In Hiterolf und Dietleib there are many allusions to the Walther story, but the poem is of greater interest from the fact that roughly the first third, to line 4740, seems to have been modeled chiefly on the otherwise nearly lost Walther. Making heavy call, to supply links, on the adventures of Hiterolf and his son Dietleib which bear an apparent derivative relationship to adventures of Walther, Hermann Schneider has offered a conjectural reconstruction of the content of Walther itself. For the purposes of a Walther study, the most significant differences from Waltherius, aside from those already apparent in the extant Walther fragments, are that probably only one named hero, Ortwin von Metz, is killed in Walther's fights, though some unnamed may have fallen; that Walther has not the advantage of a protected position during the fights (chivalric code forbade an attack of several upon one anyway, and the protection would be unnecessary); and that Hagen perhaps fights first in order and then only until he recognizes Walther. The fights end with reconciliation (but how the final reconciliation is accomplished, if Hagen fights first, is not accounted for, and Schneider's

---

28 Ibid.
view of the Hagen role remains tentative\textsuperscript{29}. The citizenry of Worms are astonished at the damage Walther has wrought upon Gunther and his party.

The \textit{Thidrikssaga} account of Thidrek and Hildibrand’s return from exile, of which Hildibrand is the hero, is modeled in part on a Hildebrand-lay (that is, a lay of the fight between Hildebrand and his son) but in greater part on a Walther-lay. Here the relationship to the models is considerably clearer and simpler than in the case of \textit{Biterolf und Dietleib}.

After the disastrous battle of Attila’s and Thidrek’s men against the Burgundians (Niflings), Thidrek confides in Hildibrand his desire to leave Attila and attempt to regain his own kingdom after thirty-two years away from it. Hildibrand is ready to accompany him, and at Thidrek’s request he carries the secret word to Thidrek’s wife Herrad. Not quite credulous, Herrad has to hear it from Thidrek’s own lips, whereupon she declares herself to be of her lord’s will and ready to share his fortunes. Just before setting out, Thidrek privately tells Attila his plans for a secret journey, but will not accept the escorting army which Attila offers. As they near country perilous because of Thidrek’s old enemies, they ride by night only, Hildibrand also leading a horse bearing treasure. As they are riding along between the Luruwald and the Rhine, Hildibrand sees a band of horsemen in pursuit, and though Herrad is fearful, Thidrek reassures her and the two heroes prepare to fight rather than flee into the forest. A demand that Herrad be given up is refused. Of the thirty-two assailants, Thidrek kills seven, but Hildibrand nine. Among the dead only two, Jarl Elson, who is prince and leader, and Ingram, bear names. Those left alive flee, except for Aumlung, who attacks Hildibrand and is overpowered but not harmed. Aumlung explains that Jarl Elson’s party had been seeking revenge on Thidrek because Thidrek’s kinsman had long before killed the elder Jarl Elson. After further telling the good news that Ermanrik, Thidrek’s mortal enemy and usurper of his lands, is near death if not already dead, Aumlung is freed, and Thidrek’s party continue on their journey unmolested. The battle feats of the two men, particularly of the ancient Hildibrand, occasion great astonishment among the citizenry.

\textsuperscript{29} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 126. However, on grounds which seem adequate, Wilhelm Lenz, \textit{Der Ausgang der Dichtung von Walther und Hildegunde}, pp. 56 f., rejects Schneider’s evidence as not actually pertinent.
of Babilonia, Elsung’s land across the Rhine.

Walther appears as a warrior in several Middle High German poems: Alpharte Tod, variant versions of Rosengarten, Dietrichs Flucht (where his name is given to two figures), and Rabenschlacht. He also appears in the Thidrikssage counterpart of the last-named German poem, as well as elsewhere. But none of these appearances and none of the allusions in works not already named have any particularly indicative value for the content of the story of Walther and Hildegund. However, the Thidrikssage account of Viúga’s first adventure30 including an encounter between Viúga and Thidrek, is apparently in considerable part derivative from the Walther legend and has features strongly suggestive of Waldere. But since the relation of Viúga to Walther (and Waldere) has not been pointed out in previous scholarship, discussion of this Walther—Waldere link will find place in a section where its bearings may be dealt with in detail.

Summarily, what Waldere tells us is as follows.

In Fragment H, Hildegund eagerly encourages Waldere, telling him that his sword Míning will not fall him if he will show his usual unflinching courage in his righteous fight against Guthere, who wrongfully started this fighting. Waldere should not be concerned about the sword; the best of treasures was granted him for help. With it he shall humble Guthere. The latter refused the sword and treasures; now he shall turn from this fight without the spoil, else die first.

In Fragment Xh, the opening speaker describes a sword as better than any except the one which the speaker also (sec, Xn. 2) has, quietly hidden in a stanfate. Xh 3 (perhaps "chest," perhaps "sheath"). The speaker knows that Theodoric intended to send the sword to Widia, with much treasure: Widia earned a reward by rescuing Theodoric from straits. A weapon in his hand, presumably a shield (hilde frotre, gutblata gripe, Xn 12 f.), Waldere then speaks, taunting Guthere with the latter’s having expected Hagen to fight with and defeat Waldere. The speaker dares Guthere to come and take the armor from one who is battle-weary. But the excellent armor on Waldere’s shoulders still

30 Bertelsen, I, 133-73.
will not fail. Yet it is God Who gives the victory, and one who has faith and acts right will find help from Him.

The most striking variation of Walsere from the Waltharius yardstick is in the characterization of Hildegund, who appears in Fragment H as having self-possession and courage in a proportion quite the inverse of that represented in Ekkeshard's Hiltgund. The fear-ridden heroine is a constant feature of the legend elsewhere, and if Fragment H is representative of Hildegund through the whole course of the narrative, the Walsere poet's innovation is quite remarkable.

Hageno's role with respect to the climactic fight is also generally presumed to have been considerably different from that of Hageno. It has been felt that in Waltharius, Hageno attacks his old friend prematurely, since he joins the fight even before Gunthari himself is personally endangered. The conflicting loyalties are thus too soon resolved, and the role of Hageno seems defective. As to the part played by the Old English Hageno, there are two principal schools of thought, based respectively on different interpretations of the hints provided in the fragments of a drama of swords. One of the two views, best represented by Ludwig Wolff, is that the X-speech and the remarks on Himming in Fragment H are foreshadowings of the later failure of Himming in the climactic battle. The other view, best represented by F. Dieter (and held also by H. Heinzl, R.C. Boer, L. Wolff, "Zu den Walsere-Bruchstücken," ZfdA, LXII (1925) 81-9.

33 Heinzl, op. cit., p. 7.
34 Boer, "Untersuchungen über die Hildesage," ZfdPh, XL (1908), 50.
F. Norman and D. C. Miller (35) is that the remarks in Fragment H indicate a sword already to have failed, of which Mimming is the replacement. In essence provisioned by G. Neckel,37 Wolf’s conjecture is that Hagena played a wholly consistent role, unshakably loyal to both lord and friend, never interceding between the combatants except at the climactic moment when Gudhere was incapacitated by a wound and it became necessary for Hagena to deflect the sword-stroke which would have taken Gudhere’s life. To this point Dieter and Norman are agreed, and Fragment H as usually interpreted lends presumptive support: at the time when Gudhere attacks Waldere, Hagena seems not yet to be involved. Wolf’s further assumption, however, is that Mimming broke on Hagena’s interposed sword and left Waldere powerless to continue the fight, hence ripe for reconciliation. This denouement is prepared for in the X-speech; we are to take it that Hagena is the speaker and is warning Gudhere not to underestimate Waldere nor to think he can hold his own before the opponent’s sword: “There is no sword equal to Waldere’s except mine, and mine is not to be drawn in this battle.” Then in support of his assertion about the excellence of Waldere’s sword, Hagena tells something of Mimming’s background.

For the dramatic import it supposes for the X-speech, Wolf’s hypothesis has proved very attractive, and among others who have accepted

35 Norman, op. cit., pp. 14 f.


37 Neckel “Das Gedicht von Waltharius manu fortis,” Göt., IX (1921), 211. (Neckel’s assumption was that Mimming was to break on Hagena’s helmet.)
it are Schneider, Heusler, and Klaeber, the last having first for some years demurred because after mention of one of the swords falls the relative clause \textit{we ic ec e hafa}, \textit{XW} 2, which seems properly to require that both swords be in possession of the speaker. But despite the attractiveness of Wolff's idea of the weapons drama, Dieter's idea is in accord with a more logically consecutive interpretation of Fragment H and with an interpretation of the X-speech in which \textit{eac} presents no difficulty.

The weaknesses in the presentation of Hagano may or may not be poorly conceived innovations of Ekkehard's, but there are other features of \textit{Waltharius} which almost surely were not of the source legend. The larger portion of the Latin poem is devoted to an account of Walthari's fights with the Burgundians (in \textit{Waltharius} called Franks), each of Gunthari's men bearing a name and each fight being given detailed description. It is suspicious, however, that none of the first eleven warriors (i.e., those killed) can be identified with certainty from any other saga remains, and only Camalo, governor of Metz, the first of the eleven, has been given a plausible conjectural identification: Camalo may be a by-name ("the old one") for one of two Ortwins—namely the Ortwin von Metz who presumably died by Walther's hand in the Middle High German version. Though the \textit{Thidrikssaga} version and the \textit{Nibelungenlied}

\begin{itemize}
  \item Schneider, \textit{Germanische Heldensage}, I, 333; \textit{Deutsche Heldensage}, p. 124.
  \item Heusler, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 74.
  \item Klaeber, "Drei Anmerkungen," \textit{Est.}, LXX (1936), 333.
  \item Althof, \textit{Das Waltherlied} (Sammlung Göschens, No. 46), p. 111 (note to \textit{Waltharius} 581).
\end{itemize}
establish the probability that there were eleven killed in the original form of the legend, it is little likely that the fights were individually described or that more than one or two of Walther's opponents (besides Hagen and Gunther) were named heroes, or that Walther was explicitly provided with the protected position to force his opponents into a series of individual combats. Dieter was first to call Waltharius acutely into question on these points, and K. Strecker, particularly, has since shown that Ekkehard is very heavily indebted to Virgil and Prudentius for the descriptions of individual fighting. One may infer that the materials for the fights as provided in Ekkehard's Germanic sources were relatively scant.

The Latin poet seems, perhaps willfully, to have viewed some of his materials without reference to the vernacular Germanic legendary context (in particular the story of Siegfried's death at the hands of Hagen and Gunther and of Hagen and Gunther's later fall, now best known from the Nibelungenlied). Ekkehard's Gunthari is called King of the Franks. But the historical Gundaharius was king of the Burgundians, and the King Gunther of legend is never given a national connection other than Burgundian. Waldere correctly remembers him as wine Burgenda. Hence he must have been a Burgundian in the popular literature of

42 Dieter, "Die Walderefragmente und die ursprüngliche Gestalt," Anglia, X (1888), 229-234; XI (1889), 159-70.


44 For discussion of Gundaharius, see M. G. Clarke, Sidelights on Teutonic History during the Migration Period, pp. 209 ff.
Ekkehard's day, as he is as early as Widsith (lines 63-67) and still uniformly is in the poetry of the thirteenth century and later. It is generally inferred that Ekkehard made the change to conform to the geography of his own time. Further, Attila's queen is called Ospirin, though everywhere else she is Helohe (the common form, but with some variants). As second wife to the historical king there was Ildico; to the legendary one, Kriemhild. No third is known. It has been suggested that Ospirin may signify "Divine Bear" and may be the Latin poet's fanciful by-name for Helohe—from the likeness to Helike, the Greek term for the constellation of the Great Bear. But few of Ekkehard's readers could have been expected to see through the disguise.

That as in Waltharius Walther and Gunther were maimed in the original legend is very doubtful. Though both figures appear frequently, neither a one-handed Walther nor a one-legged Gunther is remembered in any other legend, a fact more remarkable in that Hagen's loss of an eye is well known. The Valltari-Hildigund episode of Thidrïksaga vividly remembers the lost eye for Hogni, but, though Valltari is wounded, he is described as soon afterwards striking fire from flint, an action which, as Althof has remarked, implies at least two sound hands for him.

The Low German story of the Nibelungs knew Hagen as one-eyed (Thidrïksaga, Berteleen, II, 302), and on the basis of the phrase el ell oh aln gealhene (Nibelungenlied, str. 1734), scholars have assumed him to have been one-

45 Althof, Das Waltharilied, ed. cit., pp. 85 f. (note to Waltharius 123). The suggestion was first made by J. Grimm.

46 Althof, Waltharii Poesie, II, 351 (note to Waltharius 1362).
eyed in the High German form of the legend as well. But Gunther in both cases is sound of limb. Moreover, Thidrikssaga even presents Högni as one-eyed in a story (the Low German counterpart of the High German Nösgarten poems) which the Old Norse compiler places in a position considerably prior to the Valtari-Hildigund episode itself, but the Gunnar who appears beside Högni has no physical handicap.


48 Bertelsen, I, 343.
3. The context expanded: survey of the Mimming legend

The appearance of Mimming in the hand of Waldere is against everything Germanic legend elsewhere has to say of the sword. The poet's appropriation involved a measure of daring, and the grounds for it, in any case, are unlikely to have been merely casual. For indications of the light in which he saw the sword, hence of the use which he intended for it, we have the evidence of a very considerable body of literature in Middle High German and Old Norse, and scattered references in Low German and Middle English.

The fullest and most consecutive collection of Mimming legends is the Old Norse Thidriksæga (already several times mentioned), preserved in a number of manuscripts, one of them an Old Swedish redaction which uniquely adds an account of Mimming's end. The Thidriksæga is itself at least in the main a compilation of Low German stories and poems, translated and so arranged as to give a consecutive view of the legendary Theodoric and the figures associated with him. The fidelity of the compiler to his sources is known from the essential agreement between

49 Bertelsen's is the standard edition. For a German translation, see Fine Erichsen, Die Geschichte Thidreks von Bern, Jena, 1924. There is no English translation of the complete work. Portions are translated in Smyser and Magoun, op. cit.

50 For fuller discussion of Thidriksæga and for an English translation of the compiler's own remarks, see Smyser and Magoun, op. cit., pp. vii-viii, 50-3, 103-4.
sections of Thidrikssaga and Middle High German poems on the same subjects, as well as from the compiler’s own testimony.

Of Mimming in its maker’s hands, Thidrikssaga tells us as follows.51

At Nidung’s court, the smiths Vélen and Amelias enter into a trial of skill: the former makes a sword and the latter a suit of armor; then the sword is tried against the armor. Vélen is satisfied with his product, Mimming, only when it cuts through a yard cube of wool borne against it by the current of a stream. At the final trial, Vélen draws the sword vertically through Amelias’s armored body, asks Amelias to shake himself, and watches the rival smith fall dead in halves when he shakes. King Nidung desires Mimming for himself, but Vélen foils him by handing over a double for it. Once when unjustly attacked, Vélen kills Nidung’s seneschal, Mimming dividing him as it had done Amelias.52

Vélen has a son Viðga by Beóvild (the Beowild of Door 6–13), Nidung’s daughter. Following is the story of his first adventure.

The boy Viðga, impatient to begin a heroic career, cannot be dissuaded by his father, Vélen’s, offer to help him humble a giant and win a noble and wealthy wife. Vélen gives him horse, armor, and the marvelously hard and keen sword Mimming, Vélen’s own handiwork, with which Viðga hopes to meet, challenge, and overcome Thidrek, foremost of possible contenders, in a knightly game of battle skill, then to ally himself with Thidrek. On his way, Viðga meets a party comprised of Hildibrand and two others of Thidrek’s retinue. Though Hildibrand cagily gives false names for himself and Heimir, he is much impressed by Viðga and swears brotherhood-in-arms with him. Then the party ride towards Thidrek’s headquarters in Verona. When they near a bridge, Viðga rides ahead to bargain with the twelve robberish bridge-keepers, who, however, refuse his peaceful overtures and plan to despoil and mutilate him. The troop attack, but with Mimming Viðga kills one after another. His new friends finally come to his aid, but only in time to see him rout the five remaining robbers. During the night following the battle, knowing Viðga’s intention to challenge Thidrek and fearing that his lord’s armor would prove ineffectual against Viðga’s sword, Hildibrand takes Mimming by stealth and puts his own sword in its place. The next day, Viðga’s horse bears him across a bridgeless stream in an arrow-swift leap.


52 The vertical division of the seneschal appears in MSS. A and B, but not in MSS. Wb, which is translated by Haggoun.
the fights with the robbers are renewed and all five are killed, but this time Vidga receives assistance from Jarl Hornbogi, one of his three traveling companions, and fails to observe that the sword he fights with is not Dimming.

When they reach Verona and the challenge is laid before Thidrek, the latter, despite Hildibrand's defense of Vidga's character, responds in ungracious irritation and boasts that he will defeat Vidga, than have him hanged as a rascal. In the long and furious duel outside Verona, first on horseback with spears, then on foot with swords, Vidga's inferior sword finally breaks on Thidrek's famous helmet Hildigrim, and Vidga, thinking it to be Dimming which fails, hurls away the useless hilt and utters an imprecation upon the workmanship of his father, Valant. With his own sword, Nagelring, Thidrek is about to cut off Vidga's head, but Hildibrand steps between. His plea for Vidga, however—on the score of Vidga's past deeds and his noble lineage—is in vain. Thidrek answers contemptuously and is still resolved on hanging Vidga. Hildibrand then places in Vidga's hands the true Dimming. Vidga at once takes heart, chides himself for supposing that his father's work would fail, and soon gains ascendancy over Thidrek. The latter is several times wounded, for his armor is no match for the new weapon. He vainly beseeches Hildibrand to stop the fight, but Hildibrand, rankling under Thidrek's earlier insults, refuses to interfere. King Thatwar, Thidrek's father, is himself bound in honor to let the fight go on.

With a terrific blow, Vidga cleaves the same hard helmet on which the first sword had broken, so that Thidrek's hair pours out through the rent. Then Hildibrand relents, throws himself between the combatants, and bega Vidga, on the score of sworn brotherhood, to spare Thidrek. Vidga accedes, but only for Hildibrand's sake. Nonetheless Vidga and Thidrek are at once reconciled and became sword-brothers, and as good friends the three ride back to Verona.

Similarly Dimming proves a deus ex machina in Thidrek's hands, and Schneider has suggested that the part played by the sword in the story below was derived from an account of the Vidia-Theodoric duel.

King Thidrek and Sigurðr engage in a sword duel which lasts from morning to night on two successive days, but Thidrek is unable with his own sword to penetrate Sigurðr's armor-like skin. On the second night, Thidrek arranges with Vidga for the loan of Dimming. The next day Thidrek by trickery convinces Sigurðr that Dimming, against which Sigurðr has expressed disinclination to fight, will not be used against him. Then with


54 Bertelsen, II, 29-35.
Mimming Thidrek readily cuts through the defences which have earlier defied his own sword, and Sigurd surrenders himself to save his life.

When from his exile with Attila, Thidrek leads an army against Sifisa, it is with Mimming that Viita kills Thidrek’s proteges Erp and Ortwin, who are Attila’s sons, and Thidrek’s own brother, Thether. He thus rouses Thidrek’s implacable desire for revenge. Since at this point Viita chooses rather to flee than to fight, Thidrek chases him to a watery grave in the sea. With some variations, the same story is preserved also in Habenschlacht and Dietrichs Flucht (in the former of which Etzel’s sons are Scharf and Ort, in the latter, Erp and Ort.)

According to the Old Swedish version of Thidriks saga, however, Viita’s jump into the sea is not his end, but the mermaids, Viita’s kin, receive and save him, and he settles at what seems a safe distance from Thidrek. The latter nonetheless eventually seeks Viita out, first hides the sword Mimming, then challenges him to a second duel. In the fight both receive their death wounds, but Thidrek lives long enough to take Mimming to a Swabian lake, throw the sword far out into the water, and thus prevent its coming again into human hands.

In the fourteenth-century Middle English Horn Childe, 400 ff., Mimming, wrought by -aland, is mentioned as the paragon of swords. In another Middle English romance, now preserved only in an Old Norse translation made in 1286, the sword appears, along with the horse Slemming

56 Bertelsen, II, 243-5.
57 Ibid., pp. 247-9.
58 Ibid., pp. 395-6.
(here called Kleming), in the role again of *deus ex machina*: Mimming, which has counter-magical properties, replaces the hero’s prior sword, lost through witchery, then in due time cuts the witch’s head off.  

Mimming figures in a number of other poems, notably in *Biterolf und Dietleib* (especially lines 156-179), in the A and D versions of *Rosengarten* in *Laurin* 1577, in Veldeke’s (later 13th century) *Enide* 5692 ff., and Heinric van den Bergh’s romance (end of 13th century) *Heinric en Margriete van Limborch*, IV, 1053-59. The sword is in most cases explicitly shown the highest respect, and in Veldeke, is the most highly esteemed of three swords compared with the blade wrought by Vulcan for Aeneas. Of known Mimming allusions, Veldeke’s is nearest in time to *Waldere*.

The Mimming legend which most concerns us here is that of Vidga’s first adventure, which has a number of points of pertinence in addition to what it has to say of the sword. Though, unlike the *Waldere* poet, Eckhard makes no mention of Mimming or even any nearly comparable sword, the similarities between the account of the first Thidrek-Vidga duel and the Walther story as known from *Waltharius* are otherwise already strikingly close. Hilldibrand’s relation to Vidga and Thidrek is of course

59 The story is translated into English from Karlamagnus Saga by Smyser in Smyser and Magoun, *op. cit.*, pp. 3-27. The portion summarized above occupies pp. 23-6.


61 Vulcan sends Aeneas a sword:  
daz scharfer und harter war  
den der quote vke sahs [i.e., Ecketax]  
noch der maere Mimming  
noch der quote Nagelrin.
the same as that of Hagano to Walthari and Gunthari respectively. In the colloquy between liegeman and lord, in the fit of sulking on the liegeman’s part, and in the liegeman’s finally going to the help of his lord, the stories are closely parallel, and Viðga’s fight with the band of robbers, besides, bears considerable resemblance to Walthari’s struggles with Gunthari’s henchmen.

On the details for the use for the second sword, as well as on the time and manner of the liegeman’s intercession, the two stories differ, but when we come to the Old English poem, the differences would seem at least much slighter. From Fragment H it is to be inferred that Guðhere’s fight with Óðreir must begin as a duel, not as an attack of two against one. Hence in that fight, Hagena must not intervene for Guðhere before just such a late stage as that at which in Thidrikssaga hilldibrand intervenes for Thidrek. As will be seen in greater detail later, the dramatic role of the sword Mimming must also be substantially the same in Óðreir as in the Thidrek-Viðga duel.

But whether or not he were aware of the particular analogue to his own subject constituted by the story of the young Widia, the Old English poet’s conception of the role of Mimming can hardly have been much different from that in Widia’s duel. The consensus of Mimming legends and allusions is that the weapon is virtually infallible. In particular, wherever Mimming appears as one of two swords used alternately it comes into use only when the alternate weapon has already failed. And that Óðreir uses two swords is extremely probable. Waltherius shows Walthari using alternate swords in his climactic fight, and in however transmuted a form, the Valltari-Hildigund episode in Thidrikssaga likewise points to alternation of weapons in the root version. The Óðreir relic itself,
without regard to the specification of Mimming, preserves strong hints of such a circumstance. Moreover, such alternation is not uncharacteristic of accounts of intensified individual combat. Beowulf has to resort to a second blade in both his sword fights with monsters. Assuming then that Waldere uses two swords, one of them Mimming, the latter, to be of dramatic use worthy of any part of its history elsewhere, cannot well come into play before the other sword proves ineffectual or fails altogether, an event which we should expect to be withheld, of poetic necessity, until the climactic fight is well under way.

The adaptation to the Waldere plot of a sword action comparable to that in Hidia's duel would mean no very essential change from the received version in Waltharius, but it would involve at least the withholding of Hagena's intercession until Guthere, like Theodoric, were in very peril for his life. Such a role for Hagena has already been conjectured by a number of students of the legend.

62 Beowulf 1518-69 and 2677-2705.

63 A list of those who have held this view of Hagena would include Dieter, Eckerth, L. Simons, Wolff, Schneider, Norman, Klaeber, Heusler, and Lenz.
4. The context expanded: Vidga as modeled on Walther

The role of the liegeman who in determined neutrality watches his lord and his brother-in-arms in combat until the lord has come into perilous straits, but who then comes to the rescue and is finally the agent of reconciliation, is unique in the stories of Walther and Vidga. In view of the close resemblance, in character and situation, between Hagen and Hildibrand, as well as of the robber parallels, there must have been an influence between the respective legends.

That there might have been an influence need not rest only on the similarities already described: it is demonstrable that the account of Vidga's fight with the twelve robberish bridge keepers is identical in source with the account of Hildibrand and Thidrek's battle with Eslung's party, and the latter account appears in the story of Thidrek's return from exile, already accepted as largely modelled on a Walther-lay. The following should be compared with Vidga's fight, pp. 126 f. below.

The opening speaker is one of Eslung's men.

"We are certainly fools that we stand so long before two men and bandy words with them." Then he drew his sword angrily and struck Master Hildibrand's helmet cover. The sword cut the cover, but under that was Hildigrim, Thidrek's helmet. There the blow had to stop as formerly. King Thidrek himself now wore the helmet which had belonged to Young Sigurd. Hildibrand however swung his sword Gram, which Young Sigurd had had, and struck Ingram's helmet, and so violently he cleaved helmet and head, back and byrnie, that fire flew from it and the sword first stopped in the saddlebow, and Ingram fell dead from the horse. Now King Thidrek drew his sword Erisax and struck the first blow upon the nearest knight on his shoulder, so that the arm with the side was torn off and the man fell dead from the horse. The second blow Thidrek laid upon Jarl Eslung himself under the right arm through byrnir and shoulder,
so that the sword cut away the arm, hence to the cheek, through the jaw and back teeth, so that the Jarl sank dead from the left side of the horse. Then rose great fear and trembling, and all wished to be at home in Babilonia. Nevertheless a hotter fight developed. In a short time King Thidrek killed seven knights, but Master Hildibrand killed nine. Then the young Amlung attacked him fiercely and strove with him. The rest all fled before King Thidrek.64

Aside from the inevitable differences in names of weapons and combatants, most features of Vidga's fight with the robbers are reflected with little distortion in the Elsung episode. Further, though the bridge does not figure in the Elsung episode, the fighting does again take place at a stream beside the Luruvald. The order in which materials of the battle are arranged is only to this extent different: in the Elsung episode, the vertical sword blow which divides the victim takes a preliminary position, whereas in the Vidga fight, the blow follows a rising action. But this difference has distinct accountability, as will appear later in discussion of the materials which the Elsung episode received from a Hildebrand-lay.

The Old Norse versions of the two passages are given in parallel columns below. The lefthand column is from Bertelsen, I, 151-153; the right from Bertelsen, II, 338-339. The text of the MS. designated M, basic in Bertelsen's edition, is followed. Parts of the passage on the right are transposed as indicated by the marginal numerals.

64 Bertelsen, II, 338 f.
Vist ero ver (litlar firir oss) er ver stendom har (xij. firir
einem manni oc smælar hann naer
iamnum orðan vilt oss. brigt it
sverðan yfrum oc skal hann nu
lata vepa sin oc þar a ovan skal
hann leggja lifit.

Síðan dro stvdfus sverdf sitt og
altræm skjott oc harmælga oc
hio til viðga i hiala hans en sa
hialar ver sva hardr sam hit
hardasta stal oc sitt þeit en
hinn hardasta stein.

Hann bregtar simu sverdli haarmælga
oc hoggur til meðstara hildibrands
a hans hialmbott oc þat sverd bitr
hialmbottiinn en þar firir innan var
hildigrímur hialar þiðreks oc þar
verðast staðar nema þættu hogg sam
þyrr. Þa þiðreks konungr stjalfr
hefur nu þann hiala er at hefir
Sigrurð suæinn er allra vepna er
bætr oc mest gullbuinn.

Vidga bra hino gott a sverðli mæling
skynðilegum með mikilli reiti oc
fylgum ovari hvgryttoc hio til
stvdfus sva hit fyrsta slag a hina
vinstri oxi sva at allt þeit í svaðr
briost og herðarnar, með bryni-
ömni til hinnar heogr í sitt sva at
sær fell hverr lvtr til iæðar.

2(Num bregðir þiðrekr konungr sino
sverðli ecki sax oc hoggur fyrsta slag
hinn fyrsta riddara a hans oæl suæ
at af fyrkr hondina með sidunni oc sa
faælir dauð af hestinnum oc annat
slaeg væitir hans sialfum iarlinum
elumund undir hondina heogr hoggur
upp oælina með brynunni oc sverðit
sviðar af hondina oc upp a kinninu
oc sundr kialkann oc suæi i iarlanu
oc steypiz hann hinn vinstra vaeg
dauðr af hestinnom.

---

65 MS. B: mikil föl.
Nu varð mikill ött í hans mannum af þessi hogvi. vildv hví giarna margir vera heima. oc brigmé po allir sverðom sinum oc skielpti þeir hví at hæmum oc eggjum hvír annan til fram gango. Hví hoeogr Gramaleif til viðga a-
hialmína en hialmr hans var söva herðr at eiki belt a. Hví hoeogr
viðga till Gramaleif oc klyfr (hauð hans oc bve söva at i beltí)\textsuperscript{66} nam staðar oc fall hann davör a
iort...\textsuperscript{67}

Viðga hevir haft mikit starf meðan hann hevir veitt ovinom sinum morg stór hagguu söva at af
þeim .xij. (varo eigi fleiri eptir en fim einir).\textsuperscript{68} En sigstaf
oc þeir .v. felagar comoz aflotta vadan.

oc a litilli hrið hæfir þiðrekr konungur nu drepit .vii. riddara
annarri sinni hendi. en moeistari
hildibrandr hæfir nu drepit .ix.
þa saekir at honum bina ugli
hmungr oc boersi við hann. en
fírir þiðreki konungi flyia nu
allir poeir er eptir ero.

\textsuperscript{66} LS. B: hans hialm og hofud buk og bryniu sva ath i heste.

\textsuperscript{67} At this point the scene shifts to Viðga's waiting companions.
The interpolation is here omitted.

\textsuperscript{68} MS. B: ligde ber vii dauder.
In his study of the Thidríks saga account of Thidrek and Hildibrand’s homecoming, W. Haupt takes note of the fact that the Ælungs episode—i.e., the battle between the two heroes and Ælungs’s men—is one of the many points of contiguity between the story of the homecoming and the legend of Walther and Hildegund. Elsewhere in the same study, however, he speaks of the Ælungs episode as being in part modeled after Viðga’s fight with robbers. But it would be strange if a poet whose primary model was a Walther-lay should turn to a new model for materials of a kind already contained in the primary source. Since the Viðga adventure and Thidrek’s homecoming have much of the account of the fight in common and since both have, not in common, other features which point to a Walther-lay, the only assumption that fits is that these extant descriptions of fighting come, not one from the other, but both from the common model, the Walther-lay.

Leaning on Haupt’s study of the derivation of the homecoming legend, Schneider quotes the words opening the Ælungs fight—ver erom oc vist fol er ver stondum suæ lengi firir tuæm mannæ bæir iæmæz vid ess i ærim—as very probably echoing closely a Walther-lay. But Schneider has apparently overlooked Haupt’s remark on the Viðga adventure as a model and is unaware that for the quotation from the Ælungs episode is to be found in the Viðga story a counterpart infinitely nearer the terms to be expected

---


70 Ibid., p. 190.

71 Schneider, “Das Epos von Walther und Hildegunde,” p. 125. Schneider was not fully familiar with the materials of the parallel Viðga adventure. In his Deutsche Heldensage, p. 85, he ends a synopsis of the story as follows: “nun [when Viðga has got Minning back] bleibt Hiteg Sæger und König Dietmar muss seinen Sohn vor dem wütenden retten.”
in the Walther-lay: Vist ero ver litlir firir oss er ver stondum her. 

firir einnum menni oc maelir hann naer iammom ordum við oss. brigdit 

sverðom yðrom oc skal hann nu late vapp sin oc par a ovan skal hann leggja 

lifit. To be compared is Waltharius 666-667,72 where as his concluding 

words before launching the attack, Camelo says that talk must end and 

Walthari give up the things demanded or lose his life.

We should in any case expect the account of Viðga, the lone 

warrior, to reflect the Walther model more faithfully than would the 

account of Hilldibrand and Thífrek, who must share Walther's feats between 

them. The explanation for the reordering of the swordplay in the Elsung 

episode apparently lies in the fact that the episode borrows not only 

from the Walther-lay but also from a Hildebrand-lay. Besides providing 

climax and denouement of the actual fighting, motifs from the latter lay 

are blended with Walther-lay materials in the dialogue giving rise to the 

battle. The following, in which Aumlung is the opening speaker, imme-

diately precedes the battle description given above.

"If you would let this woman go home with us you should keep 

your lives." Hilldibrand answered: "She came out of Gusat with King Thífrek 

for something other than going home with you, and we will certainly not 

grant that." Then one of Elsung's men said: "I have never heard an old 

fellow speak so boldly and fearlessly, and at the same time so arrogantly." 

King Thífrek answered: "You must be a far greater child in understanding 

and all courtesy than you can count in years. He has led his whole life 

in honor and manliness, and thus he has become old. Don't be so rash as 

still to mock him for his age." Now Aumlung spoke: "Give up your weapons 

quickly into our power. But if you will not do that, I will tear your 

beard so that the greatest part will come away in my hand." Then Hilldi-

brand answered: "If your hand comes to my beard, you will rue it. For one 

of the two will happen: either my arm will be broken in striking, or your 

hand shall fall off. Who is your leader?" Then one of them answered:

72 Consummare etenim sermones nunc uolo cunctos: 
   Aut quaesita dabis, aut uitam sanguine fundes.
"Though you are long of beard, you are short of wit. Do you not know Lord Hilsung, our jarl? Why are you so impudent that you dare to ask about our leader?"

Aumlung's opening speech and Hilldibrand's retort point to the Walter-lay (cf. Waltharius 601 ff.). So does Hilldibrand's inquiry concerning the leader of the opposing party. But for the rest, much of the content of the passage is still reflected in Der Vater mit dem Sohn, Kasper von der Rön's fifteenth-century version of the Hildebrand-Hadubrand story. Hilldibrand opens the following colloquy.

"solt ich daheim beleiben
und haben gut gemach?
vil streitens muss ich treiben:
das machet mich oft schwach;
in Walchen und in Unger
geriten manch herfart:
des glaub du mir, du junger,
darum graut mir mein bart."

"dein bart wil ich ausraufen
(das must du sehen an)
das dir das bluot muss laufen
und auf dem harnisch stan.
dein harnisch und dein grunen schild,
den mustu mir auch geben,
und mein gefangen, ob du wilt,
wiltu icht lenger leben."

In the Thidriksaga Hilddibrand-Alibrand story, the conversation between the two heroes during a pause from fighting affords a further parallel. Alibrand tells his father: "Certainly you are not wise, though you are old." We would suppose that, having drawn Hilddibrand first into the

73 Text given in Emil Henrici's Das deutsche Heldenbuch, pp. 301-6.
74 Bertelsen, II, 351.
fight, the author has altered the sequence of materials in his Walther model in order to ascribe the wonderful sword stroke to his hero. And in the recapitulation of the fighting, since Thidrek can hardly be assigned a lower count of warriors slain than Walther, who presumably killed seven before the interruption of the battle, the present hero, Hildibrand, is assigned a higher toll.

Schneider has remarked the use of the Hildebrand-lay motif to draw Hildibrand into the battle with Eslung's men, and Haupt had already noted that the same lay furnished materials of the climax and conclusion of the battle, the Hildibrand-Aumlung fight. More recently, however, Wilhelm Lenz has wanted to take that fight as preserving original features of Walther's climactic fight. But if what happens to Aumlung bears any resemblance to what happened to Gunther or Hagen, the resemblance is most likely to be coincidental.

Here is what happens to Aumlung (the passage immediately follows that given on page 30 f. above).

Now Master Hildibrand gave Aumlung such a blow on shield and helmet that Aumlung fell and Master Hildibrand upon him and bade him give up his weapons and keep his life. Then Aumlung answered: "It is for me certainly no better to live, since so old a man has overpowered me, but nonetheless I will give up my weapons and remain alive." He gave up his weapons and Hildibrand ordered him to stand up and asked who he was and why the men had sought after their lives.

With Alibrand, after his surprise attack on his father, it goes

---

75 Schneider, "Das Epos von Walther und Hildegunde," p. 125.
76 Haupt, op. cit., p. 190.
77 Lenz, op. cit., pp. 69 ff. passim.
78 Bertelsen, II, 340.
as follows.

And the old man attacks him so hard that now the young man falls to the earth, and the old man on top of him, and (he) sets his sword against his chest and spoke: "Tell me quickly thy name and thy family or else thou shalt lose thy life." Then Alibrand answers: "I shall never tell thee that, for I should never care henceforth about life after so old a wild goose shall have climbed on top of me." Hildibrand spoke: "If thou wishest to preserve thy life, then tell me quickly if thou art Alibrand my son, for I am Hildibrand thy father." Then Hildibrand gets off him quickly; Alibrand likewise (gets) to his feet, and they kiss one another and now recognize one another.79

It would appear that the author of the Elsung episode has used as much of the Hildebrand-Hadubrand (or -Alebrand) action as could be assimilated to his story without taking over the father-son relationship of the combatants. The effect of the loss of the relationship is to be seen in Aumlung's self-contradiction: it were no good to live after this, but he will give up his weapons and live anyway.

With his Hildebrand-lay motif, the composer could have no use for a resumption of the battles with the remnants of the attacking party. But, though presumably without reflecting much of the original pattern of the fighting, Vidga's second set-to with the robbers confirms what we would assume on the basis of Waltharius and the story of Valltari and Hildigund—that in the original Walther-lay the battle was resumed and Walther ran up his total of slain. There are also elements elsewhere in the Vidga narrative which are likely to be reminiscent of Walther. The evidence of the Polish version points to the arrow-swift river-crossing by the marvelous horse; and the evidence of Waltharius 123-167, where

Attila offers a bride and wealth to Walthari and the latter refuses, points to Valen's offer to help Viðga win a bride and wealth, also of course refused. Since Schneider has thought, on the basis of Biterolf und Dietleib, that in Walther the hero might have travelled as far as the Rhine under the assumed names Sintreim and Baltram, it is possible that the use of the same pseudonyms for Hilldibrand and Heimir might have been suggested by the Walther-lay.

For confirmation of these greater and lesser features as traceable to the Walther legend, we are provided—again in Thidrikssaga—a second version of the Viðga story, in which however the figure of Viðga is replaced by that of Heimir. The parallel version is almost wholly faithful to the Viðga narrative (as presented in Appendix B), with these major differences: 1) Heimir's father suggests no giant-killing and advantageous marriage for his son, 2) Heimir meets no one—neither Hilldibrand nor robbers—and has no adventure on his way to Thidrek, 3) no one evinces any sympathy for Heimir in his duel with Thidrek, 4) the duel ends when Heimir's sword breaks, and Thidrek immediately accepts the defenceless youth into his retinue. The most particular difference between Viðga's duel and Heimir's, up to the point of the broken sword, is that in the Heimir story the horseback fighting is to some extent elaborated. Remarkably, the features missing in the Heimir story include all the portions of the Viðga story which are suggestive of the Walther-lay, and we can hardly conclude otherwise than that the version with Heimir

80 Schneider, "Das Epos von Walther und Hildegunde," p. 21.
81 Bertelsen, I, 40-43.
as hero is the earlier and that the differences in Vidga's adventure represent increment.

What remains as original in the Vidga story when both the Heimir and the Walther materials are removed is of course in part machinery for bringing the two frames together. The episode of the meeting between Vidga and Hildibrand's party was in part suggested by another legend also preserved in Thidreksaga. The attempted intercession of King Thetmar for his son Thidrek in the course of the duel seems intended only to underscore Thidrek's plight and enhance Hildibrand's role as the sole agent capable of resolving the conflict. But the Thetmar passage could be wholly deleted without a break in continuity for the essential narrative.

From the evidence presented above, it would appear that the tale of Vidia's first adventure must have been of relatively late origin. Yet there are allusions and a considerable derivative literature to indicate that by the thirteenth century the story had had wide currency. Schneider has pointed out that probably the Thidrek-Sigurth duel (see p. 25 above) and without doubt a Dietrich-Libertin duel in Dietrichs Erste Ausfahrt are modeled on the Theodoric-Vidia battle, and by the same scholar a knowledge of the story of Vidia's adventure is assumed for the author of the "Wieland Roman" to be found in Thidrikssaga. In still another section of Thidrikssaga, a story of Heimir's banishment, conceived as a sequel to Vidia's adventure and using materials from it, is fused with an

---

82 Ibid., pp. 67-8.
83 Schneider, Deutsche Heldensage, p. 95.
84 Ibid., p. 104. For the Wieland Roman, see Bertelsen, I, 74-134.
85 Bertelsen, I, 203-20.
episde from the legend of Biturulf and Thetleif. There are also two passages in 
Vom Übelen Wip referring to a great duel between Witege and Dietrich at which Hildebrand seems to have been present. The poet of 
Rosengarten D knew that Witege had brought the horse Schemming with him 
when he left his father.

In short, from the variety of extant traces of the story, it 
would appear that the composition might be of considerably earlier date 
than its apparently derivative nature would otherwise suggest. But whether 
it existed early enough to provide the mimming role of Waldere is doubt-
ful, and it seems plausible that the Old English poet, or a close ante-
cedent, might have known some earlier but already characteristic mimming 
legend and have conceived the sword-action of the Waldere-GufThere duel 
in a similar form, hence have brought mimming into the new context.

The Widia poet did not in any case need a Walther-legend to 
give him mimming: the Waldere poet already knew the sword as properly 
Widia's. But if by coincidence mimming were already in the Walther-lay 
source of the Widia story, at least the proper route of the sword's trans-
mittal to Widia—that is, from his father—must not have been contradicted 
there. If the composer of the Widia story had had any notion that the 
sword might originally have been Theodoric's (as some scholars have 
supposed it was on the basis of Waldere ßß 4 f.), it would have fallen 
in more appropriately with poetic justice for the angry Hildebrand to 
abduct mimming as one of his lord's own weapons to Widia's use, and the

86 The two passages are quoted by Millenhoff, op. cit., p. 367 f.

87 Holz, op. cit., p. 120. Dietrich now owns the horse, but will 
return it to Witege when the latter has defeated the giant Asprian.

88 See pp. 49 f. below.
poet could have reduced the machinery by which Hildebrand has to prepare for his ends.

That the arrow-swift river-crossing appears in the Viðga story points to a model in which, as in the Polish version of Boguphalus, Walther had difficulties with the ferryman and had to get across without a boat. But since the Widia-lay poet combines river-crossing and battle by assuming a bridge which may handily provide twelve robberish attackers instead of a single extortioner-ferryman, the fabulous jump is saved for a second river-crossing. It still, however, is made to precede a discovery of the enemy, then a battle.

The Widia story is likely to have rendered some of its borrowings from the Walther-lay more fabulous than in the model. The jump on horseback across the river, for example, was probably, as in the Polish version, only a jump into the water, then a swim. The conversation between Viðga and his would-be robbers, too, looks like elaboration. But the model must have contained at least something comparable: for one of the enemies' coveting Walther's shield as a share of the booty and for Walther's half-satiric refusal to give it up, there is confirmation in Waltherius 798-800 and 805 ff. For the robbers' threat to cut off Walther's hand and foot, there is also a measure of confirmation. In the Kelsung episode, Hilldibrand threatens to cut off the hand that touches his beard, and since the threat is not recorded in known versions of the Hildebrand-Hadubrand story, source for some of the contextual matter, the threat is as likely as not to have been suggested by the Walther-lay.

More closely paralleling the Viðga story, a ferocious ferryman of Rosen­garten D, whom Schneider has confessed a temptation to derive from the
Neither l « g m d t Is (me who demands a foot and a hand f r c e a . a would-be fare, Its own gruesome my, Weiltharius perhaps affords further confirmation, not only in the fact that Walther looses a hand, Gunthari a leg, and Bagano an eye, but particularly in the summary comment on the severed members lying on the field: "Thus, thus were the arm-bands (i.e., treasures) of the Huns divided!" (line 1402). The irony is applicable enough without a preliminary threat against Walther's hand and foot, but a poet would certainly more readily think of actually mutilating his combatants, as well as of then making the ironic comment, if the threat against Walther—in which the hand and foot, like Vidga's, were considered treasures—appeared already in the source. That Hagen's loss of one eye was in Ekkehard's source, we have already seen.

If the Widia adventure is to be accepted as modeled after a Walther-lay, its value for this study is greatest as indicating the probable shape of the model, presumably a form of the legend not remote from the forms known to the Walther poet and to Ekkehard. Up to the time of Walther's fights, Vidga's story offers nothing new, but taken with the tale of Thidrik's homecoming, it would indicate that these two general features, doubtful before, are to be assumed for the fighting: 1) until the final battle, the fighting was described in terms hardly more than summary; 2) there was a pause in the battle following the death of the seventh man (Waltherius agrees). Taken with Waltherius, the Vidga adventure would indicate 1) that Walther's opponents were twelve (the Valltari-Hildigund

89 Schneider, Germanische Heldensage, I, 339. The episode could perhaps more easily have stemmed from the Widia story. Before reaching the river-crossing, Hildebrand describes the difficulty and the ferryman's habit of demanding one foot and one hand. Then Ilsean, like Vidga, offers to go ahead to bargain with the ferryman. See Holz, op. cit., pp. 93-9.
episode is agreed); 2) that the hero's friend and brother-in-arms (Hagano-Hilldibrand) took a neutral position, estranged from the lord (Guntari-Thirtrek) until the latter's plight moved the retainer's sympathy; 3) that Walther ended the final battle with a sword to replace one which had broken.

For the final fight, only the Vidga story and Valtharius offer an unmarred picture; in the Polish version, the Hagen role is missing; in the Valtari-Hilldigund episode, the Gunther role. The two full-featured accounts, however, are at odds on the point at which Hagen (Hagano-Hilldibrand) intercedes for his lord and on the form of the sword action, and we can hardly conjecture which is nearer the original legend. But the Vidga story has at least this argumentative value: if Valtharius preserves the more nearly original Hagen and sword action, the Widia poet, seeing the original features as weak, makes alterations to remove the flaws—and the new features are extremely like those which a number of scholars have already assumed for Waldere.

The Widia story has no separate counterpart for Hildegund, but whatever functions of hers may be required in the altered context would be transferred naturally to Hildebrand, who, like the Old English Hildegyth, offers the hero encouragement and, perhaps again like Hildegyth, hands him the sword Wimmin to replace one which has failed.
5. Waldere in the expanded context: Fragment XW

Until 1925 it was universally assumed that the speech opening Fragment XW was Guthere's.90 Subsequently cases have been made for Hagena,91 then Waldere,92 and each case has drawn its following. But the arguments for Guthere, Hagena and Waldere have been mutually destructive, and Wilhelm Lenz has remarked whither the wind is blowing: he assigns the speech to the one remaining candidate, the heroine Hildegyd.93

The only part of the speech which is at all suggestive of a warrior is the first two-and-a-half lines, which tell us that the speaker has a sword "quietly hidden" in a stanfate. That the speaker has any belligerent intention (or sullenly anti-belligerent, as would be the case if Hagena were speaking) does not appear. The sword would seem to be one simply in reserve. From Waltharius we learn that Walthari and Hiltgunt have, as well as treasures, an extra sword, but of Gunthari or any other of his party we learn no such thing. In Waldere, it also seems that the

90 However, Grein through a laconic note (Beovulf nebst den Fragmenten Finnsburg und Waldere, p. 77) indicated that he would end the speech with XW 3 and take XW 4-10 as belonging to the author in his own person. Likewise H. Möller (Das altenglische Volkspepos, p. 157), who assumed an interpolator to have added lines 4-10. R. Imelmann, DL, XXXIX (1918), 1047, criticizing Leitzmann's assumption that Guthere speaks lines 1-10, remarked, without elaboration, that lines 4-10 would be more fitting for Hildegyd.

91 Wolff, op. cit.

92 Norman, op. cit., pp. 16 f.

93 Lenz, op. cit., pp. 39 ff. (Review of objections to Guthere, Hagena, or Waldere as speaker, pp. 35-39.)
hero has the extra weapon, inasmuch as one sword has been offered to
Gudhere (H 28), and short of surrendering all, Hildewyd's warrior-protector
could scarcely make such an offer unless he still could have a sword handy.
Tentatively, at any rate, we may suppose that the sword and the treasures
spoken of are Waldere's extra equipment and the same treasures for which
the battles are being fought, therefore that the speaker—whose words show
no character but that of companion—is Hildewyd. Waldere's challenge to
the adversary is natural enough—even called for—as following a speech of
comfort from the heroine.

The word eac in the relative clause te ic eac hafa, on stanfate
stille gehided (XW 2 2) is not compatible with one of the two swords' being
in Waldere's possession, the other in his opponents'. But Hildewyd may
properly use the word to couple the sword in her keeping with one which her
lover already has in use.

Under the assignment of the speech to Hildewyd, it is no longer
either necessary or desirable to give stanfate (XW 3) the admittedly
questionable meaning of "sheath" (as Waldere students have successively
pointed out, nowhere else in Old English writings has -faet such a meaning).
Particularly since the similar syncfatum (H26) occurs in a context with
which the meaning "sheathes" is positively not consonant, stanfate (if not
also syncfate) is very likely to mean "chest," the interpretation pre-
ferred by some editors, by some offered as alternative. In Waltharius,
the acquisition of armor for Walthari and of chests of treasure is the
province of Hildewyd's counterpart, Hiltgunt. Like Mimming, the armor
stolen for Walthari is Weland's work.94

94 Welandia fabrica (Waltharius 965).
In connection with interpreting *sae* and *stafatæ*, Lenz has already mentioned the advantages of assuming Hildesgyð as speaker, but there are several further advantages which he has not indicated. Of the X-speech, for example, commentators have troubled to assume only that the swords are pertinent to the Waldere situation. But the speech is more elaborate on the score of treasures than of swords, and inasmuch as Waldere and Hildesgyð themselves afford prizes which are the very grounds and aim of the fighting, it would be odd for the poet to dwell on prizes more remote. If the reference is to Hildesgyð's own spoil, Hildesgyð is most plausible as speaker—as best knowing the treasures and as best knowing the intended destiny of any treasures sheltered under Aetla's roof.

As another indication that the valuables of *Fragment XW* are probably those also of *Fragment H* is to be noted the orderly correspondence of the two sets of terms: in *Fragment XW*, 2ff., *anum* (for "sword")... *stafatæ...sine micel mætna...golde*; in *Fragment H*, 23 f., *swurde...synofatum...beaga maenigo*.

With both swords on Waldere's side, it is no longer necessary to suppose a shift of reference when the history of the sword is told: *hit tóhte Beodric hidian selfum onsendon* (XW 4 f.); *hit* would mean the sword last previously mentioned, the one in the *stafatæ*. In view of the character of the *Himming* legends reviewed in Section 3 above, and of the fact that dramatic exigencies would make the better battle-sword most appropriately the later resort, *Himming*, the weapon associated with Theodoric and Widia, would be the one still in reserve.

---

95 Lenz's views are in fact not compatible with the interpretation offered in this study for lines 4-7a.
Alternatively, neither is it necessary to assume—as in the 98 ascription of the speech and both swords to Guðherœ—that Walderœ and his opponent alike have swords which would properly be Widia's and that, of the two weapons, the less illustrious is Mimming. In the known legends, Widia and Mimming are virtually synonymous; that this award was ever really conceived as only Widia's second-best can be excluded.

In Xw 4 ff. (hit Hilde Seđric Widian selfum monendan ond eac sine midde wæða mid ði mece, monig other mid him golde gæpirwen), the phrase ði mece has always been taken as a redundant equivalent of eac, i.e., as meaning "in addition to the sword." Of course if Hildegyð is speaking, the words may more pertinently be rendered "(which are) with the sword." With similar uniformity mid him has been taken as colorless reiteration of ði mece—hardly in the usual style of Old English variation. Trautmann, remarking the futility of the phrase, was tempted to delete it. 97 But since Hildegyð would be speaking of a treasure hoard diverted from Theodorœ, and the virtue of gold in Theodorœ's possession would be that it might be distributed among retainers, 98 the whole in-
finitive clause monig onlres mid him golde gegirwan may fittingly be interpreted "(and) many of the rest of his retinue to adorn with gold."

In this interpretation, gegirwan, which a number of editors have taken for a scribal error, would no longer be objectionable.

The allusion to Widia's heroic rescue of Theodoric with which the speech ends (lines 7b-10) gives pretext for a special gift to Widia. In Theodoric's gifts to others of his following, the generosity of Germanic lords in general would give us leave to see virtual routine.

From the clause hit tohte Theodric Widian selfum onsendon, Schneider has assumed that Mimming (i.e., hit) was originally the property of Theodoric and that in a very old presumed lay (referred to as "Dreiheldenlied") Theodoric presented Mimming to Widia as a reward after Widia had rescued him from giants (XW 7 ff.). The Old English poet, we are to take it, expected his audience to know of the gift, but having represented the sword as in Waldere's possession, placated the audience by asserting that Theodoric only intended to give the sword to Widia, that Waldere, instead, got hold of it. Up to this point some other

99 Trautmann, op. cit., pp. 177 f., emends to gegildan; Rieger, Alt- und angelsächsisches Lesebuch, p. xx, to gigirwad (based on misreading gigirwad for MS gegirwad); after Rieger, Cosijn suggested gigirwad, adopted by Kluge, Leitzmann, and Holthausen (Beowulf, 4-7th editions). G. Binz suggested gigirwad.

100 Compare especially Beowulf 1050-1053: after gifts to Beowulf for the victory over Grendel, Hrothgar gives treasures to everyone in the hero's party.

101 Schneider, Deutsche Heldensage, p. 74, and in other works passim.
scholars are in agreement, notably Norman and Lenz. But further, Schneider assumes with Wolff that Mimming breaks while in Waldere's possession, therefore that it never reaches Widia at all.

If events were represented in this fashion, Schneider's view of what it took to placate the audience is perhaps an underestimate of the difficulty. If the sword had earned nothing of the now familiar reputation with Widia, it would seem strange for the poet to draw attention to Widia at all: it would seem doubtful whether the Widia connection could have attained such appreciable currency as already to appear in any Old English allusion unless the sword had been represented in at least one of Widia's exploits. And with the weapon familiar in an exploit of Widia's, it would be no small matter for the poet, not only to divert the sword from Widia, but then to permit its destruction before it could reach him at all.

Moreover, the Old English poet expressly describes Mimming as Weland's work and Widia as Weland's son, but for Widia to come into his heritage through the intermediary, Theodoric, has no congruity with Widia's being Weland's son.

As we have seen, Thidrikssage has an account of a loan of Mimming

102 Norman, op. cit., p. 32; Lenz, op. cit., pp. 37 f. and passim.

103 Schneider, Deutsche Heldensage, p. 124; Germanische Heldensage, I, 333.
to Thidrek, but later shows the sword again in Viðga’s hands. For Waldere, then, it would seem less perilous than Schneider’s view if we assumed that a double transference of the sword between Widia and Theodorik had already in some form found place in the literature of the time. That such a double change of hands does not necessarily reflect a later literary period, we have as evidence the parallel of the sword Eruating, turned over now to Beowulf by Unferth, now back to Unferth by Beowulf. The lord-and-man relationship of Theodorik and Viðga should only make the sword’s movement in both directions seem easier.

If, besides, the Waldere poet knew a precedent for Viðga as in some degree subject to change of whereabouts among heroes (the degree is extreme in Thidriksage, where in addition to the movements between Thidrek and Viðga, the sword is once for a time diverted from Viðga by Hildibrand, again by Heimir), he would more readily undertake the representation of the weapon as in Waldere’s possession.

104 The author of the account (Bertelsen, II, 32-3) perhaps knew of a difficulty in store for Viðga in getting the sword back from Thidrek. Viðga is unwilling to give up the sword and does so only when Thidrek’s anger shames him. The by-play between Viðga and Thidrek looks like foreshadowing of fateful happenings to circumvent the sword’s return.

105 Beowulf 1455-7 and 1806 f.

106 As a parallel, note that the poet of Rosengarten D records the return of the horse Schamming to Vițega by Dietrich (Holz, Op. cit., p. 120).

107 Bertelsen, I, 258, 274, 279 f.
The clause hit Nohte Peodric Widiaen selfum onsendon is quite consonant with the sword's having already been owned and used by Widia and if need be with its being once and for all his property by claim and right. There is still the matter of a reward from Theodoric to Widia—the julean of XW 7. But since onsendon means "send," not necessarily "give," and since not only the sword but also a great treasure was intended to be sent, we can suppose that Theodoric meant not to give but to restore the sword, and in addition to send the treasure as a reward due.

The presumed passage from Theodoric to Waldere of the sword Himmel must mean that Theodoric was at Aetla's court. In fact a poet knowing Theodoric would inevitably have known the story of his exile with Attila and could hardly have avoided a representation of Walther's adventure as falling within the exile period, which the Old High German Hildebrand (line 50) already knew as lasting thirty years. The period in legend chronology during which Himmel could be brought into Waldere's hands without conflict with the Widia legends is the earlier years of the exile; during these years, since Theodoric and Widia are separated, Widia naturally drops out of sight as an active figure until the battle involving his betrayal of Theodoric in the slaughter of Diether and Attila's sons. That the Waldere poet had in mind such a period would appear to be confirmed in his description of Theodoric as intending to send the sword to Widia, an act which would imply a separation between the two heroes of at least a considerable duration. The only such separation recorded is that incident to Theodoric's exile.

Since the refugees would seem to be in possession of Theodoric's gold as well as of the sword which he intended for Widia, we should assume that Hildegyth has robbed not (only?) Aetla and his queen, but (also?)
JUanli has objected to this assumption (as already made by Schneider\(^{108}\)) on the grounds that the Christian author of *Waldere* would not make his hero and heroine such thieves.\(^{109}\) But as in the Christian author Eckehard's poem, thieves they clearly are, of some kind: they possess many rings and other treasures, and moreover they are refugees—else they could scarcely be exposed to the peril of attack from Gutheore. Further, it cannot be determined that the heroine would have viewed Theodoric in a light much different from Aetla or Helche. Extant legend relating to the early exile makes Attila's queen Helche (as Erka robbed by Hildigund and as Ospirin, by Hiltgunt) the more-than-generous—even insistent—provider of stores of treasure to Theodoric for rewarding his warriors and assuring their fidelity.\(^{110}\) With Theodoric on the scene, about equally exalted with his royal host and hostess and having a share, direct or indirect, in the Hunnish strongroom, the *Waldere* poet may well have already felt that Theodoric's relation to the Walther story was one to be given flesh and blood. The advantages to be derived from the appropriation of Minning for his story need have been no more than a final consideration to make Theodoric either a substitute for or an addition to Helche as Hildag עד's victim. There must have been something comparable in the source, since Eckehard presents Hiltgunt as stealing armor (also Weland's work) for Walthari. For the robbery, Waldere and Hildag עד need appear no more offensive than their counterparts in *Waltherius* and the

---

\(^{108}\) *Deutsche Heldensage*, p. 125.

\(^{109}\) Lenz, *op. cit.*, pp. 41 f.

\(^{110}\) *Dietrichs Flucht* 5028-44, 7935-48; Bertelsen, II, 219 ff.
Valltari-Hildigund episode.\textsuperscript{111}

Following a period of considerable enthusiasm for textual alteration in the speech opening Fragment XX,\textsuperscript{112} editorial attitude in recent years has, if anything, been reactionary, for the emendations have generally left untouched the puzzlement presented by the passage as a whole. The word \textit{genam} (line 7b) presents equal difficulty, whoever is conceived as speaker, but since the assignment of the contextual words to Hildeswyrf offers plausible solutions for all other major difficulties, a further attempt to remove the final difficulty would seem in order.

By the majority of editors, \textit{genam} has been retained. All attempts to interpret it, however, have left much to be desired, since all interpretations have had to assume either bad syntax or tortured sense, when not both. The literal rendering usually assumed for the phrase \textit{iulean genam} runs in effect: "(he) received reward for a former deed." Syntactically, the proper reference for the supplied "he" is \textit{Theodric}, subject of the preceding clause, and accordingly Sedgefield uniquely suggested that \textit{iulean genam} might mean Theodoric "took (out of his hoard)" something for a reward to \textit{Widia}.\textsuperscript{113} Dickins took lines 7b-9 as parenthetic—in effect, "(Widia) received the reward for a former deed, his..."

\textsuperscript{111} From the concurrence of the High and Low German extant accounts, it would appear fairly certain that during his exile, even in early legend, Theodoric's provisions, including stores of treasures, could have been his only by consignment from Attila and Helche.

\textsuperscript{112} Trautmann, \textit{op. cit.}, was most extreme.

\textsuperscript{113} W. J. Sedgefield, \textit{An Anglo-Saxon Verse Book}, p. 139.
rescue of Theodoris, but, as Dobbie points out, "with difficulties of interpretation," since line 10 is obviously sequel in matter to line 9, not to lines 1-7a. Following some earlier editors, Dobbie himself takes 7b as alone parenthetic, with Æðelwīd as again to be supplied as subject for genem. But the text immediately following is an adverbial clause explaining Theodoris's reason for rewarding Æðelwīd, and it is doubtful whether Old English may more readily than Modern English could have tolerated such a parenthesis in such a position. The phrase is, besides, incredibly laconic as representing a self-sufficient allusion.

In another rendering, genem is to be construed as in the first person, with the following weird result for lines 7b-9: "(I) received a reward because Æðelwīd rescued Theodoris." Cosijn thought that julean was to be interpreted "former service" (julean genem: "Theodoris received a service in the past") and that the following explanatory clause was in effect in apposition with julean. Subsequent editors, however, have not embraced Cosijn's interpretation.

If genem must be retained, the phrase might be taken to mean

114 Dickins, op. cit., pp. 60 and 61.

115 Dobbie, op. cit., p. 140.

116 W.M. Likewise Wyatt (An Anglo-Saxon Reader, p. 265) and Schücking (Kleines angelsächsisches Dichterbuch, p. 58).


118 Cosijn, op. cit., p. 70.
that though Theodorio's intention had not been carried out, Widia (inferred as subject of genam) "received" the reward in the sense that it had been decreed for him. Such a confusion of ideas could probably be shown to occur in Modern English "received" or "got." But if the Waldere passage can be understood only through this or other tortured renderings, it would seem likelier than not that the present text is corrupt, as several of the earlier editors assumed.

Of substitutes put forward for genam, the only one which has recommended itself to more than one editor is geman, suggested by Kieger and adopted by Grein, Möller, and Henrici. In error, Henrici translates geman as a (third person) preterite, "gedachte," and despite the appropriateness of his translation ("he thought of the reward for former deeds") as integral, treats iulean geman as a parenthesis. Grein and Möller assume a first person present and take the contextual lines (XII 4-10) as being spoken by the poet in his own person. Beyond the fact that he also conceives geman as first person, Kieger does not indicate his view. In any case, editors who have rejected the change have done so on the basis of Grein's and Möller's interpretation.

However, geman construed as third person would no longer have a reference remote from the proper Waldere narrative, but would provide a


120 R. P. Sölcker, Kleine angelsächsische Dichtungen, p. 2, retains genan but provides no gloss for the word. Under glossary entry niman he remarks: "geman Wald II 7 ist wol in geman zu ändern."

very desirable complement to the preceding statement of Theodoric's intention.

The lines describing Theodoric's intention have been attributed to the poet's self-defensive parrying of objection from his audience, who would know from other sources that Widia actually received the things named. But so long as it is apparent from the context that those things miscarried, the poet's concession of Theodoric's intention does not constitute much of a defense, if any, against audience objection. Having invited special attention to his infraction against a familiar legend, the poet—if there is to be a defense at all—must give assurance that the delay is only temporary, that the intention will yet be carried out and "history" not be violated. The word geman ("Theodoric will remember the reward due Widia") would go far towards providing such reassurance.

To conform to a normal pattern, the poet would probably also take advantage of the opportunity to pay his respects (and Hildegund's) to the character of Theodoric. A persistent mindfulness for rewards due his retainers is the one indispensable attribute of a worthy Germanic lord, and the virtue on which compliments are most frequently passed, a truth for which Beowulf bristles with evidence. When Theodoric's reward for Widia's good turn is withheld, it is to be supposed that the audience would

122 Hornman, op. cit., p. 32; Lenz, op. cit., pp. 37 f.

123 Beowulf 1220 offers a strikingly close verbal parallel (even to the futurative use of geman). Wealthbeow has told the hero to be kind in counsel to her sons, then adds: Le be eaca leon geman.

124 See especially Beowulf 1046-9, 1169-74, 1484-7, and 1684-6 and the epithets listed in footnote 98 above.
more than welcome the assurance that the lord at least remains mindful of the obligation. 125

Following the X-speech, Waldere opens a challenge to Guthhere with this taunt: "Hwaet, indeed you expected, Friend of the Burgundians (i.e., Guthhere), that Hagena's hand would do battle with me and dispose of me." Some editors have assumed an illogical coordination in the sentence and take only the latter portion of the taunt as ironic: Hagena has at least fought, though obviously Waldere is not disposed of. 126 But in the two received versions of Hagen's part in the fighting (Waltharius and Thidrikssaga), he is last to be drawn into the struggle, so that anything heard of him in Waldere before the final battle would most probably be to the effect that he remained aloof.

However, Waldere is already battle-weary, so that apparently his speech cannot precede the outbreak of the fight, hence probably does not immediately follow Hagen's initial refusal to take part in the battle. Waltharius very likely presents Hagano in a form close to the Hagen of the source legend, and he must have been estranged from Gunther from the outset—according to the Nibelungenlied, sitting on his shield. But we should

125 The declaration that Theodoric would remember the reward for Widia would also in a measure absolve Hildegyd and Waldere from blame for circumventing a reward due another. Objecting to Norman's hypothesis that Waldere is the X-speaker, Klaeber ("Drei Anmerkungen," p. 334) held that a hero would not properly plume himself on the appropriation of something intended as a reward for another. With Hildegyd as speaker, so familie, the objection is less pertinent—still less so if Theodoric's intention isn't wholly circumvented.

126 Müllenhoff, op. cit., p. 276; Sedgefield, op. cit., p. 6; Imelmann, op. cit., 1047 f.; Trautmann, op. cit., p. 179; Dobbie, op. cit., p. xxv.

127 It would in any case be awkward to suppose that Hagen at first condoned the attack, then withdrew after his companions had started falling before Walther.
expect Waldere's taunt gloating over his old friend's non-belligerency to find place no later (and hardly earlier) than the first interruption of the fight. Waltharius, the Alsung episode, and the story of Wihna's robber fight, in common indicate an interruption following the death of the seventh man. That Waldere's speech comes at some such mid-point is made virtually certain in the fact that though he is already battle-weary, he yet foresees possible renew attack from some remaining "treacherous kinsmen" (line 23), hardly to be conceived as any but Cothere's followers. Presumably Hildeguyt, during the pause, has just cheered her lover and praised the weapon with which he has already disposed of so many of the enemy. But in the same speech, for the poet's purpose of foreshadowing the time when the second-best sword will be inadequate, she remarks that the best of swords is still in reserve.

If in the X-speech Himming is still in a stanfate with other treasures, Fragment E, which no longer treats of the sword as one in reserve, would be the later in order. Thus would be realized the pattern of Waldere's alternation of weapons at the climax of the fighting.

But the greater number of editors and commentators have assumed the sequence H-XI, conjectured by the first editor, who explained: "I have taken the one as first, merely because the hero's enemy is there spoken of; the other appears to be later as the hero there speaks to his foe, who has thus had time to come nearer." Some of the grounds on which others have accepted Stephen's ordering are mentioned in other parts of this study. Norman's argument for that sequence however is


129 Stephens, op. cit., p. 17.
unique in adducing "paleographical considerations." Since these considerations have a bearing on the text of Fragment XW, discussion of Norman's argument best finds place here.

Norman has suggested that the two folds of the manuscript were very probably adjacent in a volume, one within the other. If his assumption is correct and if, as seems to be the case, Fragment H fills the first and second sides of one fold, Fragment XW the third and fourth sides of the other, the only possible order for the undamaged leaves is H-XW. All other editors except Leitzmann have assumed —se opening XW to be the end of meo. But as ending the last line of the fourth side of the H fold, the letters swil are still preserved, and if the H fold is upper of the folds as adjacent, the letters can and must be taken with —se of XW. Norman adopts this reading swiloe, assuming the alliterating word in the lost half-line to be sword, and takes the order H-XW as being established.

But whatever argumentative value may lie in the fact that swil fits into —se seems counterbalanced by a further paleographical consideration. Whether the folds could have been contiguous is brought into question by the implications of Norman's testimony as to the probable history of the fragments. On the grounds that the writing is too well preserved and that the other signs to be associated with use of the leaves in bindings are missing, he has rejected the notion that the fragments ever came under the hand of a binder. But if they did not, one would naturally suppose that the cutting away of leaf segments was for the sake

130 Norman, op. cit., pp. 2 f.
131 Ibid., pp. 1 f.
of the portions now missing—perhaps for palimpsests—, and if such was the case, there is a want of logic in the arrangement which the preserved leaves would present as of a common gathering, cut-away and whole leaves alternating. Salvage of leaf-sized palimpsests would proceed from the covers inward, and the mutilation shown in Fragment XW would indicate an earlier position for that fold, a later position for Fragment H. Of course the folds could not have been of the same gathering, nor could they have been contiguous as back-to-back, since the matter of Fragment H does not follow on the matter of XW.

The assumption of a scrivener salvaging palimpsests is perhaps unprofitable, but equally unprofitable would seem a hypothesis that the Waldere folds were contiguous, so long as the assumption allows no intelligible account of the remarkable pattern of mutilation. The folds can hardly have been in adjacent position during the time of the cutting.

The possibility of reading swilce had already been seen by Holthausen, who, though it would have supported the ordering H-XW which he assumed, rejected the reading in favor of the traditional (me)ce because he could think of no sentence in which swilce would fit the context. Holthausen's volume has excellent facsimiles of the fragments. Leitzmann, evidently having mistaken the direction of the folds, adopted swilce—as alliterating with a lost preceding sweord—and asserted that the reading was possible only if the ordering were XW-H. Imelmann convincingly rejected Leitzmann's views by of course calling attention to the mistake about direction of the folds and by showing it to be virtually

132 Holthausen, Die altenenglischen Waldere-Bruchstücke, pp. 2 ff. Holthausen's volume has excellent facsimiles of the fragments.

133 Leitzmann, walther und Hiltgunt bei den Angelsachsen, p. 7.
impossible, from exigencies of grammar, that swilce before baeteran should alliterate with a neuter antecedent sweord.\textsuperscript{134} R. Priebsch, reviewing Norman (who apparently had overlooked Imelmann), rejected swilce on the same grounds.\textsuperscript{135} More lately F. Klaeber has suggested (ne geseah ic aefre swilce baeteran) as a possible restoration of the whole line,\textsuperscript{136} but the usually assumed mece still has obvious advantages of clarity and intelligibility.

The conjectures offered to account for the matter occupying the gap between Fragments H and XW as leaves in the same gathering hardly recommend themselves. Norman assumes that though Fragment H already contains notice of the failure of Waldere's first sword, the alternate sword still remains in the sheath at least as late as XW 3 (that Waldere actually draws a sword is unexpressed).\textsuperscript{137} Lenz agrees that Waldere has two swords, but thinks that only one, Mimming, is ever used. In Fragment H, according to Lenz, Hildegyd is deprecating the timorous Waldere's vague but strongly felt premonition that Mimming will fail. The missing text would have presented a colloquy between Hildegyd and Waldere during which Waldere still hangs back. Finally, at XW 11, Hildegyd has so reassured him that he is ready to risk a fight.\textsuperscript{138}

\textsuperscript{134} Imelmann, op. cit., 1047.

\textsuperscript{135} Priebsch, (review of Norman's Waldere) MLR XXIX (1934), 340. Priebsch points out that baeteran as describing the neuter sweord could only be dative or instrumental.

\textsuperscript{136} Klaeber, "Drei Anmerkungen," p. 334.

\textsuperscript{137} Norman, op. cit., p. 17.

\textsuperscript{138} Lenz, op. cit., pp. 40 f. and passim.
On Xw 12 f., Norman and Leuz are agreed. They say that the passage means "Waldere had the sword in his hand," and that "the sword" is missing. But whether the passage really says that Waldere has a sword, either missing or otherwise, is very doubtful. The passage runs haefde him on hands hilde frofre, gutbilla gripe, in which the kenning hilde frofre is unparalleled in other Old English texts. The interpretation which seems most plausible is "he had in hand comfort for battle, for the assault of swords," a description which best fits a shield.139

139 Norman and Leuz, like a long succession of scholars before them, have assumed a compound hildefrofre, but the compound is misleading. See pp. 79 f. below (note to Xw. 12).
6. "Waldere" in the expanded context: Fragment H

If Fragment XW is first in order and if our conclusion is correct as to the story time of that fragment, the text missing between the preserved leaves probably presented a battle in which Waldere killed four men, leaving only the principal adversary, Guthere, and the neutral Hagena alive. Whether or not following a night’s rest (as in Waltharius), Fragment H seems to open at the very midpoint of the fight between Waldere and Guthere, in which the action probably follows a pattern similar to that of Viðga’s duel with Thidrek and that of Beowulf’s fight with Grendel’s dam. If so, Waldere has come into sore straits following the failure of a sword, and Hildegyt’s speech of encouragement comes at a point corresponding to that at which Viðga takes up Mimming as his second sword against Thidrek.

The leads in Hildegyt’s speech are completely consonant with such a stage in the story. She first assures her lover that Mimming will not fail; its history is of an unbroken chain of bloody victories. She then so insistently exhorts him to continued courage and faith in his sword that we must infer Waldere at least momentarily not to have been master of the situation. Since explicitly the default is not of his courage and audacity in sword-play and, as explicitly, Mimming cannot fail, we must conclude that a first weapon did fail—probably, like Viðga’s first sword, on the opponent’s helmet. Though in Waltharius the hero is girded with two blades, the extra is a short sword. That Waldere might be girded with two full battle swords is hardly plausible; it
would appear likely then that the second sword has come from a chest of
tings robbed from the Huns and that Hildegund has handed the weapon over
to Waldere as Hildibrand hands the same weapon to Viuga.

The Wimmer legends are in agreement as to the sequel: Guthere's
armor proves no protection against Wimmer, and he is soon wounded. But
when Waldere is about to deliver the mortal blow, Hagen interposes him-
self as Hildibrand does between Viuca and Thidrek. Though both Waltharius
and Thidrika saga remember Hagen as finally a combatant, Waldere students
have found no insuperable difficulty in supposing that here, at least, he
is wholly faithful to both lord and friend, entering the fight like
Hildibrand for Thidrek, only to shield his lord from disaster. But
Hagen's intercession may still have cost him the loss of an eye. The
wound appears in both Waltharius and Thidrika saga, and up to the time of
the Nibelungenlied the conception of Hagen as one-eyed has wide currency.140
Possibly in Waldere Hagen throws himself bodily before the hero's sword
and receives the familiar wound. In any event, when Hagen has interceded
for Guthere, the latter has, like Thidrek before Viuca, already had his
fill of battle, and Waldere stops the fight out of consideration for his
old friend. All three are reconciled. Neither Waldere nor Guthere is
likely to have lost a limb, though both probably bear wounds. Waldere and
Hildegund continue their journey, and Waldere, since his father appears
already to be dead (Waldere wears Aelfhere's AHT, XIV 12), probably at once
assumes the throne in his homeland, with Hildegund for his queen. It is

140 It appears probable, however, that Hagen's disfiguring wound
belongs to only one group within the family of Walthar legends, and
whether Waldere is a member of the smaller group is at least doubtful.
See the discussion below, in the Appendices, of the genealogy of the
legend.
likely, too, that the poet somehow contrives the return of Mimming to Widi's possession, since like Waldere, Guthere, and Hagana, the sword is destined to figure in further and more tragic adventures.

Currently the major argument for the prior position of Fragment H, which would preclude the pattern suggested above, is that Hildegyff's remarks on Waldere's previous fighting are all of a general nature, hence must refer to the hero's career with Aetla, since if Waldere had already done extensive fighting with Guthere's followers, this more recent fighting would be Hildegyff's more appropriate concern, and she would not speak in merely general terms. Accordingly that portion of the speech which ostensibly treats of Guthere himself as Waldere's opponent is really treating of Guthere only as a symbol for his whole party.141

Viewed in relation to Waltharius, in which the preliminary fights are represented as a series of duels, every warrior bearing a name and every step of each duel receiving concrete description, Hildegyff's remarks on fighting may seem quite general. But the preponderance of evidence both within Waltharius (in borrowings from Virgil and Prudentius) and in other versions of the legend is against Ekkehard's having found such detail in his Germanic source. The Valltari-Hildegund, Elsung, and Vinga episodes indicate only a summary account of the battle, up to the climactic fight. Unless the Waldere poet has independently entered into the same kind of elaboration as Ekkehard's, Hildegyff cannot speak of the fighting in terms much more than general.

The descriptions of past fighting are in fact most intelligible if taken as referring in part (lines 12-17) to the battle with the Burgundians, in part (lines 18-22) to Waldere's career in Aetla's service. In line 13, Hildegya unmistakably implies that she herself has seen (gesawe) fighting in which, though many men were attacking him, Waldere has borne himself bravely, and the passage cannot with much plausibility be related with any but the fights with the Burgundians. The shift of reference to the time with Aetla is accomplished with the word symle (H 18) and is dictated by Hildegya's purpose of comparing Waldere's past and present motives for fighting—a purpose with which the preceding battles against the Burgundians have nothing to do.

The piety of the passage on motives, H 19b-27, is wholly obscured by Grein's assumption that metod (line 19) means "fate," and that interpretation, despite the want of parallels, has been widely accepted. The word nearly everywhere else (if not everywhere) means "God," and to offer much more than bathos in the Waldere passage (particularly H 22b-23), the usual meaning is the one to be assumed. The rendering of lines 19b-27 which fits the context is this: "I feared God for you because you fought too wrongfully in the support

142 Grein, op. cit., glossary.

143 B-T cites Grein's interpretation of metod in the Waldere passage, but adduces—doubtfully—only one other instance in which the rendering "fate" might be more fitting than "God." The word is commonplace in poetic texts, there being eleven occurrences in Beowulf alone.
(aetstealle) of another man's military enterprise. Bring honor upon yourself with glorious deeds while your motives are reconcilable to God. Have no anxiety on account of the sword: the best of treasures was granted you for help. With it you shall humble Guthere's boast because he first wrongfully sought this fighting."

The frequent interpretation of by lo Ne metod ondred paet thu to fyramlice fechten sohtest (H 19 f.), "I feared your fate because you fought too rashly," is apparently the issue of the following argument: if Hildegyth, as she says, does not chide Waldere for a want of courage (lines 12 ff.), then she must intend a stricture upon courage in excess. It is a strangely vacillating part for Waldere's companion—calling for forthright action (lines 1-11), checking (lines 12-22a, or, in Norman's view, 12-23), then again inciting to attack (line 24 to the end of the

144 Cf. O.E. gestealla, m.E. stand-by, G. Beistand, D. bijstand. O.E. wipsteall has the antithetic sense "opposition." Beistand is Grein's translation of aetsteall in line 150 of Guthlac and is Henrici's rendering of the word as appearing in Waldere. See also the discussion of H 19 in the notes following the Waldere text below.

Priebsch, op. cit., pp. 340 f., suggests that the original meaning was "company," hence to "assistance." The place name aetstealles becrh (Kemble, Codex Diplomaticus IV, 31) may mean "hill of the supporting company," approximating "garrison." Likewise Astelesham and its many variants, if the first element represents aetsteall, as is suggested by Gover, Mawer, and Stanton, The Place-Names of Middlesex Apart from the City of London (Cambridge, 1942), p. 17.

145 Military enterprise: wihradenne. My translation is in accord with the usual one, which virtually discounts -raedenne (see the note in Norman's edition, p. 38). But wihradenne as "rule by warfare" would perhaps best fit as a description of Attila's battles.

146 Norman, op. cit., p. 14, takes 22b-23 (weords He selfne godum daecum. Henem (in god rece) as "behave sensibly while there is still time."
that the readiness of the house's servants or the house itself has not yet begun at all. Sometimes been taken as following, soon after the order of It's home as

Sometimes a description of the house, or to a certain extent as requiring the house

It's not to have come before the house and certainly, as the number of opposite directions,
beginning, comparable to Hiddegard's rear-reader counterpart in the still before his. The companions are more fairly to have been. In the
attaining such sensations encountered if wear and tear of the listener

There would in fact seem a lack of proportion in Hiddegard's

be described.

than a description that the first of the order of part of it's about to
read, these three steep here in death (H 25-27) look like nothing other
(worthy) turn from this battle without spot, the Lord seek the old home

in order to express a partitive relationship of Hiddegard to be described. From shall

merely. It is also grammatically unnecessary except for further illustration—
from the remote to the protracted sense, so that these already superfluous
peasant the democratization. From above to suit those who more than to accomplish the whole

p lease, whom Hiddegard (H 20) is prepared of some indeterminate value as we—
the words the peasant (H 26) may be constructed as either singular

"Hiddegard's cannot reached (H 25-27)"

what order of the peasant and the paragraph of the peasant, the better very right—In keeping with the constraints
that the sound is repeated. The context of part of the peasant and peasant

speak sharply and preparation for an appeal for a short section now

of course it be better seen as justified an expression of sympathy of the

Hiddegard's remark that she does not unless wear and for a want

(Hiddegard)
or has just begun.  But the audience and Waldere already know of Gudhere's refusal, so that obviously Hildegyd is not speaking to give information. The recapitulation, however, is manifestly essential to the irony of the succeeding clause of the text—that Gudhere shall now turn from this battle without treasures—and would not appear at all except where the ironic fate of Gudhere were the primary consideration. Lenz has pointed out, besides, that the legend as received in Waltharius leaves no place for a speech of Hildegyd's to come between Gudhere's final refusal of offers and the outbreak of fighting.  In fact, in Waltharius, the Klungs episode, and Vidga's adventure alike, it is the enemy who breaks off negotiations by declaring that talk must cease, then aptly enough, opens the attack.

In lines 8 ff. Hildegyd tells Waldere that the day has come when he shall certainly do one of two things, lose his life or possess lasting fame. The lines have been said to fit better with a closed sequence of fights in which no night's rest intervenes between Waldere's fight with Gudhere's men and the final fight with Gudhere himself. Nonetheless, the night's rest may have occurred. The alternatives to death-or-fame are not finally excluded until the last attack is launched. At an earlier point, the hero might still hope to bargain for his life, or Gudhere and his remaining warriors might abandon the fight, but Waldere should in neither case come away with any consummate fame. The

---


to which Hildegyt refers as giving either death or fame may be the same as that on which the fights begin; it may, however, follow a night's rest similar to that in Waltharius. All that the passage tells us for certain is that the time for decisive action is at hand and that within the day Waldere is to be dead or completely victorious.

Waldere has been found objectionable on these scores: 1) that it is marked overall by a fuzzy, redintegrative quality, and 2) that it betrays a childish immaturity of conception in which the falling out of events fails to justify the promise. The basis for such objections is removed if the interpretation suggested in this study is accepted. It seems the interpretation best supported by a collation of the Walther legends and the contextual Theodoric legends.

---

150 Ibid., p. 125.
II. THE SALDERE TEXT

This edition is based on a study of the previous editions and an examination of Holthausen's facsimiles (Die Salderes-Bruchatüche). The text of Fragment A is from the right half of a fold, i.e., from sides a and d; that of Fragment H is from sides a and b of a separate fold. Each MS page contained fifteen lines of writing, set down without regard to poetic line division. On the remaining strips (each about half an inch wide) of the cut-away leaves are preserved letters from some line beginnings and endings, but some of these letters are illegible or doubtful. In A the only certain readings are a (line 14) and f (line 15); in XAB, only d (line 14). In the following table, points represent doubtful letters:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>He</th>
<th>Hf</th>
<th>He</th>
<th>Hf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For swill, Stephens reads swal, but the i, though faint, is certain. For Norman's hypothesis that swill establishes the sequence of the leaves, see Introduction, p. 60.

There are no marks of punctuation in the MS except the semi-
scoles after 4 in Rd 5. Accents for vowel length appear only in LRT, Æs, and Æw (Åw 18, 19, H 10); capitals, only in Se, Nu (reading doubtful), Halles, and Ac (Åw 25, H 8, 12, 18). There are a number of abbreviations: 7 for ond, ɔ for past, bonn for bonne, æft for aefter, frœ for from, 1, once for him, — sometimes for omn. These forms are expanded in the following edition without notice taken of specific instances.
FRAGMENT XW

"... ce basteran
buton Dam anum te is sec hafa
on stantate stille gehided.
It w is past hit dohte Beodric Widian

5 selfum onsendon, ond sec sinc micel
maima mid Wi mece, monig ofres mid him
gole gegisw"n: ulean geman
paes te hine of nearwum Nithades maeg,
Welandes bearn Widia ut forlet,

10 urh fifela geweald fort onette.
Waldere matedode wiga ellenrof
haefde him on handa hilde frofre,
gutbilla gripe—, gyddode wordum:
"Hwaet, tu huru wendest, wine Burgenda,
past me Hagenan hand hilde gefremede
ond getwaemde fedrebigea; Feta, ygif tu dyrra,
set tus heatwurgan bare byrnan!
Stande me her on eentralum Aelfheres laf,
god em gearnth, golde geweorded,

15 sallles unseede matedinges reaf
to habanme ponne hand weref
forchhord seondum. Ne bit fah wit me
ponne... unmaegas eft ongynnad,
mesum gemaad, swa ge me dydon.

20 Seah maeg sige syllan Se de symle byrf
recon ond raadfest ryhta gehwiles. Se de him to Dam halgan helpe geliffed,
to gode gice, he paer gearo finded
gif de earnunga aer geendeded.

25 ponne moten wiance welen britnian,
aehtum wealdan: past is ... .

hit: ic. 5 onsendon: ons(...)dom. 7 geman: ge num. 10 geweald:
ge at end of line; whether the letters beginning the new line are wea is
debated. 11 matedode: madelode. 12 frofre: frore. 15 Hagenan:
hagenan with e added over gn. 16 fedrebigea: (..)de wigges or (..)de
wigges. 17 XW begins with set. 18 standed: standat. 19 geweorded:
ge weored with a above ro. 21 hand: had. 22 Ne: he. 23 ponne:
followed by illegible letters at line end. 26 ryhta: ryh(•)a. 30 moten:
meten.
hyrde hyne george:
"Huru Welandes worg ne geswian
monna asendes Thara Te Missing can
heardes gehalde:
oft set hilde gedres
swafeg and swoardwund secg eafter otrum.
Aettan ordwyga, no leat Tha allen nu gyt
gedrescan to daeg, dryhtcipe . . .

He is se daeg sumen
past Tha sesalt sainga oden taeg:

lif forleosan oode langus dom
agan mid almac, Aeltheres sumu.
Nalles ic Tha, wine min, wordum side
dy ic Tha geaswe set Tha swerdplegan
Tham edwdsype asenigas monnes

wig forbugan oode on weal fleon
lice beorgan, Thah pe laura fals
Uman byrnhosmon billum heowun.
As Tha szale furthor feostan sochtst,
mael oser mearsc: dy ic Tha metod ondred,

past Tha to fyrellice feostan sochtst
act Tha actstealle oden monnes
wigaedan:
warta Tha selfe
Godam daedum Thendam Thin god recce.
He man Tha for Tha mace: Tha seard maetha cysst

gifede to sesa; mid dy Tha Guthere sesalt
best forbugan Thes Tha ho Tha beadwes ongan
mid wyrhte aerest secan.
Forsec he Tham swurde ed Tham synctatum,
beaga maenigo: nu sesal bega leas

hwofan from Umana bilda, hlaefurd secan
ealdne edel, othe he aer swefan
gif he Tha . . . . . . . . .

2 Welandes: weland(••) at end of line, with part of a still visible.
4 heardes: hearnas with dot under n. 5 secg: secn. 6 Aeltan: aeltan(•) gyt: gy(••). 8 Tha: (••). 10 langes: la(••)ge, the a very dim.
13 swordplegan: sword wlegan. 17 Tha begins with Thocon. 25 mid: (•••). gifede: gifede. 29 beaga: beaga. 31 edel: ••.
III NOTES

To the authorities cited in these notes, the Bibliography will serve as a key for abbreviated references. For citing editions, the editor's name has usually been deemed sufficient. References to Cosijn are to "De Waldere-Fragmenten," and those to Bugge are to "Spredte iagttagelser vedkommende de oldengelske digte om Beowulf og Waldere." For other studies and notes, the title (sometimes shortened) or periodical volume, as well as the page reference, is given.

Fragment XV

1. On the identity of the speaker, see Introduction, p.

   Stephen's restoration (beadome)ce, adopted also by Müllenhoff and Haigh, is objectionable for double alliteration and excessive length in the half-line. Nearly all later editors assume (me)ce. Bugge (pp. 75 f.) suggests for the whole line (me seah (or nat) ic mid mannun me)ce basteran, adopted by Weinhold and Müller. Leitzmann and Norman print swilce basteran, taking the letters swil- from the fourth side of the H-fold, and Klaeber, "Drei Anmerkungen," p. 354, suggests (me geseah ic asfre swilce basteran as a possibility for the line. See also Introduction, pp. 61 f.

2. Rieger and Sedgefield: hafu.
5. The word *stanfast* does not occur elsewhere in Old English. Müllenhoff compared Old Saxon *stenvat*, Heliand 62, 4, and earthenware vessel. Dietrich interprets *stanfast* to mean a sheath thickly set with stones. Rieger and Wülcker assume the meaning "skeve." The interpretations commonly preferred are "chest" (Stephens, Fischer, Henrici, Heinzel, Kluge, Schücking) and "sheath" (Weinhold, Strecker, Dickins, Norman, Dobbie). Neither *fast* nor any cognate elsewhere appears in the meaning sheath except once, in the MHG *wurtvaz* (cf. Lenz, *Der Ausgang*, pp. 42 and 51, note).

4. For MS *ic*, which is senseless, Müllenhoff and most subsequent editors adopt *hit*. Trautmann suggests *hine*, for which, however, he thinks that *ic* could not plausibly be a scribal corruption. He then adopts *gehite* for MS *ic* *hote*, later ("Das Beowulflied") *bone* *hote* for MS *ic* *hote*. Dickins, Leitzmann, and Holthausen (in later editions) adopt *hine*. However, Dobbie points out that in a new sentence the neuter would be acceptable for a grammatically masculine antecedent *mene*, which is itself a synonym for the neuter *swoord*.

5. Trautmann emends *selfum* to *selfne* (i.e., *mene*) as an object for *onsendom*. The letters *-en-* are not now visible in *onsendom*, but Bugge (p. 76) thinks *onsendom* to be certain for the MS. Stephens prints *on- stedom* without acknowledging the difficulty of the reading. Since publication of Bugge's notes, all editors accept *onsendom*, as for the infinitive. On interpretation of the word, see Introduction, p. 52.

6. Stephens remarks that *monig òfres* may mean "many another man, many another thing, or many other men and things." He and all subsequent editors have elected the meaning "many another thing." Beginning with
Müllenhoff, all have assumed mid him to mean mid ði mæce, but it may mean “with Theodoric” or “with Widia.” See Introduction, pp. 46 f.

7. Rieger adopts gigirwed (based on a misreading gigirwan) for MS gegirwan. Cosijn (p. 70) suggests either passive sense for gegirwan or emendation to gigirwed. Trautmann adopts for the whole line wolde gegaðan, ïulean sellan; later, golde gegaðan, ïulean sellan, with gegaðan to be taken as dependent on onsendon of line 5. Binz (ZfdPh, XXXVI, 507 f.) suggests golde gegaðad, gimma ïulean. Kluge, Leitzmann and Holthausen (Beowulf, 4-7th editions) adopt gegaðed for gegirwan. But the majority of editors retain gegirwan as coordinate with onsendon.

For MS genam, Rieger suggests genam, adopted by Grein, Henrici and Möller, and accepted but not printed by Wülcker. Except Trautmann, all other editors retain genam. See also Introduction, pp. 54 ff.

8 f. Accounts of the rescue of Theodoric by his retainers appear in several Middle High German poems: Alpharts Tod, Dietrichs Erste Ausfahrt (Virginal), Sigenot, and Laurin. The passage most closely suggestive of the Waldere allusion is Alpharts Tod 253, in which Witege claims to have saved Heime and Dietrich from death by coming to their help during their distress at Mutaren.

10. According to Stephens, the MS has gefæld or gefæræld. Bugge (p. 306) thinks it may be gestæld. Binz (Literaturblatt, XXI, 244) says the reading is really gewæld, which Norman supports by saying that either w is corrected to f or f is corrected to w. Whatever the reading—and most editors print gewæld—, it is generally agreed that the meaning is approximately “though the domain of giants.” However, Trautmann ("Zum
zweiten Waldherr-Bruchstück" uniquely emends to *burh fifera geweald* (*by the power of wings* which, as Trautmann sees it, Widia has probably received from his father and lent to Theodoric). Klaeber ("Drei Anmerkungen," p. 354), comparing Heliand 341, thinks *burh fifela geweald* may mean "by the power of giants."

Of *onette*, though syntax would point to Widia, some have assumed Theodoric to be subject. Mieger emends to the infinitive *onettan* and removes the difficulty with syntax. In extant legend, however, dashing action is more characteristic of Widia than of Theodoric.

12 f. Müllenhoff's emendation *hildesfrofre* is adopted by all subsequent editors except Müller, Fisher, and Heinzel, who adopt *hildesfroreme*, suggested by Bugge (p. 77). Cosijn (p. 71) thinks that *frore* may be phonetically altered from *frofre* and points out that *frore* also appears for *frofre* in The Rule for St. Benet (ed. Logeman, EETS, 1888), p. 10, line 1.

The phrase *gudbilla gripe* has given great trouble. Dietrich suggests it means "the thing gripped by swords," hence shield. Müllenhoff suggests an Old English cognate for Old Norse *gripa*, "precious thing," accepted tentatively by Heinzel, Holthausen, Leitzmann, Schücking, Norman. Mieger emends to *gudbill agriben*, accepted by Fischer. Cosijn (p. 71) suggests an abstract "the cut of swords" for the concrete "the cutting sword," accepted by Dickins. Trautmann emends to *gudbille on gripe*, which has tempted several subsequent editors, none of whom, however, have adopted the change. As against Trautmann's emendation, the genitive *gudbilla* is confirmed in the fact that *gripe* in simplex nearly always appears with an adjacent genitive. The rule is absolute in the Cynewulfian poems: with *græma* in Andreas 217 and 951 and Juliana 215; *gleda* in Klene
1301 and *Juliana* 391; *geese in Andreas* 187; *decra in Juliana* 125.

Compare also *Beowulf* 1765, *gripe means*. Sedgefield interprets the phrase as "handle of the sword." taking *gutmilla* as a plural for singular.

Wyatt amends to *gutmillas* (genitive singular) *gripe* and interprets like Sedgefield. But the meaning "handle" for *gripe* or *grip* is not known to have existed, as Dobbie points out, before the nineteenth century.

The difficulty seems to have been created by Müllenhoff's assumption that *hilde*, written separately in the MS, is to be taken as an element of a compound. Toller in B-T Supplement under the entry *gripe* prints *hilde frofre*, *gutmilla gripe* and interprets "help for battle, for the assault of swords." Under this interpretation, *gripe* receives a satisfactory explanation, as bearing one of its accustomed meanings and not requiring a wry rendering of the genitive plural *gutmilla*. Compare other citations of *gripe* in B-T and B-T Supplement. (The latter, in the definitions of *gripe*, is a necessary corrective of the former.)

Schücking ("Waldere und Waltharius," p. 25 f.) attacks Toller's interpretation of *frofre* as "help" and elects to retain Müllenhoff's *hilde frofre* as "battle-comfort." But *hilde frofre* can with equal justice be rendered "comfort for (or in) battle," and Toller may have intended nothing very different.

15 f. Müllenhoff retains *gefremede ond*, but thinks it is to be ignored in interpretation. Trautmann deletes the words as excessive metrically and has for line 15 f.: *baet me Hagenan band hilde getwaeme/ fedewigges*. Thus also Kluge and Schücking. Klaeber ("Zu den Waldere-Bruchstücken," p. 122) remarks that the reference of *wandest*, line 14, is futurative and that the text does not warrant an assumption that Hagena has already fought.
See also Introduction, p. 58.

Stephens restored *fece*, accepted by all editors, but did not recognize that it was the first element of the compound *fecewigges*. Until Rieger, who first indicated the correct sentence and line division, the sense of line 16, particularly of *feta*, had given great trouble.

16 f. Dietrich and several editors note the parallel of Hildebrand 55 f.:

*Doh meht du nu sodlichho, ibu dir din ellen taoc, in sus heremo man hrusti giwinnen.*

Schücking’s interpretation of *headeuwerigan* as ironic, meaning “dead,” has met nothing but objection. See Klaeber ("Zu den Waldere-Bruchstücken," p. 122), Norman (p. 18, note), Lenz (Der Ausgang, pp. 43 f.).

18. Nearly all editors adopt Müllenhoff’s *standæ* for MS *standæ*. Norman retains the latter as probably a late Northumbrian form for the 3rd sing. pres. ind.

19. Grell suggests *geapueb* (representing *geapweb*) for MS *geapneb*, but Cosijn (p. 72) says that corselets are *hond-locone* (*Beowulf* 322 and 551), not woven. Dickins and J. Hoops ("Altenglisch geap") have detailed discussion of the word, the former suggesting "broad-bossed," the latter, "broad-fronted." Citing the (imperfect) parallels of *Elene* 47 and Judith 177, Trautmann emends to *gegerwed*, later to *gearwod*.

21. Stephens inserts *halwend* before *habbane*, followed by Haigh; Müllenhoff has *halwende*.

Beginning with Müllenhoff, all editors accept *hand* for MS *had*. 
though Dietrich disagrees because of *hadan* signifying persons (Adam and Eve) in *Riddle II*, 12, and Heinzel emends only doubtfully.

22. The larger number of editors accept Möllenhoff's emendation *ne* for MS *he*. Mulder thinks the reading is really *ne*, but others do not agree. Bugge (p. 78) prefers to retain *he*, as referring to Haegna, who will now for the first time be *waldere's* enemy. Fischer takes *he* *bit fah* as "(Haegna) is my enemy," i.e., has already attacked and may do so again. Dieter (*Anglia*, XI, 169) suggests that a portion of the text has been lost before *he*. Heinzel adopts *heo* *bit fah* to mean "(the corselet) will be stained." Trautmann has *ne bit fah wit* me, "not a few are against me." Cosijn (p. 72) takes *ne bit fah wit* as "(the corselet) will not be an enemy to." Comparing ON *flæs*, Holthausen emends to *ne bit flæs* ("the corselet will not be faithless"), a reading adopted by Leitzmann and Yattendon, though *flæs* does not elsewhere occur in Old English. Later, Holthausen restores *æl fah* (*Beowulf*, 6th and 7th editions). Norman suggests *ne bid fah* as "(the corselet) will not be (blood-)stained," but like Dobbie, he also approves the rendering of Cosijn, as well as of Dickins and Sedgefield, "(the corselet) will not prove false to me."

23 f. Stephens thinks the reading is either *yfel urnanægas* or *all urnanægas*. *Yfel* is printed by all editors before publication of Bugge's notes. Bugge (pp. 78 and 306) disagrees emphatically with Stephens. He reads (p. 306) *o* or lower half of *d* followed by *ig* or the Icelandic symbol for *ng*. The symbol for the latter does not elsewhere appear in Old English MSS. He nonetheless suggests *engan wegnægas*, taking *engan* as for *engan*, "with points (of weapons)." Bugge cites *Riddle XXIV*, 4, where *engæs* appears in a similar sense, and Agathias (II, 5, according to
Norman), where means "(Frankish) spear." Weinhold, Fischer, Leitzmann print ongan maegas. Assuming ongan, Dieter suggests that the too general maegas stands for maegas. Möller has obre unmaagas. Holthausen (Waldere-Bruchstücke) and Naumann have nu unmaagas. But Holthausen later (Beowulf) accepts Bugge's suggestion. Still later (Beowulf, 6th and 7th editions) he considers ong to be a scribal error and adopts mae unmaagas, which had already been adopted by Trautmann. Klaeber adopts mae unmaagas. Kluge and Sedgfield print bonne unmaagas without indicating a lacuna. Heinzel, Learned, Norman, Dickins (pp. 51 f., note), Dobbie leave a space between bonne and unmaagas. To Norman, the last of the doubtful letters seems to be an g. He thinks ultra-violet light might establish the reading (the same might be said of line 25b in Fragment E). Dobbie's estimate that the space permits only two letters is too conservative (compare Wülcker, Bibliothek, who would allow four, and Bugge, pp. 78 and 306, who would allow three), but more than three letters would require crowding. A possessive—possibly mine (i.e., Gedhere's) ummaegas—may have appeared here, since meag, whether compounded or uncompounded, regularly appears with a genitive, as might be expected, when the kinship is to a specific person. Compare the usage in Beowulf, in which the word (inclusive also of meaga, faederan-meag, heofonmeag, winameag, and meagwine) occurs 41 times, 31 times with genitive; for the remaining ten occurrences, meat could not appear with genitive because of the general application of the word (swa socel meag don, and the like) or because only reciprocal relationship among those called "kinmen" is to be expressed.

For MS oft, Rieger adopts oft'. Sedgfield suggests oft, "persecution" instead of oft, to supply an object for ongynen. See following note.
24 f. Trautmann adopts *gemanetan*, dependent on *ongymnaef*, but Hen
("Textkritische Bemerkungen," p. 120) points out that the MS reading is
equally unobjectionable. *Ongymnaef* (see B-T) occurs several times else-
where in the meaning "attack." Presumably the object jointly of *ongymnaef*
and *gemanetan*, and of *dydon* as reflecting them both, is *me*. For other
instances in which a pronominal object is omitted, sometimes apparently
to be supplied from neighboring but not coordinate predicates, see Beowulf
24, 31, 48 f., 93, 337, 748, 1487, 1808, 2940.

Wyatt remarks with justice that *geo* would give better sense
than *se": "as they formerly did me." Compare Beowulf 2521, as well as con-
ventional use of * aer* in similar comparisons.

26. Dietrich suggested *recess* for *MS* *recon*. Grein adopts *recess* and
*recess*, probably in part without intention of altering the MS reading,
since MS *reafest* is not cited in Grein's notes. Weinhold, Fischer and
Henrici follow Grein. Kluge has *recess* *reafest*; Trautmann, *recess*
*reafest*. Dobbie says: "*recon*, as for *recon*, 'swift, prompt,' parallel
to *reafest*, gives unexceptional sense." A number of editors follow
Rieger's spelling, *recon* (*Wulcker, Sedgefield, Wyatt*).

27. Dickins and Sedgefield adopt *helpan* for *MS* *helpes*.

28. *Findeß* as the text stands is without an object. Rieger and Dobbie
assume a passage lost after *Findeß*. Trautmann first agrees with Rieger
but later suggests insertion of *hie* after *he*, or substitution of *hie* for
*he*, letting *se* of line 27 stand as subject of *Findeß*. He finally adopts
*hie* for *he*. But the omission of the pronominal object is by no means un-
paralleled (see note to line 24, above). It is perhaps as well to assume
a "squinting" relationship for *giose*—to *gelifeß* and *Findeß*. 
29 ff. Contrary to Müllenhoff's arrangement, line 29 is usually taken with the preceding rather than the following lines. Trautmann however begins a new sentence with *gif* and emends the passage to read as follows:

\[
\text{Gif he \( \text{da\ earnunga,} \) are, \text{sedences},} \\
\text{bonne moston \( \text{wlance} \) \( \text{welan\ britnian,} \)} \\
\text{ashtum wealdan, \( \text{paet is...} \)}
\]

Norman rejects the alterations, takes line 29 with the preceding lines, and renders it: "if he first determines (to perform) the(necessary, essential) good deeds."

Sedgefield takes *bonne* for "than," not "then" or "when." Without citing instances, he asserts that the omission of *ma*, as here, is not infrequent. In *Beowulf* 70, *bonne* apparently introduces a clause qualifying an adjective, *micel*, in the positive rather than comparative degree, but the instance hardly parallels the *waldere* passage, where no form even in the positive degree anticipates *bonne*. In Sedgefield's interpretation, the missing *ma* is object of *findes*; one who has faith will find, if he is thinking of rewards, more than the wealth dispensed by the proud and the possessions ruled by them.

**Fragment H**

1. Stephens translates *hyrde* as "heard." Most editors accept Dietrich's interpretation, "encouraged," like *onhyrde* of *Elene* 841. Bugge (pp. 72 f.) would include line 1 in the speech, as Hildesgyth's. He takes *hyrde* to mean "tempered," citing the parallel passage, *Beowulf* 1459 ff.; *ecg waes iren, astertanum fab/ abyrded heaposwate; naefre hit set hilde ne swac /
Möller suggests for restoration of line 1a *Hildgræf meðelode.

Cosija (p. 68) says that *hyrde hyne georne* may be a variation after parenthetic matter, in a pattern like that of *Xv* 11-13, but also suggests *de Hildgræf* for 1a. As many editors and commentators have noted, either *Hildegyðr* or *Hagena* is likely to have appeared in 1a to alliterate with *hyrde*. Only Reinzel, however, assumes the speech to be *Hagena*’s.

The name form *Hildegyðr* is established by two occurrences of the word in Old English and by analogy of other feminine names with the same suffix. See Dobbie, p. xxiv (note).

2 ff. Stephens says: "We may read *weland gewora* or *welandes wore*; in the former case the *ee* of the genitive has been accidentally omitted."

Holthausen, *Die Waldere-Bruchstücke*, remarks that nothing visible in the MS supports the *ge-* conjectured by Stephens.

"Weland’s work" is taken by Mühlenhoff, Cosija (p. 57), Leitzmann as referring to Waldere’s byrnie, by the parallels *Welandes geweorc*, Beowulf 455, and *Welandia fabrica*, Waltharius 965, both referring to byrnies. However, Streeker ("Waltharius 263 f.," p. 268) points out that the byrnies in *Waldere Xv* 18 (Aelfheros lær) and Waltharius (a piece stolen from Attila) are not to be identified with each other, and Lenz (Der Anfang, p. 27) further remarks that Weland didn’t specialize in byrnies. The phrase is nearly always taken as an alternate epithet for the sword *fæning*. For a similar sword description compare Beowulf 1460 f. (quoted above). A like formula appears as late as Chaucer’s Squire’s Tale (lines 166-7): *This is a verray sooth withouten close;* / It faileth nat whils it is in youre hoold.

"sænas sænum hara be hit mid mundum bewand."
Before publication of Bugge's notes, all editors take *hearns* as for *hearns,* "grey." Bugge (p. 73) compares *hearns* of *Beowulf* 2057 (Dobbie cites also *hearns,* *Beowulf* 2037), and assumes *hearns* to be a phonetic variant of *heardne,* as in the phrase (ge)healdan *heardne wæce,* *Waldon* 167 and 236. Cosijn (p. 69) thinks *hearns* more likely to be an error for *heardne* than a variant. Nearly all subsequent editors amend to *heardne.* Förster (*Est*., *XXIX,* 107 f.) suggests *hearse,* the dot under MS a signifying deletion (as for substituting d). Dickins and Norman retain *hearns* as for *heardne.*

Dietrich objects to the generality of *oft set hilde gedreæt,* etc., and suggests *oft be or oft him* to refer to *Mimming* or *Waldere.* Müllerhoff thinks that the fighting referred to is *Waldere's* fights against the *Burgundians* and that *hilde* should be preceded by an article or demonstrative. Heinzel, with whom nobody has agreed, thinks that the passage means that to die is nothing and that it prefaces an exhortation that *Waldere* seek fame at all costs: all he has to lose is his life. Leitzmann and Norman (p. 14), like Müllerhoff, think that those who have fallen are *Guðhare's* men. Holthausen and Klaeber ("Zu den *Waldere-Bruchstücken,*" p. 126) take the passage as general, not as relating to the *Burgundians,* but do not explain further. Imelmann ([HL, *XXIX,* 1076 f.) takes the lines to refer to *Mimming,* but excludes the fights with the *Burgundians* (which he takes to be in the future). Dobbie (p. xxv, note) thinks the reference is to *Waldere's* service with *Attila.* Lenz (Der *Anagang,* pp. 28 f.) assumes that *Waldere,* using *Mimming,* has often killed men, among his victims being already the *Burgundians.* Apparently at least the sword is being referred to, but whether as in *Waldere's* hands does not appear. *Waldere's* claim to *Mimming* is probably temporary.
Stephens, Haigh, Wülfker, Müller, Heinzel, Learned retain MS see as for seoc.

6. Fischer takes ordwyge to mean "spear warrior," but as Holthausen (Beowulf) remarks, the word may mean either a warrior at the forefront of an army, or one who fights with a pointed weapon, whether sword or spear. Walthari makes considerable use of a spear, but also of swords, in Waltharius. He is also Attila's army leader in both Waltharius and Walthar.

For Hn, Trautmann ("Zur Berichtigung") has Hn, but he later ("Das Beowulflied") returns to the MS reading Hn.

7 f. Nearly all editors assume the MS to be defective. After dryhtscipe Stephens supplies feallan, adopted by the greater number of editors. Holthausen (Waldere-Bruochstucke) followed by Kluge and Schücking, deletes to daeg, as suggested by Cosijn (p. 68), and reads gedreosan dryhtscipe: Nu is se daeg cuman. Cosijn himself prefers to take gedreosan to daeg dryhtscipe as a three-stress halfline, adopted by Naumann. Trautmann ("Zur Berichtigung") alters to daeg into to beas, later ("Beowulflied"), into pinne, and, like Cosijn and Naumann, reads 7a-8b as one line. Holthausen (Beowulf, 4-7th editions) has gedreosan to daeg pinne dryhtscipe / deormod haele! Nu is se daeg cuman. For restoration of line 8a, Grein, comparing Genesis 1199 and Andreas 1310, supplies deor and domgeorn:, adopted also by Weinhold and Fischer. Sedgefield suggests dom stlegan!, comparing Beowulf 1523 (his dom slaeg, spoken of the sword Hrunting).

Stephens reads Ac instead of Hn. The latter reading is Hugges's (p. 75), after whose notes most editors print Hn (exceptions: Wülker,
Fischer and Sedgefield). *Nu ie se daeg cumen* occurs also in Beowulf 2646 (Bugge).

9. For *ewer tewga*, Dobbie remarks the parallel of *Maldon* 207.

Trautmann thinks *aniga* has to mean "durchaus, sätzlich," finds this meaning objectionable, and alters the word to *earnigan*, which in Northumbrian would have been *earniga*.

10. Comparing *Daniel* 163 (*haefde dom micelne*) and *Beowulf* 1336 f. (*geggin pance stone longsmane lof*), Dietrich objects to the adverbia l *lange* and suggests *langae*. The greater number of editors retain *lange*, but Rieger, Trautmann, Kluge, Leitzmann, Dickens, Klaeber, Holthausen (later editions), Norman, Dobbie amend to *langae*.

12. Cosijn (p. 60) points out that Eve calls Adam *wine mìn* in *Genesis* 824.

13. Heinzel considers *gesawe* an evidence that Hildegyth cannot be speaker: she cannot, Heinzel thinks, have seen Waldere in combat. Cosijn (p. 59) replies that *gesawe* need not be taken literally but may be poetic license: whether or not Hildegyth has seen Waldere fighting, hundreds of others have. It might be remarked that if Hildegyth can be conceived to offer encouragement, she can be conceived to watch the fighting, so that it is in any case unnecessary to assume poetic license. Willenhoff, Bugge (p. 74), Leitzmann, Norman (p. 14), among others, take the passage as referring to the battles against the Burgundians. Fischer, Heinzel, Holthausen, and others think the reference is to the time of Waldere's service with Aetla.

15. Dietrich takes *weal* as dative with apocope from *wæl*, "place of"
slaughter. Where explicit, the editors assume weal acc. of weal(l), perhaps a naturally fortified place, as thought by Bugge (p. 74), who compares Waltharius 493-5, 1118, and 1136, but perhaps an artificial fortification. Trautmann compares a modern English idiom, "to go to the wall," meaning to be the weaker or inferior party. Editors cite as parallels on beolster fleon (Beowulf 755), fleon on fenhopu (Beowulf 784) fulgon on (past) faesten (Elene 134, Maldon 194), on holf bugon (Beowulf 2593), and beah...under swādweal (Beowulf 2956 f.).

In the line, Bugge (p. 74) remarks that this is best explained if Waldere has been attacked by a number of opponents at once. Norman (p. 14), comparing Waltharius (lines 982 ff.), would infer that the laðres flela are three, but the parallel is imperfect: weapons are not borne against Walthari by numbers at once.

19. Dietrich takes mael as he does weal, as dative with apocope, and interprets "with the sword," comparing hringmael, wundenmael, and brogdenmael in Beowulf. Rieger remarks, however, that these compounds are adjectives and adjectival epithets, in which mael is not to be equated with "sword." Rieger takes mael in Waldere as to be identified with OHG mehal, ON mal, "meeting, speech," and as used figuratively for "fight.

Further, Dickins compares wohlest mael with Icelandic sokkja mael, a legal term meaning "to press a suit." Cosijn (p. 68) takes mael as for OE maestel and interprets like Rieger. Bugge (p. 74) assumes the usual temporal meaning for mael and suggests maless er or meares, "limit of time." Möller, Helnzel, Kluge, and Holthausen (Beowulf) adopt maless (Holthausen earlier has mael). Bugge supports the plausibility of weal as for maless by the parallel of wæland for Wælandes, but the reading wæland is in
error. Traummann interprets *mael ofer mearce* as "fight beyond the line (marking off a dueling place)"; Cosijn, "fight beyond the (battle) line," i.e., Wulfric would leave his battle companions behind him. Hornum takes *mael* as point of space: Wulfric has sought "the place over the boundary (of a protected position)," opposed in meaning to *on wael fleon*, line 15.

Fischer takes *mael* as an adverbial accusative, the half-line meaning "for an unlimitedly long time." Taken adverbially, *mael* might make fitter sense construed as a plural, "times beyond limit," reinforcing *syme*, line 18.

Müllenhoff and Sieger adopt *metode sceaf* for *metod*. Grein retains *metod*, but glosses it "fate," an interpretation accepted by a number of editors. The grounds for rejection of *metod* or of its usual sense, "God," are not perfectly clear. Bugge (p. 74) interprets: "I feared God for thee (i.e., God's anger and punishment)," adducing in support the sentence *ic ondraede me god* (as Dobbie remarks, a translation of Genesis 42:18). Compare *pa ondraedendan heora scyppend* (a Blickling Homily)* and *an ge ondraesat esc deoflu* (Aelfric's Homily on the Assumption of St. John the Apostle).* Dobbie points to line 23b, *wenden min god recea*, in support of the meaning "God" for *metod*.

20. *Fyrenlice* does not elsewhere occur in Old English. It is frequently interpreted "sinfully, wickedly," in accord with the familiar meaning of *fyren* (fire), "sin, crime, evil deed"; frequently, however, "excessively, rashly." For the latter interpretation, Müllenhoff cites *fyrenbear*.

* The passages are cited from J.R. Hulbert, ed., Bright's Anglo-Saxon Reader, Revised and Enlarged (New York, 1936), p. 67, line 15, and p. 70, lines 18 f.
"dire distress," in Beowulf (line 14); and Stephens and Müllenhoff both cite fyrnum and firnum, "exceedingly," in Genesis (lines 316, 809, 832), but these forms, all in Genesis B, presumably reflect an Old Saxon original. In any case the fear of God would stem from deeds which had been wrongful rather than only rash as such.

Trautmann emends the word to fromlice, "boldly."

Lenz (Der Ausgang, p. 32) would take lines 20ff. as a noun clause explanatory of metod (as meaning "fate") and would take sohtest as "would seek," the subjunctive. In the usual interpretation, baet introduces a clause explanatory of my, line 19, and sohtest is a preterite indicative.

21. The word aetsteal occurs also in a place name, aetstealles beorh (Kemble, Codex Diplomaticus, IV, 31), and in the phrase him to aetstealle (Guthlac 150—also cited as 179). Müllenhoff and Rieger remark that aetstealle in Guthlac means "support," as Grein translates it there (Dichtungen der Angelsachsen, II, Cassel and Göttingen, 1857, p. 71). But for aetstealle here, Müllenhoff conjectures "position taken up by a fighter for attack and defense," to be compared with German Antritt and Anstand. Rieger emends to aetsteallan, dative of aetstealla, not recorded elsewhere, and interprets "opponent." Grein conjectures for aetstealle "the place where one stands opposing the enemy for battle," and though Henrici translates "support," nearly all editors assume the meaning to be in effect "(battle) place" or "position." Kluge interprets "encounter" (Anprall); Schücking "das (feindliche) Gegenüberstehen." Sedgefield notes that there are "hardly any examples in O.E. of a noun with act as a prefix" and, ignoring other occurrences of aetsteall, emends to aescstealle, "spear-
place," comparing aessstede. See, further, Introduction p. 69, note.

Ocres monnes perhaps refers to Aetla--certainly so if aetstealle be interpreted "support"—, in whose service Walthar has established a reputation for military exploits.

22. Sigraedenne is usually interpreted like vir, "battle," an accusative in apposition with fechtan, line 20. Norman suggests an instrumental to be rendered "according to (the other man's) plan of battle." Following a suggestion of Sedgefield, Priebsch (MLR, XXIX, 341) interprets "in (another man's) military service." The word could also mean "military domination," a dative qualifying aetstealle. It is through Atila's domination of neighboring states by force of arms that Walthar, Hildegund, and Hagen become hostages at Atila's court, and Walthari's last campaign for Atila is to quell rebellion in a vassal state (Waltharius 170 ff.).

23. Trautmann suggests but does not adopt bæt, "so that", for hæpendan, "while," a change accepted by nobody. Leitzmann begins a new sentence with hæpendan.

24. Ne murn fæor til mece is usually interpreted "do not be concerned (anxious) as regards the sword." Cosijn (p. 69) cites parallels in number for this usual application of murraen for. Dieter (Anglia, XI, p. 165), Heinzel, and Norman (p. 14 ff.), however, prefer to take mece as referring to a sword which has been lost. But Walders's loss of one sword is at least just as likely to have prompted a reassurance about the other: mece would refer to Wingning, as is usually assumed.

25. Stephens says of gifan: "This word differs from gifan, as granted
does from given, and implies something graciously afforded or allowed by a divinity or superior power." Cosijn (p. 60), objecting to an interpretation by Heinzel, remarks that the word never means "given as a present." Norman nonetheless (p. 15) interprets "bestowed" (by Theodoric).

Rieger, Weinhold, Wülcker, Müller, Heinzel, Kluge, Learned, Trautmann, Sedgefield, Dickins, Leitzmann, Wyatt retain gece as variant of gece. All other editors emend to gece.

The word before my is uncertain, but is certainly either unc or mid. Only the vertical portions of the first two letters are visible. In Holthausen's facsimile, what remains visible of the third letter is in the form of an imperfect e. Bugge (p. 75), who reads mid, remarks that unc to gece, not to soce unc, would be the normal pattern.

26. For best, Trautmann adopts baalc, "pride," which occurs with forbygan in Genesis 54 and Judith 267.

29. The greater number of editors adopt bea leas (Grein, Weinhold, Fischer: beaga leas) for MS beaga leas. Müller, Heinzel, Learned, Dickins, Klaeber, Norman retain beaga leas (but Norman includes beaga leas in his glossary). Bugge (p. 306) cites many parallels for "both" as referring to more than two things. Dobbie thinks it probable that beaga, 29a, and syncfatum, 28b, refer to the same treasure, hence that beaga really can refer to only two things, the sword and the treasure.

30. Trautmann deletes disse as metrically excessive. Cosijn (p. 70) objects to hlafurd as senseless in Hildesydrd's mouth, but is reconciled by the parallel of Beowulf 520 f. Trautmann emends to hleoburg, parallel with etel, and compares Beowulf 912 f.
S1. Grein omits her. Trautmann retains it, but thinks it is perhaps to be deleted.
IV. GLOSSARY

Words appear under the forms usually considered basic. In the alphabetic ordering, ae is treated as two letters, following ad, and p and k follow t. The prefix ge- is disregarded in the arrangement. Roman numerals designate classes of ablaut verbs and, when so indicated, of weak verbs. Finite verbs not otherwise labeled are of the indicative mood, and words not labeled as to part of speech are nouns. When no form of a word is given before a line reference, the head word is to be supplied.

The following abbreviations are used:

- a. — accusative
- adj. — adjective
- adv. — adverb
- anom. — anomalous
- comp. — comparative
- conj. — conjunction
- d. — dative
- f. — feminine
- g. — genitive
- inf. — infinitive
- i. — instrumental
- m. — masculine
- n. — neuter
- n. — nominative
- opt. — optative
- pp. — past participle
- p. — plural
- prep. — preposition
- pres. — present
- pret. — preterite
- pron. — pronoun
- redupl. — reduplicating
- s. — singular
- superl. — superlative
- v. — verb
- wk. — weak

Case, number, and gender are also expressed in compound abbreviations: nsm. for nominative singular masculine, and the like.
Proper names are listed separately.

ac, conj., but H 18.

after, prep., after H 5.

weht, f. i-stem, property, dp. Wehtum XW 31.


Har, adv., before XW 29, H 31; superl., Harest, first H 27.

set, prep., in (circumstance) H 4, 13, 21; from XW 17.

setsteall, m. a-stem, support, ds. setstealles H 21.

seteling, m. a-stem, nobleman, prince, em. setelinges XW 20.

Egan, pret.-pres. v., possess, have, inf. H 11.

En, pron., one, dam. Ænum XW 2.

Hinga, adv., certainly H 9.

beastera. See god.

beau, f. wō-stem, battle, fight, as. (or ap.?) bonduwe H 26.

bēa, m., ring, bracelet, treasure, ep. béaga H 29.

beana, n., child, son, ns. XW 9.

bēgan, pron., both, ep. béga (XW beaga) H 29.

bēom, anom. v., be, pres. 3rd s. bē XW 22, byð XW 25, is XW 31, H 8.

beorgan, III v. (with d.), preserve, inf. H 16.

bēot, boast, as. H 26.

bil(l), n., sword, dp. billum H 17.

britnian, wk. II v., dispense, deal out, inf. XW 30.

būton, prep., but, except XW 2.

byrno, f. n-stem, byrno, coat of mail, as. byrnan XW 17.

byrnhoma, m. n-stem, coat of mail, as. byrnhoman H 17.
ȧdán, wk l v., (with d.), chide, reproach, pres. 1st s. cīde H 12.
ȧman, IV v., come, pp. cūmen, H 8.
cūman, pret.-pres. v., can, know how to, be able to, pres. 3rd s. can H 3.
cyst, m. or f. i-stem, choice, best (of its class), ns. H 24.
dæd, f. i-stem, deed, dp. dæcum H 23.
daeg, m. day, ns. H 8, ds. dæge H 7.
dēm, m., glory, as. H 10.
gēdēosan, II v., fall, decline, inf. H 7; pret. 3rd s. gēdēas H 4.
dryhtscipe, m. i-stem, valor, as. H 7.
durran, pret.-pres. v., dare, opt. 2nd s. dyrre XW 16.
ēæ, adv., also XW 2, 5.
cæld, adj., old, asm. caelne H 31.
cæl(l), pron., all, gs. cælles (used adverbially) XW 20.
cænūng, f. o-stem, reward, favor, ap. cænūnga XW 29.
cæl, f., shoulder, dp. cæxelum XW 18.
cæwtscype, m. i-stem, disgrace, as. H 14.
æft, adv., again XW 23.
cæde, m. i-stem p., men, d. oldum H 11.
cællen, m., valor, strength, as. H 6.
cællærdr, adj., brave, famed for courage, ns. XW 11.
ægcæ, see ægoc.
ægel, m., home, native land, as. X H 31.
ægh, adj., hostile, inimical, ns. XW 22.
fæla, m. u-stem (indeclinable), many, with partitive g. H 18.
feohthe, f. n-stem, fight(ing), as. feohantha H 18, 20.
feond, m. cons.-stem, enemy, dp. feondum XW 22.
feorhhord, m. life-treasure, life, as. XW 22.
fetian, wk. II v., fetch, imp. s. feta XW 16.
fedewlcg, n. (or m.), battle on foot, gs. fedewlccges XW 16.
fīfel, n., monster, gp. fīfela XW 10.
findan, III v., find, pres. 3rd s. finieth XW 23.
flēan (dissyllabic), II v., flee, inf. H 15.
for, prep., with i., on account of H 24.
forbūgan, II v., avoid, inf. H 15.
forlēetan, redupl. v., let go, rescue, pret. 3rd s. forleeth XW 9.
forlēosan, II v., lose, inf. H 10.
forsecan, VI v., refuse, pret. 3rd s. forsec H 28.
ford, adv., forth, forward XW 10.
gēfreman, wk. I v., do, pret. opt. 3rd s. gefremede XW 15.
frēror, f., comfort, solace, as. frērē XW 12.
from, prep., (away) from H 30.
furthor, comp. adv., further H 18.
fyrnlece, adv., wickedly, sinfully H 20.

gē, pron., you, ap. XW 24. (Error for gēo?)
gēapneb, adj., broad-fronted (?), XW 19.
gearo, adv., surely, readily XW 28.
geoc, f., help, ds. gēoce H 25, as. gōce XW 28.
georne, adv., eagerly, earnestly H 1.
gif, conj., if XW 29, H 32; gyf XW 16.
gifeðe, adj., granted (by fate), pred. adj. H 25.
god, m., God, ns. H 23, ds. gode X̄W 23.
god, adj., good, nsf. X̄W 19, dpr. godum H 23; comp. bætera, better,
asm. (?) bæteran X̄W 1.
gold, n., gold, ds. golde X̄W 7, 19.
grip, m. i-stem, attack, assault, ds. X̄W 13.
gūmbil(1), n., war-sword, gp. gūmbilla X̄W 13.
gyddian, wk. II v., speak, pret. 3rd s. gyddode X̄W 13.
gyt, adv., yet H 6.

habban, wk. III v., have, hold, keep, gerund habbanne X̄W 21, pres. 1st s.
hafa X̄W 2, pret. 3rd s. hæfde X̄W 12.

hælig, adj., holy, ds. wk. hælgan (epithet for deity) X̄W 27.
hand, f. u-stem, hand, ns. X̄W 15, (MS had) X̄W 21, ds. handa X̄W 12.

hær, adj., hoary, grey, asf. hære X̄W 17.
he, pron., he, nsf. X̄W 28, H 26, 28, H 32, ds. him X̄W 6, 12, 27, asm.
hine X̄W 8, hyne Hl, asm. hit X̄W 4 (MS ic).


heard, adj., hard, strong, asm. heardne (MS hearne) H 4.

headuweðrig, adj., battle-weary, ds. wk. headuweðrigan (epithet for Waldere) X̄W 17.

heawan, redmpl. v., hew, pret. 3rd p. heawun H 17.
help, f., help, as. helpe X̄W 27.

hær, adv., here X̄W 18, H 31.

gehīdan, wk I v., hide, pp. gehīded X̄W 3.
hīld, f. jū-stem, battle, ds. hilde X̄W 12, H 4, 30, as. hilde X̄W 15.
hlæru, m., lord, ns. H 30.

hæru, adv., indeed, verily XW 14, H 2.

hwaet, interjection, what! well! XW 14.

gehwile, pron., everything, with partitive genitive, gs. (used adverbially)

gehwilces XW 26.

hworfan, III v., turn, go, inf. H 30.

hyrdan, wk. I v., harden, encourage, pret. 3rd s. hyrde H 1.

ic, pron., I, ns. XW 2, 4, H 12, 13, 19, ds. mē XW 15, 16, as. mē XW 22, 24.

iulfan, m., reward for former service, as. XW 7.

lǣtan, redupl. v., let, imp. s. lǣt H 6.

lēas, adj. (with gen.), without, nsm. H 29.

lēr, f., heirloom, ns. XW 18.

lang, adj., long, asm. langne H 10 (langne).

laeg, adj., hostile, gpm. laére (foes) H 16.

līce, m., body, one's person, ds. līce H 16.

līf, m., life, as. H 10.

gelīfan, I v. (with a. and tō), expect, believe in, pres. 3rd s. gelīfē XW 27.

mǣg, m., blood relative, kinsman, ns. XW 8.

mēl, n., time, occasion. H 19 (see notes).


maeg, pret.-pres., may, can, pres. 3rd s. maeg XW 25.

maedulan, wk. II v., speak, pret. 3rd s. maedulode XW 11.

mēdm, m., treasure, gpm. mēda XW 6, H 24.

meare, f., mark, limit, as. mearce H 19.
mēsa, m. ja-STEM, sword, d(-i)s. XW 6, H 24, dp. mēcum XW 24.

gemētan, wk. I v., encounter, attack, pres. 3rd p. gemētān XW 24.

metod, m., God, as. H 19.

melal, adj., great, much, as. XW 5.

mid, prep., with d., among H 11, with (persons) XW 6, (means) H 25, (manner) H 27; with i., together with (things) XW 6.

min, adj., my, vocative H 12.

mōn, m. cons.-stem, man, ge. monnes H 14, 21, sp. monna H 3.

mōnig, pron., many, as. XW 6.

mōtan, pret.-pres., may, pres. opt. 3rd p. mōtan (Mōtān) XW 30.

gēmonan, pret.-pres., bear in mind, remember, pres. 3rd s. gēmona (Mē

gēmon) XW 7.

murnan, III v., have anxiety about, imp. s. murn H 24.

nalles, adv., not at all H 12.

nē, adv., not XW 22 (Mē he), H 2, 8, 24.

near, n., wa-STEM, straits, difficulties, dp. nearwum XW 8.

gēman. See gēmonan.

nū, adv., now H 6, 8, 29.

cf, prep., from XW 8.

cfer, prep., beyond, without H 19.

cf, adv., often H 4.

on, prep., with d., in XW 3, 12, on XW 16, with a., to H 15.

and, conj., and XW 5, 16, 19, 26, H 5, 28 (always abbreviated -{ }).

ondrēdan, redupl. v., dread, fear, pret. 1st s. ondre H 19.

onthtan, wk. I v., hasten, rush, pret. 3rd s. ontēt XW 10.

onginnan, III v., attack, pres. 3rd p. ongynnān XW 25; begin (pleonastic),
consendan, wk. I v., send, inf. consendon NW 5.

ordwyga, m. n-stem, fore-warrior (or leader? or sword- or spear-warrior?), vocative H 6.

æðer, other; adj., gam. Æðres H 21; pron., gam. Æðres NW 6, dat. Æðrum H 5, asm. Æðer (one) H 9.

orm, conj., or H 10, 15, 31.

rædefest, adj., resolute, wise, pred. adj. NW 26.

reaf, m. or n., dress, armor, ns. NW 20.

recean, wk. I v., care for, be concerned about, with g., pres. opt. 3rd s. recean H 23.

recon, adj., quick, prompt, pred. adj. NW 26.

ryht, n., (what is) right, gpr. ryhta NW 26.

sculan, pret.-pres., shall, pres. 2nd s. scealt H 9 (shall do), 25, pres. 3rd s. sceal H 29.

sc, demonstrative pron., he, it, that, nsms. NW 25, 27; nsn. past NW 31.

is. ðy (therefore, anticipation of past-clause) H 19, H 25, gpn. ðara H 3; definite article or demonstrative adj., nsms.

sc H 9, dat. ðam NW 2 (or neut.), 27, H 13, 21, dat. H 28, ism. 

di NW 6, H 24, dpr. ðam H 23, apf. ðum NW 29, a. ðum H 32 (text interrupted). See also ðæs.


seæg, m. ja-stem, sææg, ns. H 5 (MS sec).

self, pron., self, dat. selfum NW 5, nsms. selfne H 22.

gæœæm, V v., see, pret. opt. 1st s. gesæwe H 13.

sige, m., victory, as. NW 25.
sine, n., treasure, as. XW 5.
standan, VI v., stand, be, pres. 3rd s. standað (MS standað) XW 18.
stanfaet, n., chest of stone or for stones (treasures)? sheath? ds.
stanfaet XW 3.
stille, adv., at rest, quietly, XW 3.
sunu, m. u-stem, son, vocative H 11.
swæ, conj., as XW 24.
swætēg, adj., blood-stained, nm. H 5.
sweordplegan, m. n-stem, sword-play, ds. sweordplegan (MS - wlegan) H 13.
sweordwund, adj., sword-wounded, nm. H 5.
geswīcan, I v., fail, prove inefficient (with d.), pres. 3rd s. geswīcan H 2.
swurd, n., sword, ds. swurde H 28.
syllan, wk. I v., give, inf. XW 25.
syngle, adv., always XW 25, H 19.
syncfaet, n., precious vessel, treasure chest (?), dp. syncfaetum H 28.
tō, adv., too H 20; prep., from, at the hands of XW 27, 28, for (as) H 25,
tō (with gerund) XW 21, to (with daege) H 7.
getwæman, wk. I v., separate, hinder (with a. of person and g. of thing),
pret. opt. 3rd s. getwæmane XW 16.
twēgen, pron., two, gp. twēga H 9.
þær, adv., there XW 23.
þaes, conj. (with particle ūæ), because, inasmuch as XW 8, ðaes H 26.
þæt, conj., that XW 4, 15, H 20 (explanatory of ðy, H 19), when H 9.
ðæ, ḟe, particle. See ðaes, ðæh.
ðæ, relative prcl., who XW 25, 27, H 3, which XW 2.
however XW 25; though XW 15.

However, wk. I v., intend (with inf.), pret. 3rd s. tohst XW 4.

Though XW 4.

while XW 23.

while XW 23.

He XW 20; conj., when XW 21, 23.

in (manner or state) XW 14.

so XW 17.

that XW 13. See also st.

d. of wit (we two) XW 25. See mid.

treacherous XW 23.

wrong, as. unryhte XW 27.

excellent, as. (or n.) XW 20.

out XW 9.

wall, as. XW 15.

power, domain, as. XW 10.

control, rule, inf. XW 31.

wealth, riches, as. walan XW 30.

think, pret. 2nd s. wendest XW 14.

be, pret. 3rd s. weart XW 24.

honor, exalt, adorn, imp. s. weordan XW 22, pp.

geweort XW 19.
wēran, wk. I v., defend, pres. 3rd s. wērea XW 21.
wīg, n. (or m.), battle, warfare, as. H 15.
wīga, m. n-stem, warrior, as. XW 11.
wīgræden, f. jō-stem, military enterprise or service or dominion? ds.
wīgrædenne H 22.
wīne, m. i-stem, lord, vocative XW 14; friend, vocative H 12.
wītan, pret.-pres., know, pres. 1st s. wēt XW 4.
wīt, prep., with (against) XW 22.
wīlæn, adj., proud, high-spirited, np. wīlænce XW 30.
wīrc, n., handiwork, as. H 2.
wīrð, n., word, dp. wīrdum XW 13, H 12.
Proper Names

Aelfhere, g. Aelfheres XW 18, H 11.
Aetla, g. Aetlan H 6.
Gothere, d. (genitive-equivalent) H 25.
Haganai, g. Hageman XW 15.
Himming, a. H 3.
Mithad, g. Mithades XW 8.
Sæodric, n. XW 4.
Waldere, n. XW 11.
Weland, g. Welandes XW 9, H 2.
Widia, n. XW 9, d. Widian XW 4.
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VI. APPENDICES

A. Genealogy of the Walther Legend

The diagram below representing relationships among versions of the Walther story is adapted from that appearing on page 95 of Wilhelm Lenz's *Der Ausgang der Dichtung von Walther und Hildegunde*, the only difference of substance being the addition here of Viðga's First Adventure.

The bases for conclusions as to the stemma of the legend are exceedingly tenuous, and some of the evidence for Lenz's arrangement is controverted by the new evidence of Viðga's First Adventure. But there remain two distinguishing features of the group comprising Waltharius, the Nibelungenlied, the Rosengarten poems, and the Värtari-Hildigund episode of Thidrickssaga: in each of the group a connection, though of shifting nature, is drawn between Walther and the Wasgenstein (represented more broadly in Waltharius as the Vosges). That the Wasgenstein is unnamed in the other extant pieces might be taken as accidental were it not that most of the group also reflect the disfiguring wound of Hagen. No such disfigurement is remembered except in versions in which the Wasgenstein is also remembered, and of the Wasgenstein group, only Rosengarten fails to bring evidence for this second distinguishing element. It is to account for these two features (at least) that an intermediate lay is assumed between the original and Waltharius. It is true, however, that instead of being added, the two features could about equally well have fallen away in the Walther group through an intermediate
lay.

To Lenz's assumption that Walther, Thidrek's Journey Home, Biterolf und Dietleib, and the Polish account of Walter and Helgund are of a distinct family, the addition of Vidga's First Adventure brings some measure of positive support. In common with each of the latter group, Vidga's adventure has at least one feature lacking to all members of the group preserving the Wasgenstein: with Walther (as reconstructed by Schneider) and Biterolf und Dietleib, the aliases Sintram and Baltram; with Thidrek's Journey Home, the Luruvald and the battle description; and with the Polish narrative, the arrow-swift river-crossing by the wonderful horse.

With respect to Waldere, there is insufficient evidence to indicate a nearer kinship to one group than to the other. The strongest ground for assuming the Old English poem to be relatively independent from both groups is the fact that, with the possible exception of Waltharius, it is considerably the oldest of the versions.

Walther as it appears in the diagram requires comment. The Middle High German Walther of which MS. fragments are preserved is assumed to have been approximately coextensive in substance with the legend (presumably oral literature) from which it is in direct line of descent. Hence a single term is used to embrace both. With the exception of the literary Biterolf und Dietleib, none of the group stemming from Walther, so-called, need have had—or is very likely to have had—a manuscript source.
B. Vidga's First Adventure*

Vidga's son Vidga was now twelve years old. He was large and strong, bold, stately in bearing, well beloved, and no little desirous of honor. Vident asked his son whether he would learn so great an artistry as he could teach him. Vidga answered: "On account of my relations on my mother's side, may God forbid that my hand ever touch the hammer handle or the grip of tongs!" Vident asked: "What will you learn, then, that can honorably provide you food and clothing?" Vidga answered: "I'd like best of all a good horse, a stiff spear, a sharp sword, a new shield, a hard helmet, and a white byrnle. With these I would serve high-born lords and ride with them as long as life is granted me." "I'll give you what you wish," answered Vident. "Where will you go?" Vidga replied: "I have heard of a man by the name of Thitrek in Amelungland, son of King Thetmar, who rules Verona. He is the most famous champion of the whole world, as far as men know. Since he is of my age, I will seek him and challenge him to a duel. If I can withstand his hard blows, he will, as I have heard, be so noble as to grant me my life if I give over my sword and become his man. Perhaps, however, it will turn out better for me." Vident answered: "I strongly advise you not to go to this Thitrek. If a duel rises between you, you can endure only a short time, he is so keen. I'll make you another suggestion. Here in the neighborhood I know a forest. A giant lives there. He is big and strong and does many a great harm. I'll help you so that you can humble him. When you have accomplished

* Cf. Bertelsen, I, 133-73.
this heroic deed, the king of Sweden will reward you well. He will give you his daughter and half his kingdom." Vidga answered: "For a woman I will certainly not do that. For it would certainly be said, if the giant slew me, that I had found a ridiculous death. I will do what I've already said. I'll turn my horse southward and prove myself with Thidrek." "If I can't prevent you," said Velent, "nothing stands in the way of my giving you what you desire."

Now Velent gave him byrnie-hose, and Vidga put them on. They were thick, well made and polished. Then he got a byrnie and put it on. It shone like silver, was hard as steel, and was double-smithed. Also it was long and broad, as was fitting for him. Then Velent took the sword and said: "My son, this sword is called Mimming. Take it and carry it well. I have made it myself and saved it for you. I will be very much disappointed if the sword doesn't bite, unless you strike improperly."

On his head Vidga then put the helmet, which was curved of hardest steel, fastened with great nails, strong and durable. A gold-adorned serpent was depicted on it, the sign of his knighthood. That it spat indicated his grimness and lust for battle. Then over his shoulder he hung the shield, which was so thick and heavy that an ordinary man could not lift it with one hand. The shield was white, and hammer-and-tongs were painted on it in red, because his father was a smith. On the uppermost rim of the shield shone three carbuncles which indicated the royal family of his mother. Finally he received a horse named Skemming. This was the best of all horses. The saddle was ivory and was marked with an adder.

Now Vidga sought his mother, kissed her and told her farewell. She wished him much luck and gave him three marks of gold and her golden ring. Then he kissed his father and told him farewell. Velent wished
him a happy journey. The separation was hard for both. Viðga took his spear and swung himself into the saddle without using the stirrups. When Velent saw that, he laughed and accompanied him to the road, showed him the way quite exactly, and gave him all kinds of directions besides. Then father and son separated; Velent went back home.

Viðga rode a long way through great forests, regions inhabited and uninhabited, and came to the great river Elder. There he didn't find the ford which his father had indicated. He sprang from the horse, led it into the forest, and bound it fast to a tree. Then he took off weapons and clothing and hid them carefully in the earth because he feared that someone might manage to steal them. Now he waded so far out into the river that the water reached up to his neck. In this fashion he tried the stream above and below.

Then three men rode up. One of them was Hilldibrand, Thidrek of Verona's teacher−companion; the second, Heimir; and the third, Jarl Hornbogi. Thidrek had sent Hilldibrand and Heimir to Jarl Hornbogi of Sindland because he wanted him as brother−in−arms for himself and his excellent men. Hilldibrand said to his companions: "I see a dwarf out there in the river. It's probably Alfrik, whom once already our young master Thidrek has taken and got from him the sword Nagelring, the helmet Hilldigrim, and many other good things. Let's try whether we can catch him again. Then we'll demand from him no smaller ransom than before." Then they dismounted and went to the river. But Viðga had heard quite well what they said and answered: "Give me peace and let me come ashore. Then you can see whether I'm a dwarf or a man like you." They granted him that and bade him come ashore. Then he sprang from the river, nine feet in one stride.
Hilddibrand asked him: "Who are you and whence do you come?"

Viðga answered: "If you are a man of honor, how can you ask me anything so, a naked man? Let me first get my weapons and put them on. Then ask me as much as you like." They agreed to that. Viðga ran quickly to his hiding place, dressed, got his weapons, got his horse, swung himself into the saddle, rode to them, and said: "God's greetings, you three brave knights. I would call each of you by his name if I knew it. Now you may ask me about my destination and as much as you please. I will answer your questions truthfully." Hilddibrand asked: "Brave comrade, what is your name? What is your family? Where are you going? Why do you ride alone in a strange country?" Viðga replied: "I am by birth a Dane named Viðga. My father is Velent, and my mother is King Hitung's daughter. I am seeking Thitrek, King Thetmar's son, and before I ride home it must be proved what kind of stiff shields, strong helmets, sharp swords and hard byrnes we have. For he is the most famous of all men in the world on account of his bravery and manliness."

Hilddibrand saw that this man was so big and superhuman that he believed never to have seen his like. To that, his weapons and his whole equipment corresponded. He saw well that his master Thitrek would come to a hard test, and it was clear without anything further which of the two would defeat the other. Then Hilddibrand conceived a trick, for he was clever. Then he said to Viðga very pleasantly: "Praised be God that I have finally found the man who seems to me to have enough courage to throw the spear against Thitrek! And if you have as much luck as bravery, you will probably cool his conceit, for he believes nobody to be his equal in daring and grimness over the whole world. Let us become sworn brothers, so that one may support the other."
Viðga answered: "You seem to me to be a brave man, and to be a great master and of a good family. Why should I refuse your friendship, since I have been riding alone till now. What is your name?" Hilldibrand answered: "My name is Boltram. I am the son of Reginbald, the Jarl of Venedig. The second of us is Sintram, Heribrand's son. The third is Hornbogi, the Jarl of Windland." Now Hilldibrand and Viðga shook hands and pledged brotherhood.

Then they rode to the river and Hilldibrand pointed out the ford. They went along their way till they came to a junction; then Hilldibrand said: "Both ways lead to Verona. One is long and bad; the other, much shorter and better, but it has its disadvantage. There is a stream over which one can pass only on a stone bridge. At the bridge is a castle by the name of Briktnan. There are twelve robbers in it. One of them is called Gramaleif. There is a toll on the bridge. We have to leave weapons and horses and can be glad if we come away with sound bones. There's little prospect of our getting past the bridge people without permission. Thirük has already tried to storm the castle, but he has not been able to take it. If someone can defeat these twelve champions, neither Thirük nor anyone else will dare withstand him. By my advice, we would choose, therefore, the longer road." Viðga answered: "Certainly we will go the shorter, for they will probably let a stranger go unharmed whither he will." They turned into the road which Viðga preferred and rode to a forest named Luruvald. Before this lay the castle. When they saw it, Viðga said: "Wait here for me. I will ride ahead to the bridge. If I urge them well, I'll perhaps put it over, so that they will let us cross without fee. If nothing comes of it, I'll just return to you again." They let him try, though it was not quite to their mind.
Vidga rode ahead now to the castle and the bridge. The bridge people sat up on the wall and observed him riding up. Then Gramaleif said: "Here comes a man who has a big shield which would seem good to me. That must be mine. Divide the rest of his equipment as you will." Then Studfus spoke: "Probably this man has a good sword. That must be mine. For no price will I give it up, though ever so much gold is offered me for it." Now Thraella spoke: "I'll have his byrnie." Then said Sigstaf: "His helmet, I will have." Then spoke the fifth: "Certainly he has a good horse. That I claim for myself." Then the sixth spoke: "I will have his coat and all his clothes." The seventh said: "What have I, then, but his byrnie-hose? Everything else is already divided." The eighth spoke: "His purse and everything in it, I will have." The ninth said: "I will have his right hand for my part." Then the tenth said: "And I have planned his right foot for myself before I go home." Then spoke the eleventh: "Then I will have his head." Then Studfus answered: "The man is not to be killed. Little good would he still have if he had lost what is now divided."

Gramaleif, their leader, said: "Go to him, three of you, and take his weapons and clothes as they have been divided, and let him get away alive with his left hand and his left leg. Then you should have borne yourselves well." Now the three went towards him. Then Vidga said: "Welcome, good comrades!" They answered: "You are not at all welcome! You are to leave here your weapons and clothes and horse, and afterwards part with your right hand and your right foot. You can still thank us if you come away alive." Now Vidga said: "This condition is unfair which you offer me, a strange and innocent man. Call your leader here. I will hear his judgment. But I will not willingly leave you my horse and
Now they went and told Gramaleif how it stood. Gramaleif heard this and sprang up and weaponed himself, and all the rest of the twelve, and rode over the stone bridge. Then Vithga spoke to them and bade them welcome. Then Gramaleif answered: "You're not welcome! I have already shared your whole goods with my companions, and moreover you shall give up your hand and foot before we part. I myself will have your shield. Then each will take for himself what is allotted." Then Vithga said: "If I went to Denmark, my father Velent would say that Thidrek had taken the shield away from me by force. But God knows that I have never seen him at all, and so long as I haven't seen him, I will certainly not give up my shield." Now Studfus said to Vithga: "Give your sword over quickly, for I will have it before I go home." Then Vithga responded: "If you take my sword away, how shall I defend myself when I meet Thidrek? If I go home from here, my father Velent would think that Thidrek had taken it from me by force, against my will. I will certainly not let it go." Now one after another demanded what they had previously chosen and had shared among themselves. But Vithga asked to go his way unhindered. Not one penny would he give them.

Then Studfus said: "Truly we are great fools that we stand here twelve before one man and he keeps bandying words with us. Draw your swords, and he shall now give up his weapons and shall lose his life as well." Then Studfus drew his sword angrily from the sheath and struck Vithga on his helmet, but his helmet was as hard as the hardest steel, and one would sooner cut into the hardest stone. Vithga drew his sword Mimming quickly, with great anger, and attacked with keen heroism, and struck Studfus the first blow on his left shoulder so that breast
and shoulder-blades together with the byrnie were cut through to the right side, so that the parts fell on both sides to the earth. Now there was great terror in the other men from this blow. Now many a one would gladly have been at home. And nonetheless they all drew their swords and now pressed upon him and each incited another to the attack. Now Gramaleif struck Vitga on the helmet, but his helmet was so hard that the blade rebounded. Now Vitga struck Gramaleif and cleaved his helmet and head, byrnie and back, so that it stopped at the horse, and he fell dead to the earth.

Meanwhile Hilldibrand said to his companions: "I see that they have come to blows. Let's ride over and see what comes of it. If Vitga overcomes these men without our coming to him, he will say we've left him in the lurch—and so it is—, and it would be our death if he met us. Moreover, I would have broken my oath which I swore to Vitga when we pledged brotherhood." Heimir answered: "I suggest that we ride over and support him if we see that he has the upper hand. If it is going badly with him, we'll ride away by stealth and not get ourselves into unpleasantnesses on account of a strange man. That is safe and not cowardly." "That would be acting rascally," said Hilldibrand, and Jarl Hornbogi added: "We pledged him friendship and faith. It is manly to help him." Hilldibrand said: "We will do what is honorable and manly." Then they sprang upon the stone bridge.

Vitga had had to toil hard while he inflicted many a stout blow upon his opponents, so that of the twelve there were no more than five remaining. But Sigstaf and the rest of the five got away by flight.

Then Vitga and his friends came together again and both sides greeted each other friendly. Now they all rode together into the
castle, took food and drink and everything they needed, remained there for the night, and lay down to sleep. Hilldibrand thought much about Vidga's keenness. It appeared to him that young Lord Thidrek, his sworn brother and pupil, had found his match. He brooded much about how fine Vidga's weapons were, and in the middle of the night he got up and took his sword and sheath. Then he got Vidga's Mimming from the sheath and stuck his own there in its place. He put Mimming in his own sheath after he had exchanged hilts and pommels on the swords. Then he lay down again and slept till morning.

As soon as day broke, they got up and prepared themselves for departure. Vidga asked Hilldibrand: "What shall we do with the castle?" Hilldibrand answered: "No longer will I dissemble before you, but will now say truthfully who I am and what I am called. My name is Hilldibrand. I am Thidrek of Verona's retainer, and we are all his weapon companions. Though I did not tell you my right name at once, I will hold to the brotherhood I have sworn to you. I advise that we hold this castle and leave our companions behind for a guard. But I will go with you to Thidrek in Verona. If you part as good friends and companions, you can possess it in common. He'll reward you well. If it happens that you separate unreconciled, you will have it alone." Vidga answered: "On this bridge lay toll and violent deeds and unpeace for strangers and natives, though a great thoroughfare led over it. For a long time no one dared to use it. For that, the castle and the rascals who occupied it were alone guilty. If I may decide it, every man will pass over the bridge free, the native as well as the stranger, young and old, poor and rich." Jarl Hornbogi answered: "It is no more than right and fair that the one who won the castle with his sword should
also determine whether it should remain standing or be destroyed." Then Vidga took a firebrand and threw it into the nearest house of the castle after they had taken all goods for themselves. And they did not ride away from there before everything was burned and broken down.

Then they went their way well pleased, for they had done their affair well. Their way led them soon to another stream, the Weser. A bridge had spanned it between two rocks. But Sigstaf with his comrades had already been there and had broken down the bridge behind them before the others reached it, for they didn't want Vidga to come over it: they promised themselves nothing good if they came together with him and his companions. It was fresh in their memory that they had got nothing of the division of weapons for which they had had such a yen. A second time they wouldn't try that.

When Vidga saw that the bridge was broken down, he gave his horse Skemming the spurs, put him into a full gallop to the river, and sprang over the stream from one bridgehead to the other, like a shot arrow. Still today one can see the imprint of the hooves and nails on the rocks where he took off and where he alighted. Hilldibrand, Jarl Hornbogi, and Heimir set out after him. When Hilldibrand's horse sprang from the rock, he plunged into the stream and came swimming to land. It went the same for Jarl Hornbogi, but he got to the other shore before Hilldibrand. Heimir had the horse Rispa. This was Skemming's brother. He sprang from one rock to the other just like Skemming, and Heimir came across the stream just as quickly as Vidga.

When Vidga came to the other shore, he espied where Sigstaf and his company stood and sprang upon them at once. They set upon him and the battle began anew. Vidga gave them one strong blow after the
other. Heimir nonetheless sat on his horse and would not help him. As soon as Jarl Hornbogi came to the other shore, he rode quickly forward, undaunted, and gave Vidga powerful assistance. The fray ended with the five hostile fellows all dead on the battleplace. Vidga however had still not noticed that he did not have Mimming.

Now they rode further and late in the evening came to a stead that belonged to Hilldibrand. There his wife lived. They passed the night with her, departed in the morning, and came still early to Verona. When Thidrek was sitting at table, it was announced to him that Hilldibrand, Jarl Hornbogi and Heimir had come. So he sprang up, went out to meet them, greeted them heartily, and asked for the news. With Vidga he did not speak, for of course he did not know who he was.

Then Vidga took off his silver-adorned glove and gave it to Thidrek. Thidrek asked what that had meant. Vidga answered: "I hereby challenge you to a duel. You are the same age as I am. I have long heard of you and have had much hardship and exertion since I left home, for I would prove whether you are so mighty a champion as is declared from land to land. Now I desire the fulfillment of my aim, if you do not refuse it. And I am now fully ready to fight with you." Thidrek answered: "I want to establish peace in mine and my father's realm so that no wanderer chancing here and no cowardly peasant may dare challenge me to a duel." Hilldibrand warned him: "Hold off, Master, and don't say such things! You don't know whom you're talking to. And to me it isn't foregone how your weapon—play is to come out, whether you or he bear off the victory when you separate. I might almost believe that you might draw that prize which is called defeat, unless you get help from someone besides yourself."

Then Reinald said: "It is truly a disgrace, Master, that any peasant's son
trusts himself to ask you to a duel in your own land." When Hilldibrand heard that, he said: "You will not disparage my sworn brother with such words a second time." Then he struck him such a blow with his fist that he fell down in a swoon. Then Thidrek spoke to Hilldibrand: "I see that you put great zeal into supporting this man. You must have already proved how much he can need it. Today he will hang outside Verona." Hilldibrand answered: "If he comes into your power when you have tested your bravery and endurance, then he must bow to your judgment, hard as it may be."

Thidrek called hastily for his weapons. Hastily they were brought to him. He got into his byrnie-hose, put his byrnie on, put the helmet Hilldigrim on his head, girded himself with his sword Nagelring, and took his white shield on which a golden lion was depicted. When he took his spear in his hand, his horse Falk was saddled. Falk was a brother of Viţga's Skemming and Heimir's Rispa. Thidrek swung himself into the saddle and rode out before Verona. Many people accompanied him, princes and knights.

When he came before the city, he found Viţga and Hilldibrand already there. A few people stood with them. Viţga sat in full battle equipment on his horse, big and distinguished. Heimir went to Thidrek, a shell of wine in his hand, and said: "Drink, Master. Yours be the victory today and always." Thidrek took the shell, drank, and gave it back to him. Hilldibrand also handed Viţga a shell. Viţga asked that it be brought to Thidrek first: "Ask him to drink to me." Hilldibrand did so. But Thidrek was so angry that he would not take it at all. Then Hilldibrand said: "You don't know about whom you vex yourself. You will find yourself today before a hero, but no peasant's son, as Reinald said."

Having spoken, he turned around, handed the shell to Viţga, and said:
"Drink. Bear yourself heroically and bravely. God be with you. May it
go well with you." Vidga took the shell, drank, gave it back to Hilldibrand,
and gave him his gold ring while he said: "Have thanks for your support.
Wassail!"

Now Vidga called to Thidrek and asked whether he was ready.
Thidrek answered that he would not long tarry. They spurred their horses,
balanced their lances, and rode as rapidly upon each other as a hungry
hawk attacks his prey. When they came together, each thrust his spear
with fearful might against the other. Thidrek's spear rebounded from
Vidga's shield, so that he retained it. But Vidga's lance remained stick­
ing in Thidrek's shield, so that the shaft shivered into three pieces.
The horses ran past each other. So they separated this time. Vidga
spoke: "Turn your horse, spur him, and ride upon me mightily. You still
have a spear. I have lost mine. Now will I still withstand you. We will
end this tilt so that you will lose your spear also, as I have mine. Else
throw me out of the saddle." Vidga drew his sword. Thidrek turned and
ran at Vidga with new spirit, put his spear on his breast, and thought
surely to pierce him. But Vidga struck the spear shaft in two with the
sword and at the same time cut the rim from his own shield. But he him­
self remained unwounded because his hard byrnie this time protected him.
So ended the second tilt. The horses ran past each other.

Now both sprang from their horses, went at each other afoot, and
struck each other somewhat with their swords. Vidga gave and received
many strong blows. Now he meant to deliver such a blow that Thidrek would
forever remember it if it went as he intended, and swung his sword with
great force upon Thidrek's helmet Hilldigrim. That was so strong that the
powerful stroke did not damage it, but the sword broke into two pieces.
Then Vittga said: "The devil take you, Velent, that you made so wretched a sword, as clever as you otherwise are if you only want to be! I would have borne myself manfully if I had had a good sword. This one brings shame and disgrace to me as well as to him who made it." Thidrekk grasped his sword Nagelring with both hands and would have cut off Vittga's head.

Then Hilldibrand sprang between them and said to his master:

"Give this man peace. Accept him and make him your man. You will never find one who is braver and more venturous for all undertakings than he is. He alone conquered Castle Briktn, which you previously could not capture with all your men. It will increase your honor if such a man serves you."

Thidrekk answered: "It remains as I have said. Today he shall hang before Verona." Hilldibrand answered: "Master, don't treat an honorable man so. He is from a distinguished royal house and wants to be your man. Accept him in a friendly and honorable fashion, as one can expect from you."

Thidrekk answered: "Indeed today I will free myself from being challenged to a duel by any vagabond while this one hangs. Get away from there where you stand. If you don't, I'll cut you first into two pieces, then him."

When Hilldibrand saw that Thidrekk would not hear his petition—indeed would not even balk at taking his own life—, he spoke: "I see that you are not to be helped. The child must be given what he cries for."

Then he drew the sword from his sheath and said: "Cursed be every fraud! Look, brave comrade! Now I will keep our bond. Take your sword Minning here, and defend yourself bravely. God help you, for I can help you no more!" Then Vittga was as glad as a bird of the day, kissed the gold ornament of the sword, and said: "God forgive me that I uttered hard words against my father Velent! See my sword Minning here, Thidrekk, brave hero! Now I am as eager to fight you as the thirsty man for a drink and the hungry man
for a piece of bread."

Now he laid blow upon blow on Thidrek and each time removed from him a piece of byrnie, shield and helmet. Thidrek could not return a stroke and could do nothing other than defend himself. Finally he was bleeding from five wounds. Then he saw of course how the fight would come out. If he got no help, he would be conquered. He called to his master Hildibrand: "Come here and end the fight. I don't know how I shall break it off alone." Hildibrand answered: "When I would have separated you, you would not accept advice. Then you would have had honor and advantage from this duel, and you would have been famed in all lands. But I am glad that at least you can never say I lied to you when I maintained that Vitta was a brave hero and a model of bravery. If I see right, your byrnie is split, your helmet battered, and your shield broken, and you yourself bleed from great wounds. With shame and disgrace you will go away from this battle. That comes of your boasting, your arrogance and your rashness. Break the fight up if you can. I will separate you only on condition that you leave it to him to decide whether he will decree the same judgment for you as you did for him, or whether he will let mercy instead of desert prevail."

Even King Thetmar saw that his son was more than matched. He took a red shield and stepped between them. Vitta asked: "What do you mean to do, King Thetmar? What is this? I say to you in truth: if you will inflict unfairness and force upon me and this man and let me be slain by your retinue, no one will call you a better hero for it, or a greater man. Moreover, someone will avenge that, for I have a mother's brother who is not below you in royal might." The king answered: "Brave hero, I will do you only good. I should like to ask you to leave off from my son,
for he will perish if you go on fighting. If you do that, I will give you a city in my land. Rule there as a count. If you like, I will help you to a distinguished marriage." Viddga answered: "In no case will I accept your offer. Your son is to have the same judgment which he determined for me: it shall be because you would force me, through the superior strength of your retinue." The king went back, and they began hard fighting anew. Thidrek defended himself bravely and manfully, but Viddga bore down upon him with superior strength. At last he cut through the helmet Hilldigrim from the left to the right side, so that the helmet knob flew off and Thidrek's temple-hair followed.

As soon as Hilldibrand saw that Hilldigrim was broken, he sprang between them and begged: "Good comrade Viddga, on account of our brotherhood, give Thidrek peace and be his companion. When you two ride through the whole world, your equal will not be found." Viddga answered: "Though he has not deserved it from me, nonetheless I will grant your petition on account of our brotherhood." Now they put away their weapons, laid their hands together, and became sword brothers. As good friends, they rode hence to Verona.
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