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INTRODUCTION

Reading the *Chronicle*: 891 to the Present

Undertaking a re-examination of the ways in which scholars and editors have read the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* is a formidable task, involving one in the reading and interpretation of dozens (if not hundreds) of texts written over a span of eleven hundred years and more. There are Old English and Latin texts to consider, as well as the accumulated scholarship of over four hundred years of *Chronicle* study. There are printed texts, facsimiles, and the manuscripts themselves to be read, not to mention reconstructions and editions of other manuscripts long since destroyed. There is prose, some pithy, some prolix, and poetry, the Anglo-Saxons' record of British history from Julius Caesar's invasion to the Danish and Norman conquests and beyond.

If, in the process of reading such a diversity of materials, one is tempted to focus upon the act of reading itself, in its own multifority, surely one can be forgiven. The materials demand it, in fact. If the *Chronicle* is where the Anglo-Saxons told themselves their own story from the beginning, in the history of *Chronicle* scholarship Anglo-Saxonists can find the story of themselves. By rereading our own story, though, we can rediscover our own illusions, about ourselves and about the Anglo-Saxons, and rediscover a way to read the Anglo-Saxons' story as they would have wanted us to.
The Texts of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*

Although we apply the convenient title "the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*" to the manuscripts which make up the *Chronicle*, it can be a mistake to allow ourselves to think that the *Chronicle* can be usefully considered as a unified, monolithic text, as the inclusive nature of the title might suggest. Each of the six main surviving manuscripts of the *Chronicle* stands as part of a separate tradition, in some way, as all six were copied and updated at various times throughout the two and a half centuries which passed between the earliest work on the Parker Chronicle in the 890s and the writing of the final entries of the Peterborough Chronicle in 1154. A genetic relationship connects all six texts, however: each is based upon a compilation dating from about the year 891 or 892, the *Chronicle*’s so-called Common Stock. Additionally, there are apparent sub-families within the manuscripts, tying together the A and G mss, the B and C mss, and the D, E, and F mss; however, even within these sub-groups, each version to some extent makes its own additions, revisions, and deletions.\(^1\) Besides these main manuscripts, however, there are a series of other related texts which must be considered when examining the *Chronicle*: those historical texts which make use of information from the *Chronicle* in their Latin histories. Earliest among these is Asser’s biography of Alfred, the *Vita Alfredi*, written approximately contemporaneously with the compilation of the Common Stock. In the late tenth century, the alderman Æthelweard’s Latin chronicle likewise relied upon a version of the *Chronicle*, as did the twelfth century productions of William of Malmesbury, Simeon of Durham, Henry of Huntingdon, and Florence of Worcester, as well as the anonymous *Annals of St. Neots*. The *Chronicle*, then, was clearly a well-known and much relied upon resource for historical information in Anglo-Saxon England, and continued to be used as

---

\(^1\) The alphabetic sigla conventionally assigned to the various manuscripts of the *Chronicle* will be described below.
such well into the Norman period. The interaction between the vernacular history embodied in the *Chronicle* and the Latin histories which relied upon it is surely one of the most remarkable features of the whole *Chronicle* tradition, as it utterly reverses the hierarchy which we are most accustomed to assuming and asserting for the Middle Ages in general—the hierarchy which places Latin texts as earlier and more authoritative than vernacular texts.

Indeed, the history of the *Chronicle* manuscripts themselves is in some ways as fascinating as the historical information about Anglo-Saxon England which they contain. Of the six central manuscripts, five of them show signs of having, at one time or another, been added to and written in almost contemporaneously with the events described. However, before any detailed discussion of the *Chronicle* and its manuscripts can take place, the manuscripts themselves must be described in some detail. The make-up and history of each of the *Chronicle* manuscripts has been carefully approached and investigated by scholars over the years; in the paragraphs which follow, I am particularly indebted to the detailed analyses of Plummer, Ker, Bately, and Dumville.

The Parker Chronicle (contained in CCCC 173), named after Archbishop Matthew Parker, who bequeathed it to Cambridge's Corpus Christi College at his death in 1575, is conventionally denoted ms A. Within this volume, however, are other texts, specifically, the *Acts of Lanfranc; Laws of Alfred and Ine*; lists of popes, archbishops, and bishops; and an originally separate volume, apparently of the eighth century, containing Sedulius's *Carmen Paschale* and a number of brief Latin pieces. The Parker manuscript's history is particularly remarkable, as its record of addenda and deletions attests to two centuries of use as a living historical document. In fact the complicated textual history of the Parker Chronicle has occasioned a great deal of scholarly debate, and remarkably little consensus. This earliest remaining manuscript of the *Chronicle*, written in and altered sporadically over a span of nearly two centuries, is unparalleled among Anglo-Saxon texts for the
challenges and rewards it promises for paleographers and students of history. The version of the *Chronicle* contained within CCCC 173 is preceded by the A version of the "West Saxon Regnal Table" and extends to the thirty-second leaf of the manuscript; it is textually the most complex of any of the *Chronicle* mss. The work of the first scribe extends to the end of folio 16r, in what is apparently the middle of annal 891. The first scribe likewise wrote an unused annal number for 892 on the bottom of 16r, but the second scribe ignored this and apparently continued the annal on the top of 16v with "7 by ilcan geare" ("And that same year"). These features of the 891 annal have led most scholars to conclude that the first scribe of the Parker Chronicle was writing at a point in time when the 891 annal was in an unfinished state, and therefore not too distant from 891½; David Dumville, however, has recently offered a dissenting opinion, suggesting that the date for the first scribe's activity might be as late as 930 (Wessex 96). Regardless of the precise date of the first scribe's activity, we can state rather confidently that the Parker Chronicle is the earliest of the *Chronicle* manuscripts to have survived. Between the time of the first scribe and the time when annal 1001 was copied, four other principle scribes wrote various sections of annals (although Plummer identified a total of ten distinct hands up to annal 1001). Early in the eleventh century, this version of the *Chronicle* as it then stood was copied into Cotton Otho xi (ms G), and was sometime thereafter transported to Canterbury, where a number of post-Conquest additions were made, the last such being annal 1070. Finally, at the end of the eleventh century (or perhaps as late as the middle of the twelfth) the scribe of ms F, who clearly had access to ms A, made a number of interpolations into it, and likewise seems to have erased a number of passages. These interpolations and erasures make up the last of the medieval additions to the Parker Chronicle.

In contrast to ms A, the B manuscript of the *Chronicle* (Cotton Tiberius A vi, ff. 1-35) is, perhaps, the least textually complex of the main *Chronicle* mss. This version of
the *Chronicle* is copied in a single hand and extends to annal 977. It is commonly believed that it was in fact copied within a year or two of the events recorded under the 977 annal; comparison with the related leaf in Cotton Tiberius A iii (folio 178, in Plummer's terminology, the beta version of the "West Saxon Regnal Table") suggests that it was probably written before Edward the Martyr's death in 979. According to Ker, however, a wormhole running through the last nine leaves of the B-text of the *Chronicle* as well as the beta version of the WSRT suggests that it followed the *Chronicle* in this ms, rather than preceding it (Ker 249). It is likely that the B manuscript, as it has come down to us, is incomplete; after annal 652, annal numbers rarely appear until near the end of the manuscript. Presumably these were intended to be filled in later by a rubricator.²

Cotton Tiberius B i contains the C-text of the *Chronicle*, which follows the Alfredian translation of Orosius's history, and the Old English poems known as The *Menologium* and *Maxims II*. The main body of this manuscript was apparently all produced at one time; the translation of Orosius was copied by four scribes, while the two poems and the *Chronicle* up to folio 118v are by a fifth. A new hand takes up on 119 with annal 491 and continues "with a change of appearance..., but probably not a change of hand, at 978" (Ker 253) until the middle of annal 1045. Ker also notes changes of appearance at the beginnings of annals 1046, 1047, and 1048, suggesting that they were "written up year by year" (253). More or less contemporary additions seem to have been made through 1056, while the annals for 1065 and 1066 are in two more hands, and a twelfth century hand added the "the last part of the 1066 annal" (Ker, 253). Portions of this manuscript (from annal 491 to 652, and again from about 945 to 977) were almost certainly copied directly from the B manuscript, Cotton Tiberius A vi.

The close relationship of the B and C manuscripts extends, however, even beyond the portions where C may rely directly upon B, and these two clearly stand together as

²I discuss this likelihood in more detail in Chapter Five.
one branch of the *Chronicle's* descent. Both, for example, contain the so-called "Mercian Register," a handful of annals dated 904 to 924 entered as a group into both manuscripts, despite the accompanying disruption of the general chronological scheme of the *Chronicle* (it is useful to note that this is a portion of the C text apparently not copied directly from B). Likewise, as I will discuss in Chapter 2, both manuscripts share a sufficient number of innovative readings throughout to indicate that they share a common textual history.

Like the C manuscript, the D version of the *Chronicle* (in Cotton Tiberius B iv) dates roughly from the middle eleventh century. Ker suggests that the "discontinuous" nature of the writing in the annals from 1054 onwards probably indicates more or less contemporary writing between 1054 and 1079, which is the last regular annal in this ms. Ker discerns eight "most noticeable" changes of "appearance, slope and ink" in these annals (254). A missing gathering from this manuscript, however, results in a gap in the text from the empty annal number ".cclxii." on the bottom of folio 9v to the first words on folio 19r: "to arcebishop" in annal 693; a second scribe has begun in the interval, and his hand continues through folio 67. Ker suggests that there may, however, have been an additional loss of material from this manuscript in the eleventh century: "probably...ff. 68-73 (quire 9: annals 1016-51) are supply leaves written in the 1070's or 1080's" (254). A late entry (an annal for 1130 mistakenly entered as 1080) demonstrates that this manuscript, like ms C, was consulted and supplemented at least once in the twelfth century. To fill in the missing annals between 262 and 693, Joscelyn supplied some of them on ff. 10-18, from other of the *Chronicle* ms which he consulted, probably including A, B, C, and E (Classen and Harmer xiii).

The Laud manuscript (ms E, Bodleian Laud Misc. 636) is usually known as the Peterborough Chronicle, since its inclusion of a number of local Peterborough charters and historical documents makes the location of its origin virtually certain. Copied at one time up to annal 1121, and continued more or less annually through 1127, and with other
additions around 1131 and 1154, this is the latest of the Chronicle manuscripts to survive, both in terms of when it was originally copied and how far its entries extend. As such, this version, along with the Parker Chronicle, receives more scholarly attention than the other Chronicle manuscripts; likewise, until the imminent publication of the facsimile of ms F, only A and E were available in facsimile. Ker notes the existence of Latin marginalia which suggest that this manuscript "was read and to some extent understood" (425) perhaps as late as the fourteenth century; the presence of an Anglo-French chronicle dating from the thirteenth century on the margins of folios 86-90v likewise indicates that at that date at least, the Peterborough Chronicle was still seen as a useful historical document.

The F-manuscript, Cotton Domitian viii, is the only fully bilingual version of the Chronicle; a Latin version of each entry follows the Old English. This manuscript dates from the late eleventh or early twelfth century; it was written by the "principle interpolator" of the Parker Chronicle, who seems to have been working at Christ Church, Canterbury. It extends to annal 1058, although it ends abruptly and imperfectly in the middle of the entry. This manuscript appears to be the scribe's working text; it contains numerous erasures and added notes of varying length throughout. Particularly long additions were made by the main scribe under annals 870 and 995. The text of the F manuscript has been edited and adapted throughout, probably by the F scribe himself, who had access to at least two divergent Chronicle mss (one of which was ms A) and was clearly doing more than simply copying an exemplar.

Like the B and C manuscripts, the D, E and F manuscripts likewise appear to belong to a single branch of the Chronicle's textual descent. Each begins with a preface derived from Bede's Historia Ecclesiastica, and the version of the Common Stock in all three mss has been augmented and altered in such a way to suggest that they spring from a northern English predecessor conventionally designated the "Northern Rescension."
Plummer suggests that the Northern Recension itself dated from near the beginning of the tenth century and was thus early in the Chronicle's textual history (Plummer, ii, cxix). These texts, then, share a background slightly different from the rest, although their own developments are each distinct.

Cotton Otho B xi, although almost entirely destroyed in the Cottonian fire of 1731, contained, along with a copy of the Old English translation of Bede's Historia Ecclesiastica and other texts, a version of the Chronicle copied from the Parker manuscript shortly after the year 1000, thus recording the state of that manuscript as it then stood. As such, this is the only copy of the Chronicle to certainly be a direct copy of another, still extant, manuscript (although as noted above, parts of ms C were probably copied directly from ms B). Unfortunately, only seven "out of a total of probably thirty-four leaves" (Ker, 231) remain, and these are fragmentary at best. Ker describes only two leaves, folios 39 and 41, as being in "fair condition" (231). This version of the Chronicle is conventionally denoted the G version; happily, before the Cottonian fire, it was not only transcribed by Laurence Nowell (preserved in BL Additional 43,703), but it also served as the basis for Wheelocke's edition of the Chronicle (1643-44), an Appendix to his edition of the Old English translation of Bede. Also associated with this manuscript is folio 2 of British Library Additional ms 34,652, which contains a copy of the "West Saxon Regnal Table," also apparently copied from ms A and detached from Otho B xi, possibly by William Lisle, in the early seventeenth century (Ker 234).

In addition to these main manuscripts, there exists a single leaf of a separate chronicle, "beginning imperfectly in the annal for 1113...and ending imperfectly in the annal for 1114" (Ker 188). Ker suggests that a change in appearance at the beginning of the 1114 annal implies that these were annals written more or less contemporarily. This leaf is now folio 9 of Cotton Domitian ix, and as Plummer notes, it "is quite independent of E, the only other Chronicle which comes down so late" (Plummer, ii, xxxvii). Plummer
includes this as manuscript H. Whether this was originally a portion of a full Chronicle ms is undecideable; certainly it provides an example besides ms E of a continuing habit of more or less regular vernacular chronicle writing into the twelfth century.

These, then, are the documents which make up the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. There also exist, as I noted above, Latin histories and chronicles which clearly relied upon versions of the Chronicle, occasionally attesting to versions and readings no longer surviving in Old English version. These original documents can be viewed only by scholars fortunate enough to see them in the British libraries where they are housed; other scholars must encounter them only through the mediation of printed editions and (more recently) facsimiles, also subject to the effects of print mediation. The effect of this mediation, as I argue below, has been monumental, possibly the phenomenon with the single strongest impact upon scholarship regarding the Chronicle up until the present day.

Print Literacy and the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: 1562-1709

The early students of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle in the sixteenth century were already deeply influenced by the forms and expectations of print-based literacy. During this early period of print literacy, however, the printed book had not yet entirely supplanted the forms and products of the manuscript-literacy period which preceded it. The sixteenth century was a time when medieval manuscripts could still be copied out longhand for the use of scholars, and even printed books occasionally served as the exemplars for manuscripts. This sort of practice continued even into "the latter part of the

---

3 Facsimiles, of course, provide a reading experience closer to the experience of reading the actual manuscripts than reading printed editions. Nevertheless, in the black-and-white images, necessary distribution, and (usually) scholarly introduction, even they constantly foreground modern textual practice.
seventeenth century" (Stevenson 'lrv), as exemplified by a manuscript copy of Parker's 1574 edition of Asser's Life of Alfred (Cambridge, Trinity College, O 7,25).

This early period of Anglo-Saxon studies (and of studies of the Chronicle in particular) can help us frame certain questions about how the Anglo-Saxons read texts such as the Chronicle as well as shed light on our own habitual ways of reading Anglo-Saxon texts. The centuries following the invention and proliferation of print technology provided the occasion for a form of "transitional literacy" which spanned the gap between the manuscript literacy of the medieval period and the highly developed print literacy of more recent times. Our own entrance into a period of computer-mediated literacy is likely to entail an accompanying period of "transitional literacy" in our own culture. Along similar lines, Katherine O'Brien O'Keeffe's influential book Visible Song has recently described Anglo-Saxon literate culture as being characterized by a transitional literacy which bridged the gap between the pre-literate oral culture of the Anglo-Saxons and their later, well-developed manuscript literacy. Considering the various transitional literacies implicated in the study of the Chronicle, it seems likely that investigating the effects of the print revolution upon the reception of the Chronicle in the sixteenth century and afterwards, can help us to see how our own reading habits and expectations may differ from those of the Anglo-Saxons in significant, non-trivial, ways.

The names of three men dominate our records of the study of the Chronicle during the sixteenth century: Laurence Nowell, John Joscelyn, and Archbishop Matthew Parker. Parker and Joscelyn apparently each owned one of the Chronicle manuscripts at some point; Parker's ownership of the ms now known as CCCC 173 has led to its common designation as the "Parker Chronicle," while Joscelyn seems to have owned ms D, now Cotton Tiberius B iv. Joscelyn also transcribed ms B of the Chronicle (now in the

---

4 For a discussion of the efforts of Nowell and Joscelyn in particular, see Angelika Lutz's article, "Das Studium der angelsächsische Chronik im 16. Jahrhundert: Nowell und Joscelyn."
Bodleian, Laud Misc 661), while Nowell's transcripts of mss G and E can now be found in BL Additional 43,703 and 43,704.

These scholars' interest in the *Chronicle* was largely antiquarian, a result of the manuscripts' already-great age. Yet the fact that these antiquarian scholars' attitudes towards these ancient texts differed from our own ideas (as well as differing from those of the Anglo-Saxons) can be seen in their treatment of the manuscripts. The ownership of these manuscripts during this period entailed a differing set of responsibilities and freedoms than it does today. Scholars consulting Anglo-Saxon manuscripts today, for instance, are forbidden from altering the manuscripts in any way, but Parker and Joscelyn freely wrote in the books they owned. Joscelyn's own hand appears in the Parker Chronicle (for example, at annal 430) along with "other Parkerian notes and underlines" (Ker 57). On the whole, ms A, however, has relatively few non-medieval markings. The extent to which Joscelyn wrote in ms D, on the other hand, is quite remarkable to our modern sensibilities. Besides inserting excerpts from other mss to make up for the missing gathering (fo. 10-18), Joscelyn also included readings from other mss at innumerable other places in the ms. Except for those annals unparalleled in other mss, scarce a leaf (if that) of the ms has not been supplemented by Joscelyn's record of variant readings, often no more than an indication of a differing vowel within a particular word.5

Perhaps because they lived before the "age of mechanical reproduction" had come fully into its own, these scholars approached these books of their own as we might approach a modern printed book--suitable for marginal markings and records of alternative readings. For us, an impenetrable aura surrounds such manuscripts; the idea of writing in them is, for us, almost unthinkable.6 For Joscelyn and Parker, however, there

---

5 Joscelyn's treatment of ms D can be seen in the facsimile of Cotton Tiberius B iv, fo. 26r which appears as Plate IV in Thorpe's edition of the *Chronicle*.

6 Although I borrow the term "aura" from Walter Benjamin's "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction," I am using it in a slightly different way. For Benjamin, the "aura" of a work is precisely what is destroyed by the process of mechanical duplication. The record of these ancient texts, however,
was no such aura. During this period of "transitional literacy," antiquarians such as Parker could look upon Anglo-Saxon manuscripts both as valuable antiquities and as books not so very different from the other books which filled their library shelves.

Yet some of the characteristics of print literacy are also in evidence in the scholarly efforts of these sixteenth-century antiquarians. Along with Joscelyn's record of alternative readings in the text of ms D, the manuscript copies of mss G and E made by Laurence Nowell in the 1560s (in BL Additional 43,703 and 43,704, respectively) indicate that these scholars already considered the act of collation to be central to the scholarly enterprise, at least where these texts were concerned. The comparison of related manuscripts, presumably in order to discover "original" readings, was one of the first activities of Old English scholarship.

The relationship between the act of collation and the process of mechanically producing identical (and "authorized") texts through print technology should be examined in some detail. Although medieval writers like Chaucer had sometimes expressed their own anxieties about inaccurate copying even before the introduction of print technology, it seems likely that the scholarly practice of reconstructing "authoritative" texts through collation was reinforced by print's foregrounding of the principle of identical textual duplication. On the continent, where print first took hold, the flourishing interest in a "pure" Ciceronian Latin prose style was both made possible and simultaneously reinforced by the uniformity possible in printed editions of the Latin classics. Lucien Febvre and Henri-Jean Martin, for example, in their classic work *The Coming of the Book* describe the forces which first brought the printing press to Paris:

suggests that as time has passed they have been farther and farther removed from the workaday world with the development of our modern "museum culture." Their "aura" is what makes them inaccessible to us, and is reflected in the physical and imaginary barriers between these books and their modern readers.

\(^7\) Nowell's transcript of ms G in particular is augmented by readings from other mss (esp. ms E) where Nowell feels the text to be defective.
Around 1470, Guillaume Fichet . . . was the central figure of a group which professed, along with reverence for the doctrines of St. Thomas and of Scotus, a love of ancient Rome and of the Latin classics. This group felt the lack of accurate texts of the classics keenly. Although manuscript copies of the authors on the syllabus were relatively numerous, the copies of the works of Cicero, Virgil and Sallust were both rare and faulty. It would have been impossible to reproduce these texts exactly and in great number, if there had been no knowledge of the new technique of printing. (174)

Fichet later wrote a rhetoric, which "summarize[d] the principles of a correct Latin prose style" (Febvre and Martin 174), and it seems clear that the possibility of large-scale exact reproduction of texts was the crucial central idea behind the connections between standardized language, authoritative texts, and the printing press.

In England too, the importance of linguistic standardization was recognized early. William Caxton's well-known preface to his translation of the Aeneid indicates some of the difficulties faced by a printer attempting to reach an English audience. By the middle of the sixteenth century, it seems clear, the idea of a standard language (whether classical or vernacular) had become widespread, and medieval scribes were undoubtedly seen (willingly or unwillingly) as corrupting forces acting upon authoritative texts. For scholars such as Laurence Nowell or John Joscelyn, then, the idea of collation as a scholarly editing strategy designed to (re)discover the "classical" state of the Old English language as well as to identify the authoritative version of the Chronicle must have been an idea closely related to the proliferation of printed materials and the scholarly interest in classical Latin.

Even though the work of Joscelyn, Nowell, and Parker never resulted in a printed edition of the Chronicle, it is reasonable to conclude that these men were familiar with the contemporary principles of textual editing and their relationship to printed editions. Joscelyn was a secretary to Parker, and Parker published not only A Testimonie of Antiquitie ("Perhaps the first edition of Anglo-Saxon texts set in type"—Frantzen 43) in 1566/67, but also the first printed edition of Asser's Vita Alfredi in 1574. Printing editions
of Anglo-Saxon texts was one of the results of Parker's researches, and his and Joscelyn's work on the *Chronicle* was surely influenced by its potential for publication.

It was not until 1644, however, that the first printed edition of the *Chronicle* appeared, edited by Abraham Wheelocke as an appendix to his edition of the Old English translation of Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica*. Wheelocke's edition, in many ways, continues to exemplify the transitional literacy characteristic of the period after the invention of print technology. Besides providing the Latin version of the text along with the Anglo-Saxon, and thus making its contents accessible to an international scholarly community by its appearance in this standard, classical language, Wheelocke made a number of changes in his text which reflected the increasing standardization brought about by print technology. For example, Wheelocke freely alters the capitalization of names in the text, silently expands manuscript abbreviations, and often changes roman numerals to Arabic.\(^8\) Likewise, to produce his text, he collates Cotton Otho B xi (ms G) and its exemplar, CCCC 173 (ms A). On the other hand, Wheelocke's presentation of the text seems, in may ways, closer to the ms presentation than many more recent editions.

Wheelocke, for example, seems to attempt to retain ms punctuation (although occasionally regularizing it) and does not repunctuate, capitalize, or structure the text to conform to modern ideas of sentence and paragraph structure. Also, as in many early editions, the Anglo-Saxon text is printed in characters intended to resemble the actual characters found in Old English manuscripts.

The second edition of the *Chronicle*, that of Edmund Gibson, was printed in 1692. Gibson's method of producing his edition places him firmly within the kind of print-literate culture we are accustomed to, although modern scholars would surely question some of

---

\(^8\) Perhaps also connected to the idea of standardization is Wheelocke's lack of consistency in representing thorns and eths. Most often, Wheelocke prints eths at the beginning of words, thorns elsewhere, although this distribution is far from regular. Nevertheless, this feature of Wheelocke's text seems best explained as an attempt to standardize the distribution of these two letters, perhaps in analogy to their complementary distribution in Icelandic texts.
his editorial decisions. The main feature of Gibson's text is his use, not only of collation, but of conflation as well. In his version of the *Chronicle* are sections from mss A and G, conflated with material from ms E, all printed together as if to represent an ur-*Chronicle* which contained any and all material found in its manuscripts.⁹ Gibson includes a Latin translation, as well as an extensive critical apparatus in his footnotes to indicate what passages come from where, but even this method indicates the underlying assumption that mss are defective, subject to the corrupting influence of their scribes, and that their texts are in need of reconstruction.

From our perspective, however, Gibson seems to have been none too selective in his choice of sources upon which to base his reconstruction. Plummer, for example, notes that "For materials Gibson did not go beyond the walls of the Bodleian" (Plummer, ii, cxxx), although whether this was through ignorance of other materials or difficulty of travel is hard to guess. Relying on the evidence of Wheelocke's edition for knowledge of mss A and G, Gibson apparently utilized Laud Misc 636 (the Peterborough Chronicle, ms E) as well as Joscelyn's transcript of ms B (Laud Misc 661) and extracts from F made by Franciscus Junius (Junius 10). Gibson's treatment of original mss, transcripts, and printed matter as being of essentially equivalent value in the preparation of his edition reveals just how deeply print-influenced his approach is: the original witnesses are of use only so far as they aid in the reconstruction of an "original" version, a version granted primacy not only by its appearance in print, but also by the scholarly project of collation and conflation which print technology brought to the fore.

Gibson made no use at all of either ms C or ms D, although he apparently intended to include information from these mss in a never-published second edition. In a letter to Gibson dated 25 January 1709, Humfrey Wanley asked Gibson to send him a fresh copy of

---

⁹ The continuing appeal (and convenience) of this belief in a "master Chronicle" is echoed in our continued reference to "the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle," a usage of which I am myself guilty (and which I shall defend from another perspective in a later chapter).
the *Chronicon Saxoniacum* "with Paper pasted to all the Margins" (Wanley 256) for the purpose of indicating readings from mss C and D.\textsuperscript{10} Gibson apparently sent Wanley a copy of his edition interleaved with paper; this book survives (with Wanley's collations) as BL Additional 44,879. In the middle of finishing these collations, Wanley wrote again to Gibson, explaining his method, and his comments, which reveal a great deal about his own perceptions of his task as a scholar and researcher, are worth quoting at length:

My Method in Collating, is to take Notice of every Reading (which occurs in the first Hand; for of those put down by Josselyne, from books still remaining, I am not mindfull) lett such Readings be never so trivial, as an a for o; a y for i or vice versa. Nay, farther, where the MS is manifestly in the fault, & you have Printed the true Reading already. For my design is to present you (as it were) copies of those MSS. And I leave it to your Judgement to alter as you shall find meet. And Alterations will be made, I perceive, by the help of this Book; for sometimes I find what sett's all the other MSS to rights, where they were faulty. Not to mention readings of less note, more accurate, or (if you please) more Saxon, than the Print. As for fresh Matter, you having used almost all the extant Books, do not look for much. But I can assure you I have mett with some already, not only augmenting what is already putt down to such or such years; but filling up some Gaps, where the Year was Blank, & nothing said. (257-58)

Wanley's method certainly indicates that the concerns I outlined earlier as deriving from the tradition of print-literacy still obtained. For Wanley, part of the value in his collations lies in their ability to provide evidence of the purest state of the "Saxon" language. Likewise, the process of collation can serve to rectify faults in the various mss ("sometimes I find what sett's all the other MSS to rights, where they were faulty"). If mss differ, according to this view, at least one must be faulty. Furthermore, it is clear that Wanley approves of the general plan of Gibson's edition: his collations can serve to fill up the "Gaps" remaining after Gibson's own collations.

\textsuperscript{10} As another indication of the difference between attitudes towards Anglo-Saxon manuscripts then and now, and of the additional dangers such manuscripts were subject to during this period, consider this passage from Wanley's letter: "I have (upon my bond of 100£) borrowed 3 Saxon Chronicles from the Cottonian Library.... In bringing the 3 MSS. abovesaid home, I chanced to slip, and have sprained thereby my left Leg, which hinders me from attending you" (Wanley 255).
The manner in which Wanley makes these collations, however, indicates even more profoundly how it is the differences between mss, rather than the mss themselves which are of interest to Wanley and Gibson. Wanley's record of the readings of mss C and D are written in differing colors of ink, both in the text and on the interleaved sheets provided by Gibson. But Wanley only records a "Reading" if it differs from the readings of other mss--indeed, it is clear from Wanley's letter that this is precisely what he means by the term "Reading." Wanley's plan to provide Gibson with "copies of the MSS" and the way that plan was carried out imply that the only value of a "copy" or a manuscript lies in its unique "Readings."

As historical texts, perhaps it is to be expected that the manuscripts of the Chronicle should have been valued by these early scholars primarily for their unique contributions to the record of Anglo-Saxon history. Yet the history of the Chronicle from its rediscovery in the sixteenth century to the edition of Edmund Gibson in 1692 and the collations of Wanley in 1709 stands as a paradigm for Anglo-Saxon studies in general during this period. The very print culture in which these scholarly works were completed left its imprint upon the goals and methods of these works, and I have attempted to outline the nature of that imprint. The legacy of these early scholars, moreover, has continued until the present day, although as early as the middle nineteenth century, some of the print-biased methods of the earlier scholars were beginning to be called into question.

**Chronicle Scholarship and the Continuing Impact of Printing: 1823-Present**

Gibson's 1692 edition of the Chronicle stood as the standard edition for well over a century, not to be replaced until the edition and (English) translation of James Ingram in 1823. In many ways, Ingram's methods were an improvement over Gibson's, as he examined the manuscript records first hand, rather than through the mediation of
transcripts or earlier printed editions, as well as including material from mss C and D. Unfortunately, as Plummer notes, "it was constructed on the same faulty plan" of conflation as Gibson's edition (Plummer, ii, cxxxii).

Henry Petrie's edition of 1848 included material up to the Norman Conquest, and formed a part of the first volume of a projected series, the *Monumenta Historica Britannica*, which was never continued. Petrie abandoned the conflation model of editing employed by Ingram in favor of using a base-text (in this case, ms A) to be supplemented by readings from other mss located, as Plummer puts it, "below the line" (Plummer, ii, cxxxiv). But even this plan fails in the execution, especially in places where the base-text contains no entry: "there is still too much conflation, and when A fails there seems to be no fixed principle as to what shall be placed above the line and what below" (Plummer, ii, cxxxiv). Petrie's choice of base text, however, reflects some of the ideas of textual authority springing from the print-influenced goals and procedures of textual editing: in this view, as the oldest ms, A should be considered the most authoritative, and most "correct." The power of this perception has continued into this century, although the "authority" of ms A for portions of the *Chronicle* other than the Common Stock may be of less value than other versions.

Benjamin Thorpe's edition of 1861 avoids the hazards caused by the choice of a base text by printing all of the major manuscripts in a parallel text format (including the surviving fragments of the mostly-burnt ms G). But Thorpe's transcriptions of the various manuscripts are not always particularly careful; like Wheelocke, for example, Thorpe shows a great deal of inconsistency in preserving ms thorns and eths. Even more significant, though, is Thorpe's lack of interest in the Latin contents of the *Chronicle* manuscripts: the Latin entries in ms E are for the most part omitted, while only the Old English portions are printed from the bilingual ms F. Such an editorial decision apparently indicates Thorpe's own ideas about textual authority: Latin is in his opinion intrusive in the
Chronicle; the Old English passages are the only authoritative portions. Other decisions of Thorpe's indicate that despite his choice of a parallel text layout, he nonetheless felt an urge to normalize his texts. Like all editors, Thorpe capitalizes names in the texts, but he also inserts annal numbers into the text of ms B and places the "Mercian Register" chronologically, contrary to its record in mss B and C.

On the whole, however, Thorpe's edition and its presentation were an improvement on the editions which had gone before, at least in principle. The significance of printing the text of each ms in its entirety lies in the assumption that each ms has its own authority and that the project of compiling a "master Chronicle" from the texts is not an appropriate response to the manuscripts' diversity. Thorpe's inclusion of facsimile pages from each of the manuscripts is also significant, for it took the power of the printed medium in another direction, a direction which would be taken even farther in the twentieth century by the facsimile editions of the A and E mss.

Thorpe's edition, however, for all its value, was effectively superseded in 1892 by Charles Plummer's revised edition of Earle's Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel, first published in 1865. Earle's editorial strategy took mss A and E as authoritative base-texts, and readings from other manuscripts are included only as supplemental information. Plummer, revising and updating Earle's edition in 1892, felt dissatisfied with the format, especially in comparison with Thorpe's format: "there can be no doubt of the superiority of Thorpe's plan of printing all six MSS. in parallel columns, though there are some grave defects in his execution of the plan" (Plummer, ii, cxxv). But if Plummer's approval of Thorpe's technique is moderated by an element of dissatisfaction, his criticism of earlier editors is less restrained:

The early editors of the Saxon Chronicle, Gibson, Ingram, and to some extent M. H. B., treated it as if it were a single homogeneous work, the product of a single mind. . . . Accordingly, they attempt to weld all the materials contained in their various MSS. into a continuous text. (Plummer, ii, cxxiv).
Plummer's condemnation of these editors' attempts at conflation is indicative of the growing dissatisfaction with at least this aspect of the print-bias embodied in these printed editions; his attempts to reproduce ms pointing (although supplementing it with commas, semicolons, and other modern punctuation) work similarly. Nevertheless, Plummer's edition still embodies a number of other features of print-bias, such as name-capitalization and paragraph structuring.

Plummer's revision of Earle's edition has remained the standard edition of the Chronicle for over a century (as Gibson's had much earlier). Other editions of individual Chronicle mss have appeared in the meantime\footnote{Classen and Harmer, ms D, in 1926; Rositzke, ms C, in 1940, Lutz, ms G, in 1981.}, but the influence of Plummer's work can be seen not only in its longevity, but in the fact that it was translated into English in 1953 (Garmonsway) and that this translation remains in print today. Likewise, Earle's belief that mss A and E represent the most authoritative mss is reflected in the fact that, until very recently, only these mss have been printed in facsimile (Flower and Smith, Whitelock).

At present, however, a new series of editions is in preparation, two volumes of which have already been published: Simon Taylor's and Janet Bately's editions of ms B and ms A, respectively. These editions are part of the "Collaborative Edition" of the Chronicle being prepared under the general editorship of Simon Keynes and David Dumville. These editions are "semi-diplomatic" in that they attempt to represent the content of the manuscripts as accurately as possible, with only limited mediation. Taylor, however, makes these notes about the conventions of his edition, conventions adopted throughout the series:

Modern punctuation and capitalisation have been employed throughout. No attempt has been made to reproduce the usage of the mediaeval manuscript. Accents or length-marks have not been reproduced.
Likewise, the paragraphing of the manuscript has not been followed, although such divisions within annals are reported in the apparatus on the few occasions where they occur.

In general, for the sake of clarity and consistency, there has been no attempt to imitate the layout of the manuscript. (Taylor cvii)

Just as Wanley's 1709 letter to Gibson revealed a great deal about both scholars' attitudes towards texts and editions, so too is this passage of Taylor's revealing. The updating of capitalization, punctuation, spacing, paragraphing, layout, and the (silent) expansion of abbreviations are carried out in this series of editions "for the sake of clarity and consistency," regardless of whether clarity and consistency are in any way representative of the manuscript texts themselves. And although it would be easy to overstate the significance of Taylor's statement that "No attempt has been made to reproduce the usage of the mediaeval manuscript," it nevertheless illustrates just how pervasive the differences between printed editions and medieval manuscripts really are. Printed books (in general) are all about consistency and clarity, produced for a broad, and broadly defined, audience. Medieval manuscripts like those of the Chronicle were produced with a much narrower audience in mind, and members of that audience doubtless had different ideas about exactly what constituted clarity and consistency.

All editions of the Chronicle, then, have been influenced to a greater or lesser degree by the print-literate culture in which the various editors found themselves. Fortunately, during recent years, scholars have begun to examine the nature of various varieties of literacy. In the world of Anglo-Saxon studies, these examinations have chiefly been concerned with what I will hesitantly term the "orality-literacy debate" and its possible applicability to the study of Anglo-Saxon texts. In the following section, I will summarize this work and discuss its relevance for the study of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle.
Orality, Literacy, Anglo-Saxons, and the *Chronicle*

The term "orality" first entered the vocabulary of Anglo-Saxonists with the publication of Francis Magoun's influential essay "The Oral-Formulaic Character of Anglo-Saxon Narrative Poetry" in 1953. Basing his arguments on the methodology developed by Milman Parry and Albert Lord for the examination of the Homeric epics and contemporary Serbo-Croatian heroic poetry, Magoun held that Old English narrative poems like *Beowulf* must necessarily have been composed orally (that is, without writing) because of their high degree of formulicity. Magoun's assertion that oral poetry "is composed entirely of formulas, large and small, while lettered poetry is never formulaic" (190) has been assailed from a number of perspectives, but in its essential assertion of a clear and rigid boundary between the "oral" and the "written," it is all too characteristic of much of the research into orality and literacy.

Until recently, discussion of Anglo-Saxon literacy was more or less confined to the orality-literacy debate and its potential applicability to the study of Old English poetry. This debate has finally settled down into a fairly comfortable middle position; John Miles Foley's recent comparative study of "oral-formulaic" composition in Homeric, Serbo-Croatian, and Anglo-Saxon traditions treats *Beowulf* as an "orally-derived" text, that is, one whose formulaic structure is influenced by and dependent upon a flourishing Anglo-Saxon tradition of truly oral-formulaic poetry (*Traditional Oral Epic*). At the same time, scholars have been able to begin investigating the nature and value of Anglo-Saxon literacy in contexts other than the composition of Old English poetry.

The most recent major work on orality and literacy in the Anglo-Saxon period is undoubtedly Katherine O'Brien O'Keeffe's 1990 book, *Visible Song: Transitional Literacy in Old English Verse*. O'Keeffe, rather than concerning herself with the possible mode of composition of Old English poetry, instead focuses upon the texts at hand: the poetic
manuscripts. By examining the physical record of the surviving Old English poetry, O'Keeffe's chief success lies in her attempt to circumvent the mediating influence of printed, edited editions. Rather than viewing scribes and scribal activity as a source of corruption and error (a layer of error which the process of scholarly editing supposedly attempts to remove), O'Keeffe re-reads the record of textual variation in the poetic manuscripts, arguing that scribes themselves (especially those working early in the Anglo-Saxon period) introduced textual variation as the result of a process of "formulaic reading." In such formulaic reading, metrically and syntactically appropriate alternate readings could manifest themselves within written copies as a result of scribes' internalized knowledge of the Old English poetic idiom.

At the same time, O'Keeffe looks at the record of the spatialization of the poetic texts, arguing that they reflect a gradually increasing degree of conventionalization in their use and division of physical space. Most significantly, she argues that metrical pointing of Old English poetry developed as a system of graphical cues which functioned to indicate poetic structure. Just as earlier scribes' work featured more examples of "formulaic reading" (and was hence closer to the "oral" world), the record of pointing suggests that the increasingly conventionalized use of textual space also marked a move away from "oral" processes of reading and writing.

O'Keeffe's terms "transitional literacy" and "residual orality" (a term she borrows from Walter Ong), however, still seem to reinscribe the essential dualism which haunts the orality/literacy debate, especially in their invocation of "a continuum whose end-points are orality and literacy" (25). Such a teleological perspective usually manifests itself in arguments regarding the deterministic influence or "progress" of literacy. Recent work on literacy theory, however, shows the inadequacy of such a perspective.12 Ethnographic

---

12 Consider recent articles which demonstrate the inadequacy of the "great leap" theory of literacy, e.g. Beth Daniell's "Against the Great Leap Theory of Literacy."
investigations of the role of the written and spoken word in various cultural domains reminds us that the cultural significance of literacy lies not in its nature so much as its use.\footnote{Perhaps the most influential of these works is Shirley Brice Heath's \textit{Ways with Words}, but consider also the essays in the Lunsford-Moglen-Slevin collection \textit{The Right to Literacy}, especially those of Andrea Fishman and John S. Lofty.} How people use writing and texts is more significant than their mere possession of writing and reading skills, likewise, the uses a culture finds for literacy are not determined by its imagined movement along a pre-set continuum from "orality" to "literacy."

O'Keeffe's nonetheless impressive work is effectively supplemented by Seth Lerer's book, \textit{Literacy and Power in Anglo-Saxon Literature}. Lerer, by examining depictions of texts and reading in the works of Bede, Alfred, Asser, and the \textit{Beowulf} poet, describes the Anglo-Saxons' perceptions of the importance of literacy as a source of political and cultural power. And although Lerer does not really concern himself with the details of just how manuscripts were read by real-world readers in the Anglo-Saxon period, his investigations into the cultural mythology of literacy are of critical importance for understanding Anglo-Saxon attitudes towards texts and reading.

The relation between literacy and power has been addressed from a different perspective in Simon Keynes's examination of the role of written texts in governmental administration during the Anglo-Saxon period. Keynes argues that although we have little documentary proof of the existence of a royal chancery, after the time of King Alfred such a chancery almost surely played a crucial role in royal government. Keynes's argument, although not concerned with the \textit{Chronicle} itself, is supported by the details of King Alfred's educational program and the relationship that it suggests obtained during the late ninth century between governmental officials, readers, and texts (Keynes 230 ff.). The fact that the \textit{Chronicle} was undoubtedly a product of Alfred's vernacular literary renaissance indicates the relevance of Keynes's demonstration of the interplay between
Alfred's interest in literacy, his translations, and the process and politics of Anglo-Saxon government.

And indeed, the relationship between text, audience, and power has been the focus of other work, in the Anglo-Saxon period and in broader medieval contexts as well. In particular, Brian Stock's notion of "textual communities" has been extremely influential in reconsiderations of medieval literacy. Springing chiefly from Stock's investigations of the development and spread of doctrinal heresy, the notion of a textual community is useful for considering the impact of written texts upon an audience composed not only of readers but also of non-readers. "What was essential for a textual community, whether large or small, was simply a text, an interpreter, and a public" (Listening 37). Stock explores how texts could reach an unlettered audience through the (orally conducted) mediation of the interpreter. And although Stock does not focus on the Anglo-Saxon period, Nicholas Howe's recent essay, "The Cultural Construction of Reading in Anglo-Saxon England," argues that the concept of textual communities is eminently relevant for the study of Anglo-Saxon literacy. Howe also investigates the etymologies of OE "raedan" and "writan," effectively reminding us that for the Anglo-Saxons, the act of reading was always coded as a public and social act.

In general, except for the poems contained within its annals, the Chronicle has been kept out of the orality/literacy debate. It is widely accepted that the chronicle genre itself is a inherently "written" form, unavailable, perhaps unimaginable, to a purely oral culture. In 1926, Reginald L. Poole argued that the annalistic chronicle form derived from earlier, calculational Easter tables, which, in their mathematical complexity could only be conceivable in a literate culture. As Poole demonstrates, such tables were eminently suited for the addition of brief entries characterizing the events of a given year; indeed, as time went on, such tables apparently began to be constructed with wide columns expressly designed for such historical entries.
The main connection that scholars have generally drawn between the Chronicle and Anglo-Saxon literacy has been through the study of paleography. Used extensively by Plummer to describe the development of the various manuscripts from the times of their respective initial copyings, Anglo-Saxon paleography was perhaps brought to a peak by the work of N. R. Ker, especially in his monumental Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon. In this outstanding work, Ker assesses the contents and script of every such manuscript known to him, including information about medieval provenances, approximate date of the script, foliation, and characteristics of the hand. As such, Ker's book is itself a massive repository of information about the spread and development of texts and scripts in the vernacular throughout the Anglo-Saxon period.

Similar methods of inquiry have been applied even more rigorously to some of the Chronicle manuscripts, especially the Parker ms. Malcolm Parkes, for example, in an influential essay, argued that the Parker manuscript had been originally written at Winchester, basing his conclusion on the script and the association of other related texts for which he could likewise deduce a Winchester provenance. This conclusion fit nicely with the often-repeated association of the Chronicle with King Alfred's court. Recently, however, David Dumville has effectively refuted Parkes's assertion of a Winchester provenance not only for the Parker Chronicle, but for the other mss which Parkes used as supporting evidence. Dumville's work on the Parker Chronicle has been revisionary in other ways as well. In his recent book, Wessex and England from Alfred to Edgar, for example, Dumville draws conclusions from his reconstruction of the development of Anglo-Saxon square minuscule, and argues for a relatively late date for the initial copying of the A ms, perhaps as late as 930. Other scholars have likewise contributed to our understanding of the Chronicle through paleographical studies. Janet Bately, who besides editing the A ms, has also written extensively on the compilation of the Common Stock, discusses the implications for our understanding of the growth and distribution of the
*Chronicle* according to the manuscript layout of the various versions in a 1988 article ("Manuscript Layout").

In the following chapters, I examine the manuscript record of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* from the perspective of literacy studies, applying three chief guiding principles. First and foremost is the idea that in order to understand Anglo-Saxon literacy, we must eschew the mediation of printed editions, and rely upon the record of the texts as the Anglo-Saxons read them, as manuscripts. Secondly, following the work of modern ethnographers and literacy theorists, we must keep in mind that the uses to which the Anglo-Saxons put their texts and their literacy are intimately connected to their practice of literacy. My methods, then, will embrace both "literary" readings and "mechanical" ones; I will focus not only on the mechanics of Anglo-Saxon literacy but also on the cultural use and value of texts and writing, especially in the recording of history. Throughout, both of these perspectives will be considered almost simultaneously, as each does (and, I would argue, must) inform the other. Lastly, I resist the temptation to rely upon a too-simple dichotomy between "literacy" and "orality"; all too often, orality is invoked to explain the alterity of medieval texts, when the reality of medieval literacy contains a multiplicity of configurations of both literacy and orality, as does our own period.

In my first chapter, I contextualize the compilation of the *Chronicle's* Common Stock as a part of King Alfred's literary translation and education program. Alfred's program was immensely influential, both for the creation of a canon of texts "most necessary for all men to know" and for its promotion of Old English as a viable literary language. The place of the *Chronicle* within this program serves as a useful starting point for considering both the effects of Alfred's program on succeeding generations of literate

---

14 This survey of work on the *Chronicle* has virtually ignored any work done from a historiographic perspective, although this is undoubtedly the perspective scholars most often take when looking at the *Chronicle*. Rather than a re-examination of the *Chronicle* as history, however, my work is an examination of the *Chronicle* as an historical document. I am more interested in how the *Chronicle* functions as a record of history than in its historical record.
Anglo-Saxons and of its own continuing growth and development as a histroical and political document.

In Chapter Two, I examine the manuscript record of three of the prose annals of the Common Stock: the famous Cynewulf and Cyneheard story (annal 755) and two of the most important annals of Alfred's reign, from 871 and 878. Here, I begin to stretch the boundaries of the orality/literacy debate, by showing that these prose texts are subject to a high degree of textual variation not so very dissimilar to the variation O'Keeffe notes in Old English poetic manuscripts. But where O'Keeffe can invoke the formulaic nature of Anglo-Saxon poetry to claim such variation as "residual orality," the case is more complex for these literary prose texts. This sort of textual variation, I also argue, has been systematically ignored or de-emphasized by our scholarly print-bias, as have the manuscript records of these passages' pointing, capitalization, and layout. These very features, though, as I argue in the case of the Cynewulf and Cyneheard story, can reveal a great deal about contemporary interpretation of these texts, and thus cannot be ignored in critical readings of the Chronicle.

My third chapter examines the Chronicle's genealogical passages. The Anglo-Saxon genealogy is a genre with clear roots in a pre-literate oral culture, yet the manuscript record of genealogies in the Chronicle and elsewhere clearly suggests that the Chronicle genealogies, in their layout and the development of regular metrical pointing, provide evidence of a strictly literate response to a minor crisis of representation, not a shift from "oral" to "written" habits of reading and writing. Likewise, I investigate the reasons behind the genealogies' eventual removal from the Chronicle manuscripts, suggesting that changes in cultural perceptions of texts lie behind their deletion, changes from one variety of literacy to another, with neither necessarily characterized by "orality."

In Chapter Four, I move beyond the texts of the Common Stock and examine the poetry of the Chronicle. Here, issues of canonicty and modern bias are again explored, as
modern critics generally acknowledge six of the *Chronicle's* entries as poetic, while Plummer's edition prints shorter or longer poems at fifteen separate points. By examining the ms record of the "non-canonical" *Chronicle* poems, I argue that these passages were often recognized as poetry by the *Chronicle* scribes, and should be recognized as such by modern critics, even if that recognition demands a reassessment of our ideas of the nature of Old English poetry. Here also, a literary assessment of the contents of these poems shows a continuity of theme and treatment between the canonical and non-canonical poetry which confirms this conclusion, as well as demonstrating the continuing perception of the *Chronicle* as the record of the nationalistic efforts of King Alfred and his descendants.

Chapter Five examines the relationship between literature in Latin and Old English during this period by both looking at the use of Latin in the Old English manuscripts of the *Chronicle* and also at Latin translations of the *Chronicle* in the texts of Asser and Æthelweard. The differing configurations of attitudes towards the two languages provide a useful parallel to the differing conceptions of literacy itself during the period. Again, orality is seen not to be the defining difference in literacies; rather the key is in cultural attitudes and cultural uses for literacy. Simultaneously, the nature of Asser's and Æthelweard's texts as histories (and histories written with specific individuals in mind, whether as audience or subject) rather than as actual chronicles suggests one dimension of the differing literary possibilities of the two languages.

Ultimately, my examination of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* from the perspective of literacy studies not only subverts the binarism so often entailed in investigations of literacy and orality but also offers a new appreciation of the cultural value of the *Chronicle* and the texts it contains. Rereading the manuscript record of Anglo-Saxon texts such as the *Chronicle* can, I believe, reinvigorate our appreciation of Anglo-Saxon literature by helping us come closer to reading these texts as the Anglo-Saxons did, rather than through
our own print-biased filters. The value of such a procedure, I hope the following chapters show, is self-evident.
CHAPTER I

King Alfred, the Chronicle, and Anglo-Saxon Literate Culture

In the Introduction, I argue that our methods of reading Anglo-Saxon texts, including the Chronicle, have traditionally been colored by the nature of our own print-based form of literacy and its attendant attitudes towards texts and writing. In fact, what we read when we read the Chronicle is itself usually a print-influenced construction. Scholarly constructions and reconstructions may be well suited to the aims of historians and linguists; editorial practices designed to make medieval texts easier for modern readers to read, however, necessarily prevent us from reading medieval texts as their original audiences did. Such practices in fact impoverish our readings, as they disguise original features of the text. In order to move beyond the print-biased notions and texts which are the product of our own print literacy, we clearly need to pay more attention to the original documents themselves, the books which the Anglo-Saxons read, the vellum-and-ink manuscripts.

Within the tradition of Old English scholarship, the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle has been thought of and treated as "a book." The pervasiveness of this concept can be seen not only in the name ("the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle"), but in the scholarly project of conflation which informs so many editions of the Chronicle, especially early ones. Yet it seems likely that the Anglo-Saxons thought of the contents of books less abstractly than we do, and that the contents of books were more concretely tied to the physical manuscripts. Where we draw an easy distinction between copying a book and writing a book, Old English does not. The verb writan was used for both sorts of task. The author
of the *Metrical Preface to the Pastoral Care* calls Alfred's scribes "writers" ("Siddan min on englisc ælfred kyning awende worde gehwelc 7 me his writerum sende suð 7 nór" Hatton 20, fo. 2v, ll.16-17). Scribes often referred to their own task with the verb *writan*. The same verb is also used in the *Chronicle*’s annal 84 to refer to the composition of the Book of Apocalypse (Revelations). For their original audiences, each *Chronicle* manuscript was "a book," written by a writer and imbued with all of the authority and self-containment pertaining to a book.\(^1\) A particular book’s relative distance from an "original" version is less meaningful in a culture where the acts of writing and copying are linguistically indistinguishable. When reading the *Chronicle* and other Anglo-Saxon documents, we must revise our ideas of what "books" are, as well as our print-influenced ideas of textual authority.\(^2\)

It is not only the texts we read which embody our academic culture’s print bias; it is also our very methods of reading. I have already outlined some precautions readers can take to avoid print-bias in their readings of Old English texts (focusing on mss; looking at texts and contexts, recalling the multiformity of medieval literacies), and such precautions must necessarily be applied in different ways in the reading of differing texts. In this chapter, I examine the specific contexts and literacies relevant to the study of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, from its first compilation in King Alfred's reign to its continuing presence in Norman England. In particular, I investigate the implications of the *Chronicle*’s probable origin as a part of Alfred’s literacy program for our understanding of

\(^1\) My point is not that the Anglo-Saxons could not or did not distinguish between the semantic values of 'book as physical object' and 'book as text contained therein.' Indeed, the Anglo-Saxons clearly used 'böc' in both senses. Rather, I am suggesting that print technology and the proliferation of multiple copies of books has caused, for us, a widening of this semantic gap, which was much narrower in the Anglo-Saxon period.

\(^2\) It is crucial to note that the Anglo-Saxons, like virtually all other Christians, had a deeply felt sense of the need to keep some texts "uncorrupted" by the process of copying. The necessity of preserving Scripture in its authoritative state prompts Ælfric, for example, to hesitate in the preparation of Old English translations of Scripture. But for vernacular texts, they often seem to have been little concerned with letter for letter (or even word for word) copying, as I will show in the next chapter.
its cultural significance. The *Chronicle*’s place within the intellectual climate engendered by Alfred’s program, I argue, was a position, to a large degree, mediated through Anglo-Saxon "textual communities." The importance of this fact lies in its power to suggest the nature of the interplay between the spoken and written word which characterized at least the early textual history of the *Chronicle*.

The extensive nature of Alfred’s program undoubtedly had a significant cultural impact, and in the second half of this chapter, I examine the internal evidence provided by the *Chronicle* regarding the cultural valuation of books as historical documents. Specifically, I argue that the Alfred’s characterization of books as ancient treasures was replaced, over time, by a less forbidding view of books as containers of (among other things) the records of history, especially English history. The role of the *Chronicle* itself in promoting this later view of books suggests its own cultural importance; understanding the place of the *Chronicle* in Anglo-Saxon literate culture is a necessary prerequisite to a reading of its contents.

**King Alfred’s Educational Program and the Origins of the *Chronicle***

The recent surge of critical interest in Anglo-Saxon literacy has, of course, resulted in a focusing of scholarly attention upon the program of literacy education sponsored by King Alfred during the late ninth century. The date of the original compilation of the *Chronicle’s Common Stock* in the early 890s certainly suggests that it sprang from a cultural moment deeply influenced by Alfred’s program. Perhaps because of Alfred’s abiding interest in them, issues of learning and education became politically and socially important in late ninth-century England. Alfred’s perceptions of the status of learning and the status of literacy in his kingdom were instrumental in his educational reform program’s formulation, and his beliefs about literacy and learning are articulated in the Preface to his
translation of Gregory's *Cura Pastoralis*. The program of reform Alfred implemented is likewise described in his Preface, a program which ultimately produced or made possible a great deal of vernacular literature, including the *Chronicle* itself. Although the degree of truth in Alfred's statements about literacy and learning have recently been questioned (Moorish "King Alfred's Letter"), his Preface nonetheless functions as a valuable record of cultural perceptions of literacy and learning. After all, the effectiveness of Alfred's Preface lies not in its possible literal factuality, but in the degree to which it reflects contemporary cultural ideas. Alfred's comments in the Preface help to contextualize the original compilation of the *Chronicle* because they provide an illustration of the cultural milieu in which Alfred found himself.

The version of Alfred's Preface preserved in Hatton ms 20 dates from Alfred's reign, and begins by addressing bishop Wærferth, reminding him of "*hwelce wiotan in wæron giond angelcynn*" ("what sort of wise men there once were among the English people"). Specifically, Alfred complains to Wærferth about the decline of Latin learning in England:

*Swa[e] clæne hio was oðfeallenu on angelcynne. ðæt swiðe feawa wæron behionan humber de hiora ðeninga cuden understondan on Englisc. ódde furdum an ærendgewrit of lædene on englisc æreccan 7 ic wene ðæt[te] noht monige begiondan humbre næren.*

(Hatton 20, fo. 1r, ll. 13-17)

(So completely was it [learning] neglected among the English peoples that there were very few on this side of the Humber who could understand in English [the meaning of] their divine service, or even render a Latin letter into English; and I believe that there were not many beyond the Humber.)

As this passage indicates, Alfred's perception of a decline in Latin literacy provides the motivation for his program. He likewise recalls "*hu ic geseah ær ðæm ðe hit eall*

---

3 The portions of this passage (and of succeeding passages) from this ms which are indicated in brackets have been erased from the ms. This was likely to have been done around the year 1000 by Archbishop Wulfstan, who had access to the book at Worcester. See Ker's comments to this effect on pp. 24-25 of the *EEMF* facsimile edition of Hatton 20.
forhergod were. 7 forbærned. hu da ciricean giond eall angele cynn stodon maõma 7 boca gefylde." ("how I saw, before it was all harried and burnt, how the churches among all the English people stood filled with treasures and books" Hatton 20, fo. 1v, ll. 4-6), but "swide lytle fiorme ðara boca wiston. for ðæm ðe hie hiora nanwukht ongiotan ne meahen. for ðæm ðe hie ðær on hiora agen geri ði ði ðri eawetene." ("they knew very little benefit of those books because they could not understand a bit of them, since they were not written in their own language" Hatton 20, fo. 1v, ll. 7-9). Asking himself why those earlier scholars who had understood these books had not themselves translated them into English, Alfred decides "hie ne wendon ðaet[e] æfre menn sceolilden. swa[e] ref[œ]celse weorðan. 7 sio lar swa[e] oðfeallan;" ("they never expected that men should become so careless, or learning so neglected" Hatton 20, fo. 1v, ll. 18-19).

Indeed, Alfred's question suggests the very solution to the problem he has in mind: to translate great works of learning into English in order to make them more widely accessible. Justifying this course by recalling "hu sio æ was ærest on ebrisce geri ði funden." ("how the law was first revealed in the Hebrew tongue" Hatton 20, fo. 1v., ll. 21-22) and then translated first into Greek and then into Latin, Alfred suggests to Wærferth "ðaet we eac sum[a],... bec. ða de niedbeærfosta sien eallum monnum to wiotome. ðaet we ða on ðaet geri ði wenden. ðe we ealle gecnewan mægen." ("that we therefore translate some books, of those that are most necessary for all men to know, turn them into that language which we all can know" Hatton 20, fo. 2r, ll. 5-7). Yet Alfred's program also included measures to make the texts translated in this program even more widely accessible: teaching English literacy skills to the children (presumably male—"gioguð" Hatton 20, fo. 2r, l. 9) of all free men. He urged his bishops to do further teaching: "lære mon sidðæn furður on ledengediðe. ðæ ðæ mon furðor lœran wille. 7 to hieran hade don"
"Teach then further in the Latin language those who wish to learn more and who aspire to a higher condition" Hatton 20, fo. 2r, ll. 13-14).

The fact that Alfred's educational program is not a reaction to low literacy rates in the vernacular deserves further consideration. When Alfred describes how he started translating the *Cura Pastoralis*, he acknowledges that even then, "monyce cūdon englisc gewrit ærædan." ("many knew how to read English writing" Hatton 20, fo. 2r, l. 16).

Alfred claims to be specifically concerned with low rates of Latin literacy, but his solution to this problem is not a program of Latin education, but increased vernacular education, with important Latin texts to be translated into the vernacular. The details of Alfred's program suggest that he is not concerned about low (Latin) literacy rates as an abstract problem, but rather that he is disturbed by the fact that his subjects are failing to benefit from the wisdom contained in books.

How this valuable information was to be disseminated to his subjects is also indicated in Alfred's description of his program. The double thrust of Alfred's program (translation and education) functioned to bring valuable Latin learning into the West Saxon tongue and then to attempt to give everyone the skills to read vernacular texts themselves. In the meantime, Latin texts which had, prior to Alfred's program, been doubly inaccessible to large numbers of English-speaking individuals became accessible to *eallum monnum*, either because they were able to read them or because they could understand them when they were read aloud. In both the short and the long run, however, the literacy portion of Alfred's program was, almost certainly, not as crucial to his plan for dissemination of these central texts as was the translation portion. The economics of textual production, we must recall, suggest that texts such as those which Alfred translated must have been expensive as books, probably much more expensive than most Englishmen could afford. The teaching portion of Alfred's program, rather, serves another function--perhaps that of increased bureaucratic control, for, as Simon Keynes points out,
one "text which King Alfred’s officials must have been expected to read was the king’s law code" ("Royal Government" 231). Central to the program, then, was the translation activity it encompassed; Alfred’s primary goal was to bring Latin learning into the realm of vernacular literature.

Keynes’s discussion of Alfred’s program examines not only Alfred’s Preface, but also the other major document relating to Alfred’s program, Asser’s Vita Alfredi. Keynes quotes Asser’s description of the program’s effects, acknowledging the importance of the translation portion of the program for his subjects who could not read:

So it came about that ‘nearly all the ealdormen and reeves and thegns (who were illiterate from childhood) applied themselves in an amazing way to learning how to read, preferring rather this unfamiliar discipline (no matter how laboriously) than to relinquish their offices of power’; and if any one of them was slow on the uptake, the king insisted that he find someone else to help him by reading out books in English ‘by day and night, or whenever he had the opportunity’. ("Royal Government" 231)

Asser’s account also indicates that Alfred felt English literacy to be necessary for the exercise of power; at the same time it suggests that "literacy" in this case should not necessarily be equated with possession of the skills of forming and deciphering letters upon leaves of parchment. In Alfred’s mind and apparently in Asser’s as well, the ealdorman, reeve, or thegn who was himself unable to read, but who could arrange to have another person read to him was equally well equipped to exercise his authority. Again, it is making use of the contents of texts, rather than possessing the skills of literacy oneself, which seems to be Alfred’s chief desire for his subjects.

The dissemination of Alfred’s vernacular texts, whether translations or law codes, was not expected to be accomplished solely through his subjects’ increased ability to read Old English. Instead, the texts were published by being read to listeners who were themselves unable to read. As such, Alfred was clearly taking advantage of the existence of Anglo-Saxon "textual communities," or perhaps was interested in fostering their
formation. As described by Brian Stock, medieval textual communities were "microsocieties organized around the common understanding of a script" (Listening 23). Springing chiefly from his investigations of the rise and spread of heretical religious communities, Stock's notion of the textual community as he presents it is a group made up of "individuals who existed in a halfway house between literacy and nonliteracy" (Listening 23). In such communities, texts could be spread by one reader to as many non-reading listeners as his voice could effectively reach. "What was essential for a textual community, whether large or small, was simply a text, an interpreter, and a public" (Listening, 37). Stock's textual communities are groups of people who act upon an understanding of a text based upon the reading and interpretive abilities of one or more members of that group. Not all members need be literate; in fact, his characterization of members as halfway "between literacy and nonliteracy" reflects the way in which texts are mediated through both writing and speaking in such communities.

The significance of the translation portion of Alfred's program becomes apparent when considered in the context of the existence of such textual communities--the translated texts of Alfred's program were able to reach a much broader public audience than those in Latin, by simple virtue of the status of English as the native tongue of the land. The fact that already "monige cuðon englisc gewriâr arædan" gave Alfred's program an immediate impact: the act of requiring the reading of law codes or other texts to the aldermen of Alfred's kingdom created textual communities much more quickly and effectively than the training of Latin readers would have. Alfred's program promoted textual communities, just as Alfred himself, and his scholars Asser, Grimbold, Plegmund, and John, themselves constituted a textual community.

The nature of the textual communities Alfred was familiar with can be seen in the records left in his Preface and in Asser's *Vita Alfredi*. Turning first to the Preface of
Gregory's *Cura Pastoralis*, we find his description of the scholars which helped him in his translations:

Ōa ongan ic ongemang oðrum mislicum. 7 manigfealdum bismum. ðisses kynrices. ōa boc wendan on englisc. ōe is genemmed on læden pastoralis. 7 on englisc hierdeboec. hwilum word be worde. hwilum andgit of andgi'ele. swa[e] swa[e] ic hie geliornode æt plegmund minum ærcebiscepe. 7 æt assere minum biscepe 7 æt grimbolde minum mæseprioste. 7 æt Ioanne minum mæsepreoste; Siðdan ic hie ōa geliornod hæfde. swa[e] swa[e] ic hie forstod. 7 swa[e] ic hie andgiftullicost. areccean meahte. ic hie on englisc awende. (Hatton 20, fo. 2r, l. 17- fo. 2v, l. 3)

(Then I began among the other various and manifold duties of this kingdom to translate into English the book which is called in Latin *Pastoralis* and in English "Shepherd-book," sometimes word by word, sometimes sense for sense, just as I learned them from Plegmund my archbishop, and from Asser my bishop, and from Grimbold my mass-priest, and from John my mass-priest. After I had learned them, as best as I understood them, and as I might most perceptively render them, I turned them into English.)

Alfred listened first to the interpretations of his scholars and discussed the sense of each word or passage before translating them into English. This sort of oral mediation of a written text is precisely what Stock describes as happening within textual communities. Asser's description of Alfred's interactions with these four scholars is even more illuminating. "By day or night, whenever he had any opportunity, he used to tell them to read aloud from books in his presence...and accordingly he acquired some acquaintance with almost all books, even though he could not at this point understand anything in the books by himself. For he had not yet begun to read anything" (Keynes and Lapidge, 93). Even Asser's tale of Alfred's learning and reciting his mother's book of English poetry demonstrates an understanding of the value of learning received by hearing a text being read aloud. By urging his aldormen to take up the same habits of reading and being read to as he himself was accustomed to, Alfred, in his literacy program, was as much concerned with the formation of textual communities as with literacy itself, at least in the short run.
On a larger scale, however, the translation portion of Alfred's plan seems designed to create a truly national textual community. In Alfred's description of how he constructed his translation ("hwilum word be worde. hwilum andgit of andgi'e'te...swafe] swafe] ic hie andgitfullicost. arececan meahte. ic hie on englisc awende."), he (along with his Latin scholars) recapitulates the role of the "interpreter" of a given textual community. By acting as the mediating influence between Latin texts and English ones, Alfred "understood a set of texts and was able to pass his message on verbally to others" (Stock, Listening 23). Alfred himself is the crucial mediator between the Latin words in the old books and the spoken English words in his subjects' ears. The textual communities in which Alfred found himself served as the models for a textual community as large as all England, with Alfred himself in the role of interpres. The fact that Alfred's translations were imbued with the authority of the highest political and religious figures in the land (king and archbishop) only confirms the importance their audience would probably have attached to them.

Undoubtedly Alfred's plan was both politically and economically expedient. The powerful potential of a nation-wide textual community such as Alfred's program fostered is reflected in the way it maximized the speed at which texts could be distributed to eallum monnum and at the same time firmly established Old English (and the West Saxon dialect in particular) as a viable and valuable literary medium, capable of conveying the knowledge "most necessary for all men to know." Alfred found himself constantly fighting the invading Danes on the battlefield and was dismayed at their destruction of libraries in their raiding; as a consequence, he designed his translation program as a means of transforming the West Saxon dialect into a tool for the exertion of hegemonic power, extending the Danish wars into a literary arena. Through his program, English became the primary language for written communication throughout England, whether in the form of books "most necessary for all men to know" or simple ærendgewartas. The Old English
word which Alfred makes such use of, "geðiode," with its dual meanings of "language" and "people, nation, or tribe," itself embodies the connection which Alfred promotes between language and nationalism, and Alfred's program served as a first step in the cultural (re)unification of the whole of England through its literature, a literature made possible largely through the translation portion of the program. The early arrival of the *Chronicle* in northern ecclesiastical centers (which would have been politically controlled by the Danes) suggests the possibility that the texts of Alfred's program were deliberately sent into Danish territory in an attempt to exert what influence he could over the invaders.\(^5\)

From this context of contemporary literary translation activity and the increased appreciation of vernacular literature which was presumably spurred by Alfred's program, then, springs the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. Although it may have been compiled away from Alfred's court,\(^6\) the Common Stock of the *Chronicle* nevertheless functioned as a document recording the history of England from Julius Caesar's invasion of Britain right until the Alfredian present. Such a document, it turned out, could fit itself neatly into Alfred's scheme. Histories, of course, were among the books most valued in Alfred's program, as the translations of Orosius and Bede demonstrate.\(^7\) Nominally these other histories focus respectively upon the impact of Christianity upon the world as a whole and England in particular, and, especially when translated into English, they served to situate

---

\(^5\) Sisam's comments about the *Pastoral Care* serve to describe the publication process of the Alfredian translations. Plummer argues that the *Chronicle* underwent a similar process of publication: "copies seem to have been made and sent to different monasteries" (Plummer, ii, cxvi). The apparently early compilation of the *Chronicle*'s Northern Recension suggests its early arrival in the north: "This enlargement must have taken place very soon after the reception of the southern *Chronicle*" (Plummer, ii, cxix).

\(^6\) For this view, see Stenton's 1925 essay, "The Southwestern Element."

\(^7\) Significantly, in the surviving mss of the *Chronicle*, one also contains a copy of the translation of Bede (ms G) while another contains a copy of the translation of Orosius (ms C). Although neither of these mss was prepared within a century of Alfred's death, it seems worth noting that their compilers saw these texts as complementary. This seems remarkable for ms G especially, since the *Chronicle* it contained was copied from ms A, which was not associated in CCCC 173 with the translation of Bede.
Alfred's England within the broad sweep of world history as well as recounting the
triumps and trials of the religion which Alfred felt was threatened by the invading Danes.

Bede's history in particular occasionally seems as much concerned with the origin of
the English people as with the history of the English church, especially when it recounts
the stories of Hengist and Horsa and the Saxon invasion. This portion of the Historia, in
fact, was cut less extensively during the process of translation into Old English than many
of its other portions (Howe, M&G, 70). At the time of Alfred's wars, Bede's record of the
founding moment of the Anglo-Saxon culture had a special relevance, as the invasion of
the Saxons was often figured as retribution for lapses in the Christianity of the British.
The invasions of the Danes in Alfred's day could be seen from the same perspective:

Helmut Gneuss argues that "Alfred even sees the Scandinavian invasion as a divine
retribution for the clergy having neglected its duties" (31), just as the Saxons had earlier
been figured. Alfred's Preface to the Cura Pastoralis, with its focus on the decline of
learning and the churches filled with old books which could no longer be read by most
churchmen before the Danish attacks (Gneuss 31) provides an indicator of just how timely
the story of the Saxon invasion must have seemed in the late ninth century. Bede's history
in particular, then, provided (among other things) an example of how a Christian nation
could be overcome, but it also showed that a pious Christianity could ultimately prevail,
and even eventually bring within its circle the barbarous pagans who had invaded and
conquered. Such lessons were clearly among the things Alfred felt to be "most necessary
for all men to know."

Roughly contemporary with the translations of Orosius and Bede and written in
Old English, rather than Latin, the Common Stock of the Chronicle embodies the reliance
upon and respect for the vernacular which was the key to Alfred's program. Significantly,
the currency of translating Latin into English is reflected in the annal which appears under
892A, in the first passage written by the Parker Chronicle's second scribe: "7py ilcan
geare . . . æteowde se steorra þe mon on boclæden hæt cometa same men cwéðan on
englisc þæt hit sie feaxede steorra" ("And that same year . . . appeared the star which one
calls 'comet' in book-Latin [and] some men say in English that it is '(long)haired star"
CCCC 173, fo. 16v., ll. 1-3). The 892A annal is usually believed to have been written
almost contempararily, as one of a series of continuing additions to the Common Stock;
the fact that it foregrounds the co-existence of the Latin and Old English languages
suggests just how deeply Alfred's program was affecting Anglo-Saxon culture in the last
decade of the ninth century, especially since the Latin loan-word "comet" had appeared in
the Chronicle in earlier Common Stock entries (which were themselves drawn from the
Latin Epitome of Bede's Historia Ecclesiastica) as an apparently viable English word (eg.
s.a. 678A, 729A). In the presumably (very) brief period between the compilation of the
Common Stock and the writing of the 892 annal, the cultural importance of the languages
Latin and Old English had become so foregrounded that the annalist felt inclined to
highlight the loan-word status of "comet," suggesting that Old English had, indeed,
achieved a level of prestige as a literary language, enough prestige to warrant this apparent
effort at maintaining linguistic purity. As such, the 892 annal provides us with a minute
illustration of just how pervasive the effects of Alfred's program really were.

From the Chronicle's very inception, one of its most remarkable features was
undoubtedly its use of Old English as its primary language. Even more thoroughly than
with the histories translated in Alfred's program, the Chronicle's existence in Old English
served to present English history to an English audience, in its own language. And just
as the Alfredian translations were apparently disseminated through the action of Anglo-
Saxon textual communities, it seems likely that the publication of the Chronicle was
characterized by the same reliance upon both the spoken and the written word. Examining

---

8 Although, as I remark elsewhere, the fact that many of the Common Stock's entries derive from Bede
(and especially his Chronological Epitome) suggests that the Chronicle, too, is at least in part an
Alfredian-era translation.
the *Chronicle* from the perspective taken by students of orality and literacy, then, seems appropriate. The successes of Alfred's program, however, had the effect of altering the makeup and habits of Anglo-Saxon literate culture; in order to assess the continuing significance of the *Chronicle*, we must look at the changes Alfred's program brought about.

**The *Chronicle* and Cultural Perceptions of Books**

King Alfred's Preface to the translation of Gregory's *Cura Pastoralis* describes the king's perceptions of how neglected the study of Latin had become in the ninth century. For Alfred, the fact that many Latin books lay unread was a reflection of the intellectual neglect of his own people. Books, according to Alfred, were scholarly treasures ("da ciricean giond eall angelcynn stodon maðma ond bocca gefyldæ" "the churches among all the English peoples stood filled with treasures and books" Hatton 20, fo. 1v, ll. 5-6), the work of wise forefathers, "ure [ie]ldran" ("our elders;") altered to "yl[ld]ran" Hatton 20, fo. 1v, l. 9). But Alfred goes farther in his comments about the greatness of those old scholars: "mon mag giet gesion hiora swæd ac we him ne cunning after sprygean" ("one may still see their track, but we know not how to follow after them" Hatton 20, fo. 1v, ll 11-12). Seth Lerner has discussed the literary history of the hunting imagery in this passage (*Literacy and Power*, 77ff.), but it is equally instructive to compare Alfred's depiction of the decline in English learning with the Old English poetic trope of the "eald enta geweorc" ("old work of giants").

Used in *Beowulf* to describe the dragon's hoard and its barrow, as well as the giantish hilt which Beowulf retrieves from Grendel's mere, the *enta geweorc* formula is conventionally used to describe marvelous items contrived by those "giants" of the past whose work can no longer be duplicated. As such, this formula signifies decline in much
the same way as Alfred's comments indicate a decline in learning. Where the formula occurs in The Ruin ("brosna be geweorc" "the work of giants crumbles" l. 2b), it also indicates another sort of decline—a decline in the very objects themselves. Alfred's description of old scholars, who never expected learning to fall away so completely, and their works, which men of his time (or at the time of his accession and before) could see but not make use of or duplicate, suggests that Alfred, familiar as he was with Anglo-Saxon poetry, was working with the same sense of a cultural decline in knowledge as was conveyed by this poetic formula. Alfred's image of books lying unread in the churches seems to provide an especially clear link between the decline of literacy and learning and the enta geweorc formula, as it suggests (in our minds at least) a comparison with Hrothgar and his apparent inability to decipher the inscription on the giantish hilt, itself enta ærgeweorc (Beowulf, l. 1679a). In his Preface, Alfred attempts to depict books as the work of historical "giants," rather than contemporary creations, even if the reality of the time belied that perception.

The cultural attitudes towards books altered between the compilation of the Common Stock and the writing of the later annals, and an indication of the changes can be seen through the Chronicle's varied references to books of all sorts. The lone occurrence of the word "book" in all of the Common Stock can be read in annal 84A: "Her Iohannes se godspelthe i–PATHMA ÆLA–EALONDE WRAT ÆLA BOC APOCALIPSIS" ("Here John the Evangelist on the island of Patmos wrote the book Apocalypse"). In the A ms, a later hand has added a similar comment under annal 47, but the compiler of the Common Stock has seen fit nowhere else to refer to books. Later annalists felt freer to refer to books—specifically, books are mentioned in the two references to the adventus Saxonum discussed below (Brunanburh and 1009E). The Peterborough scribe also writes under

---

9 The crumbling ruins in The Ruin are also related to the unread Latin texts in the English libraries through their Roman origins.
annal 1070E of books as treasures plundered by the outlaw Hereward from the 
Peterborough monastery, echoing the sentiments of Alfred from nearly two centuries 
earlier. The learned scribe of the F ms refers to scholarly books such as Gregory's 
Dialogues (482F) and Bede's Historia Ecclesiastica (995F), as well as referring to books 
specifically as a source of learning about the past (995F).

For the compiler of the Common Stock to have only called attention to the book 
of Apocalypse throughout the entirety of his own text (even though he seems to draw 
freely on such books as the epitome of Bede, Orosius's history, and (presumably) pre-
existing Easter-table annals) suggests that his primary attitude towards books was the 
perception of them as ancient and authoritative. The books of the Bible were undoubtedly 
the prototypical "books." Only the writing of such an important work as the book of 
Apocalypse was itself a history-making event, worthy of inclusion in the Chronicle. The 
later texts at the Common Stock compiler's hand were not considered equally significant, 
and this fact is reflected in the lack of notice given to later books in the Common Stock—
even at the notice of Bede's death in 734A, no mention is made of any of his numerous 
written works, although they were clearly known to the compiler and used by him. Except 
for biblical texts, it seems, books themselves were not perceived as culturally significant 
enough to warrant much space in the Common Stock.

Later scribes, such as the late eleventh century F-scribe, however, clearly saw 
books other than biblical texts as crucial documents recording the past. Not only does the 
scribe of F include the writing of other books as history in itself (482F), he also remarks in 
995F how they served archbishop Ælfric as a source of knowledge about the past, before 
going on to cite at some length a passage from Bede's Historia Ecclesiastica. In between, 
in the writers responsible for the Battle of Brunanburh and the 1009E annal, the 
Chronicle writers clearly were beginning to see books as useful authorities regarding their 
own past. In these annals, books serve as authorities which are able to support claims
about what had (or had not) happened in the past. For them to function at all in such a context indicates that books were generally perceived to contain fairly complete and accurate records of the past. If the history books were not thought of as complete, a claim such as that in the *Battle of Brunanburh*—"On this island there had never yet been greater slaughter, people killed by swords' edges before this, as books tell us"—would fail to be either convincing or effective.

That the compiler of the Common Stock would use books in composing his chronicle but refer to them only as historical objects themselves, rather than as records of history, suggests that his usage reflects a cultural attitude in which books were not widely seen as records of the past (even if the compiler himself was using them as such). The Common Stock compiler was a writer relying on books as sources; however, he was composing for a broad, English-speaking audience of Alfred's time, one coming fairly new to the reading and study of books. As such, his audience is one for whom books are likely to be seen as ancient authorities (cf. the phrase *ealde uðwitan* in *Brunanburh*; see below), as the books of the Bible clearly were, rather than more-or-less contemporary accomplishments, like the *Chronicle* itself. Just as the significance of Alfred's Preface lies not in its possible factuality but in the culturally viable attitudes and beliefs it reflects, so, too, the Common Stock compiler's usage can indicate cultural attitudes towards books which may not have been characteristic of his own attitudes.

Later annalists clearly had a different sense of the role of books within their culture. Not only did they tend to see books as works in which the whole of history was preserved, but they also had a different sense of their own role (and their culture's role) in textual production. This development is paralleled in the way that annalists at the beginning of the *Chronicle's* compilation tended to use either the first person singular "*ic*" or the plural "*we*" more or less interchangeably when writing of their own role in producing the *Chronicle*. Thus in 893A we read, "*Her on pysu- geare for se micla here.*
"pe we gefyrn ymbe spræcon." (Here, in this year, the great army which we spoke about earlier travelled...) CCCC 173, fo. 16v, ll. 5-6), while in 897A and 905A the annalist uses "I" in the construction "7 monige eac him þeh ic da geðungnestan nemde" ("and many such as them, though I have named the most distinguished" CCCC 173, fo. 19r, ll. 10-11; fo. 20v, ll. 11-12) to round off lists of those slain in battles. Annal 905A also uses "we," however, in a similar construction: "7 swide monige eac him þe we nu genemnan ne magon" ("and very many such as them, whom we cannot now name" CCCC 173, fo. 20v, l. 16).

Later annalists, on the other hand, almost invariably used "we" for such references. Following the poem on William the Conqueror in 1086E, for example, comes this passage:

Das þing we habbað be him gewritene. aegðer ge gode ge yfele. þe þe godan men niman æft– þeora godnesse. 7 for leon mid ealle yfelnesse. 7 gan on done weg. þe us lett to heofonan rice. Fela þinga we magon writan þe on dom ilcan geare gewordene waron. (Laud Misc. 636, fo. 65r, l. 28-fo. 65v, l. 3)

(These things we have written about him, both good and evil so that good men will take after the goodness and dispense with all evilness and proceed on the path which leads us to the kingdom of heaven. Many things we may write which happened in that same year.)

Similar uses of the plural pronoun "we" occur, for example, in 1001A and 1009E. These plural pronouns indicated a more certain sense on the part of the later chroniclers that they were participating in a collaborative effort of recording history. These later chroniclers apparently saw themselves fitting into a tradition of chronicle writing in ways the first generation of chroniclers did not, with their hesitation between "ic" and "we." This shift in perception is likely to be the result of the continuing existence of and reliance upon documents like the Chronicle itself. In this respect, the shift in cultural ideas about texts, writing, and history came about as a result of Alfred's educational reforms and the textual culture they engendered.
That the effects of Alfred's program were long-lasting is suggested not only by the changes in references to books and writing in the *Chronicle*, but also by the extensive copying and recopying his literary translations enjoyed throughout the tenth and eleventh centuries. The continuing composition of annals for the various rescensions of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* suggests that the *Chronicle* may have had an even more active textual life than the translations. After the original compilation of the Common Stock and the copying of the Parker Chronicle's first section in the early 890s, annalistic entries continued to be inserted more or less contemporaneously into one version of the *Chronicle* or another for over two and a half centuries, with the Peterborough Chronicle's last entry appearing under the year 1154. The Parker Chronicle itself features multiple additions, revisions, and insertions, and provides an example of how the *Chronicle* continued to be seen as a living document, with half a dozen or more distinct stages in the Parker ms's growth, from its first copying in the 890s or so to the additions made to it in the late eleventh century. Evidence from within the text of the *Chronicle* likewise suggests that the *Chronicle* eventually developed into an authoritative document recording the history of the English speaking peoples of the British isles. This can be seen most clearly in those places where the *Chronicle* makes reference to the Saxon invasion as a watershed moment in English history.

Nicholas Howe briefly discusses such references in his book, *Migration and Mythmaking in Anglo-Saxon England*, where he demonstrates how the adventus Saxorum served as the crucial origin myth for the Anglo-Saxons throughout much of the Anglo-Saxon period. Howe describes how the story of the ocean-crossing migration functions in works by authors as widely divergent as Gildas, Wulfstan, and the poets of both *Beowulf* and *Exodus*. The myth of migration he examines, however, is an essentially literary myth, one appearing in, and traceable through, written documents. Nowhere is this more clear than in the examples he quotes from the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, where the chroniclers
occasionally describe some occurrence "as being the best or worst of its kind in English history since the arrival of the Germanic tribes" (Howe, *M&MI*, 30).

Nor was the essentially literary character of this origin story lost on the Anglo-Saxon chroniclers. In two of the *Chronicle's* three clearest examples of the use of the adventus Saxorum as a benchmark, books are invoked as providing the necessary historical information needed to support the superlative assertions of the chroniclers.  

The end of *The Battle of Brunanburh* is one of these sections:

\[
\begin{align*}
ne \; weard\; wael\; mare. \\
on\; his\; eiglande. & \; efer\; gieta. \\
folces\; gefyllec. & \; beforan\; þissum. \\
sweordes\; ecgum. & \; þæs\; þe\; us\; secgad\; bec. \\
ealde\; uð\; witan. & \; sipban\; eastan\; hider. \\
engle\; 7\; seaxe. & \; up\; becoman. \\
offer\; brad\; brimu. & \; brytene\; sohtan. \\
wlanec\; wig\; sminces. & \; weealcs\; offercoman. \\
eorlas\; ar\; hwac. & \; eard\; begeatan. \; (CCCC \; 173, \; fo. \; 27r, \; ff. \; 5-10)
\end{align*}
\]

("On this island there had never yet been greater slaughter, people killed by swords' edges, before this, as books tell us, old scholars, since here from the East, the Angles and Saxons came up over the broad seas, seeking Britain. Proud war-smiths overcame the Welsh, the glory-eager men conquered the land." *Brunanburh*, 937A, ll. 65b-73)

Here "bec" ('books') is placed in grammatical apposition with "uðwitan" ('scholars'), revealing just how completely the books themselves are perceived as authorities at the time of *Brunanburh*'s composition. A similar sense of textual authority can be seen in the entry in the Peterborough Chronicle under the year 1009: "Her on þissum geare g-wurdon þa scipu gearwe þe we ær ymbe spræcon. 7 heora wæs swa feala swa næfre ær þæs ðe us bec secgad on angelcynne ne gewurdon on nanes cynges dag" ("Here in this year the ships were ready that we spoke of earlier, and there were more of them, the

---

10 The three places I am considering here are the occurrences in 937ABCD, 979DE, and 1009E. A further reference to the coming of the Saxons occurs in Æthelweard's *Chronicle*, under the year 871. Like the passage in 851 discussed below, this Latin passage refers not to books but to knowledge acquired through hearing; I will discuss the passage from Æthelweard in more detail in Chapter 5.
books tell us, than there ever were before among the English people in any king's day"
Laud Misc. 636, fo. 43r l. 29-fo. 43v, l. 2). Although the chronicler here (and in
Brunanburh) refers to the written texts as speaking, the authority upon which he bases his
claim to knowledge of the past is again the authority of books. The common practice of
reading aloud from books may have been behind the equally common idiom in which
books spoke; certainly the common practice of reading aloud gave books a living voice.
But as in the example from The Battle of Brunanburh, the significant feature of this entry
lies in the reliance upon the authority of books for knowledge of the past.

Indeed, it seems at first glance that books are the only authorities capable of
backing up such a claim as this one, which involves implied comparisons of events
spanning nearly four centuries. Yet, especially in poetry, such a claim might conceivably
still be made without reference to books or book-learning, perhaps through a claim to
traditional knowledge such as that in Beowulf, ll. 38-40a:

\[
\text{ne hyrde ic cymlicor ceol gecyrwan} \\
\text{hildewæpnum ond headowædum} \\
\text{billum ond byrnum} \quad (\text{Cotton Vitellius A xv, fo. 129v.})
\]

(I never heard of a ship more beautifully prepared with war-weapons and battle-
garments, swords and mail-shirts).

As Ward Parks argues, such formulaic hyran-gefrignan claims function to locate the
discourse within the poetic tradition, within the scope of knowledge shared by both
speaker and hearer. That the Brunanburh poet and the annalist of 1009E refer to textual
authority rather than traditional oral authority (which stems from from the world of things
heard, not read) signals a well-developed sense of textuality, one which perceives texts
like the Chronicle itself as authoritative.

The examples from 937A and 1009E both come from at least two generations after
the original compilation of the Chronicle; the only similar passage which occurs in that
portion of the Chronicle known as the Common Stock can be found in annal 851A:
describing a battle at Acleah, the annalist writes, "7par h–t mæste wæl geslogon on 
haþnu– herige– þe we secgan hierdon òp þisne 7weardan dæg" ("and there [they]
accomplished the greatest slaughter of a heathen host that we have heard tell of up to this
present day" CCCC 173, fo. 12v, ll. 34-35). Here, although not referring explicitly to the
coming of the Saxons, the Common Stock chronicler does, in fact, make a claim to
knowledge from the world of oral discourse (using a phrase well-documented as an oral-
formulaic formula--secgan hierdon, cf. Beowulf l. 875). It is significant that such a claim
comes early in the development of the Chronicle, rather than late. Before a document like
the Chronicle had become a part of the Anglo-Saxon cultural capital, such claims could
only be based on traditional (oral) authority, not textual authority. The references to
textual authority for the adventus Saxonum in the later annals were made possible in the
first place by the prior existence of the Chronicle. The vernacular Chronicle (as well as
the Alfredian translations of Bede and other books like Orosius's history), when combined
with Alfred's program of increased vernacular literacy, made such comparisons possible,
because the history of England could then be found in books which were accessible to
many readers or listeners. Before Alfred's programs, such histories existed only in Latin,
and readers of Latin, the Preface to the Cura Pastoralis reminds us, were all too rare.

For the later chroniclers to refer to speaking books as historical records suggests
the extent to which the terms of Alfred's program obtained even after his own demise.
The practice of reading aloud from books is exactly what Alfred was attempting to
promote in his program. The continuing existence of Anglo-Saxon textual communities is
indicated in the passages from Brunanburh or from 1009E; the spoken word remained the
medium through which historical knowledge was disseminated, but books, not scops, had
become the crucial repositories of historical lore. The continuing legacy of Alfred's
program lay in the changes it brought about regarding the perception of books as
accessible repositories of knowledge, rather than arcane, foreign (and unusable) scholarly
treasures. Likewise, the changes Alfred's program engendered in the forms and habits of Anglo-Saxon literate culture were equally long-lasting. The developing nature of Anglo-Saxon literacy and its relationship with the role of the spoken word (as textual communities demanded a continuing mediation of texts through spoken language) makes the subject of my remaining chapters.
CHAPTER II
Cynewulf, Cyneheard, and Reading Anglo-Saxon Prose Narrative

The Cynewulf and Cyneheard story from the 755 annal is probably the best-known prose passage from the entire Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, and Francis Magoun's 1933 comment that it was "best known through its inclusion in practically all OE primers" (361) is surely still true today. In its retelling of a tale of revenge, presumably illicit sexual relations, night attacks, and a king who defends himself unheantlice ("not ignobly") at the very doorway of his lady's chamber, the 755 annal seems to provide a prose analogue to the tradition of Old English poems which celebrate the heroic deeds of both lords and their retainers. Small wonder, then, that the story traditionally called "Cynewulf and Cyneheard"1 has attracted the attention of scholars and anthologists. Most of the scholarship focusing on this tale, in fact, has at its heart concerns about the attitudes it reveals regarding the Germanic ideal of comitatus—the bond of mutual loyalty between a lord and his retainers. Ideas of comitatus and personal loyalty are central to the discussions of Magoun, Moorman, Towers, Waterhouse, Battaglia, and Wilson.

In its focus upon action and plot, however, this annal is commonly labelled as exceptional among the "pre-Alfredian" entries.2 The style and structure of this entry, along with the fact that the bulk of the tale looks forward to events twenty-nine years

---
1 The 755 annal is given this name in Mitchell and Robinson's Guide to Old English, as well as Whitelock's updated version of Sweet's Anglo-Saxon Reader, even though as early as 1933 Magoun suggested that aldorman Osric can be seen as the hero of the narrative.
2 Of the scholars mentioned above, Moorman, Towers, and Battaglia specifically comment upon this annal's stylistic differences from the surrounding material. Cecily Clark echoes such perceptions in her essay "The Narrative Mode."
beyond the year under which it is placed, have led scholars to the common opinion that it is "Clearly an interpolation" (Greenfield and Calder, 60). The source of the material which makes up the interpolation, however, has prompted a great deal of speculation, if little serious argument. A number of commentators claim a traditional oral source lies behind the narrative. Plummer, for example, compares the 755 annal with the Icelandic sagas: "The annal which most recalls the Sagas is the slaying of Cynewulf and Cyneheard under 755; and that too may have developed orally before it was written down" (Two Chronicles, ii, xx n.). Such claims for an oral predecessor for the Cynewulf and Cyneheard entry are a critical commonplace, repeated for example by Whitelock (Sweet's 1), Mitchell and Robinson (192), and W. F. Bolton (75). Not all scholars, however, ascribe an oral origin to the tale. Greenfield and Calder, in A New Critical History of Old English Literature, for example, are somewhat more cautious, writing, "the story is detailed in a prose that suggests an oral tradition or an even earlier written source" (60).

Discussions of the Cynewulf and Cyneheard story consistently assert the centrality of the ideas of comitatus and personal loyalty as well as the story's supposed origins in oral tradition. However, while the issues of loyalty and treachery are clearly raised by the text itself, the claim that the story has its roots in oral tradition is usually less effectively supported. The strongest support usually provided for this claim is the dubious assertion that the apparently exceptional style of the annal, its seeming lack of clear pronoun reference, and its carefully balanced narrative are features of a typically "oral" style.

Perhaps more obviously here than at any other point in the Chronicle, the critical habit of invoking orality to explain unusual or confusing features of a text is plainly at work. As such, it is crucially important to examine the textual history of this annal in order to determine whether or not there is any stronger evidence to suggest an "oral" component to this annal. Critical prejudgments about the influence of orality can be tested in the text of the 755 annal and its representations in the manuscripts which contain it.
The 755 annal, as a part of the Common Stock, is found in more or less the same form in the A, B, C, D, E, and G manuscripts of the Chronicle. The bilingual F manuscript contains only an abbreviated version of the story. James Wilson, discussing what is most interesting to scholars about the entry, notes "its ambiguous grammatical structure, which, along with textual variants, makes possible several different interpretations" (312). Wilson, however, like almost all commentators, bases his own investigation solely on the version of the story found in the Parker Chronicle (although a handful of the variants are occasionally noted or remarked). This privileging of the Parker Chronicle's version is explained, no doubt, by the fact that it is the closest in time to the Common Stock's compilation; however, it ignores the fact that the A manuscript has apparently been subject to its own fair share of scribal "corruption." The A version of this annal stands alone (or is supported in its readings by only the G ms, which was copied from it) in at least eight separate places, as I shall demonstrate below.

In fact, the actual degree of textual variation in this annal has often been glossed over or presented as minimal. In Sweet's Anglo-Saxon Reader, Whitelock admits that "better readings are occasionally preserved by other versions" than the Parker version, and regarding the Reader's text, she states: "Variant readings are given in the textual notes when of special interest, or when they could represent the original text, altered by A" (1). Whitelock includes such variants at thirteen points in the text. Admittedly, Whitelock is presenting a text for students, rather than a definitive edition, but the degree to which scholars have accepted her text as definitive is reflected by the number of articles which take her text of this annal as their standard. Plummer, although he prints texts from both the A and E mss, prints variant readings from the B, C, and D mss at only eight points. What these editions fail to reveal, however, is that excluding spelling variants between the mss, there are no fewer than ninety points in this annal at which there is a substantive variation in one or more of the manuscripts (see Appendix A). Nor are these variations
necessarily insignificant; at several places in the manuscript record, entire clauses are rewritten. Even these cases of extensive revision, however, are rarely cited in critical editions.

In this chapter, I examine the textual variations in the 755 annal throughout all of the manuscripts containing it, as well as the range of variation found in two later narrative entries from the Common Stock, those found under the years 871 and 878. These annals, too, evidence a range of textual variation wider than we might expect from looking at most modern editions. A comparison of the kinds and numbers of variants in these annals, I believe, suggests that scribes of the Chronicle (in our remaining manuscripts and those which preceded them) felt fairly free to alter the texts before them (and perhaps especially so in the case of the 755 annal). The degree of variation, indeed, is such that I feel it must make us reconsider our conception of the paradigms of scribal activity which we hold in our minds and apply (consciously or unconsciously) when reading these texts. For the Anglo-Saxons process of reading was not a silent, solitary one but one for which the act of public reading was central (Howe, "Cultural Construction"). Such a reading paradigm, I believe, can account for the kinds of textual variations we see in these Chronicle entries, as a paradigm of reading in public foregrounds the role of the reader's audience, whose role is all to easy for twentieth-century print-culture readers to forget or ignore. A consideration of Anglo-Saxon literate practice, as it included such public reading and the influence of textual communities, I believe, can help us understand the startling numbers of textual variants we find in these prose entries.

The suppression of information about the textual variation in the Chronicle's text results from print-literacy-based ideas about textual authority and the value (or perceived valuelessness) of textual variation. The editorial practice of modernizing punctuation and capitalization, however, likewise hides crucial clues about how Anglo-Saxon readers approached these texts. An examination of the use of capital letters in the prose annals
examined here reveals, however, that capitalization served to indicate the structure of these texts; although they have long been ignored by literary scholars and critics, the capital letters in the manuscript representation of these annals provide valuable clues about contemporary perceptions of the structure of these prose annals. In the 755 annal in particular, the use of capitals indicates that the significance of the story does not necessarily lie where literary critics have generally believed. Additionally, in some places textual variants seem to be related to variations in ms capitalization; considerations of both variation and capitalization are crucial for understanding the mechanisms of Anglo-Saxon literacy and scribal practice as well as for understanding the significance these annals held for their Anglo-Saxon audience.

**Textual Variation in the 755 Annal**

As mentioned above, there are upwards of ninety points in the 755 annal where one (or more) of the manuscripts has a substantive variation in the text. Even this figure, however, does not reveal the true extent of the variability found in the texts. Nearly a quarter of these loci yield three or more separate readings; at four points in the story, the six major manuscripts record five separate readings. The actual number of separate textual variants exceeds one hundred and ten. All this variation occurs in a piece of prose which barely exceeds four hundred fifty words. In what follows, I attempt to describe the variants found in the 755 annals of the separate *Chronicle* mss. In their disagreements and affinities they tell the tale of how this story was read by its contemporary readers.

The most useful method of investigating these textual variants, I believe, springs from a consideration of the idea of textual innovation. By an innovation, I mean a point where the text, as preserved in a particular manuscript, exhibits a reading which is demonstrably different from the reading at the same point in its exemplar. Unfortunately,
since we do not have preserved the exemplars of each text, it is useful and necessary to extend the meaning of innovation to also include textual variants which appear in a single manuscript (or within a group of closely related manuscripts) and which differ from a reading preserved identically in all other manuscripts (or manuscript families). Applying such a definition in practice, of course, is not quite as simple as we might wish; nevertheless, the concept of innovation makes simpler the task of understanding the nature of the textual variants in this annal. Examining the variants in question, we can see that textual variation is a significant feature of this annal; each scribe is responsible for between five and thirty innovations in the 755 text. The most prolific innovator is the scribe of the B manuscript; the most conservative is the scribe of the D manuscript.

Since the G manuscript, however, is a direct copy of the A manuscript, it is the best place to begin my examination of textual innovation in the Chronicle mss. The G manuscript has generally received little attention from students of Old English, for two reasons. First is the fact that it was almost completely destroyed during the 1731 Cotton library fire. Second, its status as a direct copy of the Parker manuscript has made it seem but a pale, late reflection of a much more interesting original. It contains no original annals or entries of its own, and hence has usually not been seen as particularly useful for either students of literature or students of history. Yet the G manuscript (both what physically remains of it, and what can be reconstructed—as has been done by Angelika Lutz—from Wheelocke's edition and Nowell's transcript) is a crucially important document. It is not only earlier in origin than the C, D, and E manuscripts, but its status as a direct copy of another, still extant, ms makes it unique among the Chronicle manuscripts for what it can tell us about how the Chronicle mss were written and read. As such the innovations in the G manuscript are both particularly easy to detect and particularly significant.
The G manuscript differs from the A manuscript in at least ten (possibly eleven) separate places within the 755 annal. Three are apparent deletions: G deletes the phrases "7 hiera se æþeling gehwælcum feoh 7 feorh gebead" ("and to each of them the prince promised life and property" 755, 18b) and "simle feohhtende væran of hie" ("[they] were continually fighting until they" 755, 19b); both could result from eyeskip, as the first is apparently a jump from one occurrence on "7 hiera" to another, and the second is a similar jump from "hie" to another occurrence of "hie." The third deletion cannot, however, be explained so simply; "swipe" is missing from G where A reads "se swipe gewundad wæs" ("he was greatly wounded" 755, 21b). Four of G's innovations involve the lexical replacement of words: wæs for wearp (755, 17b), gepingian for gepiegecean (755, 19b), wær on for hæfdon (755, 26d), and on for æt (755, 39a). Twice words are rearranged: G reads "wær on ofslegene" ("were slain" 755, 35a) for A's "ofslægene værun," and the genealogy is preceded by "se wæs offa þincferþing" rather than "wæs se offa þincferþing" ("This Offa was the son of þincferþ" 755, 45c). The final two innovations in the G version of the 755 annal are places where words are added by the G scribe: G reads "offa cyning" ("King Offa" 755, 44c) for A's simple "offa," and (possibly an innovation, possibly not) "7 an hund daga" ("and one hundred days" 755, 45b) for A's "7c. daga."

The extent of this sort of innovation, however, seems to have been almost systematically downplayed in critical editions. Even in Lutz's edition, the innovations are never considered in a group, being listed separately in small groups as 'deletions of one or more words' ("das Auslassen einzeller Wörter oder langerer Textpassagen"--xxiii, n.1), 'syntactically appropriate replacements,' or 'word-reversals' ("Veränderung der Wortstellung"--xxiii, n.3)--or noted only one-by-one in the end notes, far from the text itself.

Yet just because a deletion of a word or phrase can be plausibly explained as a case of eyeskip or change in word-order is not sufficient reason to dismiss it as
uninteresting or unintentional. Each innovation in ms G can help us understand Anglo-Saxon conventions of reading and writing; indeed, the number of innovations in this text forces us to conclude either that the G scribe was noticeably careless or else that our ideas of exact copying are inapplicable to his situation. I hope to show that the latter is the more reasonable alternative, and to propose a model for Anglo-Saxon reading and writing that can help us understand not only the innovations in the G text, but in the other texts as well. To do this, however, it is necessary to spend some time characterizing the innovations in the records of the 755 annal from each of the Chronicle mss.

Starting with the earliest manuscript, we can see that the A manuscript has only one reading unshared by the others, "his lic lip æt Wintanceastre" ("his body lies at Winchester" 755, 39a) where the rest read "on Wintanceastre" ("in Winchester"). However, since the G manuscript is a direct copy of the Parker Chronicle, it is only natural that A has few unparalleled innovations, since the G copy ought (in general) to share them. That the G manuscript reads differently here (and that G agrees with BCDE) suggests how unusual this innovation in the A manuscript really is.

There are a total of six innovations shared by the A manuscript and the G manuscript. Two of these are simple lexical rearrangements: "wærun feohtende" ("were fighting" 755, 15a) where the rest read "feohtende wæron," and "him mid" for "mid him" ("with him" 755, 36b). A third innovation is in the omission of "him" from the text where the others read "hæt hie him gesunde fram eoden" ("that they might go from them in health" 755, 31c). Two other innovations involve alterations only at the morphemic level: A and G read beode (755, 11a) for CDE's beođan (and B's ymbeodan) and gebed for BCDE's bed (755, 26c). A last innovation is the alteration of "hira nænig þicgan nolde" (ms B) to "hiera nænig hit gepicgean nolde" (755, 19c). Other places where readings

---

3 A's gebed would presumably be seen in G, but this clause has been deleted from G; see above.
from A and G are not seen in other mss occur at spots where there are multiple readings which make identifying innovations more problematic; these will be discussed below.

The B text of the Chronicle is, besides A, the only other manuscript to antedate ms G; significantly, it is also the most innovative record of the 755 annal, containing no fewer than 30 innovations in its version of the Cynewulf and Cyneheard story. The B scribe clearly takes an active role in the recreation of the text before him. At two places, he completely rewrites entire clauses in his text (755, 15c; 19a). He is, however, also deeply concerned with trying to improve the flow and the consistency of the story—five times he deletes the mark for "ond" when it precedes "pa", leaving us simply "then," rather than "and then" (755, 9a; 12a; 26c; 29a; 31a).4 He has an obvious preference for the abbreviation for "paet" ("p−"), using it in place of op (twice—755, 2a; 13a; also op− for op once—755, 20c), opəet (755, 4b; 15b; 35c), for the relative pronoun se (755, 37a), and once for aer (755, 11b).5 At two points (755, 30a; 44b), he adds the pronoun "p−" for clarification of reference. Two of his innovations involve the deletion of pronominal subjects ("he") he sees as redundant (7555, 12b; 38a). The B scribe also makes seven lexical substitutions (755, 5b; 10c; 11a; 28a; 29b; 32a; 36a) and two rearrangements of lexical items (755, 13c; 18e). At one point (755, 7b), he adds the adverb ui to the verb adraefan, and he adds the phrase "on hine" to the phrase which reads in other mss, "hie simle feohende waeran" ("they were continually fighting"—755, 19d).

Simon Taylor, in his edition of the B manuscript, comments upon almost all of these alterations, concluding that in a remarkable number of cases, they amount to improvements in the style or clarity of the text. For example, he notes: "B displays a degree of sophistication in its use of grammar and syntax at 755 (p. 26/27-30) when it

---

4 A probable further example of the deletion of "7" is subsumed in the variation at (755, 15c), one of the clauses rewritten by the B scribe.

5 Taylor considers all of these to be scribal errors: "all B's errors in this long entry consist in the writing of paet, once for aer, three times for op(paet)" (lii).
omits *ond*, thus creating one subordinate and one main clause from two paratactical main clauses" (xcii). He notes other omissions resulting in "an improvement in the style of the text" (lxxxix-xl), as well as additions which he sees as improvements (xc-xl). Indeed, except for the B scribe's use of the abbreviation "*p-*" for "*pet,*" Taylor sees almost all of the idiosyncracies of the B-text as either improvements or merely neutral alternative readings.

No other single manuscript features as much textual innovation as does the B text. The next most innovative manuscript is the E ms, with twenty-three innovative elements, while each of the remaining manuscripts features fewer than ten.

The C manuscript has nine apparent innovations. For example, C reads "*he him lengest mid wunode*" ("who dwelt longest with him"), and is the only ms to include the preposition *mid* (755, 3a). A second innovation is the omission of the phrase "*7 pa utræsde on hine 7 hine miclum gewundode*" ("and then rushed out on him and greatly wounded him" 755, 13a)—although this could have been a case of eyeskip, since the next phrase in C likewise begins with the abbreviation for *ond*. Immediately after this omission, however, C inserts *pa* into the phrase "*hie ealle pa on bone cing feohende waeron*" ("then they were all fighting against the king" 755, 14a), an addition which suggests the scribe may have been trying to improve the flow of the narrative where it seemed awkward to him—a significant detail to find immediately following an apparent omission in his text. A number of C's innovations involve substitutions, either at the lexical or morphemic level: *of* for *on* (755, 4a); *him pa* for *hiera* (755, 18c); *bryttiscan* for *bryttiscum* (755, 20b); *gemettun* for *metton* (755, 25a); and *geara* for *wintra* (755, 38c). Perhaps the most interesting innovation in the C version of this annal, however, is in its description of the wounded survivor of the second battle: rather than being described as "the aldorman's godson," the C text reads "*pæs duces godsum*" ("the war-leader's godson"—755, 37a).
The D manuscript is less innovative. The D version of this annal has five clear innovations, most of which are relatively small matters. In a fairly clear case of eyeskip, the D ms, jumps from one occurrence of Cyneheard's name to the next, leaving out three or four words: "haten [7] se cyneheard" ("called [Cyneheard] [and] this Cyneheard..."
755, 8c). The D text likewise features two relatively uncomplicated lexical substitutions, reading of for oft (755, 6b) and pæt for pæt pæt (755, 32b). Also, the last line of this annal in the D manuscript reads "was se of sa was pincereping" ("This Offa was the son of Pincereb"--755, 45c). The word-order in this clause is not preserved in any other ms, and the extra "was" is apparently erroneous. Ms D also omits the phrase "7 he wraec pone aldorman cumbran" ("and he avenged Cumbra the aldorman"--755 5a), although this is likely to be a case of eyeskip as well.

The last manuscript to be copied, the E manuscript, has innovative readings in twenty-three spots. Possibly due to the E manuscript's relatively late date in the early twelfth century, twelve of the E innovations in the 755 annal are morphological in nature: addition or deletion of the "ge-" prefix (755, 8a; 9b; 25a); variations in inflectional endings (755, 1b; 10a; 16a; 18d; 28c; 31b; 43b); or substitution of prefixes (755, 11c; 34a). E also once reads "lyt" for the "lytelle" ("small") of the others (755, 9c). The subject of a clause is deleted at one point, leading to an apparently faulty construction--"pa ridon [hi] pider 7 his aldorman Osric" ("Then [they] rode thither, and Osric his [the king's] aldorman")--yet the subject can be construed as the earlier-occurring phrase "the king's thanes." Other minor deletions occur in 755, 18c and 755, 35b. The scribe of E, as well as the ancestor of D and E, miswrites the numeral which indicates the length of Cynewulf's reign: E has ".xvi." (755, 7a), while most mss have ".xxxi." and the ancestor of DE must have read ".xxi." as does D. Other innovations are the replacement of the ambiguous "7 he wraec pone aldorman cumbran" ("and he avenged Cumbra the aldorman") with the specific "sea swan wraec oone ealdorman cumbran" ("The swineherd avenged Cumbra the aldorman"--
755, 5b). Similarly, an object is moved to a position after its verb in the phrase "feahm mccliclum gefeahm" ("fought great battles"—755, 6c) rather than "mccliclum gefeohdum feahm" ("great battles fought"), while ABCDG's "7 beornraed feng to rice" appears in E as "7 ha feng beornred to rice" ("and then Beornred succeeded to the kingdom"—755, 42b). The other changes, perhaps, are more interesting. In one case a clause is rewritten (755, 19a): where D agrees with C in reading "7 heora nægn þiegan noldan" ("and none of them would accept"), E reads "heo nægn þicgan noldan" ("they would accept nothing"). In others, lexical items are replaced, perhaps with more familiar terms or those seeming more appropriate. In one such case, the E manuscript reads "hig ealle ofstægene wæron" ("they all were slain"—755, 20a) where the other mss read "hie ealle lægon" ("they all lay [dead]"). In another, the E ms has "flugon" ("fled"—755, 36a) where the others have "fulgon" ("entered"). Here, the similarities in spelling and sound no doubt contributed to the different reading, that this innovation still works semantically only made it more likely to pass the scribe's scrutiny.⁶

The innovations shared by the A and G manuscripts have been detailed above, but even though there are no other remaining pairs of manuscripts which stand in quite such a close relationship, it is commonly noted that the B and C mss are closely related to each other (for this portion of the Chronicle, Taylor, for example, cautiously suggests, "C's exemplar for 653 to 946 may have been the exemplar used by B"—xxxvii), while D and E, as representatives of the "Northern Recension," likewise share a common background. These genetic relationships are clearly reflected in the textual history of the 755 annal; versions B and C share sixteen textual innovations, while D and E share thirteen.

---

⁶ Ms E also reads "wryftes flodan" for A's "pryttes flodan." This is clearly a case of miswriting (or misreading) the relatively unusual Anglo-Saxon "p" as the more common (and similarly shaped) "wynn. This may be evidence that the E scribe may have been unfamiliar with this place-name, or unable to associate it with the Cynewulf-Cyneheard story.
Innovations shared by manuscripts within such a manuscript family presumably point to an earlier innovation in a common earlier exemplar (or exemplars).

Three of the sixteen innovative features shared by B and C are simple deletions of essentially redundant words: "7" ("and") at a clause beginning (75538b); "se" (in "se kynewulf") once (755, 6a) and "ha" ("then") once (755, 17a). At another point, an occurrence of "ha" is replaced by "hie" ("they"), initiating a new clause, rather than simply continuing the previous one (755, 26b). In three places individual words (preposition, subject and object, respectively) are added for clarification: BC have "oft mid myclum gefeofhtum feahht" ("often with great battles fought"--755, 6b) as opposed to "oft michum gefeochtum feahht," as well as "7 he hine þær(inne) berad" ("and he rode upon him there[en]"--755, 10b) where the others omit the pronominal subject, and "7 hit lytle hwele heold" ("and held it a brief time"--755, 43a). Two other innovations are simply rearrangements of lexical items: BC read "bæftæn him" ("behind him"--755, 22a) for "him beaeftæn," and "wæs ofslegen" ("was slain"--755, 22b) for "ofslægen wæs." Three other features shared only by these mss are lexical innovations. The BC reading of "pa burh" ("the town"--755, 10d) for "bone bur" ("the bower") is frequently noted, but BC also read "uteode" ("went out"--755, 12c) for the others' "eode" ("went") and "æghwilcum" for "gehwelcum" (both meaning "to each one"--755, 18d). Two final innovations occur at the level of phrasing: B and C read "amunden þe ma" where other mss have "onmunden þon(ne) ma" ("consider any more"--755, 34a), and BC also read "ecgfeorð his sumu" where others read "his sumu ecgfeorð heold". ("Ecgfeorht his son ruled"--755, 45a), rearranging and deleting the essentially redundant verb.

Manuscripts D and E are recognized as representatives of the so-called "Northern Recension" of the Chronicle. And although it might be difficult to attribute any shared features to the original preparation of the Northern Recension, some of the features D and E share in this annal do seem to reflect a Northern perspective or interest. For example, in
the material following the Cynewulf and Cyneheard story proper, D and E have "offa geflemde beornred 7 feng to pam rice" ("Offa put Beornred to flight and took the kingdom"—755, 44a), rather than the simpler "offa feng to rice" of A. Likewise, we read in D and E that Æþelbald's body "raested" ("rests"—755, 41a) in Repton, rather than merely "lið" ("lies"), and these two manuscripts are likewise the only ones to tell us that he had ruled for forty-one years (755, 42a). Other changes are less suggestive of any Northern influence. There are, for example, other lexical changes: "on" for "æt" in "on axanmynster" describing Cyneheard's resting place (755, 39b), "oð" for "oppæt" (755, 35c), and "brytwyliscum" rather than "bryttiscu-" (755, 20b). The word "peah" ("though") is deleted from both at 755, 38a. DE also read, at one point, "brytwelas" (755, 6d), while the other mss follow A's "bretwalu-." Twice lexical items are rearranged: "an swan hine ofstang" is found in DE (755, 4c), rather than "hine an swan ofstang" ("a swineherd stabbed him") and these mss once have "wær ofsægene" (755, 35a) where the rest have "ofslægene wærun" ("were slain"). DE also add "his mæge" ("his kinsman") to the first clause (755, 1a) to indicate that Sigebrith and Cynewulf were related. The length given for Cynewulf's reign in D (21 years) and in E (16 years), as noted above, suggests that a common ancestor must have read ".xxi." for the other mss' ".xxxi." (755, 7a). Lastly, both D and E fail to include Offa's genealogy beyond his father (755, 46a).

The concept of textual innovation cannot account for all of the textual variants in the 755 annal, however. In at least seven places (755, 8b; 18a; 24a; 26a; 28b; 33a; 44c), no text can be identified confidently as an innovation either because all of the independent records have different readings or there is insufficient consensus among the manuscript "families" to determine which branch might contain the innovation. Consider, for example, the variations in this passage:

7 his aldorman osric 7 wiferb his þegn 7 pa men þe (all mss)
he beaftan him lafde ær (mss AG)
he ær him beaftan lafde (ms B)
he ær beæftan læfde
he him beæftan ær læfde
he hi- beæfton læfde ær

(“and his alderman Ostric, and Wiferp his thane, and the men whom he left behind [him] earlier”). Here, the meaning is practically identical in each case; only the word order has been altered. All five of the ABCDE texts may be innovations; it is impossible to guess what might have been in a predecessor of any of those manuscripts and it is likewise unproductive to attempt to do so. Alternatively, consider a passage such as this one:

ma þe

eowre geferan (ACG)
heora geferan (BDE)
þe mid þam cyninge
ofslægene wæræ (ABC)
wæræn ofslægene (DEG)

"more than your/their companions who were slain with the king." Here, we can identify innovations within the second set of variants because we know the G reading must be an innovation (since it was copied from A); thus the DE reading is an innovative reading of a single family of mss against the readings of the other two groups (ABC). For the first set of variants, however, it must remain unclear which reading is innovative, as both appear in two separate manuscript families, with no factor favoring either reading. As a result, statements made about the significance of the shift to direct discourse in this annal can be seen to be on shaky ground at best; although the shift is documented in three mss, it appears as likely to be a textual innovation as to be original.

In each case where the location of innovation is indeterminate, each alternative is clearly textually justifiable, and each is therefore "correct" in every meaningful sense. Passages like these suggest that variations of this sort cannot be simply dismissed as scribe "errors" or "lapses." These variations after all, make perfectly good sense, syntactically and semantically. So, in fact, do almost all of the innovations within the 755 annal which I have described in this section. The degree to which the variation in the 755
annal is normal and the degree to which it is exceptional, however, can only be determined after a comparison with similar prose passages from the Common Stock.

Textual Variation in the 871 and 878 Annals

The 871 and 878 entries are two of the longer annals from the Common Stock; both deal with King Alfred's battles against the invading Danes. The 871 annal is most notable for its account of Alfred's accession to the Wessex throne; the 878 annal records Alfred's encounters with Guðrum and his eventual baptism, for which Alfred stood as sponsor. As such, these annals are chiefly read for their historical, rather than literary, value. Yet in their textual variations, these annals (and others like them) are almost as interesting and complicated as the 755 annal. They are certainly just as important for the ways in which they can help improve our understanding of the mechanism by which the prose annals of the Chronicle were copied.

Although the 871 and 878 annals together are slightly longer than the 755 annal, they do not exhibit as many textual variants as are contained within the story of Cynewulf and Cyneheard. In fact, between them, the two later annals evidence textual variants at only sixty-six points, as opposed to the ninety-one points of variation in the 755 annal. Likewise, the total number of textual innovation within these annals is lower; since almost all of the textual variations are confined to but a single manuscript or manuscript family, the total number of innovations is below eighty.

In contrast to the record of the 755 annal, the most innovative manuscript regarding these two entries is (by the slimmest of margins) the A manuscript (mirrored, of course, by G), rather than the B ms. The AG family shows sixteen innovations in these entries⁷; B has fifteen. A alone has but one innovation unshared by G (878A's "wilsætan"

---

⁷ Seventeen, if we count 878A's wilsætan, where 878BCDEG read wilsæte.
at 878, 13b), and G departs from A in only three places: "wilsæte" for the above reading in 878A, "paer" for a clause-subject "he" near the end of 878G (878, 23b), and the omission of the word "miclu-" from the 878 entry's last clause (878, 24a).

Ten of the AG mss' sixteen shared innovations in these entries fall in the 871 annal. Three of these are omissions. For example, 871AG fails to include "mynster" in the designation of Æþered's burying place, reading only "winburnan" (871, 25a). A and G also omit the phrase "to readingum" from the description of the movements of the "sumorlida" (871, 24a), and neither contains the first reference to Sidroc: "7 heora ðær weard opor ofslegen þæs nama wæs sidroc" ("and one of them was there slain whose name was Sidroc"--871, 3a). Oddly enough, twice A and G seem to replace plural forms by singular, thus we see "ii. monap" for "ii. monþas" (871, 18b) and "anlipig aldormon" for "ealdormen" (871, 31a). One of the innovations in 871AG is purely morphological: "gefeah" for "feah" (871, 11a). The replacement of "ða" with "þes" (871, 4a) alters the sentence structure to conform more closely to that of the annal's first clause, while A's interlinear insertion of the title "eorl" at the notice of young Sidroc's death (871, 14a) is followed by this word's inclusion into the main text of G. The Tironian abbreviation for "ond" is inserted in 871, 30b. A typical rearrangement of words results in AG's phrase, "gemette hie æþelwulf aldorman" ("they met aldorman Æþelwulf"--871, 2a).

The innovations of A and G in the 878 annal seem at first glance to form no particular pattern. The first one we encounter is the curious misplacement of the abbreviation for "ond" in the phrase which reads in AG, "geridon wessexena lond 7 gesåton micel þæs foices 7 ofer sæ adrafdon" ("[they] rode on West Saxon land and besieged a great portion of that people and drove them over the sea"--878, 2b), where the other mss read "they rode on West Saxon land and besieged it, and drove a great portion of that people over the sea." A and G omit one long clause, that which reads, in ms B, "7 paer wæs se gulfana genumen de hie hræfn heton" ("and there was the battle-standard
which they call 'Raven' captured"--878, 8b). Three times these manuscripts make
additions to the text: "him to comon" (with 'mon' an interlinear additon to A, 878, 13a) for
"him coman," and "gelæston swa" ("[they] performed [that] so") for the simple "gelæston"
(878, 20a). In 878, 20b, the phrase "to him" is added. The other innovation shared by A
and G in the 878 annal is the replacement of the relative pronoun "he" with the equivalent
"se" (878, 14a).

The B manuscript is the next most innovative throughout these two annals, with
fifteen total innovations, eleven in the 871 entry and four in 878. As in the 755 annal, the
B scribe is concerned with clarifying the text in the 871 annal, regularly improving
transitions or adding subjectival pronouns not included in the other texts: "hie" is inserted
once (871, 15a) and "ha" once (871, 20a). He also clarifies or elaborates whole clauses.
B reads "7 þær wearð aþelwulf ealderman ofslægen" ("and there was aldorman Æþelwulf
slain"--871, 7a), where the others read "7 æþelwulf aldorman wearþ ofslægen" as well as
rewriting clauses. On such case of rewriting yields "7 þær wearð feala þusenda ofslægen"
("and there were many thousands slain"--871, 15b) rather than the more difficult "7 fela
þusenda ofslægenra" ("and many thousands of slain") which forces readers to continue to
apply the verbal phrase "there were" from a point much earlier in the text. A second
example involves rewriting "7 on feohende wæron op niht" to read as a separate clause "7
hie op niht feohende wæron" (871, 16a). B makes two uncomplicated substitutions,
"wearð" for "wæs" (871, 6a) and "gewurdan" for "wurdon" (871, 29a). At one point B
omits the word "here" (871, 17b), at another he deletes the word "bone" (871, 27a). He
twice varies the phrase "ælfred his broþor" (which occurs four times in the annal) with
"his broþor ælfrēd" ("his brother Ælfrēd"--871, 8b; 17a). The B manuscript's innovations
in the 878 annal are not too dissimilar. B deletes an unnecessary "7" from the transition
phrase "7 þær" ("and then"--878, 17a), and replaces the simplex "rice" with the compound
"cynerice" ("kingdom"--878, 18c). Uncharacteristically, B appears to make two errors in
the 878 annal, writing "sere" for "se here" ("the army"--878, 18a) and omitting a syntactically necessary prepositional phrase, "æt alre" (878, 22a), although this seems to occur at an erasure and may simply have been recognized as a problem by the scribe which was never rectified (see Taylor li, 37).

Only six innovations appear in the C manuscript versions of these two annals. In 871C, we see "feahæd wið" ("fought against"--871, 13a) with its repeated verb rather than simply "wip" and "gelæðære" ("every"--871, 21a) for "gelæðære" ("each"). This annal also records the burying place of Ælfræd's father as Sherborne, rather than Wimborne (871, 25a). 878C in two places adds transition words: "þær" ("there"--878, 2a) and "þæs" ("from there [or then]"--878, 15a). The C manuscript also rewrites an entire clause in this annal; rather than reading "r him to gecirðon" ("and [they] submitted to them"), 878C reads "b--folc him to gebigæde" ("and that folk bowed down to them"--878, 4a).

The D manuscript has even fewer innovations: four in 871D and one in 878D. At two places, the D ms has omissions: the single word "þæm" at 871, 30c, and a possible case of eyeskip at the transition between the bottom of fo. 33v and the top of fo. 34r, resulting in the deletion of the phrase "wearþ sidræc eorl ofþælægæn se ealda. 7" (871, 13b). Also, 871D reads "rædan" for "ræda" ("raid"--871, 32a). Once in each annal, the D ms also presents a different lexical item than the other mss: "wunigænde" ("dwelling"--878, 10a) rather than "winnende" ("battling") and "gelæðære" (871, 6b) for "gelæðære."

Manuscript E, however, is fairly innovative in these annals, with seven innovations in 871E and four in 878E. Three of these are morphemic variations "hæpenæ" for "hæþænæ" (871, 10a), "genæmæn" for "namæn" (871, 18a), "hwæðære" for "gelæðære" (871, 21a), and "deñenæ scære" for "defæna scære" (878, 6a). Three of E's innovations in these annals are single-word deletions: E deletes the verb "wearþ" from what reads in other mss as "þæer wearþ heahmund bæc-- ofþælægæn" ("there was Bishop Heahmund slain"--871, 22a), deletes the title "cyning" from "æþæred cyning" ("King Æþæred"--871, 19a),
and reads "ealne here" rather than "alne bone here" ("all the army"—878, 16a). Four of the remaining innovations are essentially lexical substitutions. E reads "rad" ("rode"—871, 1a) for "cuom" (came") in the first clause of 871, for example, and the simpler "And ymb" ("And about"—871, 8a) for the others' "7 þæs ymb" ("and from then about"). Likewise 871E reads "aet er eastron" ("after Easter"—871, 24b) instead of "ofer eastron" ("during Easter"). Possibly influenced by the E ms's "cyn" for "cyning," E reads "prittigum" where AD read "pritiga" (878, 21a). Finally, there appears to be a true scribal error in 878E, where we read "wealhudu" for "sealhudu" ("Selwood").

Both the BC and DE manuscript groups also exhibit certain innovations, eight in the BC texts and six in the DE texts. The BC group twice alters transitions, writing "eft ymb" ("after about"—871, 1b) for "ymb" in 871BC and deleting "7" once in 878, 21b. B and C make a major change at one point in 878, writing simply "westsexna rice" (878, 6a) for the more complex "west sexu– on defena scire" recorded in the other manuscripts. The other innovations shared by B and C in these annals are alterations at the word or inflectional level: in 871BC we have "geongra" ("younger"—871, 14b) for "gioncga" ("young") and "westsexan" (871, 33a) for "westseaxe." 878BC also features "wintres" for "wintra" (878, 5b), "on" for "in" (878, 21c), and ".lx." for ".xl." (878, 8a).

Manuscripts D and E share only one innovation in the 871 annal, an occurrence of the article "ham" for "by" (871, 30a). In 878DE, there are two shared omissions, the phrases "7 him to gecirdon" ("and [they] submitted to them"—878, 4a) and "mid. xxiii. scipum" ("with twenty-three ships"—878-7a). D and E also read "sloh" for "ofslag" ("slew"—878, 7b) and "gisis" for "foregisis" ("hostages"—878, 18b). Lastly, D and E rearrange the words "onfeng þær" to read "þær onfeng" ("there received"—878, 22c).

Again, this accounting of identifiable innovations in individual manuscripts or related groups of manuscripts is unable to account for all of the textual variations in these annals. At five points in these annals (871, 3a; 878, 4b; 7a; 11a; 15b), there are variations
for which a lack of agreement between different ms families makes it indeterminate where the innovations took place, and the various readings seem equally reliable. Even these, however, are not quite as complex as the indeterminacies in the 755 annal--none of these points preserves more than four variant readings, and two of them have but two dissimilar readings.

**Textual Innovation and the Copying of Prose in the Chronicle**

The sheer number of textual variations and manuscript innovations in all three of these entries makes it abundantly clear that textual variation is the rule in the prose of the Common Stock, not the exception. This idea should come as no surprise, perhaps, considering Bernard Cerquiglini's 1989 statement, "Medieval writing does not produce variants, it is variance" (quoted in Fleischmann 27). In this section, I investigate the significance of the variants discussed in the previous sections of this chapter, describe how they might arise naturally from medieval processes of reading and writing, and illustrate how modern textual practices have devalued textual variations and simultaneously prevented us from understanding their origins in medieval textual processes.

One of the first things we notice after observing the number of textual variants in the 755, 871, and 878 annals is the remarkable fact that very few of these variations can with any confidence be described as errors. Of all the innovations catalogued above, no more than a dozen are certainly errors (and this number is probably generous). The most obvious candidates, those omissions resulting from eyeskips, only occasionally result in a defective text. This does seem to occur in 755D, 871D, and 878B, although this last manuscript's incomplete state and the fact that the 878B omission occurs on an erasure seem to indicate that even here the scribe knew there was something wrong. Other than
that, even the lengthiest eyeskip omissions almost always fail to corrupt either the syntax or the sense of these annals.

Yet even recent editions tend to fill in these apparent omissions. Consider, for example, this passage from Lutz's edition of ms G, annal 755:

7 ða on ðæs wifes gebærum onfundan ðæs cyninges þegnas ða unstylnesse ða þider urnon swa hwelc swa þonne gearo wæs 7 ræðost [7 híora se æpeling gehwæcum feoh 7 feorh gebead] 7 híora næsing hit gehingian nolde. Ac híe [simple feohende wæran ðe híe] ealle lægon butan anum brytiscum gisle (Version G 29)

("And then, by the woman's shouts, the king's thanes discovered the unrest and then ran thither whichever was then ready and quickest; and the nobleman promised to each of them life and property, and none of them would reconcile themselves with it. But they were continually fighting until they all lay dead except one British hostage.")

Here, the bracketed passages are from ms A; there is no evidence for them in the records of ms G. Yet the passage still makes sense (although perhaps a slightly different sense) as it stood in manuscript G:

7 ða on ðæs wifes gebærum onfundan ðæs cyninges þegnas ða unstylnesse ða þider urnon swa hwelc swa þonne gearo wæs 7 ræðost 7 híora næsing hit gehingian nolde. Ac híe ealle lægon butan anum brytiscum gisle

("And then, by the woman's shouts, the king's thanes discovered the unrest and then ran thither whichever was then ready and quickest, and none of them would settle it. But they all lay dead except one British hostage.")

Indeed, the passage as it stands in this version suggests a possible explanation for the appearance of the verb gehingian—in the context of the G version, gepicegan could not work, since there is nothing for the thanes to possibly receive (cf. Lutz 158-59: gehingian, ganz ähnlich geschrieben wie gepicegan, passte deshalb rechte gut in den Kontext von G"). But there is clearly something for them to settle. The G scribe is here writing a coherent text, one which tells an understandable story. The fact that it does not match up with his exemplar seems, perhaps, unsettling to us, but in the consistency of his
alterations and their syntactic and semantic appropriateness it seems unwise to label them "errors."

That these variants are not simply errors is confirmed by the fact that they often appear to have no simple explanation for their existence. Textual variations explainable through eyeskip, or dittography, or similar letters or word shapes can be dismissed as "mere errors," but many of the variants in these annals cannot be dismissed so easily. For example, manuscript C's replacement of "ealdormannes" with "duxes" in 755 cannot be an error. 755BC's "pa burh" for the "pone bur" of the other mss can only be partially be dismissed as resulting from word-similarity; after all, the article, too, has been altered to make the substitution work, and that would not happen through simply misreading the word "bur." Likewise, changes such as 878G's "paer" for "he" (878ABCDE) make perfect grammatical sense but it is difficult to see how this variant could arise from a simple visual error. Finally, 871B's twice-repeated replacement of "Ælfred his broþur" with "his brodor Ælfred" cannot be accidental; rather it is patently a conscious variation of an otherwise overly-redundant formula. Examples such as these can be found repeatedly in all three of the annals examined here and elsewhere in the prose of the Chronicle.

Many of the other innovations we see in these texts can, in fact, be seen as attempts to clarify or improve the text. Many of the places where the six manuscripts preserve multiple readings, I believe, must indicate places where more than one scribe felt that the text could be improved. The clearest example of this is in the 878 annal:

```
7 he for ymb (ABDEG)
7 he for þæs embe (C)
ane niht of þam wicu- to iglea
7 þæs ymb one (A)
7 þæs eft embe one niht (BC)
7 þæs eft ymb one (D)
7 þæs ymb one niht (EG)
to epandune
```
"and he travelled [C: from there] about one night [later] from the camps to *Iglea* (Iley Oak) and from there [BCD: after] about one [BCEG: night] to *Epandune* (Edington)."

The additions of "eft" or "niht" or both to the portion describing the movement to Edington in all manuscripts after A suggests that scribes understood this passage but also felt it needed a bit of patching up. (The reading in A, of course, need not represent the earliest reading, but the versions in the other mss certainly seem to point to an early reading later readers felt was unsatisfactory.)

Other changes seem equally designed as attempts to improve the text. One of the major categories of textual innovation throughout consists of transition words and phrases between clauses, such as "ond," "pa," "op" and "paer." Fully an eighth of the identifiable innovations in these three annals feature the addition or deletion of one or more of these words, twenty times in the 755 annal alone. Scribes dealing with these annals were clearly concerned with the flow of the text; these changes rarely alter the content of the annals, but they certainly affect the relationships between clauses and the flow of the prose.

Some of the other innovations are equally clear attempts to improve the text. In the 755 annal, for example, E reads "sæ swan wraec ðone ealdorman cumbran" ("the swineherd avenged the alderman Cumba") rather than using the unclear pronoun "he" in ACG's "7 he wraec ðone ealdorman cumbran" ("and he avenged the alderman Cumba"). A pair of innovations shared by 755DE are likewise improvements, probably wrought during the compilation of the Northern Recension: "raested" for "lib" and the information that Offa put Beornred to flight. A number of other innovations may likewise be read as improvements, although such subjective judgments are difficult to confirm.

Clearly, then, innovations within these texts are rarely "errors," although editors have tended to treat them as such. The project of accounting for variations as errors, in fact, springs from our print-centered ideas about the immutability and authority of text. To our print-influenced sensibilities, the act of reading is one of recreating in our own
minds precisely the words (and we believe, the meaning) of the "author" of the text; scribal activity is seen as a source of corruption, often screening us from the actual words of the "author." The Anglo-Saxon conception of the reading act, however, was somewhat different from our own; the text had a different sort of authority in the medieval period in general. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle's existence as a text without a clearly identified author is indicative of the way in which the Chronicle's authority lay in its own text. The realities of medieval textual production, and the conception of reading as public performance (and perhaps even perceptions of the Chronicle as a document being constantly written) put the authority of the Chronicle not in a generally inaccessible "master copy," but in the text at hand.

But realizing that the authority of the Chronicle manuscripts did not necessarily depend upon their being perceived as word-for-word copies of an "original" does not explain the degree of variation within them. Each scribe, for example, had at least one authoritative text before him, and would presumably copy it to the best of his ability. Yet this idea--copying to the best of a scribe's ability--naturally raises the question of what the reading and writing processes in Anglo-Saxon England really involved.

As I noted in Chapter One, the paradigm of reading current in Anglo-Saxon England at the time of the Chronicle's compilation and thereafter was based largely upon the kind of textual communities familiar to Alfred and fostered by his translation and literacy program. Alfred himself belonged to a textual community consisting chiefly of himself and his closest scholar/advisers: Asser, John the Old Saxon, Plegmund, and Grimbald. These scholars read and interpreted texts for Alfred, and it is likely that when Alfred insisted his aldormen either learn to read or make arrangements for others to read to them he was envisioning much the same sort of reading and interpretive activity. Likewise, the kinds of reading activity likely to take place in monastic or scholastic
settings (recall that part of Alfred's program involved schooling) also favored interpretive activity. In these settings, a single reader generally read to a fairly large audience.

Could such a reading context lie behind the variations in these prose sections of the *Chronicle*: a paradigm of reading that was open to textual variation and improvement, rather than based upon the ideal of slavish re-creation of an authorial original? Such a conception of reading and scribal activity helps us understand, for example, that changes like the common word-order reversals such as "waeron ofslægene" for "ofslægene waeron" (755DE, G) were essentially value-neutral. Reversals of this sort neither impoverished nor improved the text; alterations such as this, in fact, must have constituted successful copying, just as they would serve during public reading, at least where the *Chronicle* was concerned. Many of the other alterations are likewise clearly value-neutral from such a perspective, or were attempts to actively improve upon the text of the exemplar.

The kind of reading one would practice before an audience does seem to have influenced the scribes of the *Chronicle*. Evidence for this conclusion lies in the fact that as readers, the scribes of the *Chronicle* did not tend to reread the text before them. Many of the textual innovations described in this chapter provide evidence that scribes tended to make changes in their text in order to accommodate other, previous innovations, rather than to correct them. For example, the clause re-written by scribe B in the 755 annal seems to be such a case. Taylor writes:

> B's version is too different from the others, and too coherent in itself, to be due entirely to careless copying. It is possible that B's version did in fact begin life as a copying error which the scribe corrected almost immediately. He then made an intelligent and successful attempt at rectifying without having to erase (lv-lvi).

As discussed above, G's reading of *gebingian* may be a similar case. Another case was also described earlier, but bears reviewing: in 871B, we read "7 þær wearð feal þusenda ofslegen" ("and there were many thousands slain") for the others' "7 fela þusenda"
"ofslaegenra" ("and many thousands of slain"). Here in B, a clause is made out of a phrase by the addition of "paer wearð;" this prompts a second innovation, the alteration of the noun form "ofslaegenra" to the participle "ofslegem." Examples like this suggest that writers like the scribe of B were most concerned with writing coherent texts, more or less on the fly. Their purpose was less to copy an existing coherent text exactly than to produce a new coherent text. The scribe of B was not prompted by the apparent appearance of "ofslaegenra" in his exemplar to go back and "correct" his text, or to make it match his exemplar; rather, he simply made another alteration in order to produce a viable text.

The kind of reading (and writing) practiced by the copyers of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, then, was apparently heavily influenced by a paradigm of reading which featured public reading for an audience rather than silent, solitary, and reflective reading. The scribes of the Chronicle participated in the construction of the Chronicle text by altering it and improving it (as they might if actually reading before an audience) in anticipation of audience concerns. Such a conception of the reading and writing process can explain the wide range of textual variation and innovation seen in these annals; modern ideas of texts and print-imposed textual uniformity not only cannot explain such variation but have, as I have argued, tended to minimize it, misrepresent it, or ascribe it to the influence of orality.

But where the high degree of textual variation seems to be related to the Anglo-Saxon literate practice of reading aloud, in that producing readable text sequentially seems more important than "backward scanning" and non-sequential correction of texts, it is harder to explain scribal habits of punctuation and capitalization from this perspective. Points and capitals apparently function as cues to readers (whether they are reading aloud to an audience or not); the record of pointing and capitalization in these annals provides a necessary complement to the record of textual variation they contain. By considering
both, and the ways in which they are related, we can arrive at a fuller understanding of the
habits, and importance, of Anglo-Saxon scribal activity.

Capitalization in the Prose Annals: 755, 871, and 878

It is, perhaps, unsurprising that no printed editions of the Chronicle retain the
original manuscript capitalization (and few enough make any attempt to record ms
punctuation). The Anglo-Saxons had no tradition of capitalizing proper names, but since
Wheelocke's 1644 edition capitals have always been added to the names of people and
places in the Chronicle. Likewise, since Anglo-Saxon scribes apparently had different
ideas than we do about how (or even whether) to mark sentences graphically, the addition
of capitals and periods has been equally common in printed editions, despite the obvious
fact that such procrustean punctuation serves only to bring the Chronicle's sentence
structure into line with modern expectations.

Yet the fact that fewer capitals were used in texts like the Chronicle than are used
in texts of our own day should suggest to us that they are more important where they do
occur, rather than less so. By not paying attention to capital letters in texts such as the
Chronicle, we are (almost willfully) failing to pay attention to contemporary indicators of
structure and importance in these texts. Such a tactic can lead to actual misreadings of the
text, as I will argue has been the case for the 755 annal in particular.

The fact that capital letters are in fact indicators of structure and indicators of
important points in the text can hardly be doubted. Besides the capital "H" which begins
each annal in all of the Chronicle mss, capital letters occur at other obvious points of
importance. An examination of only the 755, 871, and 878 annals provides ample
evidence of this claim. Consider for example, the only place in these annals other than the
beginnings of annals to be capitalized by all scribes: the point in annal 871 where we are
told of Alfred's accession to the throne (871, 26). This is obviously a point of crucial
importance historically; it is given exceptional treatment by the various scribes. The scribe of ms A draws a large capital thorn, placing it in the margin of his text. Laurence Nowell, when transcribing ms G, included at this point a colored initial as tall as three lines of writing.\(^8\) The capitals in mss B and C are likewise placed in the margins, outside the normal writing space, and that in ms C is rubricated as well. Even in mss D and E, a capital is used at this point, although neither capital is rubricated or placed in the margin. The high degree of agreement on the treatment of this letter by the various scribes indicates the importance of this moment in Anglo-Saxon history.

Other historically significant moments are likewise given special treatment by the scribes. For example, in annal 878, the B and C scribes use capitals placed in the margin to signal the importance of Alfred's construction of defenses upon Athelney (878, 9).

Three manuscript lines later (878, 11), ms B places another capital in the margin, indicating Alfred's departure from Athelney as he began the series of movements culminating in the battle of Eddington. Given these usages, it seems difficult to argue with the fact that capitals were used as signals of important moments in the *Chronicle* narrative.

It is equally clear that capital letters could be (and were) used to signal important shifts from one section of the text to another. Thus in mss BC, the capitals in line 38 of my transcription (Appendix A) indicate the end of the "Cynewulf and Cyneheard" narrative and the resumption of the more typical *Chronicle* style (755, 38b). Likewise capitals are used in mss A and B (and Nowell's transcript of G) to indicate the beginning of the genealogy at the end of the 755 annal (755, 45c). The use of capital letters to mark off textual sections in this manner is paralleled in many places throughout the *Chronicle.*\(^9\)

---

\(^8\) Nowell apparently took some care to replicate such initials in his transcriptions. Although this portion of ms G no longer survives, it is instructive to compare his imitation of the initial "B" copied from the preface to the E *Chronicle* at the beginning of BL Additional 43, 704 with the original in Laud Misc. 636.

\(^9\) In the next chapter, I briefly discuss the use of capitals in the neighborhood of the *Chronicle* genealogies in general.
Given such evidence of the purposeful and significant use of capital letters in these annals, it is hard to imagine that the other capitals which are used are so unimportant that they might safely be ignored. Indeed, they are not; all the capitals in the 871 and 878 annals, for instance, can be understood as signals of some significant event or textual feature.\(^\text{10}\) The capitals in the 755 annal, we must assume, are likely to be equally significant.

The distribution of capital letters in the "Cynewulf and Cyneheard" portion of the 755 annal is, perhaps, somewhat unexpected. After the capital "H" which opens the annal, the first capitals to appear are in 755, 19AB. After this, however, they occur in much greater frequency. Before the more typical annalistic material begins in line 38, there are capitals at 755, 21AB; 23DE; 29B; 33BDE. The C ms is the only ms to fail to divide the "Cynewulf and Cyneheard" passage into smaller units by the use of capital letters.

John Johansen has recently argued that the episode is "structured in three progressively longer discourse units"(6), but the distribution of capital letters seems to suggest that, if anything, the discourse units get shorter at the end of the passage. The concentration of capitals in the second half of this episode indicates the importance of the action in this part of the story. In fact, the "Cynewulf and Cyneheard" episode, if we look at the evidence of the ms capitalization and punctuation, seems to fall most naturally into two separate sections. In ms A, we can see this most clearly, since the capital in 755, 19A is preceded by the special mark of punctuation (".:~") usually reserved by this scribe for annal ends. The heavy punctuation and capital here divides this passage into two separate portions. In mss ABDE, the first capital after the initial "Her" occurs between the refusal of Cyneheard's offer of life and property and the arrival of Osric and Wiferth.

\(^{10}\) All of the capital letters in 878 have been discussed above. Those in 871 not occurring at the accession of Alfred occur at the beginning of clauses containing the pairing "eptred cyning ? alfred his broþur" (871,4BDE; 871, 8E; 871, 16EN). Three of the four occurrences of this phrase are preceded by capitals in ms E; 871, 4 is the first such occurrence, and is preceded by a capital in three mss. The significance of this pairing is thus strongly emphasized by the capital letters in this annal.
This fact provides the crucial clue to the structure of the episode. The controlling symmetry lies in the two-part structure delimited by the two main battles and the two offers of amnesty. The concentration of capital letters in the second of the two sections further indicates the importance of the second set of events. Johansen's assertion of a tripartite structure is not paralleled by the capitalization in any ms; and the capitalization we do see seems to point fairly clearly to a two-part structure.

The use of capital letters in this passage not only indicates overall structure; it also seems to indicate that the key moment of the entire narrative lies in the response of Cyneheard's followers to their kinsmen's offer of safety: this response is capitalized in three mss (BDE), a greater number than at any other spot besides the initial "Her." The agreement between mss BDE here, is somewhat unusual, since B is pretty clearly a member of a manuscript family quite distinct from that of mss D and E. Yet their agreement here should serve to remind us that these three mss were also in agreement in one of the textual variants: the reading of "heora" (not "eowre") in 755, 34b.

It is difficult to explain how these three manuscripts came to agree both on the capitalization of this sentence and the word-choice which keeps the text in indirect discourse, while the A and C mss agree on the lack of a capital and feature the much-remarked use of direct discourse. In each case, both readings occur within two separate manuscript families and once in each member of the third family. As such, it is strictly impossible to decide which mss contain the innovation; likewise, the proximity of the two variable readings suggests that the capitalization and use of indirect discourse are probably related. We may never be able to determine the implications of this passage for the textual history of this annal, but what we can say unambiguously is that in all six mss (ABCDEG) either capitalization or the switch to direct discourse functions to emphasize the response of Cyneheard's men. It seems clear, then, that this response is the crucial moment of the entire annal, and the rhetorical effect of either the capital letter or the direct discourse
must be taken into account in readings of this annal. Readings which claim that the actions of Osric and Cynewulf's other followers are at the center of this story should be seriously reexamined in the light of the fact that the textual emphasis appears to center on the refusal of Cyneheard's men to accept their own relatives' offer of safety.

The Implications of the Prose Record

Ultimately, my investigation of the transmission of the prose annals in this chapter provides us a glimpse into the workings of Anglo-Saxon readers and writers, reminding us not only how our print-influenced mind-set has hindered our understanding of medieval textual variants, but also of the centrality of the medieval paradigm of reading out loud to an audience. This practice influenced the ways in which texts were approached, specifically in that "backwards scanning" was apparently not heavily practiced, that producing a coherent text was more important than reproducing the exemplar's text; and that the text could always be altered, and even improved, by any scribe.

Anglo-Saxon scribes clearly had a different sense of textual authority than we do, and their actual practice indicates that they held different ideas about the importance of literal, word-for-word copying than print-literate scholars have imagined. Nevertheless, such differences can hardly be ascribed to the influence of "orality." The truth seems to lie closer to the fact that the Anglo-Saxon paradigm of reading was informed by the practice of reading aloud to an audience. In this respect, the spoken performance of texts was, no doubt, an influence upon the nature and structure of Anglo-Saxon literacy, but it is clearly a different kind of literate practice which is at the root of the difference from our own literacy, rather than "orality."

We come to the same conclusion, after all, by considering the scribal habits of capitalization (and punctuation) which indicated the structure of these prose annals to their
readers. Capitalization and punctuation are purely visual clues, designed to impart information to readers which the words themselves do not carry. Such graphic cues may be intended to help readers give a spoken performance of the text, but their effectiveness lies in their very nature as part of the text. Whatever we make of the capital letter/indirect discourse variations in the 755 annal, it seems especially significant to note that in the very manuscripts where words are taken out of the mouths of Cyneheard's followers and put into indirect speech, the importance of their speech is marked by the use of a capital letter. The scribes who wrote the various versions of this annal were clearly quite sensitive to the differences between spoken and written language.

Finally, we are left with the critical commonplace mentioned at the beginning of this chapter which asserts that the atypicality of the Cynewulf and Cyneheard narrative is evidence of its origin in oral discourse. The sort of investigation I have performed in this chapter, however, was not designed to demonstrate anything about the story's origins, only its transmission. Nevertheless, certain of my observations might be applied to this issue as well. In particular, it is clear from the accounting of the textual variation in these three annals that the degree of variation was higher in the 755 annal than in either of the others. Although the 871 and 878 annals (combined) provide a greater quantity of prose than the 755 annal, they presented fewer variations (about 77 variants as compared to about 112 in the 755 annal). The explanation for this, I believe, lies more in the nature of the 871 and 878 annals than in the supposed orality of the 755 annal. In the later annals, there is a higher degree of textual coherence and repetitiveness. These later annals feature a number of fairly "frozen" phrases, which it seems reasonable to conclude, would be relatively less susceptible to the process of textual variation described in this chapter. These phrases ("hær weard X ofslegen," "pa deniscan ahton wealstowe geweald" and so forth), as regularly reoccurring textual features, tend to get recopied with less innovation, and hence the later annals examined here, as more "typical" of Chronicle's discourse, are
copied with less variation. The high degree of variation in the "Cynewulf and Cyneheard" episode, then, is not a result of any necessarily "oral" origin. The implications of this conclusion for Katherine O'Brien O'Keeffe's notion of "formulaic reading" will be examined in more detail in the final chapter of this dissertation.

---

11 Cecily Clark likewise makes the observation that much of the Common Stock is "semi-formulaic": "With the events noted all falling within a narrow range, vocabulary and phrasing are restricted, annal after annal using the same semi-formulaic language" ("Narrative Mode" 216). Regarding the 871 annal specifically, she writes, "although fuller than usual, [it] likewise keeps to the conventional chain of simple sentences" (216). In comparison, the 755 annal is an "exception" (219), which stands out in "high relief" (216) from the other annals.
CHAPTER III
The Genealogies of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*

The annal for the year 716 in the Parker (A) version of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* begins by recording the deaths of the Northumbrian king Osred and the Mercian king Ceolred, and then goes on to announce their respective successors, Coenred and Æthelbald. But before the chronicler finishes the entry by describing Ecgbryht's introduction of proper Easter observances and tonsuring to the Iona monks, he appends the following bit of genealogical information: "æthelbald was alweoing alweo eawing eawa pybing hes cyn is beforan awritten" ('Æthelbald was Alweo's son; Alweo, Eawa's son; Eawa, Pybba's son; his ancestry is written above'). Despite the fact that the genealogical material in the earlier entry for the year 626 has been erased from this manuscript, 626A must nonetheless be the entry to which beforan here refers, for annal 626A (as substantiated by both the B and C mss and Laurence Nowell's transcript of ms G) had indeed contained the further reaches of Æthelbald's pedigree, stretching from his great-grandfather Pybba all the way back to Woden.

This passage from annal 716A, out of all the numerous genealogical passages contained within the various *Chronicle* manuscripts, is notable for at least two distinct reasons. First is the fact that, despite the often-repetitive nature of the *Chronicle* genealogies, this is the only genealogy which has explicitly been cut short because it would repeat, if continued, passages already contained within other genealogies in the same manuscript. Other passages, if they are abbreviated, contain no references to their
shortened status. 1 Equally interesting, though, is the fact that when this passage is reached by the scribes of the B and C mss, they write a slightly different tag to refer their readers to the 626 genealogy, saying only "hæs cyn is beforan." 2 (The genealogical portions of both the 626 and 716 entries are either missing or omitted entirely in manuscripts D, E, and F.) The inclusion of the word awritten by the first of the A ms's scribes focuses readers' attention upon the very written nature of the document before them. In this earliest of the surviving Chronicle manuscripts, the scribe points out that the remainder of Æthelbald's ancestry is inscribed at another place in the manuscript, reminding readers that such written information is permanent, not ephemeral. This passage in the A manuscript, then, is a crucial starting point for a consideration of the role of writing and textuality in the Chronicle genealogies, precisely because it foregrounds the role of writing and the genealogies' existence as written artifacts in an explicit manner which is not carried through by the later scribes of the other mss. 3

In annal 716A, the first scribe of ms A decides to direct his readers' attention to a previous annal, two full leaves earlier in the manuscript. We might conclude that this was perhaps an effort to save on precious parchment, but in other spots the scribe (or, more probably, the compiler responsible for the "Common Stock") uses other strategies, repeating long passages sometimes, or silently pruning the genealogies midway. The

---

1 Laurence Nowell's transcript of ms G (BL Additional 43,703), however, cuts short the 597G genealogy after gewising with the Latin phrase "et ut superius" ("and so on as above"). This abbreviation is almost certainly due to Nowell, rather than the G scribe (since the genealogy appears in its complete form in Wheelocke's edition), and attests to the later figure's sense that the genealogies were repetitive and redundant.

2 This version of the tag also appears in annal 725A: "Her whirtred cantwara cyning foröferde hæs cyn is beforan." ("Here Whtred, king of Kent, passed away; his ancestry is above"). There is, however, no genealogical passage in 725A besides this notice; Whtred's genealogy is given in annal 694.

3 The Chronicle genealogies, like other Anglo-Saxon genealogies, have generally been approached from a textual/historical approach, in which scholars have attempted either to reconstruct the earliest, most historically authentic version of the genealogies and have attempted to explain their textual interrelationships and structure, or have discussed their political relevance. See especially the works of Kenneth Sisam, David Dumville, and Craig Davis. In this chapter, I look instead at these genealogies as texts which contain crucial information about how they were meant to be read and received.
frequent repetitions suggest that saving parchment was not the deciding factor; rather, the shortened genealogies suggest that the compiler was aware of the possibility of boring his readers by repetition. The usual solution to this was to cut the genealogy off at some midpoint, often after bringing some king's ancestry to a point where it began to parallel another, previous entry. This happens in a number of places: favorite stopping points are at the patronyms *Cerdicing* (674ABC, 685ABC, 688ABC) and *Wodening* (552 BC, 560BC, 597ABC, 626BC, 755ABC). These are logical stopping points for these genealogies, since Cerdic and Woden were well-known founders of dynasties--Woden, who was believed to have fathered all of the English royal families, and Cerdic, founder of the West Saxon line. The ancestry of each is recorded in the lengthy 855ABCD genealogy of *Æthelwulf*; likewise the *Chronicle*’s first pedigree (547BC) gives the genealogy from Woden to Geat, and the second (552BC) recounts Cerdic's descent from Woden. The first two pedigrees, then, provide benchmarks to which many of the following truncated pedigrees can refer.

Yet, throughout all the *Chronicle*’s pedigrees, it seems, there is a tension between the scribes' urge to write them out at length and the desire to limit the accompanying repetition, despite the convenience of the 547 and 552 pedigrees to which later entries can refer. In this chapter, I will argue that this tension in the *Chronicle* genealogies reflects their existence as catalogues of information structured according to an oral aesthetic which are preserved within a series of documents which, in turn, are themselves specifically textual in nature. The chronicle form itself is inherently textual, based as it is upon the Easter table form, with its mathematical precision and structure. Reflecting their conflicted status, the *Chronicle* genealogies exist as a site where issues of "orality" and "textuality" must be foregrounded. Although he cannot resolve it, this tension can be felt already by the Parker Chronicle's first scribe, and it evidences itself in his use of the

---

4 For discussions of the chronicle form's debt to Easter tables, see Poole, Jones.
word *awritten*. And perhaps unsurprisingly, the later history of the *Chronicle* genealogies reflects the emerging dominance of a "textual" epistemology.

That the scribe working on the Parker manuscript, which is the earliest surviving manuscript of this portion of the *Chronicle*, should be sensitive to the role which writing plays in his text is, perhaps, exactly what we might expect. In this period, as has been argued recently by Katherine O'Brien O'Keefe, the Anglo-Saxon culture as a whole was developing an increasingly textual epistemology, which was slowly replacing previous, "oral" ways of knowing. Working at the end of the ninth century, the first scribe of the Parker Chronicle is also the first scribe to work on any surviving *Chronicle* manuscript; as such, he is precisely the scribe who ought to have the highest degree of "residual orality." Coined by Walter Ong and imported into Old English studies by O'Keefe, the term "residual orality" refers to the degree to which attitudes towards text and language which spring from an originally oral aesthetic are present within an individual capable of reading and writing. As such, "residual orality" is a companion term to O'Keefe's less satisfactory term, "transitional literacy," which designates a culture moving along a continuum for which "'orality' and 'literacy' are the end points" (13).⁵ O'Keefe provides convincing evidence, through her examination of the transmission of Old English poetry, that there was a developing textuality during the Anglo-Saxon period. Because the Parker Chronicle's first scribe is the earliest of the *Chronicle* scribes, he is thus, perhaps, naturally the most sensitive to the conflict between oral and textual epistemologies and strategies. By looking at the ways in which this conflict plays itself out in the *Chronicle* genealogies, this chapter will confirm the progress of the developing textuality which O'Keefe sees evidence for in the textual history of the *Chronicle*'s poems. On the other hand, I will also

---

⁵ Although O'Keefe's terminology is problematic in several ways, "transitional literacy" is a less effective term than "residual orality" because it is specifically applied only to literate individuals and cultures. A literate individual is "transitionally literate" only to the extent that since literacy is continually evolving, all literacies are transitional literacies. See my Introduction.
argue that the history of the presence (and absence) of the genealogies within the various manuscripts of the *Chronicle* is as much a reflection of this developing textuality as it is a result of the genealogies' declining political relevance. Ultimately, I argue that the record of layout and inclusion of the genealogies in the *Chronicle* mss provides evidence for a developing textuality in which the influence of orality plays no clear role, despite the fact that the genealogical form itself was originally a purely oral form.

To make this case, I begin with a brief discussion of the role of oral genealogies in primary oral cultures in general, and then argue that, in their form, the Old English genealogies as they are recorded in the *Chronicle* reflect their origins in the performances of oral mnemonists. In particular, their highly rhythmic, alliterative, and repetitive form shows the genealogies to be members of a special class of Old English verse, originally designed to be memorized and delivered without recourse to writing. With this in mind, then, I will look at how Old English genealogies of this sort (in the *Chronicle* and elsewhere) farce when they are put into writing. Issues of manuscript pointing and layout will be crucial at this point, as I will apply to the *Chronicle* genealogies O'Keeffe's assumption that "the cultural movement from orality to literacy involves . . . the increasing spatialization of a written text" (25), and that this spatialization is reflected in increasingly conventionalized spacing and punctuation. Lastly, I will examine the genealogies as they actually appear in the *Chronicle* manuscripts over time: the multiplicity of pedigrees in the "Common Stock" and preserved in mss A, B, and C; their apparently less-extensive inclusion in the manuscripts of the "northern resension," D and E; and their virtual elimination from the bilingual manuscript F. The "phasing out" of the genealogies, I argue, is a result of the increasingly "textual" sensibility of the scribes, and reflects their (textual) knowledge that the repetitive genealogies are essentially redundant and hence largely unnecessary. Ultimately, the evidence of the *Chronicle* genealogies, their form, and their layout, supports O'Keeffe's claim that during this period there was a strongly
developing sense of textuality, which, in this case, made the genealogies seem first unnecessarily repetitive and finally inappropriate.

The Oral Roots of the Anglo-Saxon Alliterative Genealogical Form

The suggestion that the Old English genealogies as represented in the *Chronicle* are late records patterned after a once-thriving oral genealogical tradition is not a new one. As early as 1932, R. W. Chambers wrote of the genealogical passage connecting Cerdic and Woden, "The lines must go back to...times when such things were recorded by memory rather than by writing. They are pre-literary, and were doubtless chanted by retainers of the West-Saxon kings in heathen days" (*Beowulf* 316-17). Sisam ("Genealogies" 158ff) argues convincingly that Chambers is almost certainly wrong for this particular stretch of Cerdic's pedigree (based upon the improbable hyper-correctness of the triply alliterating verse lines of this passage), but Chambers's essential argument that the alliterative nature of the genealogies is connected to an oral poetic tradition preceding the introduction of writing goes unchallenged.

Nor should the assertion that an oral genealogical tradition existed in early Anglo-Saxon times come as a surprise. Such well-known works as "The Consequences of Literacy," by Jack Goody and Ian Watt, and *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word*, by Walter Ong, discuss oral genealogies, particularly citing their apparent variability as evidence of an "oral" mode of knowing in which genealogies are more valuable as "mnemonics for systems of social relations" (Goody and Watt 31) rather than as invariant factual recordings of lineages, as a "literate" society might presume. Indeed, their discussions of oral genealogies are directly linked to their claims of an "oral/literate" split, and Goody and Watt in particular cite some interesting examples where systems of memory and systems of writing do, in fact, clash in the preservation of genealogies.
Although more recent research (including some by Goody himself—e.g. *Interface* 106) indicates that assertions of a deterministic oral/literate split are probably unsupportable, Goody and Watt's and Ong's arguments are relevant here for the simple reason that they demonstrate the prevalence of the "oral genealogy" form within a broad spectrum of oral cultures. Goody and Watt write, for example, "Like the Bedouin Arabs and the Hebrews of the Old Testament, the Tiv people of Nigeria give long genealogies of their forbears" (31), and a later essay in Goody's *Literacy in Traditional Societies*, describing nomadic Somali society, says of that culture, "Lineage genealogical lore is part of the oral tradition, taught, conserved, and transmitted mainly by word of mouth" (Lewis 274). Regarding the Germanic world, Sisam, in his discussion of Anglo-Saxon genealogies, acknowledges that he also believes there was originally a tradition of Germanic oral genealogies, going so far as to cite Tacitus, concluding that "in times when there was only oral tradition, the ancestry of noble families was remembered" (Sisam 180). Nor was the Anglo-Saxon interest in the distant past of the genealogies an isolated instance. Besides the interest in the past (and in genealogical relationships) demonstrated by the composition of a poem like *Beowulf*, we also have the evidence of *Widsith*, whose *weold*, *wes*, and *sohte* thulas are almost universally acknowledged as among the earliest portions of the entire OE poetic corpus, even if, as Nicholas Howe asserts, they may have been somewhat altered by the *Widsith* poet (*Catalogue Poems* 170-72). At the very least, in the *Widsith* catalogues, we have an example of yet another sort of alliterative list preserved and transmitted as poetry, containing dynastic information of another sort—lands and rulers, rather than rulers and ancestors. From a variety of perspectives, then, it certainly seems likely that there was an Anglo-Saxon tradition of reciting orally transmitted genealogical material.

That this is, in fact, the case is presumably confirmed by the form of the *Chronicle* genealogies as they are recorded. The formal characteristics which mark the *Chronicle*
genealogies as reflexes of an earlier, purely oral form are clear. First, they appear in the *Chronicle* almost without exception as alliterating, rhythmic passages which can usually be arranged in half-lines and lines as (more or less) normal Old English poetry. For example, consider this passage from 685A: "*se ceadwalla was coenbryhting coenbryht cading cadda cuphaing cupha ceawlining ceawlin cynricing cynric cerdicing*" (f. 8v. ll. 7-9). This can be rearranged in the manner of regular Old English verse:

\[Se Ceadwalla was Coenbryhting \quad Coenbryht Cading\]
\[Cadda Cuphaing \quad Cupha Ceawlining\]
\[Ceawlin Cynricing \quad Cynric Cerdicing\]

This arrangement of this type of passage is so eminently appropriate for the Anglo-Saxon genealogies that I shall continue to use it throughout this chapter.⁶ Although normal Anglo-Saxon poetic practice restricted alliteration to the first three stressed syllables in a line, the Anglo-Saxon habit of rulers naming their sons with alliterating names ensured that such genealogies would alliterate on all four beats, as long as the alliterative pattern remained unbroken from father to son. But also consider, for example, the following genealogical passage from annal 728A:

\[7 se Oswald was Æþelbalding \quad Æþelbald Cynebalding\]
\[Cynebald Cuþwining \quad Cuþwine Ceawlining;\quad (f. 9v. ll. 7-8).\]

Here, even though the father-son alliteration breaks down, the pedigree still works as Old English verse, since the shift comes on the fourth stress of the first verse line. The hyperalliteration of other, more fully alliterating genealogical passages (as in the second full line above, or the 685A passage) does, perhaps, separate the genealogies' form from regular OE verse, but it also has the added effect of making it even more mnemonically memorable.

---

⁶ In such edited texts, I shall follow modern conventions of capitalization and spacing, but will retain manuscript punctuation, as far as is practicable within the limits of the technology at hand. Mere diplomatic versions of the genealogies, with less intrusive apparatus, are contained in Appendix C.
On the other hand, even a genealogical line with no alliteration between grandfather, father, and son yields acceptable verse; consider, for example, this genealogical passage from annal 731A:

\[
7 \text{ se Ceolwulf wæs Cæphaing} \quad \text{Cupa Cupwining}
\]
\[
Cupwine Leodwalding \quad \text{Leodwald Ecgwaling}
\]
\[
Ecgwald Aldhelming \quad \text{Aldhelm Ocging}
\]
\[
Ocga Iding \quad \text{Ida Ecpping} \quad \text{(f. 9v. ll. 13-15)}.
\]

Here, even though there is no alliteration between Cupwine, Leodwald, and Ecgwald, because of the positioning of the names of the respective fathers and sons, we can see that the second and third stressed syllables in such lines always alliterate, even when the names themselves do not, as in the second line here. Thus, the form of these alliterating genealogies always maintains at least the minimum necessary alliteration for Old English verse. This form likewise links in similar fashion the first beat in each line with last in the previous line. If Germanic kings named their sons alliteratively for poetic purposes, it clearly was not simply so that genealogies would alliterate; the structure of the genealogies ensured there would be sufficient alliteration to produce poetry, even when the names themselves did not alliterate.

A second characteristic of the *Chronicle* pedigrees which suggests that the origin of their form lies in the world of oral discourse is their internal redundancy and syntactic structure. Rather than consisting of simple lists of names (which for a fairly consistently-alliterating lineage could likewise fit the rules of regular verse formation) these genealogies take the form "X was son of Y, Y son of Z, Z son of A," and so on. There is one conspicuous exception to this pattern among the *Chronicle* genealogies in the list of names stretching from Noah to Adam in the pedigree of Æthelwulf, annal 855ABCD, but foreign, and known only through the mediation of written documents, these names alone are presented as an unadorned list. Except for two isolated single names in 855D, (Gewissung, which occurs as the very first word on f. 32r and Habra slightly later),
wherever native English or Germanic names are concerned (disregarding those names at
the endpoints of each genealogy, which are inherently most memorable), no name occurs
only once; each intermediary name occurs, instead, twice, once as father and once as son.
Such internal redundancy minimizes the chances for error while providing extra mnemonic
cues to aid in recalling the order of the ancestors. At the same time, the structure
preserves the meter of the verse form. Likewise, the strategy of relating the names in the
"X [was] son of Y" format gives the entire list a logical structural principle, one which
renders it inherently more memorable than a simple list of names; in essence, these
genealogies exist as catalogue poems of a very specialized sort. Although he does not
deal explicitly with the Old English genealogies, Nicholas Howe has described the nature of
the Old English catalogue poem in general:

The catalogue is not simply a glorified form of list. . . . [A] list functions well as
an aid to memory but poorly as a didactic device. At times, the thinness of content
may make it difficult to calculate the internal order of elements in a list. . . . The
order of elements in a catalogue is apparent and often instructive, for it suggests
the interrelations among the various aspects of the subject. (Catalogue Poems 21)

Where a simple list of names would not be poetry, these pedigrees are poetry, with their
own internal logic and structure, although they are perhaps somewhat limited in
expression. Lists, on the other hand, are essentially textual structures, occasions where
the spatialization of the information is paramount—the expression of relation among the
members of a list lies solely in their spatial proximity. The poetic structure of the
genealogies, however, lies closer to the "oral" end of the continuum. As Ong writes,

Even genealogies out of such orally framed tradition are in effect commonly
narrative. Instead of a recitation of names, we find a sequence of 'begats', of
statements of what someone did (99).

As poetic structures, almost without exception ruled by the verb was, which links the first
pair of names in each pedigree, the Chronicle genealogies are syntactically complete. Not
narratives, but nonetheless sentences, redundant and rhythmic, they are built like oral genealogies, not like simple "written" lists.

**Anglo-Saxon Genealogies and Writing**

If we accept the conclusion that the Old English poetic genealogical form had its origins in unrecoverable Anglo-Saxon oral genealogies, we must then ask how the act of committing the genealogies to writing has affected them. The *Chronicle* manuscripts, after all, date from late enough during the Anglo-Saxon period to suppose that what they contain has been deeply affected by the technology of writing; even if we do not assume that Augustine's supposed introduction of writing to the Anglo-Saxons in 597 did not have an immediate, demonstrable impact, writing was fairly widespread in Anglo-Saxon England by the eighth century, well over a century before the copying of the Parker *Chronicle*. As I outlined in my Introduction, in fact, the chronicle form itself is an essentially written construct. But the *Chronicle* genealogies should not be considered as an isolated group; the history of written genealogies in Anglo-Saxon England goes back well before the first manuscript of the *Chronicle*, and the *Chronicle* genealogies need to be considered within this tradition of pedigrees transmitted in writing.

Fortunately, Kenneth Sisam, in his classic article "Anglo-Saxon Royal Genealogies" investigates in great detail the genealogies contained within the *Chronicle*, as well as the various pedigrees and regnal lists found in other contexts. His comments are chiefly concerned with investigating the relationships between the various texts and with attempting to describe how the genealogies took the forms in which we find them. As such, his reconstructive approach clearly treats these genealogies as written texts. Yet this approach seems justified; although the genealogies preserve an oral-style form, they are themselves the products of a written tradition, as Sisam demonstrates. His conclusions
suggest that the genealogies, as we have them, almost certainly do not represent accurate records of the lineages of the various kings they are associated with—rather they are built up from a (more or less) reliable base of information into monuments of praise, connecting the names of the ruling houses of England with great names from the past. As such, they provide an instructive counter-example to the examples of Goody and Watt; in Anglo-Saxon England, as Sisam shows, written genealogies (rather than oral ones) have been consciously altered to fit prevailing political realities.

In particular, based mostly upon his examination of the lengthy pedigree of Æthelwulf, Sisam sees for most of the Chronicle genealogies a viable political context in the late ninth century, when the Chronicle's "Common Stock" was apparently shaped, although he argues some of the genealogies are incorporated wholesale from earlier sources. The Alfredian date for the incorporation of the genealogies into the Chronicle, however, is only natural; almost all of the genealogical passages within the Chronicle are contained within the common stock. The last and most elaborate pedigree is that of Æthelwulf, in annal 855ABCD, which traces that king's descent through the founder of Wessex, Cerdic; through the Germanic heroes and gods Woden, Finn, Geat, Sceldwa, and Heremod; and, ultimately, from biblical patriarchs—from Noah right back to Adam himself. The length and ambition of this pedigree, in fact, have been cited as evidence that the original compilation of the Chronicle must, indeed, have ended at this point (e.g. Plummer, ii, cxii n.). Following Sisam, however, most scholars no longer see this as a real possibility, since whenever the common stock was compiled, this genealogical tree stood at the the most appropriate point for the glorification of the current ruler of Wessex: at the notice of his father's death, "Since he was the father of four succeeding kings, his pedigree might be added to honour or flatter any of them, and particularly Alfred after he had re-established the prestige of his kingdom" (Sisam 190). In a sense, all of the Chronicle genealogies lead up to this one, all subtly working to exalt the Wessex line,
although some work to this effect only by their comparative lack of completeness. Those rulers of other kindoms have pedigrees which pale by comparison.

Yet the Chronicle genealogies are not the earliest Anglo-Saxon genealogies we have record of. The earlier documents containing genealogies, however, are usually literally collections of lists, often presenting the genealogies of kings of several of the Anglo-Saxon kingdoms in the same document as regral lists (lists of a particular kingdom's rulers) and other material like lists of popes or English bishops. Not contained within a larger narrative structure like that of the Chronicle, these lists exist purely as lists. A particularly early example of such a collection of lists is contained in the British Library's Cotton Vespasian B vi (fo. 104-09, now mounted separately). These lists are headed by the Latin rubric "Haec sunt genelogiae per partes britanniae/ regum regnantium per diversa loca" ("These are the genealogies of the kings reigning throughout the various parts and diverse areas of Britian"). The first genealogy on folio 109v of this ms is Northumbrian, and is laid out in regularly ruled rows and columns like this:

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
C \text{eolhulf} & \text{cuðlining} \\
\text{cuð[...]} & \text{liodualding} \\
[.]\text{iold[.]akd} & \text{ecgualding} \\
\text{ecguald} & \text{edelming} \\
\text{edhelm} & \text{octning} \\
\text{ocg} & \text{iding}\end{array}
\]

The columnar format of the genealogies in this manuscript emphasizes this text's existence as a written document; it is obviously highly spatialized. Yet the spatialization is not enough at this early date (ca. 812) to make the redundancy problematic: even though the left hand column of this genealogy contains the names of everyone (except Ida) in

---

7 I attempt, here, to represent the actual layout of the manuscript. The underlined capital C represents a rubricated capital in the ms to the left of a ruling border line; the relative positions of the names reflects their position along ruling lines. Each point within the brackets represents an illegible character. I use similar conventions of presentation in Appendix C.
Ceolwulf's line, the patronyms are retained, presumably because the layout alone could not be counted upon to indicate the relationship between the names in the left-hand column. The metrical form of the genealogies was still essential to the information they carried.⁸

A manuscript of a century and a quarter later gives evidence that readers and writers were by that time beginning to think of such genealogies as simple lists (rather than as genealogical poems, as I believe the Chronicle pedigrees, and their earlier oral ancestors were perceived). Sisam quotes from the lists in the CCCC 183 manuscript, which he dates "around 937" (147) to demonstrate the "careless" copying which these texts underwent. To quote Sisam:

> to establish that transmission was careless throughout Anglo-Saxon times it will be enough to add a curious instance from MS. CCCC 183, which King Athelstan presented to St. Cuthbert's shrine. In it a Bernician branch runs:
> Leodwald       Eadhelming
> Ecgwald        Ocging
> Eadhelm        Iding
> Ocg            Eating

because the scribe copied the column of patronyms separately, omitting *Ecgwaling* which should stand opposite *Leodwald*. (183-84)

Here the scribe has copied the genealogy in columns, rather than as a poem. The scribal practice of copying these texts in separate lists (as in Sisam's example) suggests either that (at least some) scribes were unfamiliar in this period with the genealogical form or that the task of copying was seen as somehow separate from the act of reading these lists. The scribe of the CCCC 183 ms, after all, is proceeding through the text in an order different from that which a reader must take to negotiate the text. For this scribe the layout is the chief feature of the text--more important to his task, at least, than the genealogy's metrical form.

⁸On the other hand, lists of bishops or kings, including those in Vespasian B vi, function as simple lists of names, without anything corresponding to the genealogies' patronyms. Their retention, then, surely indicates that they contain necessary information. It is the presence of the patronyms, after all, which ultimately distinguishes a genealogy from a regnal list.
That the form of the Anglo-Saxon genealogies was perhaps unfamiliar to readers and writers of this period is also suggested by other evidence. Sisam makes a convincing argument that during Alfred's reign (or possibly before) these genealogies were thought of as obeying the rules of regular Anglo-Saxon verse, showing how the Cerdic-to-Woden section prominent in many of the West Saxon genealogies was probably specifically constructed to fit the regular Anglo-Saxon verse form:

In the arrangement given below, it will be seen that . . . the first and last lines set the unusual pattern of Cerdic's longer pedigree. If Wig and Freawine are added after Giwis, another verse is produced to the pattern, and alliteration fixes the place of insertion:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Cynric Cerdicing,} & \quad \text{Cerdic Elesing,} \\
\text{Elesa X-ing,} & \quad \text{X Giwisig,} \\
\text{Giwis Wiking,} & \quad \text{Wig Freawining,} \\
\text{Freawine Y-ing,} & \quad \text{Y Bronding,} \\
\text{Brond Bældæging,} & \quad \text{Bældæg Wodenig.}
\end{align*}
\]

It would be straining coincidence to suppose that Esla arose by the accident of dittography; but to perfect the artificial verse form would call for no more technical ingenuity than the replacement of X by any name beginning with a vowel, and of Y by any name beginning with F. (Sisam 165)

At the time when these insertions were made, however, the writer responsible for this section of the genealogy apparently did not or could not discriminate between the typical genealogical verse form and the regular poetic meter. In a "perfect" genealogy, as I've noted above, the alliteration falls on all four beats, but as Sisam shows, whoever constructed the Cerdic-to-Woden portion of the genealogy constructed it according to the pattern of the standard OE verse form, with alliteration regularized to occur only on the first three stresses of the line. This suggests that by the time in the ninth century when this section of the West Saxon genealogy was composed, aesthetic principles were being applied to the genealogies which, perhaps, did not truly fit them, but rather fit more conventional verse forms. This fact suggests that readers and writers throughout the period when the *Chronicle* genealogies were being copied may not have been particularly familiar with their traditional form. Nevertheless, the application of the rules of regular
versification to the Cerdic's genealogy certainly shows that at that point in time, genealogies were thought of as verse.

Indeed, some evidence suggests that the scibes of the *Chronicle* manuscripts also perceived the genealogical passages contained within the *Chronicle* to be poetic in form, even though (as noted above) there is external evidence from as early as 937 that not all scribes saw genealogies as necessarily poetic. At the very least, the *Chronicle* manuscripts, as I show below, provide evidence for a developing tradition of metrical pointing, not unlike the development of metrical pointing of conventional Old English verse described by O'Keeffe. Such a demonstration, however, arises from my examination of the pointing and spatialization of the genealogies within the various *Chronicle* mss, including not only those passages I've considered before, but also the genealogies within the "West Saxon Regnal Table" which precedes the Parker version of the *Chronicle* and is likewise found in other contexts.

**The Pointing of the *Chronicle* Genealogies**

The earliest genealogies genealogies from any *Chronicle* ms are those in the Parker manuscript. The genealogies in this manuscript (and in all of the *Chronicle* manuscripts) differ from the genealogies in manuscripts such as Cotton Vespasian B v i and CCCC 183 in that they are written in long lines across the page (like the bulk of Old English poetry) rather than in the careful columns of the list-like records. The contexts of the genealogies in the *Chronicle* no doubt contributed to this change in presentation. While in Vespasian B v i and CCCC 183 genealogies were accompanied by other lists and tabular information, in the *Chronicle*, the genealogies are integrated into the historical narratives of the various annals in which they occur. At the same time, the genealogical catalogues are transformed
into narratives themselves, by the addition of \textit{wæs} to the first (and occasionally subsequent) pairs of the various passages.

The shift in the layout of these genealogical passages occasioned an accompanying shift in the way these passages were expected to be read. The columnar format, as I noted above, possesses a remarkably high degree of textual spatialization; even if not always followed by scribes (as in the example from CCCC 183), the layout indicated relationships between the father-son pairs through spatial proximity in a highly regular manner. The layout of these columnar passages carried a significant portion of the texts' information. Such information might have been lost when the genealogies were rewritten in long lines across the page, and the \textit{Chronicle}'s record indicates that scribes attempted to preserve this relational information by pointing the genealogies, substituting one convention of spatialization for another.

The work of the first scribe of the Parker Chronicle gives us examples of two possible responses to the problem of how to transmit to readers the information contained within the spatial formatting of the columnar genealogies. Significantly, these two alternative treatments of the genealogies are found in separate portions of the manuscript: in the \textit{Chronicle} proper, and within the "West Saxon Regnal Table" which precedes it. Like this scribe's use of \textit{awritten} in the 716A genealogy, the two treatments suggest that the Parker scribe was operating at a moment when some questions about writing and the presentation of texts had yet to be completely resolved.

In the Parker version of the "West Saxon Regnal Table," the scribe employs a method of pointing which apparently attempts to recapture the spatialization of the earlier columnar genealogies as completely as possible. Points tend to separate each name, patronymic or otherwise. Consider the first such passage here:

\textit{7 se cerdic wæs. elesing. elesa, esling. esla. gewising. giwis. wiging. wig. freqæwining. freqæwine. friþu garing. friþugar. bronding. bron ñ bældæging. bældæg woden}ing. (fo. 1r. ll. 3-5).
The last two pairs here are pointed only after the patronymics, but the rest of this passage, and most of the pairs in the later genealogy of Æthelwulf are pointed after each name. Such regular pointing recaptures the wide spacing of the columnar genealogical passages, in which each word is spatially separate from the others. Unfortunately, not only does this heavy pointing make these passages somewhat difficult to read, but when used this extensively, points themselves convey very little more information than word spacing alone. Pointing every word lessens the impact and communicative power of the points.

On the other hand, this is not the manner of presentation favored by the first Parker scribe for the genealogies contained within the Chronicle itself. Within the Parker Chronicle, points are never used within the genealogies and only occasionally precede or follow them. The presentation of genealogies within the Parker Chronicle provides none of the information contained in the layout of the columnar genealogical passages. The scribe of the Parker Chronicle must expect that his readers will be able to provide this relational information themselves, presumably from a knowledge of the alliterative genealogical form.

From the two styles of presentation used by the first Parker scribe (fully pointed and unpointed) we can conclude that at the time he was working, around the turn of the tenth century, there was no well-defined tradition of punctuating these metrical genealogies. Instead, the Parker Chronicle's first scribe felt two conflicting pressures: to recapture the spatialized nature of these texts by using punctuation, and to allow readers to supply that information from their own knowledge of the genre and its structure. The later history of the presentation of the genealogies in the Chronicle followed neither of these two methods of presentation, however. Instead, a method of pointing developed

---

9 In the A ms, points precede only the genealogical passages in 755A and 855A. Points follow genealogical passages only if they conclude an annal, except in the case of 855A.
which preserved the crucial spatial presentation of the columnar genealogies at the same time as it helped convey the structure of the alliterative genealogical form.

The metrical pointing which was used throughout most of the *Chronicle*'s history for the genealogies was already well in place by the time the B manuscript was written, around 977 or so. Although not used with uninterrupted consistency by the B scribe, the majority of the genealogical passages in the B *Chronicle* are pointed metrically, after the patronymic element of each pair of names. This method of pointing effectively captures the information conveyed by the layout of the genealogies in manuscripts such as Vespasian B vi; the father-son pairs are kept together (as they stood in the same rows in the columnar format) while separated from each other by a point, as they had been in separate rows before. The passage from 597B is representative of the B scribe's application of this pointing style:

```
se wæs ceping
cypa kynrícæ, cynríc cerdícæ, cerdíc elesing
elesa esling esla gewising, gewis wiging, wig frawining
frawinne freðhorgaríng, freðhorgar branding, brand
beòldæging, beòldæg wodeníng. (fo. 6v)
```

Here four of the twelve pairs are unpointed. But three of these fall at the ends of manuscript lines, and thus are already marked by one spatializing feature. The fourth is simply left unpointed; a number of these unpointed patronymics occur throughout the B ms. But on the whole the pointing is fairly consistent—in the lengthy 855B genealogy, there are only two places where we would expect points and do not find them.

The next earliest manuscript, the now-burnt Cotton Otho B xi (ms G), confirms that this method of pointing had become standard by the beginning of the eleventh century. Copied directly from the A manuscript, the G ms nevertheless departs from its exemplar where the pointing of the genealogical passages is concerned. Although following the pointing of the genealogies in the Parker "West Saxon Regnal Table" closely
(see Appendix B), in the Chronicle's genealogies, the scribe of ms G uses regular metrical pointing. Nowell's transcript in BL. Additional 43,703 suggests that this was the case, as it features regular metrical pointing of the genealogical passages (see Appendix B), but the present folio 42v of Cotton Otño B xi, although damaged, preserves portions of the 855G genealogy. The legible portions of three consecutive lines read:

\[
\text{cuþaing, cuþa cuþwining, cuþwin[..........]} \\
\text{lin cynricing, cynric cerdicing[..........]} \\
\text{ele[.]a esling. esla giwi'si'ng. giwis wigin[.]} \\
\]

Here, the G scribe clearly adds points which are not found in ms A. This certainly suggests that the G scribe knew of a tradition of pointing genealogies metrically, a tradition which had apparently grown up since the writing of the Parker Chronicle.

The C manuscript (written near the middle of the eleventh century) likewise regularizes the pointing of its genealogical passages, both those copied from manuscript B and those copied from B's exemplar. Ninety-five percent of the places where we would expect metrical points in the C genealogies are pointed. The regularity of the pointing in the C ms (including passages where B served as C's exemplar and which did not feature particularly consistent pointing) is unparalleled in any of the other Chronicle mss.

The fact that the later Chronicle scribes felt the genealogies to be different from than the narrative annals which contain them is suggested by the regular pointing which they received. The same conclusion can be drawn from other evidence, however. In the A manuscript, as noted above, the 755A and 855A genealogies are preceded by points, setting them off from the preceding narratives; these genealogies, however, are further marked by capitalization. These methods of setting off the genealogical passages become even more noticeable in the B and C manuscripts. In the B manuscript, all of the genealogical passages are preceded by points except one (731B).\footnote{Another exception is the 738B genealogy; however, since it essentially begins the annal, following only the introductory word "Her," we might not expect this to be pointed. See my discussion below about the exceptionally well-integrated nature of this passage.} Six of the
genealogical passages in ms B begin with capitals (547B, 552B, 685B, 688B, 694B, and 755B). The initial 's' in the 694 passage is not only capitalized but set into the left hand margin normally reserved for the capital 'H' which begins most annals. Although fewer of the C genealogies are preceded by points (thirteen of the twenty passages), almost as many (four) are are capitalized. It is probably significant that the capitalized passages in ms C are the first four genealogies (547C, 552C, 560C, and 597C); apparently the C scribe began by carefully capitalizing genealogical passages but then lapsed into a less careful habit. Regardless, it seems clear that the B and C scribes were easily able to identify the genealogical passages, point them carefully, and even indicate that they were generically distinct from the narratives around them.

The evidence of the D, E, and F manuscripts is much more difficult to evaluate when considering the pointing of the genealogies. Because of the lacuna in ms D from annal 289 to annal 693, it is impossible to determine the original presentation of the genealogies in twelve separate annals. Making the task even more difficult is the fact that the D manuscript does not contain all of the genealogies which we might expect after annal 693. The genealogical passages which remain in D, (694D, 728D, 731D, 738D, and 855D) are well-pointed; however, these passages are often pointed after each name, not just after the patronymics. This passage from 855D is representative.

 gewissung. wig freawining. freawine. freope
garing. freopgar. branding. brand heldæ
ging. hældæg. wodening. woden freafæng.  (fo. 32r ll.1-3).

Whether pointing like this represents a continuing tradition of the full pointing found in the Parker version of the "West Saxon Regnal Table," or whether it is simply an example of overenthusiastic pointing is impossible to determine.11 Regardless, the genealogies of the

11 It is useful, however, to compare the pointing of the genealogies in the D manuscript with the pointing found in later tabular genealogies, such as those in Cotton Tiberius B v, or the Textus Roffensis. In these texts, the father-son pairs are often written in one column (rather than two, as in Vespasian B vi) with points sometimes after one or both names, or neither.
D manuscript are certainly pointed heavily (and consistently) enough to suggest that the scribe felt that this genre required a fair amount of punctuation.

The evidence of the E and F manuscripts does not reverse this conclusion. Rather, the fact that there are almost no genealogical passages in either of these late manuscripts keeps us from saying much of anything about how genealogical catalogue poems were presented in the early twelfth century. Yet the comparative lack of genealogical passages in these manuscripts (and their relative scarcity in the D manuscript) suggests that the genealogies were no longer perceived as appropriate or useful to the *Chronicle* texts. The reasons for this decline are explored in the following section.

**The Decline of the Genealogy in the *Chronicle* Manuscripts**

A quick accounting of the genealogical passages in the various manuscripts of the *Chronicle* confirms the general impression that the earlier manuscripts contain more genealogical material than the later manuscripts (see Table 1). Although ms A has had several of the genealogical passages erased, it originally agreed with mss B and C in presenting a total of twenty genealogical passages in nineteen separate annals. Ten of these (in annals 552BC, 597ABC, 611BC, 648ABC, 674ABC, 676ABC, 685ABC, 688ABC, 728ABCD, and 855ABCDG) record West Saxon pedigrees; six (547BC, 560BC, 670ABC, 685ABC, 731ABCD, and 738ABCD) are Northumbrian, and three are Mercian (626BC, 716ABC, and 755ABC). One Kentish pedigree occurs in annal 694ABCD. Manuscript D lacks a substantial number of the early annals, including many of the genealogies; the missing material includes all the entries after 189 and before 693. Of the genealogies which we might expect to find after this latter date, all except that in annal 716 are present, although the 855D genealogy seems to have been reinserted into an annal from which it had been previously removed, and the genealogy under annal 755 is
Table 1

The Distribution of Genealogical Passages in the Chronicle's Common Stock

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annal</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>G(N)</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>449</td>
<td>Hengest</td>
<td>Woden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>547</td>
<td>Ida</td>
<td>Geat</td>
<td>[x]a</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>x b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>552</td>
<td>Cerdic</td>
<td>Woden</td>
<td>[x]a</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>x b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>560</td>
<td>ÆElle</td>
<td>Woden</td>
<td>[x]a</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>x b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>593</td>
<td>ÆEdelfroð</td>
<td>Ida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>597</td>
<td>Ceolwulf</td>
<td>Woden</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>x b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>611</td>
<td>Cyngils</td>
<td>Cynric</td>
<td>[x]a</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>x b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>626</td>
<td>Penda</td>
<td>Woden</td>
<td>[x]a</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>x b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>648</td>
<td>Cyfræd</td>
<td>Cyngils</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>x b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>670</td>
<td>Oswiu</td>
<td>Eoppa</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>674</td>
<td>ÆEscwine</td>
<td>Cerdic</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>676</td>
<td>Centwine</td>
<td>Ceolwulf</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>685a</td>
<td>Ceadwalla</td>
<td>Cerdic</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>685b</td>
<td>Ecgferp</td>
<td>Eoppa</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>688</td>
<td>Æie</td>
<td>Cerdic</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>694</td>
<td>Wulfred</td>
<td>ÆÐellbryht</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>716</td>
<td>ÆÆþelbald</td>
<td>Pybba</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>728</td>
<td>Oswald</td>
<td>Cealum</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>731</td>
<td>Ceolwulf</td>
<td>Eoppa</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>738</td>
<td>Endthryht</td>
<td>Leodwald</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>755</td>
<td>Offa</td>
<td>Woden</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>[x]</td>
<td>x d</td>
<td></td>
<td>x d</td>
<td>x d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>855</td>
<td>ÆÆþelwulf</td>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x e</td>
<td>x f</td>
<td></td>
<td>x d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bracketed [x]s used to indicate reconstructed genealogies.

---

a These genealogical passages erased from ms A, probably by the scribe of ms F.
b Probably copied from ms B (See Taylor xxxvii ff.).
c The 738F genealogy is present in a reduced form only, see below.
d The 755DE and 855E genealogies are reduced to one generation.
e 855G survives fragmentarily in the burnt Otho B xi.
f The 855D genealogy was apparently reinserted into an annal from which it had been removed (cf. Whitelock, EEMF 4, p. 28).
reduced to the single anomalous phrase "wæs se offa wæs pincespering."\textsuperscript{12} Ms E retains only the passage from 738 in the same form as in the earlier mss; the entry for 755 is practically identical to that in ms D, reading "se offa wæs pincespering," while the expansive genealogy of Aethelwulf has been reduced to the terse "He wæs ecgbrihting." Ms E also contains the genealogy of Hengest and Horsa (449E), which is borrowed directly from Bede, and a short Northumbrian genealogical passage in 593E, although these pedigrees survive in no other version of the Chronicle. None of the genealogical passages is copied into the bilingual ms F. In the remainder of this section, I plan to look in detail at the manuscript record of the genealogies in each of these mss.

The Parker manuscript, which stands as the A text of the Chronicle is, as I mentioned before, the earliest record we have of the Chronicle's "Common Stock" and hence of all the genealogies (except these in 449E and 593E), which are contained within the Common Stock. Nevertheless, the record of manuscript A is not complete; a number of the genealogies in the Parker manuscript have been erased (547A, 552A, 560A, 611A, 626A), and (in some cases--547A, 560A, 626A) have been replaced with other material, taken from the E ms or another, closely related ms. The replacement material itself does not always seem to be particularly indispensable; the addition to 547A reads: "7 [Ida] rixode twelf gear. 7 he timbrode Bebbanburh seo wæs ærost mid hegge be tyned 7 par æfter mid wealle." ("And Ida ruled twelve years. And he built up Bamburgh, which was first encircled by a hedge-fence, and afterwards by a wall.") As the replacement sections appear to have been written in the same hand as was responsible for the whole of the F text, most researchers have concluded that the erasures are likewise the handiwork of the F scribe, and therefore date from the twelfth century, or perhaps the late eleventh.

\textsuperscript{12} A genealogical passage also occurs in annal 1067D; however, in this chapter I am chiefly concerned with the genealogies of the Common Stock. This late genealogy, as I shall argue in a later chapter, is a special case, and its appearance in 1067D does not negate the importance of the general trends I outline in this section.
In this respect, then, the Parker Chronicle's genealogies have undergone a process of deletion which parallels the decreasing representation of the genealogies in the various manuscripts over time. Just as the scribe sees fit to include none of the genealogical passages in his bilingual version of the *Chronicle*, he also sees fit to expunge several of the genealogies from the A ms, at least from entries where he feels he has more relevant information to add (and from 552A and 611A, where nothing new is written in). The replacement of the 547A genealogy with the material on the Bamburgh hedge seems particularly useful to us because it suggests that the A interpolator did not value the genealogical material very highly at all, since he felt free to replace it with this material from E (or a related ms) which is itself, perhaps, more interesting from an anecdotal perspective but not overly significant historically. Except for those noted above, however, all of the other genealogies in A remain unerased.

The B and C manuscripts preserve all of the genealogical passages which are believed to have been in the Common Stock, and thus provide the best surviving record for those passages which have been erased from manuscript A.\textsuperscript{13} Likewise, the genealogies in the B and C mss suggest that in some places, the Common Stock had been altered by the Parker Chronicle's first scribe. In particular, the 855A annal appears to have been consciously altered, first (as in the Parker version of the West Saxon Regnal Table) to remove mention of Creoda, but also by the addition of Fripuwald, Frealaf (or Freawine), and Fripuwulf between Woden and Finn. Additionally (presumably through an accident in copying), the A ms drops Hwala, Bedwig, and Sceaf from the 855 annal.

The fact that the Common Stock contains all of the *Chronicle's* genealogical passages (excepting the genealogy of Hengest and Horsa borrowed from Bede and

\textsuperscript{13} On the other hand, the work of Angelika Lutz provides evidence that the erased A genealogies did not always agree with the BC genealogies. Her evidence stems not only from her reconstruction of ms G (based largely on Nowell's transcript and Wheelock's edition) but also on her examination of the A manuscript under ultraviolet light. Her readings and reconstructions are presented in Appendix C, "The Texts of the *Chronicle* Genealogies."
inserted into 449E and the brief genealogical passages in 593E and 1067D) tells us immediately that genealogical information was thought to be important material for inclusion in the *Chronicle* during its late ninth century compilation. Likewise, we can infer (from entries like that in 716A) that the tension between the genealogies' redundancy and their written existence was felt most keenly at the time of the Common Stock's compilation. On the other hand, the fact that later additions to the *Chronicle* did not contain extensive alliterating genealogies suggests that they were no longer deemed appropriate material for *Chronicle* entries. The reason for this, I believe, lies in the fact that in a culture with a more extensively developed textual sensibility, it was apparent that genealogical information could be preserved and recovered without recourse to the kind of mnenonically organized alliterative genealogies present in the Common Stock. It could perhaps be argued that later versions of the *Chronicle* drop the genealogies contained within the Common Stock because they were no longer deemed politically relevant, but this line of reasoning fails to take into account the comparative lack of genealogies from outside the Common Stock. Certainly, old genealogies might no longer have seemed relevant, but there were likewise no new genealogies being included. The tension between the genealogies' "oral" form and their textual existence was resolved in favor of textuality. That this is, in fact, the case is confirmed by what happens to the genealogies in the D, E, and F manuscripts.

The D and E mss are our best representatives of what is commonly called the *Chronicle*’s "Northern Rescension," which Plummer suggests was probably compiled soon after the *Chronicle*’s original compilation, in the early 890s.\textsuperscript{14} Simply counting the numbers of genealogies remaining in these two mss suggests that the genealogies were falling out of favor: ms D has seven genealogical passages, some drastically shortened, and

\textsuperscript{14} Plummer dates the Northern Rescension to "very soon after the reception of the southern Chronicle" (Plummer, ii, cxix). Bately describes the northern recensionist as "probably writing in York in the tenth century" ("Compilation" 268).
E has even fewer. However, as noted above, the gap in ms D, which covers a great deal of the Common Stock material, including most of the genealogical passages, makes it impossible to conclude that they were excised as the Northern Recension was compiled. The text of ms D after the gap suggests indeed that the Northern Recension contained most (if not all) of the genealogical passages, and that they were not, therefore removed in the 890s. Plummer, in confirmation of this view, writes, "E, or one of his predecessors η or ε, had an evident dislike to pedigrees, and they are almost always omitted" (ii, lxvii).

The E manuscript's inclusion of the genealogies of Horsa and Hengest (449E) and Æðelferð (593E), in fact, suggests that the Northern Recension added at least some genealogical passages in its revision of the Common Stock--material taken from Bede and added information of Northern interest are the two principal features of this revision.

Even so, that portion of ms D which remains does not include all of the genealogical material from the Common Stock; nor does ms E delete all of the genealogical material available to its scribe. The remainder of ms D, for example, does not include the genealogical passage from annal 716, and the genealogy in 755D is limited to the single phrase "was se offa waes hincferhing." The genealogy of Æthelwulf in 855D is preceded by the passage, "7 he was ecgbryting. 7 þa fengon his . ii. suna to rice. æpelbald to suðrigean 7 to westseaxna rice. 7 he ricsode . v. geare" and followed by a very similar passage: "On[.] þa fengon æpelwulfes . ii. suna to rice æpelbald to westseaxna rice. 7 æpelbryht to cantwara rice. 7 to eastseaxna rice. 7 to suðrigean. 7 to suðseaxna rice. 7 þa ricsode æpelbald . v. gear." This latter passage parallels perfectly what is found in 855ABC; the version preceding the genealogy (which is paralleled in ms E, which has no extended genealogy\textsuperscript{15}) seems to be a corrupt variant of the latter version, and this has led scholars to suggest that the 855D genealogy has been reinserted into an

\textsuperscript{15} The end of the 855E annal reads: "He was ecgbrihting. 7 þa fengon his/ . ii. sunu to rice ædelbald to westseaxna rice. and to/ suðrigean. 7 he rixade . v. gear."
annal from which it had been previously excised (e.g. Whitelock, *EEMF* 4, p. 28). That the material preceding the genealogy in ms D is paralleled in ms E, suggests the possibility that the original Northern Recension had, in fact, deleted this genealogical passage.

The complicated history of Æthelwulf's pedigree within the 855D annal makes it of uncertain value when considering its implications for my argument. Presumably, it had at one point been removed from a predecessor of D, perhaps as part of the Northern Recension (after all, Æthelwulf's pedigree unabashedly praised the West Saxon line, tracing its descent to Adam himself). At what point the re-insertion occurred we cannot know; it may have happened at any point from the construction of the Northern Recension (which most scholars date to the end of the ninth century) to the copying of the D manuscript itself sometime in the second half of the eleventh century. The reasons for this particular entry's odd history are unrecoverable—the significant feature of the D manuscript's genealogies is that in number they are fewer than those of earlier mss, and yet more numerous than those of later manuscripts.

The E (Peterborough) manuscript, as mentioned above, records almost none of the Common Stock genealogical material, while including the genealogy of Hengest and Horsa in 449E and a brief Northumbrian pedigree in 593 E: where 593ABC end "7 ææelfrip feng to rice" (A, fo. 6v l. 34), 593E reads "7 ææelferð feng to rice on norðhymbru— // se waes ææelricing ææelric iding." (fo. 10v l. 30–fo. 11r l. 1) The genealogical information in 755E and 855E is much briefer than in the earlier manuscripts, reading, respectively "se offa waes þingcferþing." and "He waes ecgbrihting." The only genealogical passage in the entire Peterborough Chronicle which remains unchanged from the passages in the Common Stock is that in the annal for the year 738. This passage, then, deserves special attention; barring variants in spelling, this is the only genealogical passage for which manuscripts A, B, C, D, and E all read essentially the same. Ms A, for example, reads:
Her eadbryht eating eata leodwalding feng to norþanymbra rice 7 heold. xxi. wint~ 7 his broðor was ecgbrýht eating ærce besc~ 7 hie restap begen on eorforwicceastre on anum portice:-
(fo. 9v ll. 21-23).

("Here Eadbrýht son of Eata, Eata son of Leodwald, received the Northumbrian kingdom, and held it twenty-one winters; and his brother was Ecgbryht son of Eata the archbishop, and they both rest in York in one chapel.")

This passage is unique among the genealogical passages of the Chronicle in the way in which its pedigree is integrated within the narrative. Here, Eadbrýht’s ancestry is included within the running account, rather than relegated to a notation at the end of the annal as many are, or even separated semantically by a clause boundary. All other such passages stand alone as separate (and separable) series of clauses, the names connected by the verb wæs, which appears undeleted in the first pairing of each genealogy and deleted thereafter.

Undoubtedly, it is the integrated nature of Eadbrýht’s pedigree which occasions its continued presence within the Peterborough Chronicle. That it was perceived as integral to the narrative by the Peterborough scribe is perhaps confirmed by the fact that this passage is entirely unpunctuated, while the 593E passage quoted above evidences the (by then) standard post-patronymic pointing. On the other hand, this evidence may not be reliable; there is possibly other evidence that the Peterborough scribe was not familiar with the structure of genealogical lists in general. In the genealogy of Hengest and Horsa in 449E, we read "Heora heretogan væron wegen gebroðra. Hengest. 7 horsa. h-- væron wihgtgilses suna. wihgtgils wæs witting. witting witta. wecting wecta. wodning." ("Their war-leaders were two brothers, Hengest and Horsa, who were Wihtgils's sons; Wihtgils was Wita's son, Witta Wecta's son, Wecta Woden's son.") Here the patronymic Witting has inadvertently been repeated, and this throws off the pointing, which continues after every second word, contrary to the metrical and syntactical structure of the genealogy. In the genealogical passages from 449E, 593E, and 738E, then, we have examples of incorrect pointing, regular pointing, and no pointing at all. It seems reasonable to
conclude that the main Peterborough scribe may not have been familiar with the
genealogical form, and this inference seems to be confirmed by the mechanical pointing
which goes against the sense in 449E; a scribe familiar with the form would probably not
make this mistake, while the usages in 593E and 738E might either represent a more
competent understanding of the form, or simply accurate copying. On the other hand, the
pointing in 449E is regular, but sloppy. The scribe was apparently working with some
knowledge of what appropriate pointing was for this passage, even if he was none too
careful in applying that knowledge.

Considering the D and E manuscripts as representatives of the Northern
Rescension, then, can we conclude anything about the Rescension's inclusions of the
Common Stock genealogies? Perhaps. The 855D genealogy, which seems to have been
reinserted into the D Chronicle at this point, might suggest that all of the D manuscript's
genealogies were reinsertions, and that the E manuscript's general omission of the
Common Stock genealogies results from similar omissions in the original Northern
Rescension. Yet the Peterborough manuscript contains genealogies, such as those in
449E and 593E, which do not figure among the Common Stock's pedigrees, and although
both of these fall within the range of annals missing from the D ms, I think it likely that
these genealogies (one patently Northumbrian, and one which, as Plummer, ii, 10 notes,
was taken directly from Bede) were originally part of the Northern Rescension. As such,
genealogies were apparently seen as appropriate at the time of the Rescension, and it
would therefore be unwarranted to assume that all of the genealogies were excised at this
point. Those genealogies missing from the D and E mss were probably removed at some
later date, closer to the time of their respective copyings.

The bilingual (Latin/Old English) F manuscript is likewise a representative of the
Northern Rescension, an epitome based upon a predecessor of E which Plummer
designates as ε. In the process of synopsizing the Chronicle, the F scribe (who is likewise
the "principle interpolator of A"--Plummer, ii, xxxvi) has removed all of the genealogical passages, including those which have survived even into the E manuscript. Even the well-integrated passage in 738ABCDE has been reduced, reading in F, "Her Edgb·hw eating feng to Nørðh·ry·bra rice 7 his broðer was Egcb·hw ar·b. 7 hi begen restad on Euerwíc." The F manuscript, then, gives us the clearest case where a scribe has deliberately removed the genealogical material, for in having access to the e predecessor of E and also the A ms itself, the compiler of the F ms has clearly made a decision to remove all such material (just as he apparently erased genealogical material from the A ms). And where we could not with certainty conclude whether the E scribe was familiar with the genealogical form, the case for the F scribe is much clearer--his practice in both this ms and in ms A makes it abundantly clear that he was able to easily identify genealogical information and genealogical catalogues.

In fact, the 738F passage in particular is highly instructive regarding this scribe's attitudes towards genealogical information and its inclusion in his version of the Chronicle. Of all six manuscripts, F is the only one to alter the form of the genealogy in the 738 annal. First off, the F scribe deletes the phrase "Eata Leodwalding" which identifies Leodwald as Eadbryht's grandfather. This phrase, however much we feel it disrupts the narration, seemed well-enough integrated that even the E scribe (or his genealogy-omitting predecessor) included it. But the scribe of the F manuscript is able to identify this brief phrase as a genealogical digression and hence removes it. But even more significantly, the F scribe excises the later patronymic Eating, where the other five mss apply it to Ecgbryht, Eadbryht's brother. Since the genetic relationship is explicitly expressed within the annal ("his broðer was Egcb·hw ar·b"--F) the F scribe sees the

16 The F-scribe likewise often reduces the genealogical passages even more in his Latin translations: the first part of the 738 passage is translated "Adb·t suscip·regnu·nordanh·bror. &egcb·t ar·eps·fr·ei·fuit" ("Adbert took the kingdom of Northumbria and Ecgbert the archbishop was his brother"). The F scribe seems to habitually retain single patronyms where they appear in his Old English annals, but deletes them from his Latin translations.
patronymic as redundant—it contains no new or useful information, and so is eminently deletable.

In his alterations of the 738 annal, and his erasures in the A manuscript, the F scribe demonstrates an ability to accurately identify genealogical catalogues. His removal of such forms suggests equally clearly his belief that they are, in his opinion, unnecessary to the *Chronicle*. In particular, his changes in the 738 annal clearly demonstrate his belief that genealogical information is recoverable by other means. Such a belief makes him view the alliterating genealogical catalogue form as unnecessarily redundant and hence simply unnecessary. Where the scribe of the Parker manuscript (or perhaps the compiler of the Common Stock) felt a tension between the usefulness of the oral-derived genealogical catalogue form and the permanence and authority of text, the scribe of the F manuscript belongs to a literacy tradition where that tension has been resolved in favor of textuality. Between them, we have the B and C mss, which preserve the Common Stock genealogies in their entirety, and the D and E mss, which seem to reflect a growing urge to delete them. In their general character, then, the genealogies of the *Chronicle* seem to reflect a growing sense of textuality in Anglo-Saxon England during this period, a trend which is reflected most clearly in the figurative endpoints of the *Chronicle* tradition, the A and F manuscripts.

**Conclusions**

In the history of the development of pointing conventions and the removal of the *Chronicle*'s genealogical passages we can see the effects of a growing textuality in Anglo-Saxon England. The removal of genealogical lists from the tabular context in which they had been previously located raised the textual question of how best to recapture the information contained within these texts' columnar layout. The development of regular
metrical pointing from the earlier heavily pointed and unpointed styles of punctuation used in CCC 173 by the Parker Chronicle's first scribe shows us how this question was ultimately answered.

At the same time, the tenth and eleventh century scribes of mss B and C were likewise beginning to indicate the genealogies' separateness from the narratives around them. Except for the well-integrated passage in 738ABCDE, the Chronicle genealogies became more and more separated by points and capitals from their annals. Undoubtedly, this apparent sense of the alliterative genealogical poems' separateness amounted to the identification of the genealogical poem as a genre separate from prose narrative. Ultimately, this genre began to be deemed inappropriate for inclusion in a document like the Chronicle, and in the D, E, and F manuscripts (and the A manuscript's erasures), we can see the effects of this judgment. The evidence of the 738F passage in particular suggests that the reason for this was not simply a desire to save on parchment, but that it was intimately connected to the fact that family relations were, in the late Anglo-Saxon period, recorded in other ways than through alliterative genealogies. The dynastic information contained within the genealogies could, once a document like the Chronicle had come into existence and widespread use, be found in the written histories of Anglo-Saxon England. The written chronicle form made obsolete the earlier, orally-derived alliterative genealogy. The Chronicle, after all, situated Anglo-Saxon rulers within the flow of history, rather than simply within a list of names.

Yet this conclusion is still too simplistic. Although I have structured my discussion of the Chronicle genealogies along the lines of the orality/literacy debate, the co-occurrence in the Chronicle of a genre invented only through the mediation of writing (the chronicle form) and a genre originating in purely oral poetics (the alliterating genealogy) complicates the essential dualism which usually haunts this debate. O'Keeffe's terms "transitional literacy" and "residual orality" tend to reinscribe this dualism, especially in
their invocation of "a continuum for which 'orality' and 'literacy' are the end points" (13). Such a concept of a continuum implies a deterministic movement towards "literacy," and in scholarly circles, this almost always means a literacy like our own.

The evidence of the Chronicle genealogies, however, indicates that the problems of layout and inclusion they highlight do not simply spring from an "oral vs. literate" conflict. The various methods of punctuating genealogies adopted by the Parker scribe arose not from an attempt to capture the "oral" nature of the genealogical poem, but rather through the uncertainty which arose when their inclusion in the Chronicle demanded a new layout. The eventual system of metrical pointing which developed for the Chronicle genealogies was an attempt to recapture the strictly textual information previously embodied in their columnar layout.

At the same time, the genealogical genre within the Chronicle became less and less relevant as an element of the Chronicle, leading to the non-inclusion of genealogies in later annals, and the eventual removal of even the Common Stock genealogies from manuscripts D, E, and F. Undoubtedly, this trend reflects the very real fact that the Chronicle itself fulfilled the role of political legitimization which the genealogies previously fulfilled. But it should also be noted that the genealogy form itself did not die out. Besides the genealogical passages of the "West Saxon Regnal Table," tabular genealogies also continued to be copied and recopied throughout this period; the extensive genealogies in the Textus Roffensis were written at roughly the same time as the genealogy-deficient mss E and F of the Chronicle.

The history of the genealogies in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle is not simply the history of a textual form superseding an originally oral form, taking place within a culture progressing along a continuum towards "literacy." Rather, the record of the Chronicle genealogies shows us the development of a variety of punctuation designed to recapture the spatial features of an even earlier method of preserving that oral form. The varieties of
literacy corresponding to each of the stages of the *Chronicle* may have differed from that of each of the other stages, but each was a variety of literacy: different from each other, and certainly from our own literacy, each sort of literacy implied by the *Chronicle* genealogies may have demanded different contributions from its readers, but to simply invoke "orality" as the defining difference misses the very important point that to the Anglo-Saxons, these genealogical poems were probably perceived as literary texts throughout the history of the *Chronicle*. 
CHAPTER IV
The Poems of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*

The *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* contains a number of passages which are clearly poetic in nature, above and beyond the metrical and alliterative genealogies of the Common Stock. Exactly how much poetry the *Chronicle* contains, however, remains a matter of some uncertainty. The standard compilation of Anglo-Saxon poetry, the *Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records*, effectively canonized six poems from the *Chronicle*: *The Battle of Brunanburh* (937ABCD), *The Capture of the Five Boroughs* (942ABCD), *The Coronation of Edgar* (973ABC), *The Death of Edgar* (975ABC), *The Death of Alfred* (1036CD), and *The Death of Edward* (1065CD). The canonicity of these six poems is emphasized by the fact that Katherine O'Brien O'Keeffe discusses only these poems in the chapter on the *Chronicle* poems in her 1990 book *Visible Song*. Richard Schrader's recent book on the conceptions of history in Old English poetry likewise considers only these six poems from the *Chronicle*.

Editions of the *Chronicle*, however, often include many more passages as poetry. For example, Benjamin Thorpe's parallel-text edition prints as poetry only five of the passages printed by Krapp and Dobbie (not printing 1036CD as poetry), but also includes as poetry passages under the annals 959DEF, 975DE, 975D, 1011CDE, 1067D, and 1075E(1076D).¹ Plummer's standard edition includes as poetry all of these passages and

---

¹ For convenience, I will henceforth refer to the poems shared by 1075E and 1076D and the "1075DE" poems. When considered in isolation, I will retain their respective annal numbers. This difficulty in numbering can likewise be resolved by assigning names to these brief poems; in Appendix D, I give them the names "The Bridal Feast of Ralph" and "The Bridal Guests' Ruin."
others at 1075DE, 1086E, and 1104E. More recently, Robinson and Stanley's EEMF volume includes some of the passages omitted by Krapp and Dobbie, specifically, the passages from 975DE and 1086E. The C, D, and E volumes of Dumville and Keynes's "Collaborative Edition" of the Chronicle have yet to appear, so their editors' assessments of the metricality of these passages remains to be seen. However, almost all editors of the C, D, and E versions of the Chronicle treat the indicated passages as poetic (ms C: Margaret Ashdown; ms D: Classen and Harmer; ms E: Clark).

Such editors recognize that these passages differ from the prose which surrounds them, while editors focusing on Old English poetry fail to see in them poems featuring the usual alliterative metrical structure. An additional difficulty in determining whether or not certain passages of the Chronicle are poetic springs from our critical uncertainty about what the Anglo-Saxons thought of as poetry. Early in this century, W. J. Sedgefield said of these passages, "They are written in a metre, which, strongly marked and carefully observed in some cases, is in others hardly to be distinguished from prose" (Maldon xxi). One thing we can be sure of is that the poems which have made it into the ASPR come closest to fulfilling our expectations about what Anglo-Saxon poetry was like: they feature fairly consistent and regular alliteration and meter. But if the remaining passages printed as poetry by Plummer are not really poems, what are they?

The traditional answer to this question has been that they are "rhythmical prose." Despite its vaguely oxymoronic nature, this term is well-established in the critical vocabulary of Anglo-Saxon scholars. It is used most often to describe the loosely alliterative and metrical style used by the homilist Ælfric, and exemplified best by the prose style of his Lives of Saints. This style, although usually featuring conspicuous alliteration, does not scan as poetry according to the metrical rules first articulated by Eduard Sievers in 1875. An example of Ælfric's style can, perhaps, serve to bring out the essential characteristics of his "rhythmical prose":

[Text continues here]
Æfter ðan de Augustinus to Engla lande becom was sum æðele cyning Oswald gehaten on Norðymbra lande gelyfèd swyfe on God. Se ferde on his tugode frán his freondum and magumn to Scotlande on seæ and þær sóna wearð gefullæd and his geferan samod þe mid him sipeðon.

("After Augustine came to England, there was a noble king named Oswald in Northumbria who believed strongly in God. In his youth he journeyed from his friends and kin to Scotland over the sea, and was immediately there baptised, and so were his companions who travelled with him.")

As an example, this passage is fairly typical of Ælfric's "rhythmical" style; the alliteration in passages such as this one is so pervasive that scholars have likewise occasionally suggested that Ælfric's rhythmical writing is really poetry, not prose. Nevertheless the current consensus is that Ælfric was a prose writer, not a poet.

Another prose writer known for his rhythmical style was Ælfric's contemporary, Archbishop Wulfstan. Wulfstan, in fact, is credited with having actually written two of the Chronicle passages in question, the poem in 959DE and the poetic passage at the end of 975D. These poems feature Wulfstan's characteristic rhythmical format, and include a number of words and phrases typical of his style. Angus McIntosh, in his discussion of Wulfstan's prose, remarks that these passages have been "implicitly" accepted as poetic, despite their essential metrical indistinguishability from Wulfstan's sermonic and legal prose (117). Whether prose or poetry, however, the key feature of these Wulfstanian passages (as well as the other passages discussed in the chapter) is their qualitative differences from the prose which surrounds them. In the context of the Chronicle, it makes sense to think of these passages as "poetic" at least to the extent that they stand out as stylistically elevated in comparison to the rest of the Chronicle's prose.

Regardless, those passages from the Chronicle which have been seen as rhythmical prose, however, are often more metrically scannable than either Ælfric's or Wulfstan's prose. In addition, these portions of the Chronicle often use rhyme as an important
feature of their structure. The short poem in 1067D is illustrative, even though it is not included in either the ASPR or Robinson and Stanley's recent EEMF volume:

7 cwæð þe– heo hire ne nanne habban wolde.
gif hire seo uplice arfaestwyf geuman wolde.  
þe– heo on magðhade mihtigan drihtne.
mid lichomlicre heortan. on þisan life sceortan.
on clænre forhæfredynse cweman mihtie.

("And [she] said that she would have no one, if she wished to allow herself a virtuous goodness, that she might in maidenhood please the mighty Lord, in this short life, with her fleshly heart in pure abstinence."

Each of these lines can be scanned according to Sievers's system, although not without some small irregularities. Clearly, this poem alliterates in a fairly regular fashion in all five lines. It is also uses rhyme to link lines 1 and 2, lines 4a and 4b, and possibly lines 3 and 5. This is clearly not "rhythmical prose," but full-fledged poetry, even if it does not fit itself exactly to the ideals of alliterative Anglo-Saxon poetry which modern scholars have reconstructed. The fact that it does not fit neatly into such reconstructions, however, does not mean it is not poetry, only that it is a poem with different rules. Other passages may not be as obviously poetic as this portion of 1067D; however, this passage alone should be a sufficient reminder that we should not too quickly dismiss as non-poetic texts which fail to meet our usual criteria for what Anglo-Saxon poetry ought to look like.

In this chapter, I investigate the manuscript record of the non-canonical "poetic" passages of the *Chronicle* in order to attempt to determine whether or not the evidence of the layout of these passages suggests that the *Chronicle* scribes perceived them to be poetry. Simultaneously, I examine the significance of the pattern of inclusion of poems in the *Chronicle*: their virtual exclusion from the Common Stock, their flowering in the tenth century, and their continued presence in annals throughout the eleventh. In some ways, this pattern of poetic presence reverses the pattern of the inclusion and deletion described above for the genealogies. Ultimately, I argue that the poetic passages of the *Chronicle*
give some of the strongest evidence for the nature of changes in Anglo-Saxon cultural perceptions of the chronicle genre.

The Manuscript Presentation of the Poetic Passages.

In *Visible Song*, Katherine O'Brien O'Keeffe has examined the manuscript record of those *Chronicle* poems which have been granted canonicity by their appearance in the *Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records*. In her careful examination of the pointing, spacing, and capitalization of these poems in manuscripts A, B, C, and D of the *Chronicle*, she is able to argue persuasively that early (before the middle of the tenth century) records of poetry in the *Chronicle* featured few graphical clues to the poems' metrical structure. Regarding manuscript pointing, she concludes:

It is significant, therefore, that the differences in pointing which the four records of the *Chronicle* poems preserve are temporally distributed, from the earliest records in A (and, by inference, *B*) with very light pointing, to those in B and the portions of C which were probably copied from B, which tend to point the b-line, to the late practice in C and D, which generally tended to mark both a- and b-lines (137).

O'Keeffe uses her analysis of the pointing conventions in these manuscripts to reinforce her earlier conclusions about "formulaic reading" in these poems, where she suggested that the early records in A and B included more instances of such variant readings than the later records in A, C, and D (124-25).

The distribution of the poems considered by O'Keeffe, however, is markedly different from the distribution of the metrical passages under consideration here.² While O'Keeffe needed only to look at poems from mss A, B, C, and D, the metrical passages which are less canonical are concentrated in manuscripts D and E, with occasional passages in mss C and F. None of these passages, then, was copied before the middle of

² See Table 2.
Table 2
Poetry in the *Chronicle* Manuscripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annal</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>937</td>
<td><em>Battle of Brunanburh</em>¹</td>
<td>x²</td>
<td>x²</td>
<td>x²</td>
<td>x²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>942</td>
<td><em>Capture of Five Boroughs</em>¹</td>
<td>x²</td>
<td>x²</td>
<td>x²</td>
<td>x²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>959</td>
<td>&quot;The Death of Badwig&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>973</td>
<td><em>The Coronation of Edgar</em>¹</td>
<td>x²</td>
<td>x²</td>
<td>x²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>975</td>
<td><em>The Death of Edgar</em>¹</td>
<td>x²</td>
<td>x²</td>
<td>x²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>975</td>
<td>&quot;The Death of Edgar II&quot;</td>
<td>x²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x²</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>975</td>
<td>&quot;The Youth of Edward&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>979</td>
<td>&quot;The Murder of Edward&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1011</td>
<td>&quot;The Capture of Alfhæah&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1036</td>
<td><em>The Death of Alfred</em>¹</td>
<td>x²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1057</td>
<td>&quot;The Return of Edward&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1065</td>
<td><em>The Death of Edward</em>¹</td>
<td>x²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1067</td>
<td>&quot;The Wooing of Margaret&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1075</td>
<td>&quot;The Bridal Feast of Ralph&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1075</td>
<td>&quot;The Bridal Guest's Ruin&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1086</td>
<td>&quot;William the Conqueror&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1104</td>
<td>&quot;The Vexed Folk&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Edited in *ASPR* vol. 6 (1942)
² Facsimile in Robinson and Stanley, *EEMF* 23 (1991)
the eleventh century, and those in mss E and F were almost certainly not copied until the early twelfth century.

Small wonder if these passages do not conform to our notions of regular Old English verse, when a poem like *The Battle of Maldon*, which was probably composed near the beginning of the eleventh century is often described as "late." O'Keeffe provides a preview of the difficulties involved in investigating these metrical passages in her discussion of *The Death of Alfred*, the least regular of the poems she considers:

*The Death of Alfred*, the entry for 1036, is partly in prose, partly in hypermetric, often rhyming verse (lines 8, 9, 19, etc.), which occasionally does not alliterate. . . . Scribe 2 of C is responsible for copying this entry. There is no indication that he treats these poor verses as anything but prose. In Dobbie's edition, the first five 'lines' are printed as prose. (135)

That scribe 2 of ms C, who O'Keeffe has elsewhere characterized as "a careful copyist" (130), and who "repointed and accented according to eleventh-century practice" (131), has apparently failed to see verse in the 1036C entry testifies to a contemporary difficulty in identifying such passages as poetry. Yet even this passage is identified as verse by relatively conservative editors such as Dobbie. The question of whether other rhythmic passages are verse or not, then, might be equally difficult. The evidence of contemporary readers and scribes apparently might suggest that sometimes passages went unrecognized as verse, but even this does not necessarily indicate that such passages were not poetic.

Ultimately, the record of these passages in the *Chronicle* manuscripts must be examined for evidence of which passages were in fact likely to have been perceived as poems; their treatment by scribes will reveal the scribes' understanding of the role of poetry within the *Chronicle*. In order to assess the evidence of the manuscripts, however, it is necessary to examine each of the poetic passages separately. In the remainder of this section, I will examine the evidence of the relatively short poetic passages in 1067D, 1104E, 1075E(1076D), and 1011CDE. My examination of these brief poems will help me
develop the necessary critical tools to investigate the longer poetic passages in the next section.

Earlier in this chapter, I quoted the poetic lines from 1067D, which not only featured regular alliteration, but also rhyme. The pointing of these five lines suggests that the scribe recognized these lines as poetry. Each poetic line is pointed after the b-verse, and line four, with its internal rhyme, is pointed after both verses. In terms of the poem's structure, the points after the rhymed half-lines in line 4 are, perhaps, redundant (since they indicate structural features in the poem already marked by rhyme), but the fact that the scribe pointed them indicates both his understanding of the structure and his desire to mark that structure for his readers. Whether the points at the ends of the other lines result from their rhyme (wolde-wolde, drihtne-mihte) or from their metrical positions may be impossible to determine. Nevertheless, the pointing in 1067D clearly shows the scribe's desire to mark the poem's structure with punctuation.

A number of the briefer passages from the latter stages of the *Chronicle* which are printed as short verses by Plummer are similar in presentation to line four of the poem from 1067D, but the interpretation of their layout is not always so straightforward. The last such brief passage, from 1104E, provides a useful example:

_Ealle bis was god mid to gremienne._
_7 pas arme leode mid to tregienne._ (Laud Misc. 636, fo. 75v, ll. 20-21)

("All this served to irritate God, and to vex this wretched people.")

These lines neither alliterate nor admit to easy classification according to Sievers's system, but the rhyming parallel structure of the second halves of these two lines certainly suggests the likelihood that these lines are intended as a poetic couplet. The points after the rhyming words seem intended to mark the structure here, as in the poem from 1067D, but such may not be the case. The first point precedes the abbreviation for _ond_, which, for the scribe of E, is a habitual spot for a point, while the second point marks the end of the
entire annal. Neither of these points, then, is certainly intended to mark this couplet’s structure; on the other hand, the entire couplet is set of with a capital E. The capital here does seem intended to mark off this couplet as separate from the prose of the annal which precedes it, but capitals are not so unusual in ms E to make even this certain: there are five other capitals in 1104E, not including the capital in the annal-initial "Her."

Other short poetic passages in these manuscripts receive the same sort of ambiguous treatment. Additionally, some of these brief passages include textual variations which shed light upon the ways in which scribes approached them. Interesting examples of such variation occur in the 1011CDE and 1075E(1076D) poems.

The evidence of the 1011CDE poem is complicated and suggests it enjoyed differing receptions in the late Anglo-Saxon period. As it appears in its earliest record in 1011C, the passage containing the poem reads:

\[
\ldots 7 \text{ læddon } \text{ þone } \text{ arceb- mid him } \text{ wæs } \text{ ða ræpling } \text{ se } \text{ ðe } \text{ ær wæs } \text{ heafod } \text{ angelkynnes } \text{ 7 cristen domes. } \text{ þær } \text{ man } \text{ mihte } \text{ ða } \text{ geseon } \text{ yrmðe } \text{ þær } \text{ man oft } \text{ ær geseah blisse } \text{ on } \text{ þære earman byrig. } \text{ þanon coærest cristendom } \text{ 7 blis for gode } \text{ 7 for worulde } \text{ 7 hi hæfdan } \text{ þone } \text{ arceb- mid him } \text{ swa lange } \text{ oð } \text{ þære timan } \text{ þe } \text{ hi } \text{ hine } \text{ gemartiredon. } \text{ (Cotton Tiberius B i, fo. 150v ll. 12-18).}
\]

("and [the here] led the archbishop with them; he was then a captive, who before was the head of the English, and of Christendom. There one might see misery where one had often before seen bliss in that wretched city, from which first came Christendom and bliss for God and for the world. And they had the archbishop with them as long as until that time when they martyred him."

How best to recover the poetry in this passage is not immediately apparent; based on the pointing of ms C and the assumption that at least part of this passage is poetic, I would lineate it in this manner:

\[
7 \text{ læddon } \text{ þone } \text{ arceb-} \\
\text{ mid him } \text{ wæs } \text{ ða } \text{ ræpling } \text{ se } \text{ ðe } \text{ ær wæs } \text{ heafod } \\
\text{ angelkynnes } \text{ 7 cristen domes. } \\
\text{ þær } \text{ man } \text{ mihte } \text{ ða } \text{ geseon } \text{ yrmðe } \text{ þær } \text{ man } \text{ oft } \text{ ær geseah blisse}
\]
on þære earman byrig.
þanon co-ærest cristendom 7 blis
for gode 7 for worulde
7 hi hæfdan þone arceð— mid him swa lange oð þære timan þe hi hine
gemartiredon.

("And the army led away the archbishop. With them was then a captive who had
earlier been the head of the English and of Christendom. There one might see
misery where one had often before seen bliss in that wretched city. From there
first came Christendom and bliss for God and for the world. And they had the
archbishop with them as long as until that time when they martyred him."
)

I've included a separate translation for the lineated passage in order to reflect the structure
of the poem as reconstructed. The points in this passage fall after line 2 and line 4 above,
suggesting that scribe 2 of ms C felt these poetic positions to be significant, either
syntactically, structurally or metrically. Significantly, these points bracket the three half-
lines which make up lines 3 and 4. These can be construed as purely syntactical points (as
my translation reflects), but their structural and metrical functionality should not be
dismissed. After all, they certainly do function metrically here, marking line 2 as separate
from line 3, and more importantly, signalling that line 4 was complete after a lone half-line.

That this interpretation of these points is justified can be confirmed by examining
other features of this passage. The lone half-line in line 4, for example, can be seen to
belong with line 3, sharing the vocalic alliteration and b-alliteration of line 3b. Parallel
structure within lines 1 and 3 marks them as well-defined units. Likewise, it is likely that
line 5 should appear as it does above, so that its repetition of the word "bliss" will receive
emphasis through rhyme.

In the end, the layout and structure of this passage from 1011C leaves little doubt
of its metrical nature, although this poem relies not only on traditional (Sievers-style)
alliteration, but likewise rhyme, unpaired half-lines, parallelism, and fourth-stress
alliteration (in iïne 1) as poetic features. Scribe 2 of manuscript C is apparently able to
identify the structure here, and although the pointing is light, it does effectively mark the
poem's structure. The evidence from the versions of this passage in mss D and E is, however, less clear-cut.

This passage in 1011D differs, in some ways, from its record in 1011C. In the D manuscript, this poem appears as follows:

\[\text{wæs se ræpling se } \text{þe wæs heafod angeli} \\
\text{cynnes. 7 cristendomes. þær man meahæ þa ge} \\
\text{seon ermūde þær man ofi ær geseah blisse on þære} \\
\text{earman byrig. þanon us com ærest cristendom} \\
\text{7bliss for gode. 7 for weorulde.} \] (Cotton Tiberius B iv, fo. 63r, ll. 5-9).

Here, a point appears before wæs, suggesting that the scribe of 1011D felt that the phrase *mid him* belonged to the preceding clause, rather than to the poetic passage. Although this reading reconfigures the metricality of the first half-line (and removes the possibility that *him* and *heafod* alliterate in line 1), it does provide a somewhat easier reading of the clause before the poem.

In general, the pointing in this passage of 1011D is heavier than in 1011C. Both versions feature points after *cristendomes* and *byrig*, but 1011D adds points after *angelcynnes* and *gode*, as well as the point before wæs. The points after *angelcynnes* and *gode* precede the abbreviation for *ond*, and thus perhaps have no larger metrical or structural significance. On the other hand, the point after *gode* and that which precedes this entire passage in 1011D both seem to disrupt the meter; as such they seem to argue against the possibility that the scribe recognized this passage as poetry. Likewise, this scribe's deletion of *ða* and *ær* from the first line here makes less clear the parallelism which otherwise links lines 1 and 2 with lines 3-4 (*ða* and *ær* both appear in 1011CE, l. 1).

The record of 1011D could be lineated as poetry as follows, but whether or not the scribe really recognized this passage as poetry or not is uncertain. The evidence of the first line, at least, suggests that he may not have.

\[\text{wæs se ræpling } \text{se } \text{þe wæs heafod} \\
\text{angelcynnes. 7 cristendomes.} \]
\[ \text{ær man meahte ða geseon ermōc} \quad \text{ær man ofi ær geseah blisse} \\
\text{on ðære earman byrig.} \\
\text{ðanon us com ærest cristendom} \\
\text{7 bliss for gode.} \\
\text{7 for weorulde.} \]

Such a lineation respects the ms punctuation, although introducing a metrical anomaly into line 5b. It also removes the rhyme linking lines 3 and 5. Ultimately, there is no compelling reason to suspect that the pointing of this passage is anything but syntactic (marking off lines 3-4 as a unit) and mechanical (before 7). The point before the \textit{wæs} of line 1, in fact suggests syntactic pointing which leads to a reading that removes any possibility of alliteration in the first line.

The evidence of manuscript E also raises the possibility that the scribe failed to recognize this passage as poetry. Although ms E has a point before \textit{mid him}, which separates this phrase from the preceding clause, and retains \textit{ær} in the first line, other evidence suggests that this scribe did not really understand the poetic structure of this passage. It appears in ms E like this:

\[
\text{7 læddon ðon~} \\
\text{arc~b~. mid him wæs ða ræwling. se þe ær wæs angelcynnes} \\
\text{heafod. 7 xp~endomes. ðær man mihte ða geseon earmōc} \\
\text{þær man ær geseah blisse on þære earman byrig. þanon} \\
\text{us co~ærest xp~endom. 7 blisse for gode. 7 for worulde.} \\
\text{(Laud Misc. 636, fo. 45r, ll. 23-27).} \
\]

Although the words "\textit{mid him}" are here pointed as if they belong with the poem, the word "\textit{heafod}" has now been moved, removing any possibility that it might be seen as alliterating with "\textit{him}." At the same time, this rearrangement disrupts the structure of what in 1011CD was line 2. As in the case of 1011D, this passage from 1011E gives little convincing evidence in its pointing that it was considered to be poetry. The lexical rearrangement evidenced by the phrase "\textit{angelcynnes heafod}" and the spelling "\textit{rawling}" suggest, respectively, that the poem may not have been recognized or may not have been fully understood. Attempts to lineate this poem as it appears in ms E are less successful
than for either 1011D or 1011C. The following is the best version which respects the ms pointing:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{\textit{mid him wæs ða ræwling.}} \\
\text{\textit{se þe ær wæs angelcynnes heafod.}} \\
\text{\textit{7 xp--endomes.}} \\
\text{\textit{þær man mihte þa geseon earmðe þær man ær geseah blisse}} \\
\text{\textit{on þære ærman byrig.}} \\
\text{\textit{þanon us co--ærest xp--endom.}} \\
\text{\textit{7 blisse for gode. 7 for worulde.}}
\end{align*}
\]

This is metrically the least effective of the three versions. While it is possible that the scribe of ms E felt this passage to be a poem structured as shown here, it seems just as likely that this passage was perceived as prose by the E scribe. The kinds of lexical substitutions and deletions here and in the 1011D passage, however, seem characteristic of the kinds of textual variation found in prose passages in Chapter Two above. These scribes may simply have seen this passage as prose and treated it accordingly.

The parallel passages in 1075E and 1076D reveal similar uncertainties about how their respective scribes perceived them. The brief couplet which occurs early in these annals is an interesting case. In the earlier record from 1076D, the couplet reads as follows: "\textit{þær wæs }\textit{þ}--\textit{brydealo. }\textit{þ}--\textit{wæs manegra manna bealo.}" ("There was that bridal-feast that was the ruin of many men"). The version preserved in manuscript E is somewhat different in form, if the same in intent: "\textit{þær wæs }\textit{þ}--\textit{brydeala/ mannu-- to beala.}" ("There was that bridal-feast, to the downfall of men"). In the D version, there are points after each half-line, and the end of the couplet is signalled by a following capital letter, although nothing marks the beginning of the couplet. The couplet from 1075E is pointed at the end, while the word \"brydeala\" occurs at a ms line-end. The 1075E couplet is also followed by a capitalized word. The pointing and layout of both versions suggest that both scribes recognized the structure of this couplet.
The way the two versions differ lexically, however, is also worth examining. The later version in 1075E is metrically more "normal" than the 1076D version, although the earlier record in 1076D would normally be thought of as more original. The reading in 1075E might result from a process of "formulaic reading" as described by O'Keeffe, in which metrically and syntactically appropriate alternative readings are substituted into texts by readers and scribes. It is equally possible (although perhaps less likely) that the reading in 1076D might have originally arisen through the same process. Regardless, the variant forms of this remarkably short passage suggest a recognition of them as poetic, at least so far as they maintain the poetic structure in both cases. This conclusion is buttressed by the pointing and layout of the D and E versions. The record of the passages printed by Plummer as poetry at the end of these annals, however, tells a somewhat different story.

The poetic lines which end the 1076 annal in manuscript D are punctuated and presented like this:

\[
\text{sume hi wurdon geblende.} \\
7 \text{sume wrecen of lande. 7 sume getawod to scande. } \text{hus wurdon} \\
\text{hes kyninges swican genyderade.}
\]

("Some of them were blinded, and some exiled from the lande, and some brought to shame: thus were traitors to the king brought low."")

This passage is set off from the preceding prose with a ms point and ends the annal. The points within the passage function to mark the three half-lines linked by rhyme. The whole passage should, perhaps, according to modern conventions, be laid out as follows:

\[
\text{sume hi wurdon geblende.} \quad 7 \text{sume wrecen of lande.} \\
7 \text{sume getawod to scande.} \\
\text{hus wurdon hes kyninges swican genyderade.}
\]

Again, it seems possible that while the points after lines 1a and 1b are the result of habitual pointing before "7" as much as metrical or structural markers, the point after line 2 seems
to clearly mark either a lone half-line or a rhyme. The last line, although it can be scanned metrically, has no alliteration; whether or not it is really part of the poem is difficult to determine. It does seem on the basis of content, however, to belong with the three preceding half-lines.

The parallel passage in 1075E, however, seems to both improve and impoverish the verse. In the ms, it appears as:

\[
\text{sume}
\]

\[hy \text{ würdon ahlænde } 7 \text{ sume of lande adrifene. swa würdon Will-} \text{mes swican geniðræde.}\]

("Some of them were blinded and some driven from the land: so were traitors to William brought low.")

Relineated in poetic lines, this would now be printed:

\[
\text{sume hy würdon ahlænde} \quad 7 \text{ sume of lande adrifene.}
\]

\[\text{swa würdon Will-} \text{mes} \quad \text{swican geniðræde.}\]

As in ms D, this passage is preceded by a point; the other points in the E ms, however, appear to mark poetic lines. However, the version preserved in ms E does not rhyme at all, and the replacement of "wrecen" with "adrifene" removes the alliteration of the first line. Other changes, however, appear to privilege alliteration. The replacement of "pæs kyninges" with "Willelmes" appears to give line 2a double alliteration, although it is not followed up in line 2b. "Swa" for "pus," on the other hand, raises the possibility that alliteration may be operative in this passage, if we scan these lines somewhat differently. If swa takes the stress in 2a, then it clearly would alliterate with swican in 2b; although such a scansion is perfectly regular in form, we would normally expect würdon to take stress in 2a. Even more radical, however, is the consequent suggestion that if sume takes stress in 1a and 1b, we might see line 1 as alliterating on "s" (sume, sume). Ultimately this 1075E passage gives us two possibilities: if we scan it the way we scanned its analogue in
1076D, it neither rhymes nor alliterates (barring the internal alliteration of 2a). But if we scan it in a less traditional way, both lines might be seen as alliterative.

The record of such varying passages as we find in 1076D and 1075E gives us clear examples of the kinds of difficulties these passages present. The early couplets in the passages seem clearly to have been perceived as poetic couplets. The later passage which ends these annals, however, is less easily interpreted. The end of 1076D was almost certainly seen as poetic by its scribe: the points parallel the rhyme to clearly mark the structure, setting off the first three half-lines from the following line. In 1075E, the record differs, either preserving a version without the alliteration and rhyme featured in lines 1-2 of the 1076D passage, or presenting us with a more alliterative version, but one structured according to less-traditional metrical system. The layout suggests that the passage may have been seen as poetry, however; if this was indeed the case, though, the standards of alliteration and stress were apparently very different from those we are accustomed to applying to Old English verse.

Ultimately, the evidence of the shorter poetic passages from manuscripts C, D, and E suggests that the earlier records tended to be more sensitive to the poetic nature of these passages, at least as far as the layout of the versions suggests. The poem in 1011C is presented more effectively as poetry than either its 1011D or 1011E analogues. The evidence of 1067D and both passages in 1076D suggests that the scribes of the latest portion of manuscript D had a regular habit of pointing rhyming passages, and perhaps a habit of pointing regular poetic lines on the B-verse. The record of the passages in 1075E (as well as that in 1011E) suggests that the scribe of E either transmitted these poetic passages sloppily (rearranging and substituting words to disrupt rhyme and alliteration schemes preserved in C and D) or had a somewhat different idea of what was appropriate as poetry. As the 1104E passage confirms, the evidence from these passages in ms E is
ambiguous at best in revealing how well the scribe of ms E understood these poetic passages.

**The Longer Poetic Passages**

Due to their relative length, it would be impractical to quote the entirety of the remaining non-canonical poetic passages of the *Chronicle* within the text of this section; I refer readers instead to Appendix D, in which I have edited the texts according to the principles I used in the previous section and attempt to articulate these principles more fully. In Appendix D, I also briefly discuss the relation of the metrical systems of these poems to traditional Sievers-style versification; in this section, I propose to investigate what the manuscript record has to say about scribes' reception and transmission of these "non-standard" poems.

The longer poetic passages that I will consider in this section lie in annals 959DE, 975DE, 975D, 979DE, 1057D, and 1086E. Some of these passages rely heavily upon rhyme (e.g. 1086E), while others make use of more or less standard alliteration (e.g. 975DE). Some were clearly recognized as poetic by their scribes; others, however, appear to have gone unrecognized.

The passage most obviously recognized as poetic by its scribe is the poem on William the Conqueror in 1086E. The Peterborough scribe responsible for copying this poem carefully pointed it, marking the rhyme with points. Passages from this poem such as the following are typical:

```
he forbead þa heortas.  swylce eac þa ðaras.
swa swiðe 'he' lufode þa headeor.  swilce he were heora fæder.
Eac he sætte be þæ– haran.  þ– hi moste freo faran.
```
"He forbid the [hunting of] harts, and likewise of boars. He loved the noble creatures as strongly as if he were their father. Also he ordered regarding the hares that they be allowed to roam freely.")

The regular pointing of the rhymed passages here in 1086E demonstrates that the Peterborough scribe not only recognized the rhymed structure of this poem, but thought that that structure ought to be marked with punctuation. The regularity of the pointing in this passage is even more interesting in light of the places where the pointing apparently breaks down. In line 15 (as I've lineated the poem in the Appendix) the scribe points neither half-line:

\[ac he moston mid ealle \quad pes cynges wille folgian\]

("But they must above all follow the king's will."")

Apparently the scribe is unable to see any rhyme here and thus uses no punctuation. The possibility that 15b could be rearranged to rhyme on "wille" (which would be a close enough rhyme, considering others recognized by the scribe) never occurs to the scribe; instead, the entire line is seen as not participating in the poetic structure strongly enough to be marked. A possible explanation might be that the scribe is not entirely accustomed to rhyming poetry such as this; this hypothesis is supported by the pointing of lines 2-4:

\[Se cyng was swa swide stearc.\]
\[7 bena- of his underboddan man.\]
\[manig marc goldes. \quad 7 ma hundred pundae seolfres.\]

("The king was very severe, and took from his subjugated follower[s?] many marks of gold and more hundred pounds of silver."")

Editors are almost universal in their agreement that "stearc" and "marc" are here intended as rhymes (Plummer, Sedgefield, Clark), but the scribe has not here pointed this pair as a rhyming pair. Seeing "marc" as a rhyme for "stearc," however, leaves only "goldes" as the initial half-line of line 4, a situation which would cause serious metrical difficulties, if a

---

3 Whiting, in his study of the rhymes in this passage, suggests that this rhyme is acceptable; he reads "folgian" as if pronounced "folse" (95). Whether we accept this rhyme or assume a lexical rearrangement has taken place is somewhat irrelevant; the scribe's treatment of the ealle-folgian pair suggests that he did not hear a rhyme.
Sieversian metrical system is operative. The scribe apparently realizes this, however, writing and pointing "manig marc godes" as a complete half-line. The practice of the Peterborough scribe in 1086E, then, suggests the remarkable conclusion that he saw this passage as poetry, even though he may not have been as familiar with rhyming poetry as he might have been. Instead, he seems to have been looking for the structures of traditional OE verse, unable or unwilling to point according to rhyme but against his sense of meter or even to make the most obvious rearrangement of his text to restore a missing rhyme.

That the E scribe is clearly able to identify verse and mark its structure as he sees it gives us a powerful tool to examine the other large poems which he copied. Although the evidence of layout is less conclusive than in 1086E, the evidence from 959E, 975E, and 979E all confirm that the E scribe was well acquainted with a tradition of metrical and structural pointing of Old English verse which he applied to these passages.

The least clear case of this occurs in the 979E passage. In this poem on the death of Edward the Martyr, the E manuscript marks the structure with both capital letters and points. The poem is largely structured as a set of balanced antitheses; four capitals occur, one at the beginning of the poem, one after the last pair of balanced statements. The other two capitals mark the beginning of one set of opposed statements, and the middle of another. As such the capitals, while clearly marking important points in the text, are not used consistently here as clear structural clues. On the other hand, points are used very consistently to set off each member of the pairs of opposed statements: such points bracket the theses in lines 4a, 5, 7, 10-11a, 13 (although no point precedes 13a), and their antitheses in lines 4b, 6, 8-9, 11b-12, and 14-15. These points are clearly intended to mark this passage's structure—even though all such points fall between half-lines, then, it is doubtful they they are intended chiefly as metrical markers. Only two other points appear in this entire passage, one written in above the line (evidently a later addition) before the
"7" in 17b, and the one at the end of line 2. The superscript point might be intended as metrical, but since it precedes the "7" abbreviation, this is unprovable. The other point can only be explained as a metrical point, marking a lone half-line, suggesting that here, too, the E scribe wished to mark metrical structure for his readers. Nevertheless, the overall pointing of this passage suggests a desire to mark the syntactic and rhetorical structure of the antitheses, rather than the poetic structure. That the two often coincide, though, makes any conclusion based solely on this passage risky at best.

The E scribe's practice in the poems of 959E is likewise ambiguous. Although the majority of the points in 959E precede either "7" or capital letters (and hence can be explained as either metrical or mechanical points), there is evidence that the pointing of this passage may have been intended as metrical pointing. First of all, the half-lines 16a and 17a include within them the abbreviation "7"; these two uses of this symbol do not occur on a verse boundary, and are likewise not preceded by a point. In these lines (although not in 9b) the "mechanical" point preceding "7" is avoided when it would not simultaneously serve a metrical function. In addition, other points are used after 20b and 27b which seem to function as metrical points. Although the pointing here is not heavy when not in the neighborhood of "7," those points which are present (as well as the "missing" points in 16a, 17a, might possibly suggest a pattern of metrical pointing, especially on b-verses.

The poem at the beginning of 975E, however, provides the clearest evidence that the E scribe tended to point metrically, on the b-verse. In the nine poetic lines here, 7 are pointed on the b-verse, while one of those b-verses left unpointed occurs at the end of a ms page. Only one a-verse is pointed, the rhyming verse in line 7 (although the rhyming word in 5a is not pointed). This pointing is nearly as regular as that in 1086E; there can be little doubt that here, at least, marking the poetic structure of this passage was the scribe's intention.
Examined as a group, then, we can describe the scribe's pointing habits when it comes to verse as follows: point b-verses of non-rhyming verse; point both rhymes in rhyming half-lines. (Notice the identical pointing of 1067D.) His application of these habits in 1086E and 975E is almost perfect. The less-than-perfect application of these standards to the passages in 959E (13 of 27 full lines pointed, seven non-rhyming a-lines pointed), 979E (pointing syntactic and rhetorical structure, rather than metrical structure) suggests indeed that the Peterborough scribe was either less confident about the poetic nature of these passages or unsure of it altogether.

The longer poetic passages in the D manuscript are even more difficult to interpret than the poems in the E ms. Four of the poems (959D; both poems in 975D; 979D) are in one hand (Ker's hand 2, who likewise wrote 1011D), while the poem in 1057D is in yet another, itself possibly distinct from the writers of both 1067D and 1075D. The poems in the tenth century annals are written in the same hand as was responsible for the tenth century poems from the D ms considered by O'Keeffe (937D, 942D); they therefore serve as the basis for the crucial comparison of this writer's treatment of "canonical" and "non-canonical" poems.

Unfortunately, scribe 2 of ms D was, according to O'Keeffe's estimate, "no good reader of verse" (135). Her comments about his habits of pointing in 937D and 942D are worth quoting at length:

In the seventy-three lines of The Battle of Brunanburh, the scribe points six a-lines and forty-five possible b-lines. While it may appear from these numbers that the scribe preferred to point b-lines, the numbers are misleading. In three instances (10a, 32a and 41b), the scribe misplaces a point in the middle of a line, and in two further cases, a-line points precede an 7, a conventional place for pointing prose (2a and 62a). His pointing of only 60 percent of the b-lines and his lack of pattern in doing so suggest that his pointing practice is either lax or uncertain. His practice for the 942 entry is casual as well. In this poem he points six a- and six b-lines, though not the same half-lines. He mispoints 10b in mid-line here as well, by positioning a point between the free morphemes of hafteclommum. Actually, the
pointing in 942 is closer to prose pointing than metrical pointing, since the majority of points separate items in a series. (134-35)

Given this assessment of scribe 2's pointing practice as "lax or uncertain," it is difficult to determine the value of his pointing practice as evidenced in the 959D, 975D, and 979D annals. In 959D, for example, there are 27 points in 28 lines of poetry. Twenty-two of these, however, fall before either "7" or a capital letter, as in 959E, and three of these fall in mid-line, rather than at the end of any half-line (while only one case of "7" within a half-line remains unpointed--16a). The remaining points (after 5a, 13b, 18a, 20b, and 27b) might be seen as metrical points, as they show no obvious pattern of syntactic or structural use. But that only five of the points in this poem are likely to be purely metrical is scanty evidence indeed. While this is still more potentially metrical points than in 959E (where, conversely, there was a better record of not pointing mid-line "7"), the evidence of 959D is no more conclusive of any pattern of metrical pointing.

In the two poetic passages in 975D, there are only two points which do not precede either "7" or a capital letter. Both occur in the second poetic passage, after 14b and 17b. Both occur on clause boundaries, and on apparent rhymes (although at 17b the rhyme is only inflectional, even if carried through 4 half-lines). These points then cannot be considered to be strictly metrical.

The poem in 1057D is by another hand entirely (although possibly the same hand as was responsible for the poems in 1065D and 1067D--Ker is somewhat unclear on this). He places points at 1b, 4b, 6b, 8b, 11, 14b, 15a (before "7"), 17a, and at the end of the poem, at 18b. With the exception of the point at 15a, all of these seem to occur at clause boundaries, and are thus probably not strictly metrical. The possibility that the scribe may not have recognized this passage as poetry is supported by the record of lines 2-3: "Se wæs Eadwerdes broðor sunu kynges/ Eadmund 'cing'" ("He was Eadwerd's brother, son of the king, king Eadmund"). The lack of inflectional ending on Eadmund and the interlined word "cing" suggest an attempt by the scribe to fix up the text somehow; it is
tempting to reconstruct a metrically superior possible reading: "Se wes Eadwerdes broðor Eadmundes sumu kynges." If such a line preceded the reading recorded in 1057D, it would provide clear evidence that the scribe here was not reading this as poetry, because it would suggest that he had substituted non-metrical material in a fashion appropriate for prose, but not for poetry.

Ultimately, the evidence of manuscript D is in some ways divided against itself. In the long works in the scribe 2's hand, there is little or no compelling evidence for metrical pointing (including the 1011D poem). On the other hand, the late short poems in 1067D and 1076D evidence a clear pattern of regular pointing, after the b-line for unrhymed lines, and after both halves of rhyming lines—the same pattern used by the E scribe for 1086E and 975E. The 1057D poem may have been written by the same scribe; however, it is apparently pointed syntactically, rather than metrically. Possibly this passage went unrecognized as poetry.

Taken together, the evidence of mss D and E together suggests that late scribes such as these may not have always been able to perceive the verse in their texts (even such "regular" verse as that in 937D, 942D, and 1065D, as O'Keeffe notes). However, their ability to recognize verse in some cases is conclusively demonstrated by the pointing in such passages as 975E, 1067D, 1075D, and 1086E. The pattern shown in these passages of pointing b-lines of non-rhyming lines and both halves of rhyming lines gives us evidence that not all late scribes fit the description given by O'Keeffe to ms D's scribe 2: "the reader shows little familiarity with either the formulae or conventions of Old English verse" (135). Instead, it seems clear from the evidence of this section that a conventional pattern of pointing Old English verse continued to be used and developed, even as Old English poetry came to depend less on alliteration and more on rhyme. That scribes of both the D and E manuscripts had trouble marking as verse passages with less than consistent rhyme
or alliteration only confirms our own perception of some of these passages as non-standard Anglo-Saxon poetry.

The Place of Poetry in the *Chronicle*

The compiler or compilers of the Common Stock of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* saw no reason to include any Old English poetry within their document, even though King Alfred was known to have held Old English poetry in high regard. And not until the writing of the 937 entry, *The Battle of Brunanburh*, was poetry first entered into the *Chronicle*. After this, however, poetry became a more or less regular feature of the *Chronicle*, with long or short poetic passages entered into the *Chronicle* in fourteen separate annals spanning from 937 to 1104.

That later annalists clearly felt poetry to be appropriate material for the *Chronicle* can hardly be doubted, even if there is evidence that the *Chronicle* scribes did not always recognize the poetry before them. At the same time as the alliterating genealogies were coming to seem inappropriate for including in additional annals, then, poetry was coming to seem more appropriate for inclusion. The dynamics of these shifts have important implications for our understanding of the place of the *Chronicle* in Anglo-Saxon culture.

I argued in Chapter Three that the failure to include further genealogies in the *Chronicle*, and their eventual deletion from its manuscripts was a result of a cultural shift in the mechanism used to locate rulers within a historical context. Before the *Chronicle*’s existence, alliterating genealogical poems accomplished this cultural work; these genealogies were usually maintained as lists by clerics, although the form of the genealogies was based upon an earlier, purely oral form. After the publication of the *Chronicle*, however, English history was made widely accessible, and rulers could be (and
were) more easily and more fully situated in the flow of history through their inclusion in its pages (although this did not bring about the end of clerical lists of genealogies).

The rise of poetry in the Chronicle marked a different cultural shift, but one just as deeply connected to the Chronicle's publication. In Chapter One, I argued that the original publication of the Chronicle was almost certainly an integral portion of King Alfred's educational program, designed to play a crucial role in the development of English nationalism by presenting the history of all the English peoples--Northumbrians, Mercians, West Saxons and others--in a single unified document. The cultural work done by the Chronicle, then, is what is celebrated by the early poems of the Chronicle, as much as the political and military events they describe. Indeed, I think it is worthwhile to consider the Chronicle poems as falling into two separate main groupings, each of which functions in its own way to make political statements about the nature of the English kingdom. The first of these groups consists of the tenth century poems beginning with Brunanburh and ending with the 979DE poem. The second group of poems consists of those poems grouped about the Norman Conquest: the poems in 1057D, 1065CD, 1067D, 1075DE, and 1086E.

It is significant that the first poem to find a place in the Chronicle, The Battle of Brunanburh, is both the longest of the Chronicle poems and the best known. Occurring in annal 937 of mss A, B, C, and D, Brunanburh is a politically canny celebration of Athelstan's victory over a combined army of Northmen, Scots, and Strathclyde Welsh. This victory is commonly seen by both literary and historical scholars as the culmination of the nation-building efforts of the West Saxon dynasty founded by King Alfred:

The victory of the English forces at Brunanburh under the command of Athelstan and his brother Edmund was the military climax of a movement by which Alfred the Great and his immediate successors, having first freed their hereditary West Saxon kingdom from the threat of Danish conquest, gradually gained power over the whole of England and made themselves secure against their enemies abroad (Pope 54).
Similar sentiments are expressed by Steaton, who argues that even the Anglo-Saxon scholar and homilist Ælfric viewed Athelstan in much the same light, listing him with Alfred and Edgar as "the three English kings whose histories might encourage a harassed people" (343).

Brunanburh shows itself to be highly conscious of political affiliations in its abundant use of names for individuals, nations, and places. Despite the modern uncertainty of the precise location of Brunanburh, the Brunanburh-poet is careful to outline and emphasize the nature of the combined forces on both sides. The losers of the battle, we are told, are Anlaf (king of the Dublin Vikings) and Constantinus (king of the Picts and Scots). Their troops are variously styled Scotsmen (11a, 19b, 32a), Northmen (18b, 33a, 53a) and sailors (11b, 32a). Twice (11, 32a) such names are poetically paired to suggest that Athelstan's enemies were a combined force of "sailors" (i.e. Norse vikings) and Scotsmen. Once put to flight, the Northmen in particular seek Dinges mere and Dublin. The repeated use of all these names and descriptions clearly marks Athelstan's enemies as non-Anglo-Saxon; Athelstan's English force, on the other hand, is depicted as a relatively united group. West Saxons and Mercians both make up this force, and they operate in complete complementarity:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{wesseaxe forð.} \\
\text{ondlongne dæg. eorodcistum.} \\
\text{on last legdun. lāþum þeodum} \\
\text{heowan herefleman. hindan þearle.} \\
\text{mecum mylenscearpán. myrce ne wyrndon.} \\
\text{heeardes hondplegan. hæleþa namum} \\
\text{þæ mid anlæfe. ofer æra gebland.} \\
\text{on lides boßme. land gesohtum.} \\
\text{feæge to gefeohite.} \\
\end{align*}
\]

(937A, ll. 20b-28a)

("The West-Saxons in horse-troops pursued the track of the enemy peoples all day long, hewed the fleeing army, struck from behind with mill-sharp swords. The Mercians did not refuse hard hand-play to any of the warriors who, with Anlaf,
over the waves' washing, on the ship's bosom, sought that land, doomed men to battle.")

The English leaders are each named only once, at the very beginning of the poem. Elsewhere, they are identified by their family relationships: "afaran eadwardes" (7a), "eadweardes afaran" (52), "pa gebroher begun ætsamne" (57). Not only do these familial designations serve to emphasize the fact that Athelstan and Edmund are indeed the heirs to Edward and Alfred, but they also subtly imply that Athelstan and Edmund are familiar enough to English readers that they don't need to be named more than once. Anlaf, by contrast, is named three times. Readers are brought into a community in which the members of Edward's family are common knowledge.

The poem's final lines emphasize the nature of this specifically Anglo-Saxon community. By invoking the cultural myth of the Anglo-Saxon migration, Brunanburh functions to remind readers of their Anglo-Saxon heritage and identity. The migration-era victories over the British and Welsh (the last four lines of the poem feature the proper names "Engle," Seaxe," "Brytene," and "Wealas"4) are here made to serve as precursors to the victory at Brunanburh. In both eras, combined forces made up of Angles and Saxons (Mercians and West-Saxons) put the Welsh and their allies to flight. By emphasizing and echoing this shared history, Brunanburh reinforced the political unity of Athelstan's kingdom and its own direct descent from Alfred's kingdom.

To a surprisingly large degree, the Chronicle's other tenth century poems (each of which is likewise concerned with the reign of a descendent of Alfred) have much the same effect. This can be seen most clearly, perhaps, in the 942ABCD poem, The Capture of the Five Boroughs. In this brief poem, the nature of Edmund's kingdom is expressed by the celebration of his recapturing of the "five boroughs" of Leicester, Lincoln, Nottingham,

---

4 The A manuscript here reads "wealasses." Although the double "e" here seems to be a fairly normal orthographic variant (cf. "heerades" in l. 25) it is interesting to consider reading "we ealles ofercoman" ("We overcame all") in line 72b. Indeed, the form "wealasses" is unusual in more than one respect, for the expected "wealas."
Stamford, and Derby. The "Danes" of these boroughs ("dæne") had earlier been under the power of a Norse king "for a long time":

\[
\begin{align*}
daene \ wæran \ ær \\
\text{under norðmannum} & \ nyde \ gebegde \\
on \ hæþena & \ on \ hæþeclo-\mu~ \\
lange \ praeg & \ (942A, \ ll. \ 8b-11a)
\end{align*}
\]

("The Danes were before that under the Northmen, afflicted by hardship, in the grips of heathens, for a long period.")

The use of the term "Danes" here is crucial, for just as *Brunanburh* emphasized that Mercians and West Saxons were united under Athelstan, *The Capture of the Five Boroughs* announces that Edmund has brought the inhabitants of the Danelaw south of the Humber into the English nation. The "Northmen" remain the antagonists of the English; the fact that the Danes were now considered part of the English nation is an indicator of just how successful Alfred's political solution to the Danish invasions of the ninth century had been. Alfred's grandson was king of all England south of the Humber, including the Danish "five boroughs," and the *Chronicle* served as the logical place to celebrate this particularly English triumph.

The remaining tenth-century poems maintain the sense of English nationalism which is developed in *Brunanburh* and *The Capture of the Five Boroughs*, even if there is evidence that they may not have been written until the early eleventh century. Specifically, the accomplishments of Eadwig are related in a poem in Wulfstan's rhythmical style, which makes an explicit comparison to the accomplishments of the rulers which preceded him:

\[
\begin{align*}
He \ arerde \ godes \ lôf \ wide. & \quad 7 \ godes \ lage \ lufode \\
7 \ folces \ frîð \ bette & \quad swidoسط \ para \ cyninga \\
pe \ ær \ him \ gewurde & \quad \text{be manna gemyne}. \quad (959E, \ ll. \ 6-8).
\end{align*}
\]

("He lifted praise of God widely, and loved God's law, and improved the peace of the folk most greatly of those kings who were before him within the memory of men").
The comparison to other rulers within the "memory of men" in 959 (or a generation later) makes the comparison specifically valid only as a comparison with other members of Alfred's line. Yet the formulaic claim to knowledge of things in human memory operates in a superlative manner: such claims are usually to be understood as involving all time. The invocation of this formula of traditional authority, however, is in clear contrast to Brunanburh, where history books are cited as the appropriate authorities for such claims.

In the 973ABCD poem, The Coronation of Edgar, however, both types of historical claims are made, claims to historical knowledge based on traditional authority as well as on books:

\[ \text{þær wæs preosta heap.} \]
\[ \text{micel muneca ðreat. mine gæfræge.} \quad (973A ll. 8b-9) \]

("There was a group of priests, a great throng of monks, according to my learning..."")

\[ \text{buton ðær to lafe} \]
\[ \text{þa agan wæs wintergeteles pœs ðe gewritu secgað.} \]
\[ \text{seofon 7 twentig.} \quad (973A ll. 14-15a) \]

("But there was as a lack yet in the count of winters, as writings say, seven and twenty")
The claims to oral traditional authority here and in the 975ABC poem, The Death of Edgar (mine gæfræge, l. 16b), however, are not being used to make comparisons with previous rulers. Instead they are used to claim authority for events which the poets presumably were not personal witness to. The central importance of book-learning in these poems is clearly revealed by the very calculational complexity of the passage in 973; in this respect, The Coronation of Edgar, at least continues to stress the importance of written works as records of Alfred's descendents. The 975DE poems, on the other hand, emphasize the national unity of the English in ways more reminiscent of The Battle of
Brunanburh and The Capture of the Five Boroughs. The first lines of the 975D poem read:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Her eadgar gefor} & \quad \text{angla reccent} \\
\text{westseaxena wine} & \quad 7 \text{ myrcene mundbora} \\
\end{align*}
\] (975D, 1-2)

("In this year, Edgar passed away, ruler of the English, friend of the West Saxons, protector of Mercians."

Line 4 of the same poem explicitly mentions that Edgar is "afaran eadmundes" ("the son of Edmund"). In this poem, it is significant that the son of Edmund has continued to rule over both West Saxons and Mercians—the English. National unity is once more explicitly linked to the line of Alfred and Athelstan.

The last of the poems in this section of the Chronicle occurs under the year 979 in manuscripts D and E. This poem on the death of Edward the Martyr is the last of the Chronicle's series of tenth century poems praising descendants of Alfred. Undoubtedly, the political confusion which resulted from Edward's shocking murder contributed to the unrest which eventually resulted in renewed Viking attacks which culminated in Cnut's reign over England. Yet the 979DE poem (apparently written after Edward's canonization), continues to stress the political unity of the English, even in the face of Edward's murderers:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Ne weard angelcynnne} & \quad \text{nan waersa deed} \\
\text{gedon bonne peos was.} & \quad \text{syðdon hi ærest} \\
\text{hryton land gesohton.} & \quad \text{(979E, ll. 1-3)}
\end{align*}
\]

("To the English there was no worse deed done than this was, since they first sought Britain.")

Echoing Brunanburh here, the invocation of the adventus Saxonum in the last of these tenth century poems serves to unite this group of poems as effectively as they portray an England united against the "Northmen."
The fact that the poems in annals 937, 942, 959, 973, 975, and 979 all serve to praise or memorialize the kings of England from Athelstan to Edward the Martyr suggest not only that there was an Anglo-Saxon habit of composing such poems, but that they were deemed highly appropriate for inclusion in the Chronicle. In a very real sense, these poems replace the genealogies which were no longer being entered into the Chronicle for these rulers. More subtly than the genealogies, these poems, by referring to the Saxon invasion of England, stress these rulers' descent from the original Germanic invaders, just as the genealogical WSRT indicated each West Saxon king's descent from Cerdic, founder of the West Saxon Dynasty. But such genealogical claims as those in the WSRT insist upon the separateness of each of the invading tribes--the Chronicle's tenth century poems, on the other hand, function to indicate the invaders' unity. These poems replace the genealogies with a more effective record of the English kings, for they not only trace their descent, but imply that they are the political heirs of all the Saxon invaders, not Cerdic alone.

That the eleventh century Chronicle poems serve a somewhat different function can be observed as early as the 1036CD poem, The Death of Alfred, although the grouping of poems around the Norman Conquest of 1066 is the eleventh-century poems' chief feature. In the 1036CD poem, it is not the arrival of the Saxons which is invoked for comparative purposes, but rather the coming of the Danes:

\[
\begin{align*}
ne \text{ weard } & dreoricre \text{ deed} \quad \text{gedon on } \text{ hison } \text{ earde} \\
\text{sippan dene } & \text{ comon} \quad 7 \text{ her friō namon.}
\end{align*}
\]

(1036C, ll. 11-12--Dobbie's lineation)

("There was no more horrible deed done in this land, since the Danes came and made peace here.")

The verbal parallels between this passage and the opening lines of the 979DE poem implicitly link the murders of Edward and Alfred, although the reference to the arrival of the Danes in The Death of Alfred hints at the depth of the changes to Anglo-Saxon culture
in the intervening half-century. The Danes' arrival provides the defining moment for the poet of *The Death of Alfred*, rather than the *adventus Saxonum*. Yet the Norman Conquest thirty years later provided a new motivation for the poetic expression of English identity.

Surrounding the Conquest is one of the densest groupings of poetry in the entire *Chronicle*. Longer or shorter poems appear in 1057D, 1065CD, 1067D, 1075E(1076D), and 1086E. All of these were very likely to have been written after the Conquest itself (for 1057D in particular, see Whitelock, *EMF* 4, 28). The poems in 1057D and 1067D concern themselves specifically with the exiled prince Edward and his daughter Margaret (later queen of Scotland), but 1057D clearly implicates Cnut for having exiled Edward in the first place, while emphasizing Edward's kinship with King Edward:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\textit{Her com eadward æþeling to englalande.} \\
&\textit{se wes eadwerdes broþor sumu kynges} \\
&\textit{eadmund 'cing' } \\
&\textit{irensid wes geclypod for his snealscipe.} \\
&\textit{pisne æþeling cnut cyng hæfde forsend} \\
&\textit{on ungerlande to beswicane.} \quad (1057D, ll. 1-6)
\end{align*}
\]

("Here came prince Edward to England; he was king Edward's brother's (king Edmund's) son. [Edmund] was called "Ironside" for his valor. King Cnut had sent this prince to Hungary to supplant him.")

The English are thus yet again placed in opposition to their traditional enemies and oppressors the "Northmen," here represented by Cnut. Yet Edward's return from Hungary was frustrated by his early death.

\[
\begin{align*}
&\textit{Ne wiston we for hwylcan intingan} \\
&\textit{b- gedon weard b- he ne moste} \\
&\textit{his mæges eadwardes cynges geseon.} \quad (1057D, ll. 12-14)
\end{align*}
\]

("We do not know for what reason it came about that he was unable to see his kinsman, king Edward.")
This repeated reference to the kinship of these figures (as well as the reference to England itself again in line 18) functions to reinforce a common English identity—not only by recalling the familial relationships expressed in Brunanburh and implied throughout the tenth-century poems, but also by recalling these figures’ own descent from those earlier kings. The use of poetry in this annal and in 1065CD recalls those tenth-century poems as well.

The 1065 poem, *The Death of Edward*, reasserts the English king’s dominance over the inhabitants of Britain, as well as reiterating the perceived impropriety of Cnut’s reign:

```
hæląda wealdend.
weold we gefungem. walu~ 7 scottu~
7 bryntu~ eac. hyre ædelredes.
englu~ 7 sexu~. oretmægcu~.
swa ymbchypaad. ceald brymmas.
þ~ eall eadwarde. æðelu~ kinge.
hyrdon holldice. hagestealdæ menn.
þæs a blidemode. beahleæs kynge.
þæah he lang ær. lande bereafod.
wunode wæxclastu~. wide geond eordan.
syðan cnut ofercom. kynn ædelredes.
7 dena weoldon. deore rice.
englalandes. xxvii.
wintra gerimes. welan bryf/nodan. (1065C, ll. 8b-21)
```

("The lord of warriors ruled very virtuously the Welsh and Scots, and the British as well, the son of Athelred ruled Angles and Saxons, so that all the warriors, military men, surrounded by the cold streams, lovingly obeyed the noble king Edward. He was always happy, the innocent king, though he long before, bereft of his land, dwelt upon the exile-paths, widely around the earth, after Cnut overcame Athelred’s kin, and the Danes wielded the dear kingdom of England for the count of twenty-eight winters, and enjoyed its wealth.")

This is the greatest expression of the power of the English kings within the *Chronicle*.

Edward has ruled over Scots, Welsh, British, Angles, and Saxons, and reclaimed his kingdom from the Danish interlopers headed by Cnut. His lineage is clearly conveyed:
As this poem occurs in the last annal before the Norman Conquest, it is hard not to see its superlatives not only as constituting a panegyric memorial to Edward, but also as an expression of national unity. The Danes here represent the English people's traditional enemy; their invasions (and conquest) providing by contrast the defining feature of English nationalism. Placed into the English history books as the last statement before the narrative of the Norman Conquest, *The Death of Edward* not only praises the last English king of the traditional royal line, but asserts an English national identity, even a destiny, and implies that not all conquests are final.

By contrast, the poems in 1067D and 1075E (1076D) hardly seem at all connected to any sense of English nationalism. At the most, we could say that the 1067D poem's concern with St. Margaret, whose descent from the English royal line through Edward Atheling is detailed later in the annal, is evidence for a continuing concern in English, rather than Norman, royalty. The 1075E (1076D) verses on the bridale of Ralph seem chiefly to express the ruthlessness of William, rather than any strictly nationalistic message.

By the time the 1086E poem, *William the Conqueror*, is added to the *Chronicle*, the Norman Conquest is apparently seen as a fait accompli, with no reasonable hope of an English recovery. This poem (the *Chronicle*'s last, except for the brief couplet in 1104E) seems to function as gesture of acceptance. Like the annal itself, the poem attempts to show the good and bad sides of William's character: "Das þing we habbað be hit gewritene. ægðer ge gode ge yfele. þa godan men niman æft þeora godnesse. 7 forleon mid ealle yfeleness. 7 gan on done weg. be us lett to heofonan riċe." ("These things we have written about him, both the good and the evil, so that good men will take after the goodness and let go of all evilness, and walk on that path which leads us to the kingdom of heaven.") This passage follows the poem immediately and echoes a similar
passage in the Preface to Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica*: William's life serves as a model for the lives of Englishmen to follow.

The fact that the *Chronicle* includes a poem on William the Conqueror at the notice of his death in itself shows that he has come to be accepted as an English king--throughout much of the tenth century, after all (and even as late as the 1065CD poem), such memorial poems were almost utterly conventional in the *Chronicle*. The last of the major *Chronicle* poems, in the context of the *Chronicle* poems as a group, serves to honor William as a king of England as even Cnut was not honored. Yet the fact that no later kings are so memorialized also suggests that the chroniclers themselves may have sensed the end of the Anglo-Saxon era.

The record of poetry in the *Chronicle*, then, seems to function as a record of King Alfred's legacy (as, it could be argued, the entire *Chronicle* does). The tenth-century poems which eulogize the descendants of Alfred consistently emphasize the unity of the English people under these West Saxon kings by referring to written histories of the English and by invoking the myth of the Anglo-Saxon migration, just as Alfred's education program made the West Saxon dialect the intellectual coin of the realm. The inscription of such nationalistic and propagandistic poems into the manuscripts of the *Chronicle* was an inscription into the repository of Anglo-Saxon culture as well. The conservative, often highly formulaic diction of these poems (especially *Brumianburh* and other of the tenth-century works) is but one more factor in why poetry was so eminently appropriate for the expression of such nationalistic sentiments: the heroic poetic idiom itself served as an invocation of the Migration Age, recalling as it does to our own ears, heroic poems such as *Beowulf* or *The Fight at Finnsburh*—both poems which feature Hengest himself as a character. The conquests of the eleventh century, by the Danes under Cnut and the Normans under William, occasioned further inscriptions of English nationalism, but these later poems seem at odds with the earlier poetry, defining the English more in opposition
to these conquerors than by their own, much earlier, conquest of Britain. But even the poem on William the Conqueror inserted into the Chronicle narrative did not completely signal an acceptance on the part of the English of their subject status—the poem, and entries in the Peterborough Chronicle for nearly seventy more years, were still written in English. In the literature of the Anglo-Saxons, the legacy of Alfred outlived even William the Conqueror himself.

Conclusions

In the preceding section, I treated the groupings of tenth- and eleventh-century Chronicle poems as groups, as if they all functioned in similar relationships to one another and to the Chronicle as a whole. Yet none of the Chronicle manuscripts features all of these poems, and reading the poems as a group is surely a somewhat risky proposition. On the other hand, I think it does make sense to consider the role of the poems within the cultural context of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, perhaps not as the Chronicle itself is reflected in any one of its manuscripts, but as it stood as a cultural entity during the Anglo-Saxon period. This is precisely the usage of most modern scholars, after all; when we speak of the Chronicle, we often refer not to any specific manuscript, but to an otherwise ill-defined complex of texts, both surviving and otherwise.\(^5\)

This perspective is at work on two levels in this chapter. First, in my examination of the pointing, layout, and lexical variation in the Chronicle poems, it seemed likely that not all of the poetic passages in the Chronicle were recognized as poetry by the various scribes concerned. Poetic passages (such as those in 1011D and 1011E) were repointed and rewritten in ways that altered their metrical structure so severely that the passages

---

\(^5\) For a particularly clear illustration of this, consider Dumville and Keynes's "Collaborative Edition" of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, which is to contain over twenty volumes of Old English and Latin editions.
may not even remain poetic at all. But in the context of the *Chronicle* as a living historical
document, such apparent misreadings do not alter the crucial conclusion that such
passages were originally entered into the *Chronicle* record as poetry. If later scribes failed
to recognize these poems as poems (or, indeed, if they merely did not feel they needed to
mark them as distinct from prose), it would not alter the fact of their poetic nature.

As such, Anglo-Saxon ideas of the role of poetry in the *Chronicle* can and must be
examined not by looking only at the poems contained within a single manuscript, but as I
have examined them here. Any one manuscript, through accidents of transmission to
which the living *Chronicle* was no doubt subject or through other causes, may lack one or
more poems, but each poem entered into the *Chronicle* must take its contextual place
beside each of the *Chronicle* poems which preceded it. Thus, in the annals for 975, for
example, we see in mss A, B, and C the canonical *Death of Edgar*, and an "alternate"
version in 975DE. These are, however, clearly two separate poems; they illustrate the
very fact that by the time the 975 annals were being composed, poetry was plainly seen as
appropriate *Chronicle* material in more than one center. We can understand the 975E
poem in the context of all the earlier *Chronicle* poems, then, even though it is only the
second poem in the E manuscript itself.

The phenomenon of poetry in the *Chronicle*, then, encompasses a larger scope
than any one manuscript. Within this broader context, I have argued that in the tenth
century *Chronicle* entries, poems tended to be inserted in order to praise or memorialize
the kings of Alfred's and Edward's line. At the same time, they asserted the developing
nationalism of the English. Where the genealogies of the Common Stock preserved the
traditional separation between the various Anglo-Saxon kingdoms, by invoking the Saxon
invasion as the defining moment in English history, the tenth-century *Chronicle* poems
asserted the cultural unity of the English, bolstering the political reality which saw the
West Saxon kingdom ruling ever greater portions of the island of Britain.
In the eleventh century, *Chronicle* poems continued to assert an English political identity. While the 1036 and 1065 poems each lamented the passing of separate branches of the West Saxon line, defining English identity as opposed to Cnut and the invading Danes, the series of poems grouped around the Norman Conquest documents the assertion of an English identity at the same time as it ultimately presents William himself as a poetically-eulogized king. In the end, William himself received the same treatment, in the Anglo-Saxons' own historical document, as had the tenth-century West Saxon kings like Edgar, Eadwig, and Edward the Martyr. Yet after *William the Conqueror*, the tradition of royal panegyric passes out of the *Chronicle*; in succeeding generations, if the English asserted an identity in opposition to the Normans, it was in the language they used in the *Chronicle*, rather than in its poetry.
CHAPTER V

Latin in the *Chronicle* and the Latin Chronicles

According to the usual scholarly estimation, the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* is, above all, an Old English document. But, as scholars such as Sir Frank Stenton have suggested, there is some evidence that many of the annals of the Common Stock may be translations of Latin originals (*ASE* 15). Those annals drawn from Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* and its chronological epitome are conspicuous examples, and the suggestion that a Latin chronicle (perhaps similar to the continuations of Bede's epitome) may have predated the surviving manuscripts of the *Chronicle*, while impossible to prove, has also been seriously advanced. Such a suggestion might receive support from the form of the annals as they appear in the manuscripts of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*; almost without exception they are dated relative to the birth of Christ by the use of the abbreviation "an-". This abbreviation indicates the underlying Latinity of the chronicle genre: the full form of the abbreviation can be seen, for example, in the annal for the year 1 in manuscript E: *ANNO \textit{i. Octauianus rixade \textit{Ivi. wintra. 7 on p\textasciitilde. xlii. geare his rices. crist was acenned}.} (*"In the year 1: Octavian ruled 56 winters, and in the forty-second year of his rule Christ was born").*\footnote{\textit{Clemoes takes the abbreviation "an-" as standing for "annis" (the nominative form) rather than "anno" (31, and note 7, p. 32). However we read this abbreviation, though, it is clearly Latin.}}

This bit of Latin which pervades the *Chronicle* has often been suppressed (intentionally or otherwise) by editors of the *Chronicle*. The "an-" abbreviation is printed in Thorpe's edition, but not in the more recent editions of Plummer, Classen and Harmer,
and Lutz. These later editors tend to replace the Latin abbreviation and the roman
numerals which follow it with Arabic numerals which are more familiar to us, but which
were entirely unknown to the Anglo-Saxons. The Latin indication of temporal location
which opens each annal has thus been deemphasized. The prevalence of this conventional
annal opening, however, hints that the original compilers of the Chronicle were, in all
probability, familiar with a tradition of Latin chronicling, a tradition which used a similar
Latin locative for indicating chronology. Bede's chronological epitome is a clear example
of a Latin text which uses precisely this mode of dating: in Bede's epitome, for example,
we see constructions like "Anno ab incarnatione Domini XLVT" (Colgrave and Mynors
560) as well as the simpler "Anno DLXV" (562).

Following the Latin indication of the year in roman numerals, however, almost all
of the Old English annals begin with the Old English "Her" ("Here"). As Peter Clemoes
has pointed out, this formalized opening is an innovation of the Chronicle, "intended to
form a bridge between such a number in the present and a statement 'such-and-such
happened' with a referent in the past" (28). Yet Clemoes's focus upon the present-vs.-past
dimension of the usage of "Her" in the Chronicle should be supplemented by noting that
"Her" also serves as a bridge between the Latin which opens each annal and the Old
English texts which make up the annals. Nicholas Howe has suggested that the
Chronicle's "Her" serves as an indication of the very Englishness of the Chronicle's history
("Senses of Place"); as it forms a bridge between Latin and Old English, "Her" moves the
reader's consciousness towards England, even for the early annals relating chiefly to
Rome.3

---

2 On the other hand, the recent editions of Bately and Taylor retain the abbreviation and roman numerals,
as do some (but not all) earlier editors.
3 In a very real sease, the matter forming the bridge also includes the roman numerals which indicate the
years. The numerals are presumably to be read as Latin (compare the usage of "Millesimo" in annals after
1000 in mss DE), although roman numerals are sometimes to be read as English words in Old English
texts (cf. 1065C, where xxvii. must be read as "eawheta ond twentig" to fit the poem's meter).
That the underlying Latin foundation of the *Chronicle*'s chronology is expressed in these Latin abbreviations is only to be expected, for the framework of dating used in Anglo-Saxon England clearly stemmed from a learned Latin tradition (see Harrison). The Old English "*her*" functions more or less as a gloss upon the Latin "*an*" and hence the opening of each annal stands as a reminder of the relationship shared by most of the Old English literature originating in Alfred's reign: it exists largely in the vernacular but was based upon Latin originals and derived from Latin learning. Whether this is strictly the case for the bulk of the annals of the Alfredian *Chronicle* is probably impossible to determine, but regardless, the "*an*" abbreviations are a constant reminder to readers that the *Chronicle* owes its structure to a Latin tradition, and that the text as a whole marks a significant departure from that tradition by its very existence in Old English.

The history of Latin in the *Chronicle* and the relationship of the *Chronicle* to such Latin histories as those by Asser and Æthelweard (not to mention later Latin chroniclers such as Symeon of Durham, Florence of Worcester, or William of Malmesbury) is more extensive and more complicated than we usually think. Generally, investigations of the relationship between the Old English of the *Chronicle* and related Latin texts have taken the form of source studies. Some of these studies are enormously valuable (Plummer's Introduction to his edition of the *Chronicle*, for example), but such source studies usually fail to explore the cultural significance of the Latin-Old English interchange. I suggested in Chapter One that Alfred's education program functioned to promote an English national identity, but the Latin abbreviations which begin each annal suggest that while the *Chronicle*'s adoption of the vernacular may have functioned as part of a linguistic attempt to define a national identity, the *Chronicle*'s format also acknowledges the Latin roots of the learning which Alfred wanted to disseminate. The relationship between source and

---

4 Notice also that the dates for particular days based upon the kalends, nones, and ides of each Roman month are used throughout the *Chronicle* and also stem from the tradition of Latin learning.
product is crucial to our understanding of Anglo-Saxon literacy, and is itself embodied in these texts. This chapter will examine the role of Latin in the *Chronicle* in Old English manuscripts (A-G), the Latin histories based upon the *Chronicle* (Asser and Æthelweard in particular) and the twelfth-century histories which used the *Chronicle* as a source. Ultimately, I argue that the context of the *Chronicle* included an almost continual interchange between historical writing in Latin and Old English, to a far greater extent than is customarily acknowledged.

**Latin in the Old English Chronicle Manuscripts**

The Common Stock of the *Chronicle* contains almost no Latin text, other than the "*an-*" abbreviation which begins each of its annals and the common reckonings of particular dates. The only extended passages from the Common Stock to utilize the Latin language occur in the 855 genealogy of Æthelwulf, bracketing the list of names spanning from Noah to Adam: "bedwig sceafing. Id est filius noe se wes geboren on패어 earce noes. lamech. matusalem. enoh. iared. malalehel. camon. enos. seth. Adam primus homo. et pater noster id est xp-s." (855C: "Bedwig, son of Sceaf. He is the son of Noah; he was born on Noah's ark. Lamech, Methuselah, Enoch, Jared, Mahalaleel, Cainan, Enos, Seth, Adam, the first man and our father: he is Christ.") Portions of this macaronic passage are missing from the A manuscript, but nearly identical versions of this passage in mss B, C, and D suggest that the entire passage must have originally been part of the *Chronicle's* Common Stock.

Significantly, the conjunction of Latin and Old English in this passage again functions as a bridge, spanning the gap between the native genealogical tradition represented by the alliterating genealogy and the tradition of Latin learning represented by the biblically-derived genealogy of Noah. This bridging function of the Latin in the
Common Stock seems particularly appropriate in the light of Alfred's educational program. Just as Alfred endeavored to make Latin learning accessible to the English people through his translation program, these bits of easily-interpreted Latin incorporated into the Chronicle's Common Stock served as a continuing reminder of the Chronicle's debt to Latin learning, at the same time as they emphasized the power and distinctness of native traditions.

It seems particularly important to note the brevity and simplicity of these passages. The Latin words in the 855 annal might have been understood by anyone with even a passing acquaintance with the Latin language, especially since such phrases may have been familiar from liturgical practice. Composed at the same time as Alfred's educational program was being put into effect, the Common Stock seems to have been prepared with a sense that its readers would have only a rudimentary knowledge of Latin at best. The relatively infrequent use of Latin in the later B, C, and D manuscripts of the Chronicle attests to the continuing importance of the vernacular historical tradition and its value to an audience not highly Latin-literate.

But the ways in which these bits of Latin are inscribed into the Common Stock records in the ABCD manuscripts complicate our understanding of the relationship between Latin and Old English in the Chronicle by highlighting some of the differences between Latin literacy and English literacy, at least during some parts of the Anglo-Saxon period. The Latin passage in the 855A annal reads: "ada~ prim3 homo et pat~ nr~ + xp~s am~" (855A, fo. 13r); that is, "adam primus homo et pater noster est Christus amen" ("Adam, the first man and our father, who is Christ--amen"). The degree and variety of abbreviation used in this passage does not accord with the first Parker scribe's normal usage when copying Old English passages. Although this scribe frequently uses the superscript macron abbreviation in Old English words (where it usually stands for a following nasal consonant [n, m, occasionally nd in ond]; e in ge; or er, as in winter) and
at least once uses the abbreviation for "us" here seen in "primus" (in "weorþuste", 878A), this Latin passage is exceptional for its usage of these abbreviations. Other places of relatively dense abbreviation usage occur where the scribe is clearly attempting to save space in a line (eg. 878A, fo. 15r, l. 17), but such is not the case here. Instead, the circumstance which makes such heavy abbreviation appropriate at this point must be the Latinity of the passage. The difference in language implied or at least allowed differences in orthography. Certainly, during the Anglo-Saxon period, scribes used different scripts for Latin and Old English (see Ker, Catalogue, xxvi, for elaboration); my point here and elsewhere is that the use of different orthographies within a single text serves to indicate difference. The Anglo-Saxon use of differing orthographies with a single text is analogous to our own habit of printing foreign words in italics.

The same Latin passages in the B, C, and D manuscripts are not as heavily abbreviated as that in ms A. But in B and C in particular, it is still quite clear that the Latin section has been carefully distinguished graphically from the surrounding Old English by the scribes. In ms C, the first letter of the Latin passage is a rubricated capital "I" as tall as three lines of writing, standing beyond the left ruling margin line. The line preceding this large initial is left half-filled. In ms B, the text reads "dest filius noe," and comparison with ms C suggests that the B scribe expected a rubricator to fill in the missing "I" (for "Id est") in the adjacent margin. And while the D manuscript does not mark the beginning of the Latin passage in the 855 genealogy, all four manuscripts (ABCD) use a conspicuous capital to mark the resumption of the Old English entry after the genealogy of Noah.

The similarity of the treatment of the Latin passages in 855B and 855C suggests that a rubricated initial may have also stood in the exemplar apparently shared by these mss for this entry. In the early history of the Chronicle, then, it seems likely that graphically differentiating Latin text from Old English was a normal, perhaps necessary,
practice; such practice was continued in mss B and C. The scribe's practice, using
extensive abbreviation over and above his habitual usage for Old English, suggests that
Latin was perceived in his period as a less phonetically- and more graphically-oriented
language. The manner in which the B and C scribes signal the crossover into Latin
language by using (or leaving space for) a large rubricated capital also serves to
graphically distinguish this passage from the surrounding Old English. The significance of
this differentiation, I believe, lies in scribes' expectations of their readers' literacy. The
need to graphically disambiguate Latin and Old English--over and above the level of their
being different languages--probably arises in the context of reading aloud. Considering the
likelihood that Anglo-Saxon texts were expected to be read publically, a shift from one
language to another would be effected more smoothly if the transition were marked
graphically. The fact that differing languages featured differing orthographies throughout
this period functioned to cue readers to a shift in the language of the text when such a shift
occurred.

In contrast with mss ABCD, the E and F manuscripts present us with texts
containing a much larger and more extensive Latin content. But the nature of the Latin
content of these manuscripts could hardly be more different. In manuscript E, Latin annals
and passages supplement those of the Old English text, providing additional information
not contained in the vernacular annals. In the F manuscript, on the other hand, with few
exceptions, each Old English annal is followed by a Latin translation of the same material.
The marked differences in the relationship between Latin and Old English in these
manuscripts suggest that the E and F mss provide evidence for two very different ideas
about the relative cultural importance of these languages in the early twelfth century. A
consideration of the role of Latin in these manuscripts is essential for any understanding of
the cultural valuation of Latin and Old English late in the Anglo-Saxon period as well as in
the early Norman period.
The thirty-seven Latin entries in ms E are listed by Plummer in the Introduction to his edition of the *Chronicle*, where they are described as falling into four identifiable groups:

(i) 114-625; all these entries, with one exception, relate to ecclesiastical affairs...
(ii) 769-812, a group of entries relating to Charles the Great and his wars; (iii) a small group of entries dealing with English ecclesiastical affairs [890, 892, 964];...
(iv) 876-1062 (excluding those of group iii) a series of entries relating to foreign, and principally Norman affairs. (Plummer, ii, xliv-xlvi)

These Latin entries occur either as entire annals or as supplements to Old English annals, sometimes preceding, and sometimes following the Old English text. "Groups (i) and (ii)," Plummer writes, "are both taken almost verbatim from the Annals of Rouen" (Plummer, ii, xlvi) while Group (iv) apparently comes from a similar source, perhaps a Norman chronicle. In Plummer's view, the latter two groups were present in E's exemplar e, the earlier two groups added at some later point.⁵

If we accept Plummer's reconstruction of the chronology of the inclusion of these Latin entries, as it is amended by Whitelock, it seems likely that Latin passages were added to the *Chronicle* text in at least two separate stages. This important conclusion suggests that the inclusion of Latin annals into an Old English chronicle was not a one-time, nonce occurrence. In terms of scribal expectations of readership, such additions to the *Chronicle* imply that readers of this version could be expected to read and understand both Old English and Latin. That such expectations existed at (at least) two separate moments for the inclusion of these annals indicates that bilingual literacy was apparently a continuing condition in portions of the Late Anglo-Saxon or early Norman period. The implied bilingualism is unlikely to be a result of Alfred's education program, but it might instead indicate that late in the *Chronicle*'s history, its audience was less general and

---

⁵ Dorothy Whitelock points out that Plummer has missed the fact that certain of the entries from his Group (i) are, in fact, also found in F (EEMF 4, p. 27). Consequently, she argues that Group (i) probably stood in E's exemplar and was excised by the F scribe after the first three entries (s.a. 114, 124, 134), although there is insufficient information to determine whether or not the same was true of Group (ii).
secular and more specifically monastic. In a monastic setting, Latin literacy would possibly be less remarkable, even if English literacy was still expected as the norm. The E manuscript of the Chronicle, after all, is still overwhelmingly an Old English document, with only occasional passages in Latin.

The F manuscript of the Chronicle, on the other hand, contains Latin and Old English in roughly equal proportions. Here, in principle, each Old English annal is followed by a Latin version of the same annal. Often the Latin is a translation of the Old English, but not always. Plummer's account of the relations between the Latin and Old English portions of the F manuscript entries is careful and detailed (Plummer, ii, xlii ff.), and the variety of dependences is consistent with the conclusion that the F scribe was working directly from the predecessor of E for the most part, composing both Latin and Old English entries as he wrote.6

The nature of the bilingual literacy implied by the structure of the F manuscript is a very different sort of bilingual literacy than that of the E manuscript. Where the E manuscript suggests that its readers are expected to be able to read both Latin and Old English, the F text implies that readers would only be able to read one or the other.7 While the F scribe was certainly able to read and compose in both languages, the fact that both Latin and Old English are used redundantly to present the same information implies that this manuscript was produced in order to be accessible to readers literate in one language but not necessarily in the other. Such a reading audience might well have existed after the Norman Conquest; we have little difficulty imagining a monastic setting containing both Norman monks not literate in Old English and English monks without a high degree of Latin literacy.

---

6 Conversely, Magoun suggests that they are separate versions of the Chronicle which have been combined, in ms F, into a single document (240-41).
7 A similarly bilingual text is the version of the Wonders of the East preserved in Cotton Tiberius B v, although in that ms, the Old English texts follow the related Latin texts.
The differences in the treatment of Latin and Old English in the E and F manuscripts seem to imply two very different complexes of ideas about the cultural values of literacy in Latin and Old English. Indeed, literacies in the two languages seem to have differed in kind as well as in their relative cultural value. Consider the 755 entry from manuscript F as representative of the F scribe's customary methods of writing the two languages:

\[\text{dcclv. Her Cynewulf bena– Sib–te. 'cinge' his rice. 7 Sib–tes broder}
\text{cynehraed gehaten ofsloh Cynewulf. 'on merantune' 7 he rixade xxxi. gear}
\text{And das yican geares mon ofsloh Æðelbald myrcena cing.}
\text{on hreoapandune. And offa gefeng myrcene 'rice' gefly–don}
\text{Hic Cynewulf abstulist Sib–to regnu– q– cynew[... post] Beornrede.}
\text{ea occidit– ap– meredune a Cynhardo fr–e ia– dicti Sib–te.}
\text{Eod– anno Æðelbald rex mercio– occidit– in hreoapandune.}
\text{& Offa suscip– regnu– fugato b–nredo rege herede adelb–. (fo. 47r)}\]

("755: [OE] Here Cynewulf took the kingdom from Sibert the king and Sibert's brother called Cynehard killed Cynewulf at Merantun and he ruled 31 years. And in this same year Æthelbald the Mercian king was slain at Repton; and Offa took the Mercian kingdom [and] put Beornred to flight.

[Latin] Here Cynewulf removed Sibert king; this Cynewulf later was killed at Merantun by Cynhard, brother of the already-mentioned Sibert. In the same year Æthelbald king of the Mercians was killed in Repton and Offa took the kingship, having driven out Beornred the king, heir of Adelbald.)

Like the Latin passage in 855A, the Latin passages in the F manuscript exhibit a wider variety and greater concentration of abbreviations than do the Old English annals of the same manuscript. The differences in orthography are even more vividly evidenced in the 738F entries quoted in Chapter 3. The F scribe uses the abbreviations for a following nasal and for "-er-" in the Old English passages, but uses many more of the conventional Latin abbreviations in his Latin text. Similarly, proper names are commonly rendered differently in the two languages. In this passage, we can see that "d" is often replaced by "d," "æ" by "a," and inflectional endings are likewise altered. Such differences in orthography are among the features of this ms which led Magoun to conclude that the
Latin and Old English portions were prepared at different times and not brought together until the writing of the Cotton Domitian *Chronicle*:

Where translating from OE he [the hypothetical translator of the Latin annals' exemplar] presumably did not spell every name exactly as in his OE source, yet as a matter of convenience presumably by and large followed its orthography; such would be the natural thing for a translator to do. At any rate, if I am right or nearly right, the spellings of these proper names would in this regard have differed in his source from those of F or rather the source of F, as such orthographic differences would tend to prevail between almost any two OE manuscripts. (241)

Magoun's argument that a translator would naturally alter orthography and that "almost any two OE manuscripts" would likewise tend to differ in orthography apparently misses the crucially important point that for the F scribe (as for the first scribe of A), Latin and Old English, as languages, had very different orthographies. Differences in the spelling of proper names, as well as differences in abbreviation conventions, are orthographic differences between the written forms of the two languages.

Such orthographic differences were a continuing feature of the written Old English and Latin languages throughout this period, plainly present in the *Chronicle* in mss A, E, and F ⁸ The more complicated, less "phonetic" orthography of Latin texts corresponds to the linguistic hierarchy implied by the terms of Alfred's educational program. If literacy in Old English was to be taught before literacy in Latin, we would expect that Latin readers, besides being bilingual, would also be more comfortable with the more complex Latin orthography. Yet the structure of the F manuscript suggests that literacy in Latin did not always entail literacy in Old English.

The record of Latin in the manuscripts of the Anglo-Saxon *Chronicle* suggests that during the period they span, the relationship between literacy in the two languages

---

⁸ Later in this chapter I will also describe orthographic distinctions made between the two languages in the Asser and Æthelweard mss. The technique of distinguishing the two languages is not confined to mss relating to the *Chronicle*: it is practiced (with half-hearted consistency), for example, in the the *Exeter Book*. 
underwent a number of changes. While the earliest manuscript, dating from the time of Alfred's educational reforms, reflects the importance of English literacy over that of Latin literacy, the early twelfth-century ms E seems to exhibit a combination of languages which implies a truly bilingual audience. The roughly contemporary ms F, on the other hand, suggests that its readers must have been conceived of as monolingually literate, in either Latin or Old English, but probably not (or only rarely) literate in both. The remarkably sparse occurrence of Latin in mss BCD confirms the central importance of vernacular literacy right up until the Conquest, but tells us little about Latin literacy during this period. Latin translations of the Chronicle, however, in the works of Asser and Æthelweard, do give us a view of the nature and importance of Latin literacy—and its relevance for study of the Chronicle—in the late ninth and tenth centuries.

**Asser and Æthelweard**

The study of the works of Asser and Æthelweard is unfortunately complicated by the fact that the only surviving manuscript witnesses of both works were almost entirely destroyed in the Cotton library fire of 1731. Our main sources for these texts, as a result, are early printed editions, which are themselves sometimes of only questionable reliability. Nevertheless, the very existence of these documents, as well as the circumstances of their composition and preservation, give us vital clues about the role of Latin literacy in Alfred's court and in the late tenth century.

Besides their manuscripts' destruction in the fire of 1731, however, the texts of Asser's and Æthelweard's histories are similar in a remarkable number of other ways. Neither history is strictly a translation of the Chronicle: Asser's use of the Chronicle serves as only a portion of his *Life of King Alfred*, and Æthelweard also makes use of other sources for his history besides the Chronicle. And although both texts were
preserved in English manuscripts, they seem likely to have been originally composed for foreign audiences: Asser's Life was probably directed at a Welsh audience, while Æthelweard addresses his history specifically to a distant relative in Germany, Matilda, abbess of Essen. Lastly, both histories were used by later historians: Asser's Life was one of the chief sources for Florence of Worcester, while Æthelweard's text served as a source for William of Malmesbury.

Each of these correspondences can contribute significantly to our understanding of the cultural importance of the the Chronicle and its Old English and Latin versions. The fact that the Chronicle served as a vernacular source for these Latin documents reverses the very terms of Alfred's literacy education program. In the case of Asser's Life this seems especially remarkable, for Asser was apparently writing in 893, while Alfred himself was still alive, and presumably while the literacy education program was still in full force. Since Asser himself claims to have generally split his time between Wales and Alfred's court and because he often glosses places names in Welsh as well as Latin, Keynes and Lapidge argue that "it is evident that the Life of King Alfred was written principally for the benefit of readers (and listeners) in Wales" (56). Besides reinforcing our sense of the significance and importance of Latin as a medium for international communication in Alfred's time, the Old English-to-Latin translation activity embodied in Asser's Life represents the reciprocal interchange between the two languages which Alfred's gathering of scholars made possible.

Yet the preservation of Asser's Life of King Alfred in Cotton Otho A xii suggests that the audience which this text found (at least the text as we have it preserved) was not only in Wales but also in England proper. Perhaps as a result of the Life's unfinished nature (the preserved text is possibly that of a preliminary draft), it remained an English document. Although Cotton Otho A xii (as it stood in the Cotton library) contained the fragmentary Battle of Maldon as well as Asser, there seems to be no conclusive evidence
that both texts occupied the same medieval ms. Nevertheless, the English origin of the
text is confirmed by the layout of the manuscript's first page as it is represented in the
facsimile from Wise's edition (see Keynes and Lapidge 224-25). Likewise, the opinion of
the usually reliable Humfrey Wanley held that the Asser ms was in a number of English
hands of about the year 1000. The fact that an English scribe copied this text a full
century after its composition confirms its usefulness to an English audience of this period.

At roughly the same time (or perhaps a little earlier) the alderman Æthelweard
compiled his own Latin record of English history, also relying heavily upon a copy of the
Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. Charred fragments of this manuscript survive, now bound up in
two volumes, Cotton Otho A x and Cotton Otho A xii, and Campbell describes them as
"of the early eleventh century" (xii)—contemporary with the Asser ms. Campbell also
hypothesizes that the Æthelweard manuscript "may have been the first fair copy made of
the work" (xii) although, apart from the dating, his reasons for this conclusion are unclear.

Like Asser, Æthelweard writes for an audience unable to read English: the abbess
of Essen, his remote cousin Matilda. Æthelweard's history is apparently the result of a
more or less extended correspondence between the two, for the Prologue implies that at
least one letter has travelled in each direction before Æthelweard ever set to work on his
Chronicle. Once again, it seems significant to note that such a text was composed in
Latin for a foreign audience, but nonetheless was preserved in England. And not only
preserved there, but like Asser's Life, put to use by a later historian, in this case William of
Malmesbury.

---

9 It does seem that the charms which followed Asser in the Cotton ms were from the same original codex. Nonetheless, these short items may have been added to the Asser text much later in the Anglo-Saxon period, and their existence in this ms probably tells us little more than that there was a bit of useful space at the end of the Asser text.
10 Elisabeth van Houts has discussed the significance of the apparent correspondence between Æthelweard and Matilda. See her "Women and the Writing of History."
Æthelweard himself is usually identified with the ealdorman Æthelweard, "who was prominent in the affairs of Wessex in the time of Æthelred the Unready, and was a man of literary interest" (Campbell xiii), although Sisam felt there were difficulties with this identification ("Royal Genealogies" 178-79, note 3). As a man of letters, Æthelweard was closely associated with the chief literary figure of his time, the homilist Ælfric. Æthelweard and his son Æthelmær are described by Ælfric as "keen readers of his translations [into English]" (Campbell xiv) as well as also having apparently commissioned some of them. Kenneth Sisam has noted that Æthelweard was also supposed to receive from Ælfric a copy of the first series of Catholic Homilies (Studies 161).

Æthelweard's apparent literacy in both Latin and Old English is often seen as exceptional among lay figures of the late tenth century. Æthelweard's apparent preference for Old English, on the other hand, suggests that he himself is the product of an educational system not unlike that outlined by Alfred, in which English literacy skills were widely taught, and Latin literacy more commonly restricted to the clergy. Æthelweard's Latin literacy was by no means perfect (see Campbell xlv-lix for a full account of the often peculiar linguistic features of Æthelweard's prose), but it was, on the whole, adequate to the task of translating a large amount of Old English prose into Latin.11

In the witnesses which do survive for the texts of Asser and Æthelweard, there remains evidence of the same sort of orthographic differentiation between Latin and Old English embodied in the A manuscript of the Chronicle. The personal names in each case retain orthographic features foreign to Latin texts but normal for Old English. The surviving fragments of Æthelweard's Book Four show a regular use of the letter "ð," for example, although the thorn and wynn do not appear. The orthography used in this ms, then, seems somewhat idiosyncratic, employing one of the characteristic Anglo-Saxon

---

11 Michael Lapidge's article on the "Hermeneutic Style" is also useful for a consideration of Æthelweard's prose style.
letters but not others. The treatment of inflected forms is likewise a bit ambiguous:
Campbell writes "Latin case-endings are freely added by Æthelweard to native personal
names," but simultaneously, "Native case endings occur occasionally" (lv-lvi). Ultimately,
the usage of "θ" in the Æthelweard manuscript suggests a habit of applying Old English
orthography to Anglo-Saxon names, but the evidence of the case endings and the apparent
lack of thorns and wynns in the text serves as a reminder of just how similar the
orthography of the two languages could be.

The only text of the Asser manuscript which can be studied as far as letter forms
are concerned is that portion of the manuscript's first page which was printed in facsimile
in Wise's 1722 edition. The facsimile itself is not particularly exact; Keynes and Lapidge
write "the quality of the facsimile is not adequate for the purposes of dating the script"
(225). Yet the facsimile does preserve some significant features of the script: Stevenson
argues, for example, "That the scribe of this portion of the MS. was an Englishman is
proved by the fact that he uses the Anglo-Saxon forms of ʃ, r, and d in Ælfred, line 10"
(xxxiii). Stevenson's point is merely that the scribe is an Englishman, but it seems equally
important to note that Alfred's name is written with letters which are identifiably "English"
within a Latin text, while "The rest of the facsimile is written in the modification of the
Caroline minuscule employed by English scribes in writing Latin in the late tenth and early
eleventh centuries" (Stevenson xxxii).

The continuing tradition of using different orthographies to represent Latin and
Old English, whether in the Old English Chronicle manuscripts or in the Asser and
Æthelweard manuscripts, suggests, at the very least, that there were continuing traditions
of Latin and vernacular literature throughout this period, each with its own conventions.
Such a conclusion may not seem unexpected, but the fact that both traditions thrived
throughout this period makes the translations of Asser and Æthelweard (and their
continuing survival and apparent usefulness in England) all the more important for our
understanding of the *Chronicle* as a cultural document. An examination of these translators' treatments of the genealogies, poetry, and prose within their Latin translations of the *Chronicle* will provide a useful index of some of their perceptions of these genres within the *Chronicle* as a whole.

It is important to recall that neither Asser's text nor Æthelweard's is strictly a translation of the *Chronicle* (although Æthelweard in particular is often referred to as "The chronicler Æthelweard," just as his document is called "Æthelweard's *Chronicle*"). Asser's text especially seems to partake of a tradition of hagiographic writing, and was certainly influenced by Einhard's Latin *Life of Charlemagne* (see Keynes and Lapidge 54; also 254, note 139). Nominally, Asser uses entries from the *Chronicle* only so far as they reflect upon the life of his subject, King Alfred. Nevertheless, the annalistic structure of the *Chronicle* provides the framework for Asser's *Life*, a structure Asser occasionally finds too constrictive. In Chapter 21, for example, Asser feels he has spent too much time following the *Chronicle*'s lead:

*Sed, ut more navigatium loquar, ne diutius navim undis et velamentis concedentes, et a terra longius enavigantes longum circumferamur inter tantas bellorum elades et amorum enumerationes, ad id, quod nos maxime ad hoc opus incitavit, nobis reedundum esse censeo, scilicet aliquantulum, quantum meae cognitioni imotuit, de infantilibus et puerilibus domini mei venerabilis Ælfredi, Angilsaxonum regis, moribus hoc in loco breviter inserendum esse existimo.*

(Stevenson 19)

("I should no longer veer off course--having entrusted the ship to waves and sails, and having sailed quite far away from the land--among such terrible wars and in year-by-year reckoning, I think I should return to that which particularly inspired me to this work: in other words, I consider that some small account (as much as has come to my knowledge) of the infancy and boyhood of my esteemed lord Alfred, king of the Anglo-Saxons, should briefly be inserted at this point."--Keynes and Lapidge 74)

A similar passage of nautical imagery appears in Chapter 73, where the annalistic structure is again characterized as a digressive departure form Asser's main purpose. Despite the
importance of the *Chronicle* as a source to Asser, he seems at times to find it an inconvenience to his project.

Yet Asser's use of the *Chronicle* and its structure is by no means slavish. When indicating the year in which particular events occurred, he alters the *Chronicle*’s scheme of dating, writing (as can be seen in Wise's facsimile) "Anno Dominice Incarnationis" rather than the *Chronicle*’s simpler "An~" ("Anno"). Likewise, Asser often puts the events of a single year into several of his chapters. The only genealogy used by Asser appears to have been moved and altered. Rather than appearing as the genealogy of Æthelwulf under the 855 annal, Asser places it in his first chapter (annal 849), where it becomes the genealogy of Alfred, not Æthelwulf. The genealogy reads, in part:

Ælfric rex, filius Æthelwulfì regis; qui fuit Ecgberht; qui fuit Ealhmundi;.... Qui Geata fuit Tætua; qui fuit Beauu; qui fuit Sceldwea; qui fuit Heremod; qui fuit Itermod; qui fuit Hathra; qui fuit Huala; qui fuit Beduig; qui fuit Seth; qui fuit Noe; qui fuit Lamech; qui fuit Mathusalem; qui fuit Enoch; <qui fuit Iared;> qui fuit Malaleel; qui fuit Caïnan; qui fuit Enos; qui fuit Seth; qui fuit Adam.

(Stevenson 2-4)

It is clear that Asser has changed this genealogy in more ways than simply by transferring it from Æthelwulf to his son, Alfred. Where the genealogies of the *Chronicle* had been narrativized by the addition of the verb "wäes" usually into only the first pair of names, here there is a verb ("fuit") and a relative pronoun ("qui") connecting every father-son pair. Explicitly treating each generation with a separate clause moves the genealogy even further from its native structure, as represented in the non-narrativized lists of mss such as Vespasian B vi. The Latin passages which, in the Common Stock, bracketed the portion of the genealogy from Seth to Adam are not present in Asser. Here no features of format or layout distinguish the names from the Biblical tradition from those names which arose through native, vernacular tradition. Asser's Latin text erases (or at least fails to highlight) some of the differences between the vernacular and Latin traditions. In fact, his insertion of a passage from Sedulius's *Carmen Paschale* after the genealogy's "Geat" suggests that
Asser is actively trying to connect the two traditions, rather than trying to show their distinctness. Possibly because Asser's *Life* is intended for a foreign audience, the only genealogy in the text serves to legitimate the West Saxon king by indicating his classical (Latin) ancestry, rather than focusing on his Germanic heritage and indicating its separateness from the classical tradition.\(^{12}\)

Because Asser can only use text from the Common Stock of the *Chronicle*, we have no way of knowing how he might have translated any Old English poetry as he produced the *Life*. His use of Sedulius's poem in the genealogy of Alfred indicates that Asser feels Latin poetry is appropriate for inclusion in such a document, a judgment which can be contrasted with the Common Stock's compiler's decision to exclude poetry from the *Chronicle*. The use which the later Æthelweard makes of the poetry (and genealogies) in his exemplar provides another comparison to Asser's practice.

Æthelweard's treatment of the Common Stock's genealogies seems to anticipate their eventual removal from manuscripts of the *Chronicle*. In those portions of Æthelweard's history drawn from the Common Stock, genealogical comments appear only in seven annals.\(^{13}\) Except for the genealogies in 755 and 855, however, these are greatly

---

12 Sisam, in "Anglo-Saxon Royal Genealogies," discusses the differences in the Ceridic-Woden pedigree in Asser's text as it varies from the 855 *Chronicle* genealogy, suggesting that Asser may have relied upon a version of the genealogy earlier than that ultimately contained within the *Chronicle's Common Stock* (158-65). Sisam writes: "either he [Asser] transcribed a pedigree which was the basis of the *Chronicle* list, or he used a copy of the *Chronicle* which contained the 855 entry in an earlier form" (159-60). The implications of this seem not to have been fully worked out. Not only does Asser use an earlier version of the genealogy than occurs in ms A or any extant version of the "WSRT," he associates it with Alfred, rather than with Æthelwulf. Since Asser, when following the *Chronicle*, usually follows it fairly closely, these two coincident features might lead us to suspect that at the time of Asser's writing, the Common Stock of the *Chronicle* had not been completed, and that Asser here combined materials from two sources (a chronicle and a genealogy of Alfred) which were later altered and combined according to a different plan. Such evidence might point to a date for the publication of the Common Stock after Asser's writing (usually dated to 893), and to the likelihood that the Common Stock existed in an unfinished state at Alfred's court—and that it was therefore probably compiled there.

13 These occur in the places in Æthelweard corresponding to annals 547, 560, 597, 674, 688, 755, and 855. Æthelweard also includes the genealogy of Hengest from Bede in the narrative of the Saxon invasion.
reduced, usually indicating only the upper limit of the genealogy. Consider, for example, the genealogy of Ælle in 560:

\[
\text{Ælle quippe Iffing ad Northanhymbre seriem mitititur, quorum genus usque ad generalissimum ascendit, id est ad Vuothen. (Campbell 13)}
\]

("Ælle the very Iffing was placed in the Northumbrian series [of rulers], whose race goes to the most general ancestor—that is, to Woden")

This is the only genealogical passage in Æthelweard to retain the native "-ing" form of patronymic; all of the other passages express the familial relations in strictly Latin terms; for example, in the genealogy of Æthelwulf, Æthelweard uses the Latin terms auus ("grandfather"), proauus ("great-grandfather"), atauus ("great-great-grandfather"), and abauus ("great-great-great-grandfather") to describe the king's ancestry.

Nevertheless, where Asser seemed concerned to integrate the Germanic genealogical tradition into the learned Latin (ultimately Biblical) genealogical tradition in the genealogy of Alfred, Æthelweard seems quite willing to rely only upon the native Germanic traditions. Woden in particular (and to a lesser extent Cerdic) is seen as the definitive royal ancestor, as shown in the genealogy of Ælle above. Woden is the farthest ancestor named in the genealogies corresponding to those in the Chronicle annals 547, 560, 597, and 755, even though the 547 genealogy goes even farther in the Chronicle mss—from Woden to Geat.\(^{14}\) Cerdic is the farthest reach of the genealogies derived from Chronicle annals 674 and 688, and the only ancestor mentioned by Æthelweard at these points. Most interesting, however, is the treatment of Æthelwulf's pedigree. In the Chronicle manuscripts (and in Alfred's pedigree in Asser) this genealogy is carried all the way to the ultimate ancestor, Adam himself. In Æthelweard, however, the ancestry of Æthelwulf leads to a different end. With some small alterations (the omission of Cupha, the

\(^{14}\) Indeed, Woden is the only ancestor mentioned in any of these except for the genealogy of Offa under 755. It is important to note that the 560A genealogy apparently went beyond Woden as well (cf. Lutz 127-28), although in 560BC the genealogy goes only as far as Woden.
replacement of Bældæg with Balder), Æthelweard presents Æthelwulf's genealogy in essentially the same form as given in the *Chronicle* through his eighteenth father Scyld. At this point the *Chronicle* genealogies include a number of names beginning with Heremod and (in BC) ending in Sceaf, which are left out of Æthelweard's genealogy. Instead, Æthelweard claims Scef as the father of Scyld, and in a passage much quoted for its parallel to *Beowulf*, recounts his arrival on the island of Skaney "cum uno dromone . . . armis circumdatis" ("with one ship, . . . surrounded by arms").

What is less commonly pointed out is that Æthelweard ends Æthelwulf's genealogy at this point. Unlike the *Chronicle* genealogies, Æthelweard does not claim that Scef was born in Noah's ark, nor does he continue the genealogy to Adam. Sisam suggests that this may be because Æthelweard's "scholarly friends like Ælfric would not encourage belief in the fabulous birth in the Ark of an ancestor of Sceaf" ("Royal Genealogies" 178). But it seems significant that at the precise point where Asser deviates from his apparent exemplar to present a seamless transition between Germanic and Biblical genealogical traditions, Æthelweard ends the genealogy at the furthest extent of Germanic lore, with Scef. For Æthelweard, the traditions are not seamlessly united; rather they appear to be incompatible. Surprisingly, the translation of this genealogy into Latin seems to be the occasion which results in the perception of this incompatibility. For Æthelweard, perhaps as a result of the nature of English nationalism in the tenth century, the ultimate ancestors are Germanic, and possible connections between Germanic and Latin-based genealogical traditions are unnecessary. Æthelwulf's descent from Cerdic, Woden, and Scef, the three originary ancestors cited by Æthelweard, after all, functions in this text to legitimize the rule of Æthelwulf's descendants over West Saxons, Angles, and Danes, just as the *Chronicle* poetry of Æthelweard's day emphasized the same political realities.

On the other hand, political realities were not the only force operating on the production of Æthelweard's translation. Elisabeth van Houts points out that Matilda of
Essen's role in the production of Æthelweard's translation undoubtedly sprung from the German nunneries' function as places where the dead were remembered and their souls prayed for:

Matilda of Essen was as conscientious as her cousins in keeping record of those members of the spiritual community of Essen who needed to be prayed for. A charter of King Otto III dated 5 February 993 sums up this task neatly when it says that 'the nuns of the aforementioned place [Essen] are night and day engaged in praising the Lord for the redemption of the souls of our kinsmen'. For this purpose the nuns kept several memorial books and necrologies. (60)

And although van Houts's argument that "his main interest was in genealogy" (64) seems at odds with the fact that so many of the Common Stock genealogies have been abbreviated or deleted, Æthelweard's Prologue contains an elaborate reckoning of the kinship of Matilda and Æthelweard himself, revealing a not inconsiderable degree of genealogical understanding. That he nevertheless deletes many of the genealogies and alters others may, in fact spring from the purposes Matilda undoubtedly communicated to Æthelweard. Of the seven annals preserving portions of Comon Stock genealogies, four are explicitly West Saxon (s. a. 597, 694, 688, 855). The ancestry of other kings is of less value: only Offa's genealogy from annal 755 is preserved in full, as is that of Æthelwulf, Matilda's own great-great-great-grandfather. Genealogical lore relating especially to Matilda's own family is foregrounded; other such lore usually abbreviated or deleted. The fact that Æthelwulf's ancestry is not extended beyond Scef may simply reflect Æthelweard's own knowledge that these ancestors were not, in fact, Germanic pagans whose souls needed Matilda's prayers.

In complementarity to its varying preservation of genealogical lore, Æthelweard's text only incompletely reflects the tradition of *Chronicle* poetry which had grown up since the compilation of the Common Stock. The poems found in mss of the *Chronicle* in
annals 937, 942, and 959 have no poetic counterpart in Æthelweard,\textsuperscript{15} and there is no indication that Æthelweard might be translating poetry into prose in these annals. Nevertheless, the 973 and 975 poems have clearly inspired the poetic passages which conclude Æthelweard's text. Campbell notes that these poems are "not translations" although "they derive leading thoughts from the OEC poems on the same subjects" (xxxi). Campbell does not note, however, that the "leading thoughts" of these poems are distributed unevenly between them--Æthelweard's first poem seems to contain only some of the "thoughts" of the 973 poem, "The Coronation of Edgar," while Æthelweard's second poem includes material from the end of "Coronation" as well as material from the beginning of "The Death of Edgar" from 975. The prose passage which links the two poems in Æthelweard's text likewise seems to stem from the passage in 973 which indicates the date (ll. 10b-16b).

Æthelweard's inclusion of Latin poetry (even if poetry of uneven literary quality) suggests he strove for a certain amount of literalness in his translation the Chronicle. Such literality makes the sorts of changes we have seen, for example, in the 855 genealogy all the more significant. Paralleling the OE Chronicle poetry and the 855 genealogy, Æthelweard's poems also carefully indicate the lineage of Edgar in order to exalt the race of Alfred, although the ostensible reason for this is Matilda's descent from Alfred, rather than any attempt at writing nationalistic propaganda. Among the "leading thoughts" from these poems which Æthelweard sees fit to translate are "eadmundes eafora" ["proles Eadmundi"] and "eadgar engla cyning" ["Anglorum insignis rex Edgarus"], while Æthelweard adds to his text the passage "Monarchus Brittanum/ Nobilis, ex stirpe frondens Saxorum,/ Edgarus anax" ("Noble king of the Britons, arising from the race of

\textsuperscript{15} Of course, we would not expect the poem at 959 to be available to Æthelweard, as it was probably composed after his writing, since it is one of the poems written by Archbishop Wulfstan.
the Saxons, Edgar the king). The appropriateness of such poetic panegyric to Æthelweard's history suggests the degree to which there was a widespread consensus regarding the role of the *Chronicle* in Anglo-Saxon culture. Æthelweard's repeatedly expressed goal is to recount the history of his and Matilda's race; his translation of the *Chronicle* for this purpose indicates the continuing cultural perception of it as the history of the English, and of the race of Alfred and his descendents in particular.

**Conclusions**

The continuing traditions of separate orthographies for Latin and Old English texts, along with the versions of the *Chronicle* preserved in Old English manuscripts and translated during the Anglo-Saxon period into Latin, together suggest that one of the effects of King Alfred's translation and literacy program was a literary culture dominated by two languages and two varieties of literacy, and characterized by a more or less continual interchange between them. The underlying Latin framework upon which all versions of the *Chronicle* was based was continually indicated in the mss, by the reckonings of dates and the Latin "anno" tag and roman numerals which began each annal. Throughout the Anglo-Saxon period, such reminders of the importance of Latin learning, however, likewise served to indicate that such learning could be put to the service of strictly English learning and English history.

---

16 This last appellation seems to be an invocation of the adventus Saxonum on a par with the references in *Brunanburh* and other places in the *Chronicle* (see Chapter One). Æthelweard also refers to the invasion narrative in his version of annal 871: "nec ante nec post tantâ ruina audita est ex quo gens Britanniam obtinerat bello Saxonum" ("neither before nor after has such ruin been heard of since the Saxon people won Britain in war"). This passage is not preserved in any of the *Chronicle* mss proper; it is difficult to decide whether Æthelweard has added this to his text or whether it simply represents a reading which had dropped out of other mss. The linking of the adventus Saxonum motif with the claim to oral authority here is striking, nonetheless.
The evidence of later historians such as Florence of Worcester, Simeon of Durham, and William of Malmesbury suggests that after the Conquest Latin literacy and Latin literature were culturally foregrounded—Florence and William, after all, used the already-translated works of Asser and Æthelweard for their sources, possibly indicating their own ideas of the primacy of Latin texts. On the other hand, the E manuscript of the *Chronicle* (as well as the fragment known as ms H) indicates a continuing tradition of vernacular *Chronicle* writing well into the twelfth century.

The most interesting of the *Chronicle* documents, however, for its importance when considering the developing relationship between vernacular and Latin literature in the twelfth century is the much-neglected ms F. In considering the audience of this thoroughly bilingual production, we must conclude that it was written for a dual audience of readers literate in one language or the other, but not both. Because the Latin versions of the annals in this ms follow the Old English versions, it is interesting to speculate that this manuscript may have functioned as a teaching text—the Latin versions essentially glossing the OE, and hence the entire ms possibly served as a document for teaching English literacy. The possibility that when the F manuscript was written, Latin literacy preceded Old English literacy in the curriculum truly signals the end of the Anglo-Saxon period, for even before Alfred's time (if his claim in the Preface to the *Cura Pastoralis* is taken at face value), many learned to read English, and few learned to read Latin. Nevertheless, even if Latin literacy did, at this late date precede vernacular literacy, the existence of a document like ms F still suggests that reading OE was a skill worth developing, even in the twelfth century.

Basing our understanding on the history of the *Chronicle* texts, then, before the period in which the F manuscript was written, Latin literacy was an additional sort of literacy, suitable for clergy, best put to use in the clarification and production of English texts, or for communication with foreign audiences. The F manuscript was the last gasp in
the previously easy interchange between Latin and vernacular historical writing, the exact opposite of the historical texts of William of Malmesbury and Florence of Worcester. Where these writers made the contents of the *Chronicle* accessible to Latin-literate readers by compiling Latin histories, the F scribe apparently attempts to make it accessible by providing it with a Latin gloss, and hence pointing the way towards English literacy. The F scribe's own assessment of the value of the vernacular *Chronicle* is confirmed by his use and augmentation of the A manuscript. Yet his view was not to prevail; the later tradition of historical writing made use of the *Chronicle* only through the mediation of the twelfth-century Latin historians. For all practical purposes, the contents of the vernacular *Chronicles* were lost until rediscovered by the antiquarians of the sixteenth century.
CHAPTER VI

Conclusions

The purpose of this dissertation has been twofold throughout: to re-examine the manuscript evidence of the *Chronicle* in order to increase our understanding of the nature and development of Anglo-Saxon vernacular literacy in the period the mss span and to explore the ways in which such a close rereading of these texts affects our understanding of the cultural, historical, and textual processes which gave the *Chronicle* its form. The preceding chapters have ranged over the spectrum of genres which Anglo-Saxon historians saw fit to inscribe into their books of national history. As such, the various portions of this project may seem to invite us to make few connections between them, as prose, poetry, genealogical catalogue, and Latin text rarely overlap. Nevertheless, the twin strands of my argument serve to emphasize that our readings of the *Chronicle* (and other Old English texts) have heretofore failed to place enough emphasis on an understanding of contemporary literary and textual practice in the Anglo-Saxon period. Our print-based preconceptions of textual authority, scribal activity, and literate behavior have served to misdirect our readings in subtle but important ways, and only by consciously reconceiving our expectations can we read texts like the *Chronicle* in non-anachronistic ways.

The most obvious (and possibly most misleading) set of preconceptions coloring scholars' approach to Old English texts such as the *Chronicle* is the complex of ideas commonly referred to as the issue of orality and literacy. The simple dichotomy contained within these terms is plainly inadequate to represent the complexity of the interaction
between the spoken and written word in any literate culture—ancient, medieval, or modern. Yet the terms remain current in the common critical parlance; a consequence of their use, all too frequently, however, is the falsely teleological assumption that all literacies are like our own, and that texts which exhibit features uncharacteristic of our own variety of literacy (whether those features are a high degree of formulicity, extensive variation in textual transmission, or a less rigidly conventionalized use of textual space) are influenced by "orality." As I have suggested elsewhere, however, the urge to explain such features by stepping outside the institution of literacy erases the differences between various forms of literacy. The ease and frequency with which the invocation of orality is made, often with surprisingly little serious investigation of the spoken word's role in the actual textual production, should serve as a reminder of how dangerously appealing the use of the orality/literacy dichotomy can be.

And as I have shown in the Introduction, the difficulties embodied in the critical "orality/literacy" vocabulary are exacerbated by the very nature of the texts we read. In one way or another all editions of the *Chronicle* are altered by the mediation of print technology. Such mediation takes many forms: some effects are relatively innocent (printing "w" for the Anglo-Saxon *wyne*); others more intrusive (using "modern" capitalization, paragraphing, and punctuation); and others yet are subtly and insidiously powerful (textual reconstruction, the implicit authority granted to a "best text" by the act of mechanical reproduction). Table 3 summarizes these effects for a spectrum of editions of the *Chronicle*. Our uncritical acceptance of these mediating influences is equivalent to assuming that modern literacy and medieval literacy are essentially similar, and that reading an edition of the *Chronicle* is the same thing as reading the *Chronicle*. Yet all effects of such print mediation are anachronistic and serve to create a barrier between us and the actual texts used and read by the Anglo-Saxons.
Table 3

Print-Biased Features in Editions of the *Chronicle*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Edition</th>
<th>W 1644</th>
<th>G 1692</th>
<th>T 1861</th>
<th>P 1865-99</th>
<th>Facs. 1941-54</th>
<th>Coll. 1983-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year of Publication</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collation</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflation/Reconstruction</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Authoritative&quot; Base-Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Names capitalized</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modernized punctuation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modernized word spacing</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modernized sentence structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modernized paragraph structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman (annal) numerals Arabicized</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviations expanded</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviations expanded silently</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empty annals omitted</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W for wynn</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

W (Wheelocke)
G (Gibson)
T (Thorpe)
P (Plummer)
Facs. (Flower and Smith, Whitelock)
Coll. (Dumville and Keynes' Collaborative Edition: Taylor, Bately)
The value of avoiding anachronistic readings of Anglo-Saxon texts, I believe, is self-evident, and the twofold structure of my argument (examining both the writing of these texts and reading/interpreting their record) serves to highlight the connections between understanding Anglo-Saxon literacy and understanding the significance of Anglo-Saxon texts. For the *Chronicle* in particular, this has meant that my examination of the graphical conventions associated with prose, poetry, genealogy, and Latin, as well as the transmission of these genres, has occasioned a reexamination of their developing importance to the cultural document which was the *Chronicle*. The value of such reconsiderations can, perhaps, be demonstrated through an examination of the remarkable annal for 1067 in ms D of the *Chronicle*.

In an earlier chapter, I delayed discussion of a portion of annal 1067D, with the promise that I would discuss its exceptional status in a later section. That portion of this annal was the brief genealogy which occurs within it, and which is the only alliterative genealogy added to any branch of the *Chronicle* after the composition of the Common Stock. The genealogy in question is itself exceptional, not only for the fact that it occurs in isolation, separated by two hundred years worth of annals from the 855D genealogy, but also because it is the only genealogy of a woman in the entire *Chronicle*. It reads as follows:

*Of geleaf*

*fullan 7 æðelan cymne heo was asprungen. hire fæder wæs eadward æþeling eadmundes sumu kynges. eadmund æþel reding. æþelred. eadgaring. eadgar. eadreding. 7 swa forð on þ– cyne cymn. 7 hire modor cynn gað to heintrice casere þe hæfde anwald ofer rone.*

(Cotton Tiberius B iv, fo. 81v, ll.18-23)

("She [Margaret] was sprung from a faithful and noble race. Her father was Edward atheling, son of King Edmund. Edmund son of Æthelred, Æthelred son of Edgar, Edgar son of Eadred, and so forth in that royal line. And her mother's family goes back to Emperor Henry, who had power over Rome.")
In the context of the Common Stock genealogies (some of which, we should recall, had passed out of ms D's branch of the *Chronicle*), this genealogy is also interesting for the way in which it preempt the further reaches of the genealogy.\(^1\) Where the end of the 716 genealogy (the only Common Stock genealogy to be cut off in a similar manner) explicitly directed readers to a point earlier in the ms where the rest of the genealogy could be found, here the annalist merely assumes that a reader can find the material somewhere. In fact, there is no particular genealogical passage in the D *Chronicle* to which this can refer, although it is probably possible to trace the family descent through the narratives of the tenth and eleventh century back to the line of Alfred and Æthelwulf. This genealogy, then, confirms the conclusion I made in Chapter Three on the evidence of the Common Stock genealogies alone that late in the *Chronicle*'s history, the Anglo-Saxons were accustomed to a textual epistemology in which genealogical lore was not solely deposited in alliterating catalogues but also in texts of other sorts. This passage makes use of or reference to both sorts of locations for genealogical learning.

The fact that this genealogy explicitly connects Margaret to the West Saxon royal line also seems especially significant considering that Margaret is also the subject of one of the *Chronicle* poems only a handful of lines earlier in the manuscript. In Chapter Four, I argued that in the manuscripts, the non-canonical "poetic passages" of the *Chronicle* were often graphically distinguished from their surroundings sufficiently to indicate that scribes perceived them as generically distinct from prose. As this conclusion (which was by no means not without its limitations--scribes did not always clearly indicate these poems' metrical structure) allowed me to examine all of the *Chronicle* poems as a group, it served as a necessary preamble to my observations about the use of poetry in the *Chronicle* to

---

\(^1\) Other interesting features of this genealogical passage which deserve further critical attention are the claim to descent from the non-Anglo-Saxon Henry, and the fact that any attention is paid to Margaret's descent on the maternal side in the first place. These features are likewise marked as exceptional by comparison with the *Chronicle*'s Common Stock genealogies.
continue to emphasize West Saxon kinship and dynastic relationships in the context of a unified England. Here in 1067D, a poem and a closely associated genealogy function to serve the same purpose, even though this particular poem does not in itself indicate that Margaret springs from the traditional line of West Saxon kings.

This conclusion is buttressed, perhaps, by the fact that the poem in 1067D is perhaps the most consistently and regularly pointed poem in the entire complex of *Chronicle* manuscripts. In part, this consistency may result from its comparative brevity: there are few opportunities to mispunctuate in a poem only five lines long. In this poem marked for its use of both alliteration and rhyme, the scribe points the end of every full line, and the only line pointed medially is line 4, the only line with internal rhyme. Such regular pointing here (and similar pointing of poetry is found in ms E, especially at 975 and 1086) suggests that, as O'Keeffe asserts, there was, late in the Anglo-Saxon period, a well-developed tradition of marking the metrical structure of poetry through the use of punctuation.

But the fact that these poems (e.g. 1067D, 975E, 1086E) feature rhyme and appear to use a less strict metrical system than much other Old English poetry has led scholars (including O'Keeffe) to discount or deny their poetic status. Part of the reason for this, it seems, brings us back around to the terms of the orality/literacy question. The methodology O'Keeffe employs in her work on Old English poetry, after all, demands that she consider only poems which are structured "oral-formulaically." Her analysis of the manuscript transmission of Anglo-Saxon poetry argues for a developing literacy based upon the increasingly conventionalized use of textual space (as indicated chiefly by manuscript pointing) and upon the diachronically decreasing prevalence of what she calls "formulaic reading": the scribal substitution of metrically and syntactically appropriate alternative readings into texts. O'Keeffe invokes orality to explain texts with less conventionalized use of textual space than other texts and to account for textual variation
as residual interference from scribes' internalized knowledge of "oral-formulaic" poetics. For her purposes, then, texts other than traditional (Sievers-style) alliterative verse simply would not serve.

The quality and utility of O'Keeffe's observations about ms pointing and textual variation should not be underestimated, but her invocation of orality to explain those observations is problematic. My examination of the Chronicle manuscripts provides powerful evidence about both textual variation and metrical pointing which suggest that it is not orality which lies behind the developments she identifies, but rather a shift from one sort of literacy to another. In the case of textual variation, O'Keeffe's failure to examine variation in prose texts leaves her without a valuable source of comparison. Indeed, my examination of variation in the prose of the Chronicle in Chapter Two suggests that syntactically and semantically appropriate substitution and rearrangement is a feature of prose texts as well as of poetry, even though oral-formulaic theory has no relevance where prose is concerned. In fact, the sheer numbers of variants in my sample prose passages greatly outstrip the variants in O'Keeffe's poetic texts (she discusses a mere eight variants in four mss of the 350+ word text of Brunanburh, compared to roughly ninety in the 450+ word text of the 755 annal in the same mss). By failing to examine textual variation in prose texts, O'Keeffe has missed an invaluable point of comparison.

In fact, the relative frequency of variation in the two sorts of texts suggests a conclusion precisely opposite to O'Keeffe's. The formuicity of the poems she examines appears to have helped ensure that their transmission remained more stable and less variable than even prose in the self-same manuscripts. The very feature which O'Keeffe sees as a site where the influence of orality can creep in instead seems to function conservatively. The formulaic structure of Old English poetry ensured that fewer alternative readings would fit within the text, with the end result that the poetic texts were transmitted with less variation than the prose texts, where metricality was not involved in
scribal substitutions. Textual innovation was a regular feature of vernacular copying during this period, but it seems clear that the metrical structure of Old English poetry limited the range of acceptable innovations so severely that poetry was copied with far less innovation than prose.

Similarly, O'Keeffe's conclusions about the development of metrical pointing seem questionable in light of my examination of the *Chronicle*’s genealogies. While again, her description of the chronological development of the convention of metrical pointing is careful and interesting, her argument that it signals a move away from orality is less convincing. In the case of the genealogies (which share the poetry's metrical structure, and were apparently perceived as poetic at least at some points in the Anglo-Saxon period), the metrical pointing which developed seems to have arisen when earlier columnar genealogies were narrativized and written across the page, rather than in columns. The pointing of early and late genealogies of this sort suggests that the metrical points came to be used to recapture the textual information previously encoded in the columnar genealogies’ spatial layout. The fact that scribes such as those of the B and C mss of the *Chronicle* applied such pointing far more regularly to their genealogies than to their poems suggests that the cross-genre influence (if, indeed, there was any) was likely to have been from the genealogies (where the pointing convention was well-developed and consistent) to the poetry (where metrical pointing was less regular), rather than vice versa.

To return from this brief digression, O'Keeffe's explanation of metrical pointing conventions seems hard to reconcile with the kind of pointing we find in the 1067D poem, where rhymed poetry is pointed. Here again, oral-formulicity cannot be invoked for explanatory power, because there is no evidence for a tradition of Old English oral-formulaic rhyming poetry. Nevertheless, the regular pointing of poems such as the one in 1067D stand as reminders that the Anglo-Saxon definition of Old English poetry was likely to have been broader than we sometimes give it credit for.
Besides its use of poetry and genealogy, one other feature of the 1067D annal makes it remarkable. The occurrence of a Latin maxim between the poem and Margaret's genealogy means that this is the only annal in the entire Chronicle in which a poem, a genealogy, English prose, and Latin prose all appear. The Latin here appears after a description of how Margaret's pious customs impressed Malcolm, leading to his own repudiation of his former ways:

\[
\textit{Be ām se}
\]
\[
apostol paulus ealra peoda læroy cwæd. Saluabit-- uir infidelis
\]
\[
p_\sim \text{ muliere-- fidele--. Sic \& mulier infidele-- p_\sim uiru-- fidele-- \& rl.--. ā-- is on}
\]
\[
uran gepeode. Ful oft se ungeleaffull/la wer biō gehalgod. 7
\]
\[
\text{leafille}
\]
\[
geæled purh ā-- rihtwise wif. 7 swa gelice ā-- wif purh geleaf
\]
\[
fulhe wer. (Cotton Tiberius B iv, fo. 81v, ll. 11-16)
\]

"About this the apostle Paul, teacher of all peoples, said, "Saluabitur uir infidelis per mulier fidelem. Sic \& mulier infidelis per uirum fidelem. et reliqua." That is, in our language, "Quite often the non-believing man is sanctified and saved through a righteous woman, and so likewise a woman through a faithful man."")

The chronicler here quotes from Scripture in Latin, but then translates it for his readers, just as in the 892A annal, the Latin loan-word "cometa" was glossed for English readers as "feaxede steorra" ("long-haired star"). In the 1067 annal (the year after the Norman Conquest), such an assertion of the Englishness of the reading audience strikes us as just as clearly nationalistic as was the use of the poem and the genealogy of Margaret.

The 1067D annal, then, by recapitulating the generic contents of the Chronicle as a whole at the precise moment when the William was consolidating his power and making the Conquest permanent, stands as a quite conscious and conspicuous assertion of English nationalism, and serves as a fitting point to conclude my investigation of the Chronicle's genres. The chronicler here shows a keen sense of just what it was that the Chronicle was all about, and has composed an annal which deliberately hearkens back to the line of Æthelwulf, Alfred, and Æthelstan. His knowledge of the Chronicle's (and its contents') cultural significance surpasses that of modern scholars, who have not seen this annal as
exceptional in any way. The 1067D annal's use poetry, genealogy, and Latin, however, makes it stand out to us, once we begin to read the *Chronicle* on its own terms, without our own preconceptions.

Unfortunately, in this branch at least, the *Chronicle* (itself by now the work of ancient scholars and authorities) is beginning to crumble away along with any hopes of England's return to the rule of a West Saxon king. The D manuscript carries on, in what might be described as timeless English fashion, until 1079, where its story ends abruptly and incompletely, the hopeful nationalism of annal 1067D ultimately insufficient to turn aside the conquering Normans. In its final annals, the D manuscript stands as a most powerful reminder of the importance of linking studies of literacy with an understanding of the cultural moment involved: the Norman Conquest provides a context not only for the nationalistic expression of 1067D but also for the changes in literate practice which led to the D *Chronicle*'s abandonment as a document of vernacular history after the 1079 annal.
APPENDIX A

The Texts of Annals 755, 871, and 878.

In this Appendix, I attempt to present diplomatic transcriptions of the major witnesses to the prose included in annals 755, 871, and 878. The texts are arranged in parallel in order to facilitate comparison between the various manuscript versions. So far has been practicable, I have preserved ms punctuation and capitalization, although word-breaks have generally been normalized. Likewise, manuscript abbreviations are indicated (with the symbol "~"), rather than expanded. Line breaks and page breaks in the original mss are indicated by "|" and "//" respectively, where I have record of them.

Below the transcriptions are various horizontal lines, which underline what I take to be significant variations occurring in at least one of the original texts. In general, simple orthographic variants are ignored, rather than marked. Spelling variants are not indicated, even if they seem to reflect manuscript affilations (for example places where B and C stand together with the monosyllable "cing" where the others have the disyllabic "cyning"). Case endings are marked only if a change in consonant appears; final "-a" and "-e" are treated here as interchangeable, as are all endings of the form "-Vn." Although I have attempted to minimize them, some textual variants wrap around from one line to the next; these are identified according to the first of the two lines. Each locus of variation is assigned a letter to distinguish it from others in the same "line" of text. Variation (755, 1a) is the first textual variant in line 1 of the 755 annal. This notation is used throughout Chapter Two.

At the end of each line of text stands a capital letter indicating which of the major Chronicle manuscripts it represents; "N" here indicates a line from Laurence Nowell's transcript of ms G, BL Additional 43,703. "G" is used to refer to the mostly-burnt Ohto B xi manuscript.
Her cynewulf benam sigebryht / his rice 7 westseaxna wiutan/ A
Her cynewulf benam sigebryht / his rice. 7 westsexna/ witan B
Her cynewulf benam sigebryht / his rice. 7 wessexna/ witan C
Her cynewulf benam sigebryht / his rice 7 westseaxna wiutan/ D
Her cynewulf benam sigebryht / his rice. 7 westsexna witan E
Her cynewulf benam sigebryht / his rice 7 wessexna wiutan F
a__ b_

for unryhtum dædu-- buton hamtunsircire 7 he hæfde þa 0p he/ A
for unryhtum dædum butan hamtunsircire 7 he/ hæfde þa þe he B
for unryhtum dædum butan hamtunsircire 7 he/ hæfde þa oð he C
for unryhtum dædum butan hamtunsircire. 7 he hæfde þa oð he D
for unryhtum dædum-- buton hamtunsircire. 7 he hæfde þa oð he E
for unryhtum dæ/dæ-- buton hamtunsircire 7 he hæfde þa oð he F
a__

ofslog þone aldormon / þe hi-- lengest wunode 7 hiene þa cynewulf / A
ofslog þone aldorman / þe him lengest/ wunode 7 hine þa cynewulf B
ofslog þone aldorman / þe him lengest/ mid wunode. 7 hine þa cynewulf C
ofslog þone aldorman/ þe him længst wunode. 7 hine þa cynewulf D
ofslog þone aldorman/ þe him lengs wunode./ 7 hine þa cynewulf E
ofslog þone aldorman / þe hi-- lengste wunode./ 7 hine þa cynewulf F

on andred æradæfe 7 h~ þær wunode off{æt hiene an swan ofstang/ A
on andred æradæfe 7 he þær/ wunode þe he an swan ofstang B
of andred æradæfe/ 7 he þær wunode off{æt hiene an swan ofstang C
on andred æradæfe. 7 he þær wunode. oð öæt an swan hine ofstang D
on andred æradæfe. 7 he þær wunode. oð þæt an swan hine ofstang E
on andred æradæfe 7 he þær wunode oð þæt hiene an swan ofstang F
a__ b__ c__________

æt pryfetes flodan 7 he wræc þone aldormon cumbran/ A
æt pryfetes flodan 7 se/ wræc þone aldorman cumbran. B
æt pryfetes/ flodan 7 he wærc þone aldorman cumbran. C
æt pryfetes flodan. D
æt wryftes1 flodan/ se swan wræc ðone aldorman cumbran. E
æt pruntes flodan 7 he wræc þone aldorman cumbran. F

7 se cynewulf oft micillum gefeohtem feaht uuþ bretwalu~/ A
7 kynewulf oft mid/ myclum gefeohtum feaht uuþ brytwalum. B
7 cynewulf/ oft mid/ myclum gefeohtum feaht uuþ brytwalum./ C
7 se/ cynewulf of myclum gefeohtum feaht uuþ brytwalas. D
7 se cynewulf oft feaht micllum gefeohtum feaht uuþ brytwalas. E
7 se cynewulf oft miclum-- gefeohtum feaht/ uuþ brytwalas. N

1 The reading "wryftes" here is clear, though not recorded even in Plummer's edition. Nevertheless, as an obvious orthographic error, I do not count it as a textual variant.
æpelæge se was cyneheard haten 7 se cyneheard wæs þæs sigebrihþes A line 8
æpelæge se was kynæheard haten. 7 wæs þæs sige/brihtes B
æpelæge se was cyneheard haten. 7 he wæs sige/brihtes C
æpelæge se was/ cyneheard wæs þæs sigebrýhtes D
æpelængæ se was cyneheard gehatæn. se cy/neheard wæs þæs sigebríhtes E
æpelængæ se was cyneheard hatæn 7 se cyneheard wæs þæs/ sygebríhtes N

broður 7 þa g-ascode he þone cyning lytle werode on/ A line 9
broðor. þa gealscode he þone king lytle weorode/ on B
broðor 7 þa gealscode he þone cyng lytle werode/ on C
broðer. 7 þa ge/alscode he þone cyning lytle werode on D
broðor. 7 þa acode/ he þone cining lyt wyred on E
broður 7 þa g-acode/ he þone cyninc/ lytle wered on N

wifcyðge on merant hone 7 hine þære berad 7 þone bur utan/ A line 10
wifcyðge on merant hone 7 he hine þærinæ berad/ 7 þa burh utan B
wifcyðge on merantone. 7 he hyne þær berad. 7 þa burh/ utan C
wit/ cyðge on merantone. 7 hine þær berad. 7 þone/ bur utan D
wit cyðge on me/rantone. 7 hine þær berad. 7 þone bur uto/N E
wifcyðge on merantone. 7 hine þær berad 7 þone bur utan N

bæcode ær hine þa men offundan þe mid þam kyninge warun/ A line 11
ynmecodan þe hine þa menn offundan/ 5e mid þam cinge wær. B
bæcode ær hine þa menn offundon. 5e mid þam/ cinge wær. C
bæcodon ær hine þa men offundon/ 5e mid þam cyninge wær. D
be codon./ ær hine þa men afundan 5e mid þam cyninge wær. E
bæcode ær hine þa men offundan 5e mid þa~ cyninge wærN

a__ b________ c________

2 The variants in the numerals here I consider as an innovation in DE and a second in E. The assumption that a common predecessor had .xxi. which was further altered to .xvi. in E is too likely to admit of another interpretation here.
hine werede ọp he on ọnne æþeling locude 7 ða ụt ræsde/ on hine A line 13
hine werede ọp he on ọnne æþeling/ locade 7 ða ụt on hine ræsde B
hine werede. ọp he on ọnne æþeling/ locode. 7 ða ụt ræsde/ on hine. C
hine wa/raed eð he on ọnne æþeling locade. 7 ða ụt ræsde/ on hine. D
hine werede. eð he on ọnne æþeling/ locade. 7 ða ụt ræsde on hine. E
hine werede ọp he on ọnne æþeling/ locude 7 ða ụt ræsde on hine N

7 hine miclum gewundode 7 hie alle on bone Cyning/ A line 14
7 hine miclum gewundode/ 7 hie ealle on bone cing B
7 hie ealle ọp on bone cing C
7 hyne myculm gewundode. 7 hy ealle/ on bone cyning D
7 hine mycclu- gewun/dode. 7 he ealle on ðone cining E
7 hine miclu- g-wundade 7 hie ealle on bone cyning N

13b________________ a__________________________ c__________

wærun feohende ọp ηæt ηie hine ofslægenne hæfdon 7 ða/ A line 15
feohende wæron ọp- hie hine ofslægenne hæfdon. ða B
feohende wæron ọp- hie hine ofslægenne hæfdon. ða C
feohende wæron ọd ọt hæg hine ofslægen hæfdon. ða D
feohende wæron. ọd/ ðet hæg hine ofslægen hæfdon. ða E
wærun feohenden ọp ọt hine ofslægenne hæfdon 7 ða N
a________ b____ c________

on þæs wifes geberum onfunden þæs cyninges þegnas þa un/stilnesse A line 16
onfunden ọp- þæs kings geferan on/ þæs wifes un/stilnesse B
on þæs wifes geberum/ onfunden þæs cinges þegnas ða un stilnesse C
on þæs wifes/ geberum onfunden þæs cyninges þegnas þa/ un stilnesse. D
on þæs wifes geberum onfunden þæs cyninges þegnas þa un stilnesse/sa. E
on þæs wifes geberu- onfunden. þæs cy/ninges þegnas þa un stilnesse N

15c________________________ a__________________________

7 ða þider ụrnôn swa hwelc swa þonne gearo wærb/ A line 17
7 þyder ụrnôn swa hwylc swa þonne/ gearo wærd B
7 þæder/ ụrnôn swa hwelc swa þonne gearo wærd C
7 ða þyder ụrnôa. swa hwylc swa ðonne gearo wærd D
7 ða þider ụrnôa. swa hwelc swa þonne gearo wærs E
7 ða þider ur/non swa hwelc swa þonne gearo wæs F
a____________ b________

d________________ d________ e________ f______

7 radost 7 hiesa se æþeling gehwelcum feoh 7 feorh gebead/ A line 18
7 heora se æþeling æghwilcum feoh 7 feorh / bead B
7 him ọa se æþeling æghwilcum feoh 7 feorh bead C
rađost. 7 heora se æþeling/ gehwilcum feoh 7 feorh bead . D
hrađost. 7 se æþeling gehwilcan feoh. 7 feorh bead/ E
7 rađost / F
a________________ b________ c________ d________ e________ f________
7 hiea nænig hit gepticgean nolde:- Ac hie simele feohtende de A line 19
7 heora man þæs onfon wolde. Ah hie on hine/ sime feohtende B
7 hiea nænig þicgan aolde. ac hi sime feohtende C
7 heora nænig þicgan nolde. ac hie symble feohtende D
7 heo nænig þicgan noldan. ac heo symle feohtende/ E
7 hiea nænig hit geptivean nolde. ac hie N

waran op hic alle lægon butan anu- bryttiscu- gisle 7 se/ A line 20
waron op b-hie calle lagen butan anu-// bryttiscum gisle 7 se B
waron op b hie calle lagon/ butan anum bryttiscan gisle. 7 se C
waron op b hie calle lagon butan anum bryttiscan gisle. 7 se D
waron. op hig calle ofslagene wæra. buton anum/ bryttiscan gisle.7 se E
calle/ lægon butan anu- bryttiscu- gisle 7 se N

swìpe gewundad wæs. ða on morgenæ gehierdun ðæt þæs/ A line 21
wæs swìpe fortord. ða on morgen ge/hyrdon þ- þæs B
wæs forwundod/ ða on morgen gehyrdon þ- þæs C
swyde gewundod wæs. ða on morgen/ gehyrdon þ- þæs D
swyde 'ge'wundod wæs. ða on morgen gehyrdon þ- þæs E
gewen/dad wæs. ða on morgen gehyrdun þ- þæs N

cyninges þegnas þe him beæftan wærân þæt se cyning ofslæ/gen wæs A line 22
cyninges þegnas þe him beæftan him wæron þæt/ se cing wæs ofsleen. B
cyninges þegnas þe him beæftan him wæron þ- se cing wæs ofslegen. C
cyninges þegnas þe him beæftan him wæron þæt se cyning ofslegen wæs. D
cyninges þegnas þe him beæftan him wæron þ- se cining ofslegen wæs. E
cyninges þegnas þe him beæftan wærân þ- se cyning ofslegen wæs. N
cyninges þegnas þe him beæftan wærân þ- se cyning ofslegen wæs N

ða ridon hie þider 7 his aldorman osric 7 wiferb/ his þegn A line 23
ða ridon hie þyder 7 his aldorman/ osric. 7 wiferb his þegn B
ða ridon hi/ þæder 7 his aldorman osric. 7 wigferð his þegn C
ða ridon/ hi þyder 7 his aldorman osric. 7 wigferth his þegn. D
ða riden þider 7 his/ aldorman osric. 7 wiferð his þegn. E
ða rydon by þyder 7 his/ealdorman osric 7 wiuerð his þegn N

7 þa men þæle beæftan him læfte ær 7 þone æpel/ling A line 24
7 þa men þæle his ææle læfte ær 7 þone æpelinge B
7 þa/ men þæle his ææle læfte ær. 7 þone æpelinge C
7 þa men þæle his beæftan ær læfte ær. 7 þone æpelinge D
7 þa men þæle his ææle læfte ær. 7 þone æpelinge E
7 þa men þæle his ææle læfte ær. 7 þone æpelinge N
Her cuom se here to readingum on westseaxe~ 7 þæs ymb .iii. niht ridon/
Her com se here to readingum. on westsexe 7 þæs eft ymb/.iii. niht ridan
Her com se here to readingum on wessexe 7 ðæs eft ymb .iii. niht/ ridon
Her com se here to rea/dingum on westseaxe. 7 þæs ymb .iii. niht ridon/
Her rad se here to readingu~/on westseaxe. 7 þæs ymb .iii. niht ridon
  cwen se here to readingu~ on west/seeaxe. 7 þæs ymb .iii. niht ridon
Her cwo[ ]re to ri ]jingu~. on we[ ]j/seeaxe. [ ]þæs. ymb .iii. niht [ ] G
   a_______ b_____ A line 1

.i. eorlas up  þa gemette hie ægelwulf aldorman on englafelda 7 hi~/
twegen eorlas upp  þa gemete ægelwulf/ ealdorman hie on englafelda 7 him
.i. eorlas upp  þa gemette ægelwulf ealdorman hie on englafelda. 7 him
twegen eorlas up.  þa gemette ægelwulf ealdorman hie on englafelda. 7 him
twegen eorlas up.  þa gemette ægelwulf ealdorman hie on englafelda. 7 heom
.i. eorlas up  þa g~/mette hy ægelwulf ealdorman on englafelda. 7 bi~/
i. eorlas up  þa g~met[ ] hy ægelwulf ealdormo[ ]englaf eda. 7 hi~/
a_________________________ A line 2

þær wiþ gefeah 7 sige nam
þær wiþ gefeah 7 sige/ nam 7 heora ðær wearð ofer ofslégan
þær wið gefeah 7 sige nam 7 hyra ðær wearð/ ofer ofslégan
þær wið gefeah. 7 sige nam 7 heora wearð ofær þær ofslégan/
þær wið gefeah 7 sige nam. 7 wearð/ þær se ofer ofslégan.
þær wiþ gefeah. 7 sig~ nam
þær wiþ g~/feah 7 sig~ nam
   a_________________________ A line 3

þæs ymb .iii. niht ,æpered cyning 7 ælfræd /
þæs nama was sidroc./ ða ymb .iii. niht æpered cung 7 ælfræd
þæs nama was sidroc. ða ymb .iii. niht æpered/ cing. 7 ælfræd
þæs nama was Sidrac. ða ymb .iii. niht æpered/ cyning. 7 ælfræd
þæs nama was sidrac. ða/ ymb .iii. /niht ælerfred cining. 7 ælfræd
þæs ymb .iii. niht æpered cyning 7 ælfræd
þæs ymb .iii. [ ] æpered cyning/ 7 ælfr
3a__________________ a________ A line 4

his broður þær micle fyrd to readingu~ gælæddon 7 wiþ þone here
his broðor þær/ micle fyrd to readingum gælæddan 7 wiþ þone here
his broðor þær micle fyrd to readingum gælæddon/ 7 wið þone here
his broðer þær mycele fyrd/ to readingum gælæddon . 7 wið þone here
his broðor þær mycle fyrd to readingu~ gælæddon. 7 wið þone/ here
his broður þær mycele [ ] to readingum/ g-lædd[ ]wiþ þone here
his broður þær mycele { } to readingum/ g-lædd[ ]wiþ þone here
Æbelwulf/ aldormon wearp ofslægen
ær weard æpelwulf ealdorman ofslægen.
ægelwulf ealdormann weard ofslægen.
ægelwulf ealdorman weard ofslægen.
ægelwulf aldorman wearp ofslægen.
a[e]lf ealdorman wearpelegen.
ægelwulf ealdorman weard ofslægen.

Ælfred his broþor/ his brothor/ his brothor/ his brother/ his brother.
Ælfred/ his brothor/ his brother.
Ælfred his broþor/ his brothor.
Ælfred/ his brothor/ his brother.
Ælfred/ his brothor.

Ælfred/ his brothor/ his brother.
Ælfred/ his brothor/ his brother.
Ælfred/ his brothor/ his brother.
Ælfred/ his brothor/ his brother.
Ælfred/ his brothor/ his brother.
Ælfred/ his brothor/ his brother.

ægelwulf ealdorman weard ofslægen.  
a[æ]lf ealdorman wearpelegen.
wæron þa eorlas 7 þa gefealth se cyning æþeræd wib þara cyninga/ A line 11
wæran þa eorlas 7 þa feahht se cing æþeræd wib þara cyninga/ B
wæron þa eorlas. 7 ða/ feahht se cing æþeræd wib þara cinga C
gewenan þa eorlas. 7 ða feahht se cyning æþeræd wib þara cyninga D
wæron þa eorlas. 7 ða feahht se cining æþeræd wib þara cining/ E
wæron þa eorlas/ 7 þa gefealth se cyning æþeræd wib þara cyninga / F
[ jeron þa eorlas/ ] jæ g-feal[ ] æþeræd w[ ]ara cyninga G

getruman 7 þær wæarth se cyning bagsecg ofslægen 7 ælfred his/ þroþur A line 12
getruman 7 þær wærd se cing bagsecg ofslægen. 7 ælfred/ his þroþor B
gewetan 7 þær wærd se cing bagsecg ofslægen. 7 ælfred his þroþor C
gewetan. 7 þær se ciming bagsecg ofslægen. 7 ælfred his þroþor D
getruman. 7 þær wærd se cyning bagsecg ofslægen. 7 ælfred his þroþor E
getruman. 7 þær wærd se cyning bahsecg ofslægen/ 7 ælfred his þroþur F
g-tru/man. 7 þ[ ]wærd se cyning bahsecg ofslægen. 7[ ] i/red his [ ]þor G

wib þara eorla getrum. 7 þær wæarth sidroc eorl ofslægen se alda A line 13
wib þara eorla getrum. 7 þær wæard sidroc eorl ofslægen se alda.

feahht wib ðara/ eorla getrum. 7 þær wæard sidroc eorl ofslægen se alda/ B
wib þara eorla getrum. 7 þær/ C
wib þara eorla getrum. 7 þær/ wæard sidroc eorl ofslægen se alda. D
wib þara eorla g-tru/man. 7 þær wæarth sidroc eorl ofslægen se alda E
wib þara eorla getrum. 7 þær/ wæard sidroc eorl ofslægen se alda. F
wib þara eorla g-tru/man. 7 þær wæarth sidroc eorl ofslægen se alda G

7 sidroc ’eorl’ se gioncga 7 osbearn eorl 7 fræna eorl/ 7 ðareld eorl A line 14
7 sidroc se gioncga 7 osbearn eorl/ 7 fræna eorl/ 7 ðareld eorl B
7 sidroc se gioncga 7 osbearn eorl 7 fræna eorl. 7 ðareld eorl/ C
7 sidroc se gioncga 7 osbearn eorl 7 fræna eorl. 7 ðareld eorl/ D
7 sidroc se gioncga 7 osbearn eorl 7 fræna eorl. 7 ðareld eorl E
7 sidroc/ eorl se gioncga. 7 osbearn eorl 7 fræna eorl. 7 ha/reld eorl. F
lu/droc eorl se geon/ga. 7 osbearn eorl. 7 fræna eorl[ ]ared [ ]rli G

13b a b

7 þa hergas begen g-fliemde 7 fela þusenda ofslægen/ra A line 15
7 heþ þa hergas begen geflymnde/ 7 þær wærd feala þusenda ofslægen B
7 þa hergas begen geflymnde 7 feala þusenda ofslægen C
7 þa hergas begen geflymnde 7 feala þusenda ofslægrendra D
7 þa hergas begen gefly-nde 7 feala þusenda ofslægrendra E
7 þa hergas begen g-flymde. 7 feala þ[ ]nda ofslægrendra F
7 þa hergas begen g-flymde. 7 feala þusenda ofslægen/ra G

7 onfeohhtende wæron òb niht 7 þæs y-b .xiii. niht gefealth’ æþeræd/ A line 16
7 hie òb niht foehhtende/ wæron. B
7 on/ foehhtende wæron òb niht. C
7 on foehhtendi wæron/ òd niht. D
7 on foehhtende wæron òd niht. E
7 on foehhtende wæron òd niht. F
7 on foehhtende wæron òb niht. G
cyning  7 ælfrēd his brōður  wið þone here æt basingum  7 þær/  A line 17
cing  7 his broðor ælfrēd  wið þone æt basingum  7 þær  B
cing  7 ælfrēd his brōðor  wið þone here æt basingum  7 þær/  C
cyning.  7 ælfrēd his brōðor  wið þone here æt basingum.  7 þær  D
cyning.  7 ælfrēd his brōðor  wið þone here æt basingum.  7 þær  E
cyning.  7 ælfrēd his brōðor  wið þone here æt basingum.  7 þær  F
cyning.  7 ælfrēd his brōðor  wið þone here æt basingum.  7 þær  G

a__________ b_____

þa deniscan sige  namon  7 þæs ðymbi.  monæþ gefæht æþered/  A line 18
þa deniscan sige/  naman.  7 þæs ðymbi.  monæþ gefæht æþered  B
þa deniscan sige  naman.  7 þæs ðymbi.  monæþ gefæht æþered  C
þa deniscan sige  namon.  7 þæs ðymbi  twegen monæþ gefæht æþered  D
þa deniscan sige genamon.  7 þæs ðymbi  twegen monæþ gefæht æþered  E
þa deniscan sig–/ namon.  7 þæs ðymbi.  monæþ gefæht æþered  F
þa deniscan sig– namon[ ]i.i.  monæþ g–fæht æþered  G

a______ b_____

cyning  7 ælfrēd his brōður  wið þone here æt meretune  7 hie/  A line 19
cyning/  7 ælfrēd his brōður  wið þone here æt meretune  7 hie/  B
cyning/  7 ælfrēd his brōður  wið þone here æt meretune  7 hie/  C
cyning/  7 ælfrēd his brōður  wið þone here æt mere/dune.  7 hie  D
cyning/  7 ælfrēd his brōðor/ wið þone here æt mæredune.  7 hie  E
cyning/.  7 ælfrēd his brōður  wið þone here æt meretune.  7 hie  F
cyning.  [ Ælfrēd[ ]]ur wi[ ]ðone here æt m[  G

a______

warun on tuæm gefylcu–  7 hie  butu geflym[don 7 lónge ondæg sige/  A line 20
waran on twæm gefylcum  7 hi  þæb butu geflymdan  7 lange/ ondæg sige  B
warun on twæm gefylcum  7 hie  butu geflym[don 7 lange/ ondæg sige  C
warun on twæm gefylcum.  7 hi  butu geflym[don 7 lange ondæg sige  D
war– on/ twæm gefylc–  7 hy  butu g–fly–don.  7 longe– ondæg sige/  E

[ 7 hy  butu g–flym[  F

a______

ahton  7 þæþ earþæþ micel  wælslith on g–hwæþere hond  7 þæþ deniscan  A line 21
ahton  7 þæþ earþæþ micel  wælslith on gehweþre hand  7 þæþ deniscan  B
ahton  7 þæþ earþæþ micel  wælslith on gehweþre hand/  7 þæþ deniscan  C
ahton.  7 þæþ earþæþ micel  wælslith on gehweþre hond.  7 þæþ deniscan/  D
ahton.  7 þæþ earþæþ micel  wælslith on gehweþre hond.  7 þæþ deniscan  E
ahton.  7 þæþ earþæþ micel  wælslith on gehweþere hond.  7 þæþ deniscan  F

[ 7 earþæþ micel wæl][ lyht on [  G

a______
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>æt wiltune 7 hine lange on dæg geflymde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 þa deniscan ahhton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>wælstowe geweald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 ðæs geares wurdon .uuiii. folc gefeohht gefohten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>wip þone here on þy cinerice be suþan temese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 butan þa~ þe him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>aelfred ðæs cyninges broþur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 aalipig aldor/men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 cyninges þegnas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>oft rade on ridon þe monna ne ri~de/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 ðæs geares wærun ofþægene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>.uuiii. eorlas 7 an cyning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 þy geare/ namon westseaxe frþ wip þone here:~</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.ix. eorlas 7 an cing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 þy geare/ namon west/sexan frþ wip þone here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.ix. eorlas 7. i. cing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 þy geare nannon/ wessexan frþ wip þone here./</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.viii. eorlas. 7 an cyning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 þy geare nannon west seaxe frþ wip/ þone here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.ix. eorlas. 7 an cyning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 þy geare na/mon west seaxa frþ wip/ þone here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.ix. eorlas 7/ an cyning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 þy geare nannon wessexae frþ wip/ þone here.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Her hie ne bestæl se here on midne wint~ offer tueltan niht to cippæ/hamme A line 1
Her hine bestæl se here on midne winter offer xii. niht to cyppanhamme B
Her hine bestæl se here on midne wint offer xii. niht to cyppanhamme C
Her hine bestæl se/ here on midne winter offer twelftan niht to cippæ/mae D
Her hine bestæl se here on/ midne winter offer twelftan niht to cippæ/or. E
hine bestæl se here on midne wint/t offer twelftan niht to cyppanha~. N

7 geridon wesseaxena lond 7 gesæton micel þæs folces 7 offer/ A line 2
7 geridan westsexna land 7 ge/þætan. 7 mycel þæs folces offer B
7 geridon westsexna land 7 þæs gesæton/ 7 micel þæs folces offer C
7 geridon westsexna land 7 gesæton. 7 micel þæs folces offer D
7 geridan westsexna land 7 gesæton. 7 micel þæs folces offer E
7 geridon/ wesseaxena lond. 7 g-sæton micel þæs folces 7 offer N

sæ adraefdon 7 þæs oþres þone måestan d/el his geridon A line 3
sæ adraefdan. 7 þæs oþres/ þone måestan dæl his geridan B
sæ adraefdon. 7 þæs oþres þone måestan dæl hi geridon C
sæ adraefdon. 7 þæs oþres þone måestan dæl hi geridon D
sæ adraefdon. 7 þæs oþres þone måestan dæl hi geridon E
sæ adraefdon. 7 þæs oþres þone måestan dæl hi/ geridon. N

7 him to ge/cirdon buton þæm cyninge æelfred 7 he lytle werede A line 4
7 him to gecyrdan butan/ þæm cingæ æelfred he lytle weorde B
7 þæs folc hym to gebide buton/ þæm cyninge æelfred he lytle werede C
7 þæs folc hym to gebide butan/ þæm cingæ æelfred lytle werede D
7 him to g-cyrdan. butan þæ/cyning æelfred. 7 he lytle werede. E

a________________________ b________________________

uniepelice/ æft~ wudu~ for 7 on morfaestenum 7 þæs ilcan wintra A line 5
uniepelice æfter/ wudu for. 7 on morfaestenum. 7 þæs ilcan wintræ B
unyæpelice æfter wudu for. 7 on morfaestenum. 7 þæs ilcan wintræ C
unyæpelice æfter wudu~ for. 7 on morfaestenum. 7 þæs ilcan wintræ D
uniepelice æft~ wudu for. 7 on morfaestenum. 7 þæs ilcan wintræ E

a________________________ b________________________

wæs Inwæres// broþur 7 healfdones on west seax~ on defena scire A line 6
wæs/ ingweres broðor 7 healfdones on westsexna rice B
wæs inwæres broðor/ 7 healfdones on wesseaxena rice C
wæs inwæres broðor 7 healdones on wesseaxum on defenascire. D
wæs iweres broþor 7 healfdones on west/sexum on defenascire. E
wæs iweres broþor. 7 healdones on wesseaxum~ on defenascyre N

a________________________
7 xl. mon/na his heres
7 lx. manna his heres 7 þæs wæs se guðfana genum-. ðe hie hraefn heoton;
7 lx. manna his heres. 7 þæs wæs se guðfana genumen þe hie hraefn heoton. / D
7 xl. monna his heres. 7 þæs wæs se guðfana genumen þe hie hraefn/ hætön. E
7 xl. monna his heres 7 þæs wæs/ se guðfana genumen þe hie raefn heoton. N

æt æþelinga eige 7 of þam gewerocce was winnende wiþ þone/ A line 10
æt æþelinga eige 7 of þam gewerocce was winnende/ wiþ þone
æt æþelinga eige 7 of þam gewerocce was winnende wið þone C
æt æþelinga eige. 7 of þam gewerocce was wunigende wið þone D
æt æþelinga eige. 7 of þam gewerocce was wunigende wið þone E
æt æþelinga eige 7/ of þam g-þeorcce was winnende wiþ þone N

here 7 sumursætnæ se dael se þær nihtest wæs 7 pa on þære seofoðan/ A line 11
here. 7 sumursætnæ se dael þe þær neðest wæs. / 7 on þære seofoðan B
here. 7 sumursætnæ se dael se daer neðest wæs. 7 on þære .vii. C
here. 7 sumer/sætnæ se dael þe þærneðest wæs. 7 on þære .vii. D
here. 7 sumer sætnæ se dael þe þær neðest wæs. / 7 on þære seofoðan E
here 7 sumur/sætnæ se dael se þær neðest wæs. 7 on þære seofoðan/ N

wiecan ofer eastron he gerad to ecgbyrhtes stane be eastan sealwyda A line 12
wucan ofer, eastron he gerad to ecgbyrhtes/ stane be eastan secelwuda B
wucan ofer eastron he gerad to ecgbyrhtes stane/ be eastan sealwuda C
wucan ofer, eastron he gerad to ecgbyrhtes stane/ becastan sealwudu. D
wucan ofer, eastron he gerad/ to ecgbyrhtes stane be easton sealwudu. E
wucan ofer, eastron he gerad to ecgbyrhtes stane/ be castan sealwuda. N
7 him to co- 'mon' þær ongen sumorsæte alle 7 wilsætan A line 13
7 him coman þær ongean sumet/sæte ealle. 7 wilsæte. B
7 him comon þær ongen sumarsæte ealle. 7 wilsæte. C
7 him comon þær ongean/ sumorsæte ealle. 7 wilsæte. D
7 him comon þær ongen/ sumorsæte ealle. 7 wilsæte. E
7 hi~ to comon þær ongen su/morsæte 'ealle' 7 wilsæte. N

a

7 hamTun/scir se dél se hierne behinon sæ was 7 his gefægene wærum A line 14
7 hamtunsceir se dél þe hire/ beheonon sæ wæs. 7 his gefægne wæron B
7 hamtunsceir se dél þe hire beheonon sæ wæs. 7 his gefægne wæron. C
7 hamtunsceir se dél/ þe hire beheonon sæ wæs. 7 his gefægne wæron. D
7 hamtunsceir se dél þe hire beheonon sæ wæs. 7 his gefægne wæron./ E
7 ha~ tunsceir se dél se hyre be/ heunon sæ wæs. 7 his gefæg-ne wærun. N

a

7 we for/ ymb ane niht of þam wicu~ to iglea 7 þæs ymb ane A line 15
7 he for embe/ ane niht of þam wicum to iglea. 7 þæs eft embe ane niht / B
7 he for þæs embe ane niht of þam wicum~ to iglea. 7 þæs eft embe ane niht C
7 he for þæs/ eft ymb ane D
7 he for ymb ane niht of þam wicum to æglea. 7 þæs/ ymb ane niht E
7 he for ymb/ ane niht of þa~ wican to iplea. 7 þæs ymb ane niht/ N

a

7 þær gefeacit wip ale þone here 7 hiene getiemde A line 16
7 þær gefeacit wip aleæe þone here 7 hiene geyflynde. B
7 þær gefeacit/ wip aleæe þone here 7 hiene geyflynde C
7 þær gefeacit/ wip aleæe þone here 7 hiene geyflynde D
7 þær gefeacit/ wip aleæe þone here 7 hiene geyflynde E
7 þær gefeacit/ wip aleæe þone here 7 hiene geyflynde. N

a

7 hi~ æft~ rad̄ op̄æt geworc 7 þær sæt .xiii. niht 7 þa salde A line 17
7 him æft radahoop̄æt geworc 7 þær sæt .xiii. niht. þa salde B
7 him æft rad// oþ þ~ geworc 7 ðær sæt .xiii. niht. 7 ða salde C
7 him æft rad oð æææt/ geworc 7 þær sæt .xiii. niht. 7 þa salde D
7 him æft rad oð æææt geworc. 7 ðær sæt .xiii. niht. 7 þa salde E
7 him æft rad oþ þæt geworc. 7 ðær sæt .xiii. niht. 7 þa salde N

a

7 sele he he him fore/gislas 7 micle apas þæt hie of his rice uuoldon A line 18
7 sele he him foregislas 7 mykke apas/ þ~ hie of his cynerice woldon. B
7 sele he him foregislas 7 micle apas þ~ hie of his rice woldon. C
7 sele he him gislas. 7 mycle apas. þ~ hi of his rice woldon/ D
7 sele he him gislas. and/ mycel apas. þæt hi of his rice woldon. E
7 sele he him foregislas. 7 mi/cele apas þ~ hy of his rice woldon. N

a

b

A line 18
him eac gehton/  þæt hiera kyning fulwihhte onfon wolde A line 19
him eac geheta  þæt/ heora cyng  fulwihhte onfon wolde. B
him eac gehton/  þæ– hyra cyng  fulwihhte onfon wolde. C
him eac gehton  þæ– heora cyning  fulwihhte/ onfon wolde D
him eac geheto/  þæt  heora cyng  fulwihhte onfon wolde. E
hi– eac gehton  þæ– híora cyning fulwhihte onfon wolde. N

hie þæt gelæston swa/  þæs y–b .iii. wiccan co– se cyning to him A line 20
hie þ– gelæston.//  þæs ymb .iii. wucan com se cing B
hie þ– gelæston .  þæs embe. / .iii. wucan com se cing C
hi þ– gelæston'  þæs ymb .iii. wucan com/ se cyning D
hi þ– gelæston  þæs ymb .iii. wucan co– se cyn E
hie þ– gæstanw. swa.  þæs y–b .iii. wucan. co– se cyning to hi– N
a________________ b________________
godru– britisga su– para monna/  þæ In þa– here weorþuste wæron A line 21
gupram britisga sum/ þara manna  þæ on þam here weorþeste wæron B
godrum britisga sum/ þara manna  þæ de on þam here weorþeste wæron C
godrum britisga sum/ þara manna  þæ i in þam here weorþuste wæron. D
godrum britisga sum/ þara manna  þæ in þa– here weorþuste wæron E
godru– britisga sum. þara monna  þæ in þa– here weorþeste wæron./ N
a________________ b________________
aet alre  7 þæt is wiþ æþelinga eige  7 his/ se cyning þær onfeng A line 22
[erasure]  /  þ– is wiþ æþelinga igge  7 his se cing þær onfeng B
aet alre  b– ys wið æþelinga/ igge  7 his se cing þær onfeng C
aet alre.  7 þæt is/ wið æþelinga igge.  7 his se cyning onfeng þær D
aet alre./  7 þ– is wið æþelinga igge  7 his se cyng onfeng þær E
aet alre.  7 þ– is wiþ æþelinga yge.  7 his se cyning þær ou/feng N
a________ b________ c________
aet fulwihhte 7 his crism lising was æt wep/mor 7 h– was .xii. niht mid A line 23
æt fulwihhte 7 his crisman lising wæs æt wedmor 7 he was .xii. niht mid B
eaet fulwihhte 7 his crysumlysing/ wæs æt wedmor 7 he was .xii. niht mid C
eaet fulwihhte 7 his crismlyising was æt wedmor. 7 he was .xii. niht mid D
eaet fulwihhte. 7 his crismlyising was æt wedmor. 7 he was/.xii. niht mid E
eaet fulwihhte. 7 his crism lising was æt wetmor/ 7 þær wæs .xii. niht mid N
a____
þa~ cyning~ 7 h– hine michu~ 7 his g–feran mid feo weorðude: A line 24
þam cinge 7 he hine myclum 7 his geferan/ mid feo weorðode; B
þam cinge 7 he hine/ michum 7 his geferan mid feo weorðode. C
þam cyninge. 7 he hine myclum/ 7 his geferan mid feo weorðode. D
þam cyng. 7 he hine mycclum/ 7 his gefe/ran mid feo weorðode. E
þæ~ cyning~ 7 hine 7 his/ geferan mid feo wurðude. N
a____
APPENDIX B

The Genealogical Passages of the "West Saxon Regnal Table"

The West Saxon Regnal Table is a brief document containing not only the genealogies tracing the descent of Cerdic from Woden and of Æthelwulf from Cerdic, but also statements of kings' regnal lengths and assertions of their individual descents from Cerdic. It survives, wholly or incompletely, in seven manuscripts, three of which are associated closely with texts of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. Two other manuscripts contain abstracts of the Table or closely related texts. This document has received relatively little critical attention except for its relationship to the Chronicle; it has been edited recently, however, by David Dumville from all of its witnesses ("Regnal List").

The versions of the West Saxon Regnal Table (WSRT) associated with the Chronicle are tied to mss A, B, and G. Dumville's version P occupies the first side of the first leaf of the Parker Chronicle, while his Q (folio 2 of BL Additional 34,652) formerly stood as the preface to Chronicle ms G, and is a copy of the P version of the WSRT. Dumville's T is folio 178 of Cotton Tiberius A iii and probably once stood at the end of ms B of the Chronicle.

The other witnesses of the WSRT come from a variety of contexts; most commonly, they are found in manuscripts with a collections of "list-like" material: Rochester Cathedral Library A.3.5 (the Textus Roffensis: Durville's ms R); Cotton Tiberius B v (ms U—a tabular abstract of the WSRT); Stowe 944 (ms S a variant of the WSRT and continuation); CCCC 383 (ms W); and BL Additional 23,211 (ms N). Additionally, it is found in a copy of the Alfredian translation of Bede, between Bede's Preface and the list of Chapter headings (Cambridge University Library Kk 3 18; ms V).

The genealogical passages in the WSRT confirm the general trend described in my account of the pointing in the Chronicle genealogies. The earliest records of the WSRT show no consistent pattern for the pointing of the genealogical passages, while the later records show a fully developed tradition of metrical pointing. The Parker version of the WSRT features extremely heavy pointing, as shown in this passage:

7 se cerdic wæs. elesing. elesa.
esting. elsæ. gewising. giwis. wiging. wig. freawining. freawine. frihu
garing. friphuar. bronding. brond bældæging. bældæg wodening. (fo. 1r. ll. 3-5).

Here, points are inserted after almost every name; only near the end of this passage does the pointing begin to follow the standard post-patronymic pattern which ultimately develops. On the other hand, the genealogical passage preserved in the equally early BL Additional 23,211 version of the WSRT, like the genealogies of the Parker Chronicle, is almost completely unpointed:

Ond se æðe[.....]
wæs. ecgberhting ecgberht ealhomunding ealh[.....]
eabin eaba eoping eoppa ingilæing ingild c[.....]
ing coenred ecelwalding ecelwald cudu[ring cud[].
cudwining cudwine cœauning ceaul'i'na cynri'[.....]
cynrie cœriðing criodo cœardicin
At the beginning of the eleventh century the scribe of manuscript G of the *Chronicle*, when copying the WSRT followed the pointing of his exemplar quite closely, reproducing the heavy pointing of the Parker version.

7 se cercic wæs elesing, elesa.
esling. esla. gewising. gewis. wiging. wig. freawining.
freawine. frihtogaring. frihtugar. branding. brond.
bældæg. bældæg. wodenig.

Indeed, the G scribe here points even more heavily in spots than the Parker scribe, inserting points after both Brond and Bældæg. At other spots, however this scribe deletes points which are present in the Parker exemplar, writing "7 cupburh godreding. 7 oenburh/ cenreding" for the Parker ms's "7 cupburg. cenreding. 7 oen/burg. cenreding." The evidence of BL Additional 34,652 is thus divided against itself: in places it is pointed more heavily than even the Parker WSRT, while in other places, it deletes points to provide metrical pointing.

But the T version of the WSRT, that associated with ms B of the *Chronicle*, dates from even earlier than the version in BL Additional 34,652. Its pointing exemplifies the careful metrical pointing which came to be the standard for the alliterating genealogies.

7 se cercic wæs elesing. elesa esling. esla giwising
giwis wiging. wig freawining. freawine feohogaring.
freohogar branding. brand bældæg. bældæg wodenig. (fo. 178 ll. 3-5)

The version of this passage of the WSRT contained in the Old English Bede (CUL Kk. 3. 18) is identically pointed (with the addition of a point after "gewising" corresponding to the line-ending "giwising" of Cotton Tiberius A iii). Likewise, the version of the WSRT in the early twelfth century *Textus Roffensis* features this same post-patronymic metrical pointing.

Ultimately, the evidence of the manuscripts of the WSRT confirms the development of a tradition of metrical pointing for the alliterative Anglo-Saxon genealogies. The early versions in CCC 173 and BL Additional 23,211 demonstrate no consistent tradition of pointing these genealogies, while the later documents provide evidence of fairly consistent pointing. The evidence of Dumville's version Q (BL Additional 34,652 fo. 2), shows that even in the eleventh century such pointing was not inescapable, especially when a scribe was faced with a heavily-pointed exemplar. Nevertheless, the same scribe's reaction to the unpointed genealogies of the *Chronicle* proper (as preserved in the 855G annal) show not only that this scribe was familiar with the metrical pointing of these documents, but preferred it to the unpointed style of his exemplar in 855A. The pointing of WSRT Q is likely to be the result of the well-known phenomenon whereby a scribe tends to stick most closely to his exemplar at the beginning of a document, while reverting to his own preferred practice later in the document, as at 855G.
APPENDIX C

The Texts of the Chronicle Genealogies

In this Appendix, I attempt to present diplomatic transcriptions of the genealogies of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, at least as far as the limits of the available technology will allow. In order to facilitate comparisons of the manuscript record of the various genealogical passages, these passages are presented in parallel texts as far as is practical. They are presented in columns; although this does not represent the manuscript layout, it does allow for easy comparison of parallel passages.

Manuscript capitalization and punctuation are retained, although I have regularized manuscript spacing, original manuscript line-breaks and page-breaks are indicated with single and double slashes where I have record of them. Manuscript abbreviations are generally left unexpanded, and are indicated by the character "~" placed after the letter above which the manuscript macron occurs. This character is also occasionally used to indicate the similarly-shaped unit of manuscript punctuation. Characters which are rubricated in the mss are indicated by underlining. The character æsc ("æ") is used here for the OE a-e digraph as well as for the "hooked e" which is often used in the A ms and occasionally in B and G.

Portions of these texts at present unreadable in the mss are presented here in italics. Italicized portions of the A-text are from Lutz’s reading of them after her examination of the manuscript in ultraviolet light; italicized portions of ms G are from Laurence Nowell’s transcript in BL Additional 43,703. Because of the fragmentary nature of ms G in general, its genealogies are presented separately, after the other texts.

449E  (fo. 7r col. 2 ll. 13-19)
Heora he/retoogan wæron
twegen/ georðra.
Hengest. 7/ horsa.
b− wæron wihtgildes/ suna.
wihtgils wæs/ witting.
witting wittu/ wecting
wecta/ wodning.

547A  (fo. 6r l. 21ff)
id. w[. . . . . . . . ]g
[. . . . . . . . ]
[. . . . . . . . ]guing/
[
[. . . . . . . . ]
[. . . . . . . . ]ng/
beor[. . . . . . . ]ding

547B  (fo. 5r-5v)
Ida wæs copping ¹
coppa esing/
esa wæs inguing.
ingui angenwitting.
angenwit/ aloing.
alo c benocing.
benoc branding

547C  (fo. 119v l. 11ff)
Ida wæs copping
eoppa esing
esa wæs inguing./
ingui angenwitting.
angenwit aloing.
alo c benocing./
benoc branding.

¹ Capital "I" is a particularly troublesome letter in these manuscripts. It often occurs (as a long version of the regular letter) with no apparent reason; I have printed these as capitals, although they may not have had special significance to their readers.
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brand/ bældæging
bældæ g wodening
woden freþolafing/
freþelaf freþuling
friþulf finning.
finn god/ulfing.
godulf geating.

552A  (fo. 6r l. 26ff)
cerdic waes cynrî/cœs [f.]d[.]
[...]
elesa elising
esla gew[...][g
gewis wiging/
[w.]g fr/[.]lawining
[...]/f. [ne[...][b[.][g[...][g
[...][b[.][g[.][r] branding/
brand [/.]/æl.jæging
bæld[.][g w[...][n].[n.]

552B  (fo. 5v)
Cerdic/ waes cynrices fæder
2
cerdic elising
elesa elising
esla/ giwising.
giwig.
wig frewining.
freawine/freþogaring.
freþogar braning.
brand bældæging[ms edge]3
bældæ g wodening.

552C  (fo. 119v, l. 18)
Cerdic/ waes cynrices fæder.
Cerdic elising.
elesa elising.
esla giwising.
wiwig.
wig frewining.
freawine freþogaring.
freþogar braning.
brand bældæging.
bældæ g wodening.

560A  (fo. 6v l. 2ff)4
ælle wæs/ yffing
yffe uxfreæing
uxfreæa wifgiling.
wilog/. westerfalcing
westerfalca sæfugling
sæfugel sæ/balding.
sæbald sigegeating
sigegeat swedæging/
sweðæg sigegearing
sigegear vægæging.
wægæ g wodening/ [ms edge]

560B  (fo. 5v)
ælle wæs/ yffing/
yffe uxfreæing
uxfreæa wifgiling.
wilog/ westerfalcing
westerfalca sæfugling
sæfugel sæ/balding.
sæbald sigegeating
sigegeat swedæging/
sweðæg sigegearing
sigegear vægæging.
wægæ g wodening/

560C  (fo. 119v l. 26)
ælle wæs/ yffing/
yffe uxfreæing
uxfreæa wifgiling.
wilog/ westerfalcing
westerfalca sæfugling
sæfugel sæ/balding.
sæbald sigegeating
sigegeat swedæging/
sweðæg sigegearing
sigegear vægæging.
wægæ g wodening/

593E  fo. 11r l. 1)
se wæs ædelicing.
ædelric idiing.

597A  (fo. 7r l. 3)
se wæs cuþaing
cuþa cynricing
cynric cerdicing
cerdic/ elising

597B  (fo. 6v)
se wæs cuþing/
cuþa kynricing.
Cynric cerdicing.
cerdic elising/

597C  (fo. 120v l. 10)
Se wæs cuþyng
cuþa kynricing.
Cynric cerdicing.
Cerdic elising.

---

2 Capital "C" is likewise troublesome. Ker (252) noting the close relationship of manuscripts B and C between 491 and 652, remarks that "the archaic enlarged form of initial c" is used at the same point four times in both mss. Ker does not note where these occur; I am printing any "enlarged" Cs as capitals.

3 The manuscript has been bound upon paper which obscures the end of this line; because of this, in my examination, I was not able to discern whether a point was originally present at this point. This occurs at more than one point in ms B; I will mark the relevant points as I have this one.

4 Lutz was unable to recover any of this annal from her examination of it under ultraviolet light; however, see the 560G annal for the probable form of 560A. Significantly, 560G continues beyond Woden by adding the pair "woden friþowulfing."
elasa esling  
elsa gewising  
gewis wicing  
wig frawining  
fræa/wine fræbugaring  
fræbugaring  
brænd bældæging  
bældæging  
bældæg wodening:

611A (fo. 7r l. 19)  
cyne/gils w[..]s [...]
[...]ol cu[pa] [Jng  
cu[pa] [Jy][r][...][g

611B (fo. 6v)  
se knygils wæs ceoling  
coola cuping  
cuďa cynricing;

611C (fo. 121r l. 2)  
se knygils wæs ceoling  
coola cuping  
cuďa/ cynricing.

626A (fo. 7r l. 35ff)  
p[..]d[..] w[..]s[..]b[..]g  
[..]ybb[a] [Jy][r][...][g  
[..]ynewold[..]g  
cy[...][n]ecnebing  
[...  
[.........]ing  
eo[......]  
[...  
[...]/[...  
[.........]ing

626B (fo. 7r)  
penda wæs pybbing.  
pybb[a] creoding  
creoda cyne/walding.  
Cynewald cnæbing.  
cnæba iceling.  
icel/ cnæming.  
cnæmær angæleowing.  
Angælæcw offering.  
offa wærmunding.  
wærmund wælæging.  
wælæg/ wodening.

626C (fo. 121r l. 16)  
penda wæs pybbing.  
pybb[a] creoding.  
creoda cyne/walding.  
Cynewald cnæbing.  
cnæba iceling.  
icel/ cnæming.  
cnæmær angæleowing.  
angælæcw offering.  
offa wærmunding.  
wærmund wælæging.  
wælæg/ wodening.

648A (fo. 7v l. 23)  
se cupred wæs cuichelming.  
cuichelm cyngilsing:

648B (fo. 7v)  
se cupred wæs cwichelming.  
cwichelm Cyngilsing.

648C (fo. 121v l. 23)  
se cupred wæs cwichelming.  
cwichelm Cyngilsing.

670A (fo. 8r l. 18)  
7 se oswæ waæ æpelferþing  
æpelferþ æpelricing  
æpel/ric iding  
ida eopping.

670B (fo. 8v)  
7 se osweo waæ æpelferþing  
æpelferþ æpelricing.  
æpelric iding.  
ida eopping.

674A (fo. 8r l. 24)  
se wæs cenfusing  
cenfus/ cenfuring  
cenfærþ cuþgilising  
cuþgilising  
coelwulf/ cynricing  
cynric cerdicing.

674B (fo. 8v)  
se wæs Cenfus/ing  
cenfus cenfuring.  
cenfærþ cuþgilising  
cuþgilising  
coelwulf/ Cynricing  
cynric cerdicing.  

676A (fo. 8r l. 30)  
7 centwine waæ cyngilsing  
Cyngils coelwulfing/

676B (fo. 9r)  
Se centwine waæ/ cyngilsing  
cyngils coelulfing.

685A (fo. 8v l. 7)  
se ceadwalla waæ coenbryhting/  
coenbryht cading

685B (fo. 9r)  
se ceadwalla/ waæ centrihting.  
Centriht ceadding  

685C (fo. 123r l. 14)  
se cead/walla waæ centirihting.  
centriht ceadding.
Ida copping.  
[738]B (fo. 10v)
Her eadbriht eating  
eata leodwaling  
ecgbriht eating

738C (fo. 124v l. 22)
Her eadbriht eating  
eata leodwaling
ecgbriht eating

738D (fo. ?)
Her eadbriht eating.  
eata. leodwaling
ecgbriht eating

738E (fo. 22r)
Her eadbriht eating  
eata leodwaling
ecgbriht eating

738F
Her eadbriht eating

ecgbriht eating

755A
Se offa was þincgferþing.  
þincgferþ/ eanwulfing  
eanwulf osmoding  
osmod eawing  
eawa pybing  
pybb/ creoding  
creoda cynewalcing  
cynewalcing cnebing  
cnebb/ icel/ comähring  
comær angelpéow ing  
angelpéow ofþing  
offa wæþ/ Munding  
warwend wihthlæg  
wiþlæg wodening. ~

755B
Se offa was þincgferþing.  
þincgferþ/ eanwulfing  
eanwulf osmoding  
osmod eawing  
eawa pybing  
pybb/ creoding  
creoda cynewalcing  
cynewalcing cnebing  
cnebb/ icel/ comähring  
comær angelpéow ing  
angelpéow ofþing  
offa wæþ/ Munding  
warwend wihthlæg  
wiþlæg wodening.

755C
Se offa was þincgferþing.  
þincgferþ/ eanwulfing  
eanwulf osmoding  
osmod eawing  
eawa pybing  
pybb/ creoding  
creoda cynewalcing  
cynewalcing cnebing  
cnebb/ icel/ comähring  
comær angelpéow ing  
angelpéow ofþing  
offa wæþ/ Munding  
warwend wihthlæg  
wiþlæg wodening.

755D
wæs se offa was þincferþing.

755E
se offa was þincferþing.

855A (fo. 13r)
O~ se æþelwulf was ecgbrehting  
ecgbriht ealhmuning  
ealhmuning eawing  
eawing eawing  
pybb/ Ingilding  
Ingild was Ines broþur  
westseaxna cyninges

7 ðæs þæs eft/ ferde to so-e petre  
7 þæs eft his feorch g-sealde  
7 hie wæron/ centredes sunu  
centred was coelwaling  
coelwaling cuþaing  
cuþa/ cuþwining  
cuþwine ceaulning  
ceaulin cynricing

855B (fo. 16v)
se æþelwulf was ecgbrehting.  
ecgbriht ealhmuning.  
ealhmuning eawing.  
eawing eawing.  
eawing eawing.  
eawing eawing.  
eawing eawing.  
eawing eawing.  
7 he heold þ~ rice/ .xxxvii  
wintra

855C (fo. 129v l. 11)
7 se æþelwulf was ecgbrehting.  
ecgbriht ealhmuning.  
ealhmuning eawing.  
eawing eawing.  
eawing eawing.  
eawing eawing.  
eawing eawing.  
eawing eawing.  
7 he heold þ~ rice. /xxxvii.  
wintra

7 eft ferde to sce petre  
7 þær his feorch g-sealde.  
7 hie wæron centredes sunu.  
centred was coelwaling.  
coelwaling cuþing.  
cuþa cuþwining.  
cuþwine ceaulning.  
ceaulin cynricing.
cynric cerdicicing/
cerdic elesing
elesa esling
esla gewising
gwis wiging
wig freawaling
frewine friepogaring
friepogar bronding
brond balædag/ing
balædag wodening
woden friepowalding
friepuwald frea/wining
frealaf friepuwulfiag
friepuulf finingar
fin god/wulfing
godwulf geating
géa tætwaing
tætwa beawing
beaw scealdwaing
scealdwa heremoding
heremod itermoning
iter/mon hrawraing

se was geboren in þære earce
noe
lamech
matusalem
enoh
laered
maleel
camon
enos
sed
æðæ~ primus homo/ et pater~
þ xp~s
am~:~

cynric creoding./
croda cerdicicing.
cerdic wæseseling./
elesa esling./
esla gewising.
gewis wiging.
wig freawaling.
frewine freopogaring.
freopogar bronding.
brand/ balædaging
balædag wodening.
woden frealafing
frealaf/ finingar.
finn godwulfing.
godulf geating.
geatta/ tætwaing.
tætwa beawing.
beaw scealdwaing.
scylda/ heremoding.
heremod. itermoning.
iternon hæra/ing
hæra hwalding.
wæla bedwinging.
bedwig sceafing./
[Id est fílius noes]
se was geboren in þære earce
noes/
lamech./
matusalem.
enoh.
iared.
malæhel./
camon.
enos./
seth.
Adam primus homo. et pater nr./
[Id est xp~s;]
[Id est xp~s;//]

5 The "I" missing from the B ms at this point clearly suggests that it was originally intended to be filled in later by a rubricator (along with the annual numbers?). Its appearance in the C ms likewise provides strong evidence that the two manuscripts did in fact rely upon a common exemplar for this portion of the Chronicle.
855D
7 se æþelwulf wæs/ ecgbrihting.
ecgbryht. ealhmunding.
ealhmund/ eafing.
eofa epping.
eoppa ingeldiag.
ingeld wes i/nes broder
westseaxna cyninges.
? heold þ- rice .xxxvii./ wintra.
7 oft ferde to sc-e þetre.
7 þær his feorh ge/scelde.
7 hi wæron cænredes suna.
cenred wæs ceal/walding.
ceolwald cuþing.
cuþa cuþwining.
cuþwine/ ceaulining.
ceawlin. cynericing.
cynric. creeding./
creoda. cearticing.
ceartic wæs elesing.
elesa gewising//
gewissung.
wig frecawining.
freawine. freþe/garing.
freþegar. branding.
brand beldæ/ging.
bældæg. wodenring.
woden frecaeling./
frealaf. finning.
fin godulfing.
godulf gaiting.
geat. tætwaing.
tætwa beawing.
beaw sceald/waing.
scealdhwa heremoding.
heremod. iter/maoning.
itermon haðrahing.
þæpra.
hwala./ beowung.
beowi sceafing.
id est filius noe.
se wæs/ geboren on þære earce
nones

855E
He wæs ecgbrihting.

lameh
matu/ralem.
enoc.
iared.
malaæ'h'el.
camon.
enos./
seth.
adam. primus homo. æt pater noster. est xp-s,
The Genealogies of Ms G (from BL Add. 43703 and Cotton Otho B xi)

Manuscript G (contained in Cotton Otho B xi) was largely destroyed in the Cotton Library fire of 1731. Only one of the annals containing genealogies has survived, even fragmentarily, annal 855G. Our chief records of the G manuscript's genealogies, then, are the early printed editions of Wheelocke and Gibson, and the transcript of ms G made by Laurence Nowell in 1562. I include the record of Nowell's transcript here (even where it departs from what is likely to have been in ms G) as the best potential record of ms pointing for ms G. Comparison with the surviving portions of 855G suggest that Nowell's habit of generally pointing genealogical passages after the patronymics was likely to have been the pattern followed in ms G, although 855G also does show that Nowell does not slavishly follow the pointing of his exemplar.

547G-Nowell
Ida was eopping.
eopa was/ esing.
esa was e/ inguing.
inguigenwi/ angewing.
angewit aloching.
aoc beonocing.
beonoc/ branding.
brand beældeging.
beældeg wo/deneng.
woden6 fridwulfing.
fridwulf/ finning.
finn. godwulfing
godwulfing geating.

sæbald sigegeating.
sigegeat swæfdræging./
swæfdræg wodeneng.
woden friprowadleng.

597G-Nowell
se was cuhaing.
cuha cyn/ricing.
cynric cerdicing.
cerdic elesing./
elesa elesing.
esla gewising
etc ut superius./

552G-Nowell
Cerdic was cynrices fe/der.
cerdic elesing.
elesa elesing.
es/la gewising.
weis wiging.
wig freawining.
fre/awine fridgaring.
fridgargar branding./
brand beældeging.
beældeg wodeneng.

611-Nowell
cynegils was ceoling/
ceol. cuhaing.
cuha cynricing./

626G-Nowell
penda was pybbing
pybba crydng.
cry/do cynewolding.
cynewold cnebbing.
cnebbia iceleng.
icel eomarin.
eomen angelpeowin.
angelpeow offing.
offa warmunding.
war/mand wihtlaeg.
wihtlaeg wodeneng.

560G-Nowell
.Elle was yffing.
yf/e was uscraeining./
uscræa was wilging.
wilgis was weat-falcing./
was-falca seafaling.
sæfageal sebalding./

648G-Nowell
se cuared was cwichelming.
cwichelm cynegising./

6 Interlined after 'woden': 'frepolefeing frepolaf'. This insertion by Nowell likely took place after his consultation of other ms, probably the B ms in particular.

7 The Latin tag here is almost certainly Nowell's. See Lutz 13, 135.
670G-Nowell
7 se Oswio wes ædeluerping.
ædeluerp/ was æpelricing.
æpelric iding.
ida eoping./
æpelhald was alweoing.
alwea eaving./
eawa pybing.
þæs cyn is beforean awiten./

674G-Nowell
se wes cemperging.
cenferging.
cenifer/ cupgiling.
cupgils cœolfulising.
ceolfulc cym/ricing.
cynric cerding/ cœolfulising.
æpelhald cœolfulising.

676G-Nowell
7 cantwine was cynegilsing.
cyngils cœolfulising.

685G-Nowell
se ceawalde was cenbyrhting.
cenbyrht was c’e’æa/ ding. 8
c’e’æa cœapaning.
cupá cœawalining.
ceawalining cym/ricing.
cyng ‘ric cerdicing.
7 mul was cœawallan bropor/
7 þone mon eft on cent forbærned.
7 þy ican gæare/ ecgwerp cyning mon ofsloþ.
se ecgwæp was osweoing./
osweo æpeluerping.
æpeluerp æpelricing.
aæpelric/ iding.
ida eoping./
æpelhald æpelricing.
aæpelric/ iding.
ida eoping./

726G-Nowell
7 se oswald ’wæs’ æpelbal/ding
æpelhald cœnebalising.
cœnebal cœupwining.
cœupwine cœawalining.

731G-Nowell
7 se cœalwulf ’wæs’ cœapaning.
cœalwulf cœupwing/
cœupwine leodwading.
leodwald ecgwalding.
ecg/wald ealdhelming
ealdhelm ocging.
ocga iding/
ida eoping

738G-Nowell
eadbryht eating
eata leodwading ...
ecbryht eating ...

755G-Nowell
Se ofa was hincgferping.
nin’c’ægferp eanwulfing.
æanwulf oswmiding.
osmod/ eawing
eawa pybing
pybba creoding
creoda cœynwaling
cœynwad cœnebing
cœneba/ iceling
icel eomæring
eœmae ængelhe/ Owen
gænelpeow offin
tafce wærmunding.
wærmund wýhleing
wêltaeg wodening:

8 The letters inserted by Nowell in this and the following line are probably later additions as well, from another manuscript. Compare the spelling in ms C.
855G-Nowell
Ond se æpelwulf/ wæs ecgbrihting.
ecgbryht ealhmunding.
ealh/mund eafing.
eaf/a eopping.
eoppa ingilding/
ingild wæs ines bropur
westseaxna cyninges.
þæs/ þe ferde eft to sce–e petres.
7 þær eft his feorh/ g-sealde
7 hie weron cenredes suna.
cenred wæs ceowalding.
ceowald cuþaing.
cuþa cuþwineing/
cuþwinao ceawulineing.
ceawuline cynriking.
cynriic cerdicing.
cerdic elesing
elesa esling.
esla/ giwising.
wiwis Wiwiging.
wig freawining
freawine/ friþugaring.
friþugar bronging.
brong beal/dageing.
bældæg wodening.
woden friþuwalding/
friþuwalde freawining.
friþuwalf friþuwalfing.
friþuwulf finning.
fin goduwulfing.
goduwulf/ geating.
geat tetwaing.
tatwa howing.
beaw/ sceldwaing.
sclwæa heremoding.
heremod iter/moning..
hermon hrawraing.
se wæs geboren/ in þære earce
noe.
læch.
matusale–.
enoh.
alared/
maleel.

855G–Othe B xi
On[...........]/wæs[...]gyþhting.
ecgbryht ealh[......]
[........]/eafing
eaf/a eopping.
eoppa ingilding
[...........]/brop..
wesæxna cyninges.
þæs[.........]/sc–e[...]ire
7 þær eft his feorh[......]
7[.........]/cenre.es suna.
cenred wæs[...........
[........]/cuþaing.
cuþa cuþwineing.
cuþwine[.........]
[...]/lin cynriking.
cynric cerdicing
[...........]/
elæa esling.
esla giwi'sing.
wiwis Wiging.
[...........]/
fr[...],wine friþugaring.
friþ[......]roning.
b[...]/b[...dageing
bældæg wod[......]
woden friþuwalding/
[...]friþuwald freaw[......]
[......]friþuwulf[...]/
f[…]puwulf finning
[...........]/ng.
goduwulf geat[i,]g/
geat tetwa[...]
[......]/wing.
beaw sceldwæ/aing.
sclwæa herem[......]
[...]renevod itermoning/
i[…]rmon hra[......]
[......]g-boren in þære earce/
noe.
læch.
mæ[......]
[...].oh.
ialred.
malaehel./

9 The points in boldface in this passage are clearly visible in the ms.
10 The ms reads here: laf
freawine
The interlined "laf" in Nowell's hand presumably suggests Nowell consulted ms A, as Lutz reads "wine" in this position in Othe B xi. I was unable to confirm or disprove Lutz's reading.
camon.
enos.
sed.
*Adam. primus homo et pat~ nr~*
+ xp~ s am~
camon.
enos.
sed
*Ad[...irimus homo. et pat~/nr~*
+ xp~ s am~.
APPENDIX D

The Non-Canonical Chronicle Poems

In this Appendix, I edit the non-canonical poetic passages of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle under the essential assumption that they are, in fact, poetic. The arguments presented in Chapter 4 itself, hopefully, will be justification enough for this assumption. In editing these passages, I attempt to indicate the poetic structure by sticking closely to the modern conventions of layout used for the presentation of Old English verse. At the same time I attempt to indicate, so far as is possible, manuscript lineation, punctuation, capitalization, and abbreviations. The result, of course, is a highly artificial text; I trust, however, that the benefits of this layout outweigh the complications caused by its clumsiness.

In lineating the poems below, I have been led by manuscript punctuation and capitalization as well as other structural indicators contained within the texts such as apparent rhyme, alliteration, or meter. This method leads to a number of noticeable differences from previously published lineations. My assumption has been that the poems may depart from Sievers's metrical system, but that if they do so in places, at other places they may be quite conventional, and that the departures will tend to be conservative rather than radical. Each line below is accompanied by a possible scansion; at the end of the Appendix, I include some comments about the metrical trends evidenced by these passages.

The abbreviations and symbols used in the texts are as follows:

// end of ms line
// end of ms page
~ superscript ms abbreviation, usually (but not always) a macron
7 ms abbreviation for ond

Points and capitals are used only where they occur in the mss; spacing and layout are modernized. Notes follow each poetic passage.
The Death of Eadwig

This poem is one of two passages from the *Chronicle* which can with some confidence be ascribed to Archbishop Wulfstan. (The other is the poem at the end of annal 975D.) This identification was first made by Jost in 1923, and has been widely accepted since; his article remains the standard description of these passages' affinities with the style of Wulfstan. See also, however, Angush MacIntosh ("Wulfstan's Prose"), for a general discussion of the metrical underpinnings of Wulfstan's variety of rhythmical prose.

959D (fo. 52r l. 9 ff)

\[A\]N--. dccecliviini.

Her eadwig cyning forð/ferde. 7 feng cadgar
his broþor to rice.

On his/dagum hit godode georne. 7 god him geuðe
þæt/ he wunode on sibbe þa hwaþe þe he leoðode.

7 he dyde/ swa him þærf wæs. carnmode þæs georne. 5
He/arıæððe godes lop wide. 7 godes lage lufode.

7 fol/ces frid bètte swyþpost þara cyninga
þæ aþ him/ gewurde be manna gemyade.

7 god him eac fylste/ þæt cyningas. 7 eorlas
gorne him to bugan. 7/ wurdun underþæðode

to þam þe he wolde. 7 butan/gefeohite
eal þe gewìde þe he sylþ wolde.

He/ weard weald geon geoland/ swyðe geweorðed./
for þam þe he weorðode

godes naman georne./ 7 godes lage smeade 15
of tæl 7 gealm. 7 godes lop rær/ðe
wide. 7 side. 7 wislice rædde
offost a symle./ for gode. 7 for weorulde
caltre þe þæðode.

Ane// misðæde he dyde þeh to swyðe. 21
þæ he ðloðode/ unsida lufode.

7 heþene þeawas innan þyson/ lande
gëbrohte to fæste.

7 ut lændisse hinder in/ tihte.

7 deriende læda bespeon to þyson earde./ 25
Ac god him geunn þæt his god dealæ
swyðoran/ weorðan þone misðæða.
his s'awle to gescyld/nysse on langsuman side;

1a. An alternate, and perhaps preferable, way of scanning this half-line would be: x--xxx--x (A1).

3a. The phrase "On his dagum" appears in 975D, apparently as a viable half-line on its own. Here (and in 959E), however, it seems most appropriate to treat it as a long anacrusis, especially since it is capitalized and capitals seem to usually mark separate sections of poems.

16a. This line contains the only ")" in this poem to not be preceded by a point; significantly this falls within a half-line.

18b. The same half-line occurs below in line 6 of 1011C, although it is perhaps split into portions of two half-lines in 1011DE. The point after "symle" here indicates the break between half-lines: I treat the analogous line in 959E somewhat differently as it is pointed differently.

22b. Scanning this line as xx--x--x (C1) might be preferable, as the line would then alliterate.
Her eadwig cyning forðerde. / 7 feng eadgar
his broðor to rice.
On his dagu− hit go/dode georne. 7 god him gethe
þe− he wunode on síbbe  þa/ hwile þe he leofode.
7 he dyede swa him þearf wes earnode/ þes georne. 5
He arerde godes lóf wide. 7 godes lage lafo/de.
7 folces fró better swiðoste þara cyninga
þe ær him ge/wurde be manna gemynde.
7 god him eac fylste þe cinin/gas. 7 eorlas
gorne him to bagon. 7 weren underþeod/de 10
to þam þe he wolde. 7 butan gefehte
eal he gewilde/ þet he sylf wolde.
He weard wide geond þeodland swiðe/ geweorðad
for þam þe he weorðode
godes naman geor/ne. 7 godes lage smeade 15
oft 7 gelome. 7 godes lóf rærde/
wide 7 side. 7 wislice ræde
oftost a simle for gode. 7 for/ worulde
call his þeode.
Aae misðæda he dyede þeah to swiðe. 20
þe ælþeodige unsida lufode.
7 hæðene peawas in/nan þysan lande
gebrohte to fæste.
7 utlaðendisce/ hider in tihtæ.
7 deorriende leoda bespeon to þysan/ carde. 25
Ac god him geanne þe− his gode deod
swyðran/ wearðan þonne misðæda.
his sawle to gescel'dnesse/ on langsuman syðe.

x−xxx−−−x (A2b) x−−−x (C1)
x−xx−−x (A1)
xxxx−xx−x (A1) x−xx−x (A1)
xx−xxx−xx (A1) x−xx−−xx (A1)
xx−xx−xx (A1) −xx−x (A1)
xx−xx−xx (A1) −xx−x (A1)
xxx−xx−xx (A1) xx−xx−xx (A1)
xx−xx−xx (A1) xx−xx−xx (A1)
xx−−xx (A2b) −xx−x (A1)
xxxx−−−x (A2)
xx−xx−xx (A1)
xx−xx−xx (A1)
xx−xx−xx (A1)
xx−xx−xx (A1)
xxx−−−−xx (A1)
xx−xx−xx (A1)
xxx−xx−xx (A1)
xx−xx−xx (A1)
xx−xx−xx (A1)
xxx−xx−xx (A1)
xx−xx−xx (A1)
xx−xx−xx (A1)
xx−xx−xx (A1)
xx−xx−xx (A1)
xx−xx−xx (A1)
xx−xx−xx (A1)
xx−xx−xx (A1)
xx−xx−xx (A1)
xx−xx−xx (A1)
xx−xx−xx (A1)

1a. See note to 959D, l. 1a.
3a. See note to 959D, l. 3a.
16a. The lack of points before "7" here and in 17a are indicative of the scribe's view of these pairs as units; this seems to suggest that he recognized them as independent half-lines.
18. Compare 959D, line 18 and note. The pointing here allows this placement of the caesura. See also 1011D, l. 6; 1011E, l. 7.
22b. See note to 959D, l. 22b.
The Death of Edgar II and The Youth of Edward

At the end of the 975D annal is the second Wulfstanian passage. Whitelock (EEMF 4, 29) writes of these passages: "The annal for 959, as well as a passage in 975D replaced by a brief abstract in E, is in the style of Wulfstan." Jost apparently agrees with this likelihood (121) that the E version is reduced from the poetic version in D, even though none of the specifically Wulfstanian phrases or constructions pass into the E version. It is tempting to suggest that Wulfstan may have had a prose exemplar like that in E before him and that he revised it into his own style, as he did with some of Ælfric's sermons (see MacIntosh 124, and note 20). A fuller consideration of the relationship between the D and E mss in this section of the Chronicle might help answer the question of the relationship between the poem which ends 975D and the prose which ends 975E.

975D (fo. 53r ll.)

Her cad/gar gefor  angla reccend x--x-- (B2) --x-- -- (A2b)
westseaxena wine. 7 /myrcna mundborae. xxx--x (A4) x--x-- (A2b)
Cud wæs þæt wide  geond/ feola þoða --xx--x (A1) --xx--x (A1)
þæ ðafren eadmundes  ðer sater a ðæt. xu--x--x (D*1) xu--xx-- (B1)
Cyncahs hyne wide  wæroðdon swie 5 --xx--x (A1) --xx--x (A1)
bugon / to þam cyninge  swa him wæs gocynede. --xx--xx (A1) --xx--x (A1?)
Næs flota / swa ræn  ne se here swa strang xu--x-- (B1) xu--xx-- (B1)
þæ on angelseynne/ ðæs him gefætte xx--x--x (A1) --xx--x (A1)
þæ hwile þæ se æðcele cyning  cynie/stole gerehte. 9 xx--xx--xx--x (B1) xx--xx--xx--x (A1)
her eadward cædges sunu/ feng to rice. 7 Sona on þam ilcan geare on her/fest æwode cometa se steorra. 7 com þa on/ ðæm æftan geare swyðe mycel hungor. 7 swyðe/ mænigfealdre styrrunga geond
angelseyne.//

On his dagum  for his iugode
hodes wiþersacan  godes/ läge bracon.
þæfere cœldorman. 7 ðe manega./ 15 xx--x-- (A1) xx--xx (A1)
7 munuc regol myrdon. 7 mynstra tostæcton.
7/ munecas todæfðon. 7 godes þeowas fesedon.
be cad/gar kyning het ær þone halgan biscoþ
þælhol/ gestalian. 7 wydewan bestrypætan
oft. 7 gelome. 7/ fela unrihta. 20 --xx--x (A1) xx--xx--x (A1)
7 yfelra unlag.  arysan up sibdaan./ xu--xx--xx--x (A4) x--x--x--x (D*1)
7 aa æfter þam  hit yfelode swiðe.
x--x--x (C1) xx--xx--xx--x (A1)
7 on þam timan/ wæs eac oslac se mæra
erol geotod of angelseyne./
x--x--x (A1) x--x--x--x (A1)

4b. Ms "gatene" here is almost certainly a mistake for "ganetes." cf. 975E. Interestingly, the same half-line occurs in the 975ABC poem, l. 26a.
5b. These half-lines may or may not have been intended to rhyme; cf line 5 of 975E.
20a. Compare the pointing of 859DE, l. 16a.
23-24. These lines appear identically in 975E, where I nonetheless lineate them as prose. The context here suggests that they be read as poetic; while a metrical reading is likewise possible in 975E, the lack of pointing there does not indicate any change in style. The lack of a differentiating style of punctuation in both records suggests continuity—from poetry to poetry in 975D, from prose to prose in 975E.
975E (fo. 38r 1. 30)

Her cadgar gefor angla reccect/ x--xx-- (B2) --z-- -- (A2b)
west seaxena wine 7 myrcene mundbora. x--xxvx--x(A4) x--xx--x(A2b)
Cuð was ðet / wide geond feola þeoda. --xx--x(A1) --xx--x(A1)
þæ aferan ealdmunt ofer gane/tes bað x--xx-- -- (A2b) xxuxxu(B1)
cyningas hine wide wurðodon side. 5 xxx--x--x (A1) --xx--x(A1)
bugon to / cyninge swa wæs him gecynde. --xxuxx (A1) --xx--x(A1)
naes se flota swa rang. / ne se here swa strang. xxuxx-- (B1) xxuxx--(B1)
þæ on angle cynne æs him gefe/tede. xx--x--x (A1) --xx--x (A2b)
þæ hwile þe se ægele cynng cynestole gerehte. 9 xxxuxxx--x (B1) xxx--xx--x(A1)

And her eadward eadgares sunu feng to rice. 7 þæ so/na on þam iclean geare on herfestæ æte/o’wde cometa/se stecorra. 7 com þæ on þam caftan geare swiðe my/cel hungor. 7 swyðe mænigfealde styrunga geond /angelcyn. 7 Ælfere ealdorman het to wurpon swyðe/ manig muncu lif þe eadgar cyng het ær þone hal/gan biscop adelwold ge stædelian. 7 on þam timan wæs eac oslac se mæna eorl geutod of angelcynne.

4a. Cf. 975D’s "eadmundes." The loss of the inflectional ending as written here is not unusual in ms E, but it is worthwhile to note that it does have the effect of producing a metrically less complex line than the corresponding version in 975D.
5. Here 5a and 5b definitely rhyme.
12-13. Several of the phrases from the second poem in 975D are evident here, although none of the words or phrases characteristic of Wulfstan’s style.

The Murder of Edward

979D (fo. 53v)
ne weard angelcynne nan wyre dead x-- --xux (D) x--x-- (B1)
egodon þonne peo was x--xx--x (A1)
syþan hi æft brittenland gesohton --x-- -- (A2a?) xxx--x (A1)
meotn hine ofmyþredon ac god hine mærsode --xxuxxx (A2b) x--xx--x (A2b)
he was on lice heorlice cynng 5 --xx--x (A1) --xxux (A4)
he is nu æft deade heofonlic sanct xx--xx--x (A1) xx--
hyrne noldon his heorlican magas wrecan xx--xx--x (A2b) --xx--x (A4)
ac hine hafað his heofonlican faeder x--xxu (C1) xxx--xx (A4)
swyðe g’wrecan --xx--x (A4)
þæ heorlican banan woldon his gemynd 10 x--xxux (B2) --xx--x (E)
on corðan adilic ac se uplica wrecend x--xx--x (A1) xx--xxux-- (A2b)
hafað his gemynd on heofonum 7 on corðan tobræd xxxuxxx (A1)xx--xx-- (B2)
þæ de noldon ær to his libbendan lichaman onbugan xxxuxxx (A2b)--xx--x (A1)
þæ nu eadmodlice xx-- --x (D2)
on sceowum gebuað to his deada banum 15 x--xx--x (A1) xx--xx--x (A1)
nu we magan ongytan ðæt manna wisdom xxuxxx (A1) x--xx-- -- (A2a)
and heora smegunga 7 heora radas syndon xxxuxxxx (C2) xxx--xx--x (A1)
ahtlice ongean godes gepeah --xux (E) xx--

1. Through an egregious oversight, I failed to examine this poem in the D ms. The text here is from Classen and Harmer, stripped of capitalization and punctuation.
3a. Probably "æft" here is an error for "æres" from 979E, which is metrically more effective (the stresses here on "syþan" and "hi" are unusual).
6b. This half-line is metrically deficient according to Sievers’s scheme; it is possibly an example of a "light" E-verse. Cf. 18b.
7b. "Wrecan" here (and the related forms in 9 and 11b) might be taken to suggest that the first syllable was perceived as long when this verse was composed. Perhaps the "w" combination contributed to the weight of such syllables. These verses do scan satisfactorily as 'light' A-verses, however, even with the short first syllable in "wrecan."

10-12. Lineating these lines effectively is difficult. It is likely that the repeated use of "gemynd" is intended to rhyme, however this leaves a remainder "on heofenum 7 on eordan tobræd") which would be either an exceptionally long half-line or a short full-line. The lineation adopted here does not take advantage of this rhyme, but does have the advantage of showing alliteration in line 11. It is possible that the key structural point of these lines is their antithesis; they may not be intended as poetic lines in the regular sense.

979Œ (fo. 38v l. 25ff)

. Ne wearð angel cynne  nan wærsa dæd/
  gedon þonne þeōs wæs.  x-- --x --x (D)  x-- (B1)
  syddan hi ærest  bryton land /gesohton.  x--xx--x (A1)
  men hine ofmyrðrodon.  ac god hine mært/sode.  --xx--x (A1)
  he wæs on life eoričic cing.  üxxx--x (A1)
  he is nu after deade / heofonic sanct.  vx--xx--x (A1)
  Hine nolden his eoričican / magas wrecan.  üxxx--xx (A2b)
  ac hine hafad his  heofonlica faeder //
  swide gewrecen.  x--xx--x (A2b)  xx--xx-- (A4)
  pa eoričican banan  wolden his gemynd /  --xx--x (A4)
  on eordan adiligian.  Ac se uplica wrecend  xx--xx-- (A1)
  hafad his ge/mynd on heofenum.  7 on eordan tobræd  xx--xx--x (A2b)
  pa þe nolden/ ær to his liðbendu~ lichaman onbugan.  xxx--xx--x (A1)
  pa nu eadmoldi/ce  xx--xx-- (B2)
  on cneowum abugað to his dædum banu~.  --xx--x (E7)
  Nu we ma/gon ongytan  þ~ manna wisdom
  7 smæunga  7 heore / rædas syndon  xx--xx--x (A1)
  nahtlice ongean  godes gelpeah.  xx--xx--x (A1)

5. The replacement of the disyllable "cyning" (979D) with "cing" here causes a potential metrical problem, perhaps suggesting that the E scribe (or a predecessor) failed to see this as verse.

10-12. See note on 979D, ll. 10-12.

17-18. The removal of "heora" in this line seems not to affect the metrics of this line significantly.
The Capture of Alfheah

1011C (fo. 150v l. 12ff)

mid him was ḏa rapling se ḏe ær was heafod
angelyynes 7 cristen/domes.
þær man mihte ḏa geseon yrmdæ  þær man /ofþ ær gesehal blisse
on þære earman byrig. 5
þanon co-/ærest  cristendom 7 blis
for gode 7 for worulde

1011D (fo. 63t l. 5ff)
was se rapling se ḏe was heafod
angelyynes. 7 cristendomes.
þær man meahæ þa ge/soon ermœþ  þær man ofþ ær gesehal blisse
on þære/ earman byrig.
þanon us com ærest  cristendom/
7 blisse for gode. 7 for worulde.

1. The point preceding "wæs" suggests the form of this line. This is the lineation for this line used by Plummer in his edition.
6. The point before "7" suggests this lineation for ll. 5-6, although the possibility exists that the pointin before "7" here is strictly mechanical.

1011E (fo. 45r l. 23ff)

mid him was ḏa ra[wling.
se ḏe ær was  angelyynes / heafod.
7 xp-endomes.
þær man mihte þa geseon earmœþ  þær man ær gesehal blisse
on þære ærman byrig. 5
þanon / us co-/ærest  xp-endom.
7 blisse for gode. 7 for worulde./

1. Ms points before and after this line lead to this lineation.
2b. The placement of "heafod" after "angelyynes" in 1011E suggests that the scribe did not recognize the poetic structure of his exemplar. The alternative structure presented here, however, hints that he may have simply seen a different poetic structure than the 1011C scribe, for example.
The Return of Edward

Whitelock (EEMF 4, 28) argues that this and the 1067D poem were actually composed after 1070.

1057D (fo. 76v)
Her com cadward æpeling to englalande. xx-- --vx (A2a) x--vx (A1)
se /wæs cadwerdes broðor sunu kynges xx--vx (A2?) vxvx (A1)
eadmund 'cing' -- -- (?)
iren sid' wæs ge clypod for his snell scipe. xxvxvx (B2) xxvx (C2)
þisne æpeling cnut cyng / hæfde forsend 5 xxx--vx (B1) -- vx (E)
on ungerland to beswicane. xxvxvx (B1) vxvx (A1)
ac he þær geþeh to godan men xxvx (B1) xxvx (B1)
swa hi-- god uðe 7 hi-- wel gebyrede. xxvx vx (C1) xxvxx (A1)
swa þ~ he begeat þæs caseres maga to wife xxxvxxvx (A2b) xxvx (A1)
7 bi þære fægerne bearn team gestrynnde 10 xxxvxxvx (B1) vxvx (A1)
seo waes Agathes gehaten. xxvxvxvx (A1)
Ne wiston we for hwylcan intingham x--vx (A1) xxvx (A1)
þ~ gedon weard þ~ he ne moste xxx--vx (A1)
his / mæges eadwarde cynges geséon. xvxvxvx (A2b) vxvx (E)
Wala þ~ was héowlic sid. 7 / hearum eallre 15 xxxvxxvx (B1) xvxvx (A1)
þissere þoede þ~ he swa rāde vxvxvxvx (A1) vxvxvx (B1)
his lif ge/andade. þæs þe he to englalande com xvxvxvx (A2b) xxxvxxvxvx (E)
for ungesælheþe þissere earman þoede. xx--vx (A1) xxvxvx (A1)

3. The inserted "cing" here, as well as the uninflected "eadmund" and the metrical irregularities in 2b hint that these changes may have sprung from an original half-line "sunum kinges eadmundes."

15. "Wala" here might be given its own line, as in 1086, below. Regardless, this exclamation is likely to be extra-metrical.

18b. The apparent parallel with l. 16a is perhaps intended as rhyme.

The Wooing of Margaret

1067D
.7 cwæð þ~ heo hine ne nanne habban wolde. xxvxvx (C1) xxxvx (A1)
gyf hire seo /uplece arfaestys geunnan wolde. xxxvxvxvx (A2b) xvxvx (A1)
þ~ heo on meðhade mih/tigan drihtne. xxxvxvx (C2) vxvx (A1)
mid lichoman heortan. on þisan life sceortan./ xvxvx (A1) xxxvxvx (A1)
on cleare forhæfedyssse cweman mihte. 5 vxvxvxvx (D*4) vxvx (A1)
### The Bridal Feast of Ralph

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1076D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>þær was þ~ brydeal. ð~ was manegra manna bealo.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1075E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>þær wes þ~ brydeal/ mannu~ to beala.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The Bridal Guests' Ruin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1076D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sume hi wurdon geblende./ 7 sume wrecen of lande.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 sume getawod to scande.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>þus wurdon /þæs kyninges swican genýðrade.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1075E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sume /hy wurdon ablænde 7 sume of land adrifene.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>swa wurdon /Will~mes swican geniðrade.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-or-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
William the Conqueror

Of all the "non-canonical" passages under consideration here, this seems to be the one most often agreed upon as poetry.

1086E (fo. 65r l. 11ff)

Castelas he let wyrcean. 7 earme men swīde /swencean. Se cyng wæs swa swīde stearc. 7 bēna~ of his un/derpeoddan man. manig marc golde. 7 ma hundred pund a scolfres. Ðet he na~ be wihte. 7 mid mycelan un/rihte of his landleode for littere neode. He wæs on git/sunge befeallan. 7 grædinasæ he lufoðe mid ealle. he sæt/te mycel deor frið. 7 he lægde laga þær wið. þær~ swa hwa swa /sloge heort oððe hinde. þær~ hine man scolde blendian. he /forbead þa heortas. swylce eac þa baras. swa swīde 'he' lufoðe / þa headeor. swilce he wære heora fæder. Eac he sætte be / þa~ haran. þær~ hi mosten freo [.]faran. his rice men hit / mændon. 7 þa earne men hit beceorodan. Ac he swa stið/ þær~ he ne rohte heora eallra nið. ac hi mosten mid ealle þæs / cynges wille folgian 15 gif hi woldon libban. oððe lande habban. land oððe eahtha. oððe wel his sehta. Wala wa. þær~ æng / man scolde modigan swa. hine sylf upp ahebban. 7 ofer / ealle men tellan. 20 Se ælmihtiga god cyðæ his saule mild /heortnisse. 7 do hi~ 'his' synna forgifnesse.

2-4. My lineation here is in conflict with all previous editors, who see "stearc" and "marc" as rhymes. As I argue in Chapter 4, however, it seems the scribe did not treat these lines as rhymed.
15. For a defense of this line as a good rhyme, see Whiting. Again, however, the scribe does not point the line as he regularly points rhymes.

The Vexed Folk

1104E (fo 75v ll. 20-21)

Ealle þis wæs god mid /to gremienne. 7 þas arme leode mid to tregienne.
The Metries.

In lineating and scanning these passages, I've attempted to stick as closely as possible to the rules of Old English versification as described by Eduard Sievers and summarized by John C. Pope in *Seven Old English Poems*. On the whole, almost all of the lines here can be so lineated; nevertheless, certain features stand out in these lines which require comment, as they mark differences from the Sieversian tradition of Old English verse. In particular, these poems feature rhyme, fourth-stress alliteration, unpaired half-lines, and metrical anomalies such as extensive anacrusis. Each of these features needs to be examined in some detail.

Rhyme. In the poem on William the Conqueror (1086E) in particular, rhyme is a crucial feature of the poetry, and this poem rhymes quite regularly. Yet in many of the other passages edited here as well, rhyme is also used, sometimes in conjunction with alliteration, sometimes on its own. Sometimes rhyme is used as a linking device between half-lines, sometimes across larger stretches of poetry. Consider the following examples:

Ac god him geunne  þæt his god ðéada
swyðran/ weorðan  þone misðæda.  (959D)

cyninge hine wide  wurðodon side.  (975E)

þær wes þ~ bryðeala/  mannu~ to beala.  (1075E)

Eac he sætte be/ þa~ haran.  þ~ hi mosten freo faran.  (1086E)

In one form or another, rhyme seems to be a part of the metrical system of the following poems: 959DE, 975DE, 975D, 979DE, 1011C, 1067D, 1075DE, 1075D, 1086E, 1104E. Clearly, this is not an insignificant feature of these poems.

Fourth-Stress Alliteration. Although according to traditional models of Old English poetics, alliteration on the fourth stress of the line is not only disallowed but avoided, in these poems, there are a number of cases where this sort of alliteration seems to be significant. Consider these lines:

call he gewilde  þ~ he sylfwolde
He/ weatð wide geond þeodland  swyðe geweorðad.  (959D, ll.12-13)

oft 7 gelome.  7 godes lœf rærde  (959D, l. 16)

his s'a'wle to gescyld/nyssc  on langsuman side;  (959D, l. 28)

bugon to þam cyninge  swa him wæs gecynde.  (975D, l. 6)

aþælwod gestalian.  7 wydewan bestryptan  (975D l. 7)

syðdon hi ærest  brytonland gesohton.
men hine ofmyrðrodon.  ac god hine mærside.  (979E, ll. 3-4)

on cneowum abugað  to his dædum banu~.  (979E, l.

7 smeagunge  7 heore rædas syndon  (979, l. 17)

mid him wæs ða/ ræpling  se ðe æþæt wæs heafod  (1011C, l. 1)

þær wes þ~ bryðeala/  mannu~ to beala  (1075E)

Although not as prevalent, perhaps, as rhyme, these examples, too, are surely too numerous to ignore. Line 4 of 979E is particularly important, as the m-alliteration occurs in three of the line's four stressed
syllables. Other lines here could probably be scanned so that the fourth stress did not fall on the alliterating syllable (979D, l. 16, for example). On the whole, however, this evidence suggests that this phenomenon is important enough to justify scanning these ambiguous lines as alliterating lines. It is likewise interesting to note that in none of these examples does the alliteration fall on both the third and fourth stressed syllable of any line. Compare, however, a line such as is found in 975D: "westseaxena wine. 7 myrna mundhara" where we have alliteration of the AABB type, with double alliteration in each half-line, but with differing letters.

Unpaired Half-Lines. Of the unusual features of these poems, this is the most prevalent within the canonical Old English poetic corpus. Such well-known poems as Wulf and Eadwacer and Maxims I have solitary half-lines. Their appearance in these poems, then, should be no surprise; however, their relative frequency here suggests a less strict metrical system than that described by Sievers and Pope.

Anacrusis. A large number of the lines in these passages are scanned as featuring anacrusis—one or more unstressed syllables occurring before the first stressed syllable of a verse. Thomas Cable has investigated anacrusis in A-verses, concluding that the resulting five-place verses are generally excluded from Old English poetry, although the same rhythmical structure is quite common in OE prose ("Constraints"). Interestingly, he points out that such a structure is allowed in th poetry when the extra place (whether the first syllable in a verse, or a different place) is filled by the verbal prefixes a-, on-, for-, of-, be-, et-, or the negator, ne. In the passages edited here, it is interesting to note that a large number of these anacruses are similar function words: "ond" in particular occurs quite often in this position (eight times in 959D alone). Cable suggests that this pattern is normal for "ordinary formal discourse" (103), but is "avoided" for poetry. His examination of the meter of Beowulf is what leads him to these conclusions; I would like to suggest that in such later poems as those considered here, when compounding and variation were less productive for poets, the allowed forms of anacrusis expanded to include "ond" and eventually other function words as well.

Taken together, these features of the poems in consideration here should serve as a powerful reminder that our traditional ideas of what Anglo-Saxon verse looked like are more our ideas than Anglo-Saxon ideas. The "irregularities" of meter, alliteration, and rhyme described here are, I hope to have shown, quite important to these poems, and not as irregularities, but as poetic features.
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