

THE ANGLO-SAXON CHRONICLE: ITS ORIGIN AND
HISTORY.

By SIR HENRY H. HOWORTH, K.C.I.E, D.C.L, F.R.S, F.S.A, PRESIDENT.]

PART II. *The second Christ Church Canterbury Chronicle
or MS. F.*¹

In the previous paper I argued that the so-called *Peterborough Chronicle*, MS. E, was the handiwork of the Peterborough historian, Hugo Candidus, and claim to have made that conclusion, which had previously been suggested by more than one writer, a critical certainty. It follows that the document in question ought not, as it stands, to be classed with the other copies of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, but rather with such compositions as the *Chronicles* of Florence of Worcester and Henry of Huntingdon, with which it largely agrees in date and from which it differs chiefly in the fact that it is written in the vernacular and not in Latin. It is in fact a compilation, and does not in the main consist of annals written year by year or at successive dates more or less contemporaneously with the event recorded.

It seems almost certain, as Professor Earle first suggested, that when the fire took place, in 1116, which destroyed the monastery, the monks set about to replace their library, and among their needs was a chronicle, retailing the early history of the country, doubtless to replace a corresponding work in the old library which had also been written in the vernacular. They accordingly secured a copy of such a chronicle reaching down to the year 1121. In this were then

¹ Part i. of this paper appeared in *Archaeological Journal*, lxxv, 141.

inserted a series of entries specially relating to Peterborough, and composed in a late and corrupt form of Anglo-Saxon. Thus was constituted the original compilation, which could not, therefore, have been made earlier than about 1122. To this several successive additions were made at different dates, apparently in different hands, but in the same corrupt form of the language, and probably all composed by the same writer, who was the original compiler, and carrying down the narrative of events to 1154, just before the death of Hugo Candidus, when the manuscript ends.

The object and purpose of some of these additions, which were based on sophisticated documents, were probably to take advantage of the circumstances above named to create and establish claims to rights and privileges in the fashion so much in vogue in the twelfth century.

The compilation of this example of the chronicle was no doubt made at Peterborough itself, where the majority of the interpolated documents existed; and we can have little doubt that the monks, having secured (probably by way of loan and not improbably through the efforts of their former abbot, then bishop of Rochester and a patron of letters), a copy of a chronicle which, as I shall show presently, was composed elsewhere, proceeded to put together their own annals by transcribing this copy with considerable faithfulness, and phrase by phrase. During the process they inserted such documents and statements from among their own records and traditions as might be useful in their polemics with rival houses and with tenants and otherwise, and such as were especially interesting to their own confraternity.

As I have pointed out, the earlier of these insertions down to 1013 are based on a series of Latin charters, nearly all of which are still extant, and all of which, with perhaps two exceptions, are spurious, and were concocted to support privileges and rights no legal title to which was forthcoming. The two exceptions were a possibly genuine grant of lands in 852 and a bald statement about the destruction of the abbey by the Danes in 870, when it is virtually certain that Peterborough shared the fate of the other abbeys of the Fen country.

From 1013 onwards, the insertions stand on a different

footing and it is probable that whatever mistakes they contain are not due to deliberate sophistication, but to the lapses which betimes attend the work even of careful writers.

They comprise, as we have seen, the *bonâ fide* information that the compiler was able to collect from various obits, tombstones and the like, from entries in service or other books, and from the living traditions of the monastery. These, although scanty, are in some cases interesting. As I have said, they were entered at various intervals in the matrix of the work which consisted of a composition in homogeneous speech brought down to the year 1121.

From 1121 to 1154 the *Chronicle* was composed at Peterborough itself and, as we have seen, was entered up at intervals. In several cases these intervals corresponded with the careers of the several abbots, each abbot's annals being entered up on the succession of the next one. Although written in different hands, they are composed in the same homogeneous but corrupt form of English in which the actual insertions are written, and were probably all the work of one author, who was doubtless Hugo Candidus.

In any future edition of the *Chronicle* it would be well, it seems to me, to treat all these insertions in, and additions to the *Peterborough Chronicle* as the definite work of the local compiler, and to print them in an appendix, apart from the main portion of the text, from which they differ so completely in language, authority and matter.

Before we discuss that portion of the *Peterborough Chronicle* which ends in 1121, apart from its insertions, and which constitutes a document of the first value, it is necessary that we should analyze another copy of the *Chronicle* which, since the publication of the *Mon. Hist. Britt.* has been known as MS. F. This manuscript is now preserved in the British Museum, and is there numbered Cotton, Dom. A, viii. It seems to have belonged to Camden, the historian, and to have been given by him to Sir Robert Cotton, and was in the Cotton collection when Gibson produced his edition of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, in which he refers to it as MS. Cot.

Gibson did not consult the original, but used the collations from it made by Junius in a copy of Wheloc's edition. Junius' collations are contained in the volume in the Bodleian, calendared as Junius 10.

Gibson thus speaks of it in his preface :

Qui in hac Editione, nomine Cot. codex cognoscitur, reperitur in Bibliotheca D. Joh. Cotton, Londini. Hunc cum Chronico Wheelociano contulerat, ac variantes illius Lectiones suo Libro inseruerat Cl. Franciscus Junius, novam, opinor, Chronici Saxonici editione orbi daturus. ¹

Junius entirely left out the Latin parts of this document in his collation.

It is quite plain for several reasons that MS. F once belonged to Christ Church, Canterbury. Dr. M. R. James tells us that in the earlier of the two printed catalogues of the books at Christ Church, Canterbury, compiled in the twelfth century, there is attached to each title a curious sign, sometimes a monogram, sometimes two or three capital letters, sometimes a Greek letter or a seemingly meaningless hieroglyph, and he shows that this was a device of the Christ Church monks for ear-marking their property. In all cases where the book entered in the catalogue is extant, the same sign by which it is marked in the catalogue is found on its initial page. ² Dr. James says the catalogue cannot be much later than 1150.

Dr. Plummer points out that MS. Tib. A, viii is shewn to have been such a Christ Church book by having on its front page the mark L. a. in the right top corner of its first leaf, standing either for *Liber Anglicus* or *Latine et Anglice*.

Mr. Herbert and Dr. Plummer had previously come to the same conclusion by identifying the manuscript with the *Chronica latine et anglice*, entered in a later catalogue of Christ Church library, made under Henry of Eastry, prior of Christ Church, 1285-1331 (MS. Cott. Galba, E iv, fol. 134, see Plummer, II, xcvi). Lastly, there is the critical fact that the manuscript incorporates a number of documents not found elsewhere, and specially dealing with the affairs of Christ Church, Canterbury,

¹ *Op. cit.* b. ii

² *Guardian*, May 18th, 1898.

vide infra. So much for the original home of the manuscript.

MS. F differs from all the other copies of the *Chronicle* in the very inartistic way in which it is written. Instead of being like them, a quite respectable specimen of penmanship and a fitting occupant of a monastic library, it is rather the first draft of a compiler who scribbled the text and corrections over margins, etc. etc. in a most careless, slipshod hand. Professor Earle calls it "a feeble, shambling hand." This is not all, as Professor Plummer says "The bulk of the *Chronicle* is all in one hand, but there are innumerable additions, interlinear and marginal, and it is often impossible to say whether these minutely written insertions are by the original scribe or a different one. There are also annotations here and there in a later hand, which I believe to be that of R. Talbot."¹ Some of the writing has been defaced by the reckless use of restoratives to try and make the faded writing more clear.

The manuscript is unfortunately incomplete and ends abruptly, in the midst of the annal for 1058, shewing that some portions of it are missing. The crowded writing runs down to the very bottom of the last page. The last words in it are "Siward ~~abb~~ to ~~h~~ to Rof," Rof being the incomplete word Rofeceastre, which occurs at full length in the corresponding passage in the *Peterborough Chronicle*.

One of the features of this manuscript is that it is accompanied by a Latin translation. In the case of the concluding sentence just mentioned, there is no Latin translation appended, nor is there room for it, but it doubtless once occurred on a page now lost. It is plain, therefore, on every ground, that the manuscript is a mutilated one. How much it has lost we have no *direct* means of knowing: we can only infer.

The last definite date in it is 1058, but it is plain that it was written some time after this, for in the last Latin entry we have the phrase, "Et Edwardus pater Edgari et Margaretae Reginae Scotorum." Inasmuch as Margaret did not become queen of Scotland until the year 1070,

¹ Plummer, *A. S. Chronicle*, II, xxxvi.

it is plain that this entry could not have been written earlier than that year.

Again, it was long ago noticed by Professor Earle, and has been amply confirmed by Mr. Plummer, that the scribe of MS. F was the same person who put certain glosses and marginalia in MS. A, which he took partially from MS. E, partially from his own composition as contained in MS. F itself and nowhere else, and partially from other sources. "A good place," says Mr. Earle, "for identifying the two literateurs is the annal 943, where the text of F fits in exactly to a mutilation in the marginal note of A. The scribe of F, as Mr. Plummer has shewn, also inserted in MS. A certain notes about archbishop Lanfranc" which are generally quoted as the *Acts of Lanfranc*.¹ *Lanfranc's Acts* carry down the account of his life to its close in 1089, and further tell us that after his death the see was vacant for four years, nine months and nine days, and that St. Anselm was consecrated in 1093, so that the scribe of F was clearly writing after 1093. Again, in the annals 876, 928, 942, 994, 1024 and 1031, we have in F a number of entries partly in Latin and partly translated into Anglo-Saxon, all referring to the dukes of Normandy, and the last one mentioning the death of duke Robert and the succession of William the Conqueror, of whom it is said *he was siddan cing on Engla lande*, which could only have been written after 1066.

These entries about the dukes of Normandy are not only found in MSS. E and F of the *Chronicle* itself, but they also occur, as we shall see, in other documents, and have been traced eventually to the *Annals of Rouen*. I shall have more to say about them presently. Here it must suffice to mention that, according to M. Delisle, the *Annals of Rouen* were not compiled till the beginning of the twelfth century. This makes MS. F, like MS. E which also incorporated them, a document of that century.

Lastly, and perhaps most conclusively, the main part of the text of F is an epitome of that of E, or of a manuscript like E. The compilation of this particular material, in the form we find it in E, cannot, as we have seen,

¹ Plummer, II, xxvi. and xxxvi.

according to our present lights, be carried back further than 1121, and it follows that the text of F must have been compiled after the latter date, which again makes it a work of the twelfth century.

This date is confirmed by other facts. The bilingual character of the document, as Professor Earle said, marks the transition period from the use of the vernacular to that of Latin in English history, which was a prevailing feature in the twelfth century. The language points the same way as in the continual confusion of the two thorns, the *dh* and *th*, the use of the later forms *beri* or *byri* for *berig* or *byrig* in such names as Salisbury, etc. and the substitution of a later diction generally. In 1006, as Professor Earle says, F shows a very characterizing lection *prutne here and uneargne* where C, D and E have *rancne here and unearhne*. This is probably the oldest example of the French *prud*, used in our modern sense of "proud"; and it seems to imply an advanced decade of the twelfth century.¹

Petrie assigns the writing of the MS. to the twelfth century. Mr. Warner, who has re-examined it for me, does the same, and when complete its text doubtless came down to at least the third decade of that century.

It is quite plain, therefore, that the manuscript was written by some monk of Christ Church, Canterbury, probably in the first half of the twelfth century, and it may sometime be possible to recover the name of the writer. The compiler was probably an Englishman, for he knew both Latin and the vernacular well, and translated from either language into the other with facility. I cannot improve on Mr. Plummer's acute dissection of the relation of these two versions to each other. He says, *inter alia*, "There are several Latin entries to which there is no corresponding Saxon; there are a few Saxon entries, from which the Latin is either wholly wanting or only inserted later. An addition is made in the Latin and not in the Saxon, or *vice versâ*, though often additions or corrections are made in both. In one case an addition in Latin is inserted in the Saxon text, and not in the Latin. . . It not infrequently happens that the Latin

¹ *Op cit.* liii.

is nearer to and contains more of the original than does the Saxon epitome. Where the Latin is the fuller, corresponding additions are often made to the Saxon between the lines or in the margin. Conversely there are cases in which the Saxon contains more than the Latin, and here, too, occasionally the defect of the latter has been subsequently supplied. Sometimes the same annal will be fuller in one part in the Latin, in another in the Saxon version.¹ Neither version is therefore truly a translation of the other, although they have so much in common, and they would rather seem to have been concurrently compiled by one scribe with his authorities lying around him, whence he took for either version, as his caprice directed him." For these reasons it is more than ever desirable that the full text of both versions should be printed for us side by side. We especially need a scientific edition of the Latin version which, as Dr. Pauli long ago pointed out, contains some valuable original matter. Such an edition would be of interest to us apart altogether from the value of its actual contents. It would be important as a twelfth century example of the way in which Anglo-Saxon terms and phrases were then understood.

The Latin portions of F were entirely neglected by Junius in his collation, and were accordingly overlooked by Gibson. MS. F was collated at first hand, as he claims, by Ingram for his edition, but he also fails to give the Latin portions. They were partially used in the *Mon. Hist. Britt.* and by Thorpe and much more amply by Mr. Plummer, but he gives them in a scattered and incomplete way and entirely omits some of the longer insertions.²

Let us now turn to the actual contents of the manuscript, which is clearly and definitely not an original composition, but a compilation.

The first thing that attracts attention is the insertion in it, in some cases on erasures, and in a later hand, of a number of documents and charters like those inserted in MS. E, only, instead of relating to Peterborough, having

¹ Plummer, i, xlii. and xliii.

² A facsimile of the Latin text of F is given by Thorpe (plate vi).

reference to Kent, and especially to Canterbury. These documents, if they were genuine and reliable, would be of high importance and interest, and they deserve a closer attention than has hitherto been devoted to them. The first one is entered in the *Chronicle* in the year 694, and reports an alleged great council, mycel concilium, magnum concilium, as it is called in either version respectively, held at Baccanaelde, and presided over by Wihtried, king of Kent, clementissimus rex Cantuariorum, by Brihtwald, the most reverend archbishop, father and primate of all England, and by Tobias, bishop of Rochester; for the purpose of regulating the affairs of the churches and monasteries in Kent (ða feoð innan Cent; intra Cantiam).

Both versions of the grant are omitted by Mr. Plummer, who generally gives the variants of MS. F, but the Saxon text is printed by Gibson, at page 48. The Anglo-Saxon version (called an abbreviation in the note) is alone given in the *Mon. Hist. Brit.* 324; by Thorpe in his edition of the *Chronicle*, I, 66 and 67, note; and by Haddan and Stubbs, III, 244 and 245. Birch gives both texts in his *Cartularium*, I, pp. 137 and 138.

The Anglo-Saxon copy, with an exception to be mentioned, is a mere epitome, by the compiler, of the Latin, which is considerably longer and more detailed, and is unattested, while the Latin has several attestations. The privileges granted by it are styled *leges* in the attestation of the archbishop.

Let us now turn to the Latin version from which the Saxon text was epitomized and translated; a notable fact about it is that it has been largely tampered with: considerable portions of the original writing have been erased, or partially erased, and other clauses and statements inserted, while the narrative is given in oblique instead of direct form, showing that it is not in its original shape. This makes it important to examine any other copies of the charter extant anywhere outside MS. Dom. A, VIII.

Several such copies exist, and their texts form two, or rather three, different editions of the document, and afford a capital instance of the gross way in which grants of privileges were invented and afterwards sophisticated and dishonestly enlarged in the Middle Ages.

Of these the oldest and most complete is contained in a charter from the Stowe collection, no. 2, now in the British Museum, which was printed by Birch in his *Cartularium Saxonicum*, i, no. 91, pp. 128-133. It was not known to Kemble, Thorpe or Haddan and Stubbs. Birch speaks of it as a twelfth century copy. To it is appended on the same parchment what professes to be a confirmation of this same grant, also by Wihtred, made at a council at Clovesho. These two originally separate documents were duly copied about 1220 into a cartulary of Christ Church, Canterbury, which is now preserved at Lambeth.¹ This cartulary professes to have been taken "de codicellis primariis sive cartis terrarum antiquitus dictis Land boc." The text of this last copy of the double document is given by Haddan and Stubbs,² who took it from the Lambeth manuscript.³

The Stowe and Lambeth manuscripts here mentioned (which are apparently the oldest extant copies of the grant) agree entirely except in small literal variants. What is important to note is that they also agree with the text in the *Chronicle* before it was tampered with, and they further present us with a more perfect form of the original, inasmuch as *inter alia* the witnesses are all given instead of only the names of the king and bishop Berhtuuald as in the *Chronicle*. There are also some minor differences due to the compiler of the *Chronicle* himself, and to be mentioned presently.

Let us now turn to another set of copies of the document. The oldest of these extant is apparently contained in the Lambeth MS. 1212, p. 307, which, Birch says, is of the thirteenth century. It is also contained in the register of the Prior and Convent of Canterbury, A1, fol. 88, a manuscript of the fourteenth century, which was used by Spelman and Wilkins, and also by Kemble. There is another copy in MS. Cott, Claudius D. 11, fol. 25, of the sixteenth century, used by Twysden, and another contained in MS. CCCC 189; another is in a manuscript of the sixteenth century in the Harleian Library,

¹ MS. Lambeth, 1212, pp. 385, 386.

² *Op. cit.* III, 238-240 and 300, 301.

³ This Lambeth MS. was [apparently also used by Spelman, *Concilia*, i, 189 and Wilkins, *Concilia*, iv, 745, 746.

W. 1757, fol. 170, also in a Norman-French translation in the *Polistoir of Canterbury*, WS. Harl, 636¹.

These copies of the charter differ greatly from those previously described. Their phraseology has been much altered, but they are also greatly changed in substance. They profess to give up the royal authority in the nomination of bishops, as well as of abbots and the rest, and are written as if Wihtred were king of the whole of England and not merely of one of its kingdoms, and apply the grant to all England as well as to certain specified Kent churches, while the authority of the archbishops is greatly enhanced at the expense of the bishops. From the number of copies in which they occur, it is clear that these various alterations were widely accepted. What is more important for our purpose is that MS. F was altered in conformity with them.

These sophisticated copies, by which the privileges originally granted were so widely extended, were also clearly drawn up after the original composition of the *Chronicle*, since they alone are dated, the older copies having no date. As Haddan and Stubbs point out, the date they give was borrowed from the *Chronicle* which enters the document as part of the annal 694. The changes involved in the text are so important and so illuminating as evidence of the unblushing way in which documents in the Middle Ages were tampered with, that I deem it essential to give in parallel columns the variants between the oldest text of the document and that in the *Chronicle*.

STOWE TEXT, BIRCH, I, p. 128.

In nomine domini Dei nostri et
salvatoris Jhesu Christi: Congrega-
tum est . . . Berhtuualdo
reverentissimo archiepiscopo Brittan-
niae simulque Tobiae Hrofensis
aecclesiae, ceterisque Abbatibus . . .
tractantes anxie examinantes de statu
. . . Cantiam quae a fidelibus regibus
prodecessoribus meis et proquinquis,
Deo . . . stare quidve servare

DOMITIAN A. VIII, BIRCH, I, 138.

Statim autem cum potitus est
regno precepit congregari . . . Brih-
uualdo reverentissimo archiepiscopo et
patre et primate totius Britanniae
simulque Tobia episcopo Rrofensis
aecclesiae cum caeteris *episcopis*²
abbatibus . . . tractantes de statu
. . . Cantiam *et de his* quae a fidelibus
. . . prodecessoribus *ejus* et propin-
quis Aedelberhto posterisque ejus

¹ See Haddan and Stubbs, III, 244.

² *meis* expuncted and *ejus* over the line.

amodo . . . constituimus . . . Ideo ego Uuihtred . . . alicui ex laico . . . quia scimus . . . dimiserit impunitus . . . Ideo horrendum . . . et hereditatem ejus . . . quotquot ex aliquo ei concessum fuerit de terrenis substantiis ad id ut eo . . . in caelis quia . . . aeterni et ad ejus imperium trahere desiderat tanto . . . statuimus atque decernimus . . . familiae monasteriis . . . quae a me ipso vel antecessoribus . . . et sanctis apostolis etiamque Maria Virgine domini nostri sacrata . . . precipitur servandum est quando quis evenerit . . . obigere de saeculo Abbas . . . *propterea invitatur* propriae porraehiae episcopus et cum ejus consilio . . . inveniatur . . . episcopo examinatur, . . . et ab episcopo benedicatur sanctificatur dominus spiritualis gradui Dei servitiae et tonsure seu sacrae velamine mancipatus . . . licentia archiepiscopi in diocesi suo . . . faciat . . . Metropolitani episcopi . . . atque abbates . . . quis ovis de ovibus aeterni . . . erret.

Hoc preceptum statuimus his monasteriis quorum nomina haec sunt adnotata primus primi apostolorum principis Petri. Id est Upmynster, Raculf, Suðmynster, Dofras, Folcanstan, Limming. Scepeig, Aet Hoe. Haec omnia interdiximus sicut ante diximus ut nullus habitus ex numero laicorum ad se pertrahat vel suscipiat ullum monasterium de his predominantis.

Adhuc addimus majorem libertatem . . . Inprimis Christi ecclesiae cum omnibus agris . . . ceterisque praedictis omnibus ecclesiis . . .

Deo . . . stare¹ valeant quidve servare oporteat amodo . . . constituentes . . . Ego inquit Wihtredus . . . alicui *homini* ex laico . . . scimus *enim* . . . dimittet,² impunitum . . .³ Ideo *que dico*¹ horrendum . . . et hereditatem . . . Cum autem *Deo oblatum aliquit*⁴ fuerit de terrenis substantiis *ad hoc* ut² . . . in caelis . . . *quod* quanto . . . aeterni tanto . . .² *decernimus* . . . familiae monasteriorum . . . quae a me vel ab antecessoribus . . .⁵ . . . precipitur hoc servandum est² *quando* evenerit . . . migret de seculo *episcopus*⁶ *vel* abbas . . . invitetur *archiepiscopus* propriae parochiae et cum ejus consilio . . . invenitur . . .
. . .
ab *illo* examinetur . . . et ab eo benedicatur . . .
. . .
licentia ejus . . . fecerit . . . Metropolitani autem archiepiscopi⁷ . . . atque episcopos abbates . . . quis de ovili Christi *scilicet* . . . aberret . . .
. . .
. . .
. . .
. . .
. . .
. . .⁸

. . . *inprimis ecclesie Christi quae est in Dorobernia*⁹ cum omnibus agris . . . ceterisque omnibus ecclesiis . . .¹⁰ pulsione regalium tributorum²

¹ Alteration here.

² Erasure here.

³ "quia" partly erased.

⁴ From "cum" to "aliquit" written over an erasure.

⁵ A whole line erased.

⁶ "Archiepiscopo" with "illo" over the line.

⁷ "Archiepiscopo" with "eo" over line.

⁸ Six lines erased or partly erased here.

⁹ Written over an erasure.

¹⁰ "Praedictis omnibus," but the first word underlined for erasure.

subjiciantur . . . vel pulsione . . .
 regum censuris . . . statuimus . . .
 ut per eorum intercessionem mereamur
 audire felicem sententiam. . . .
 . . . nisi ante pleniter emendaverit
 Venite benedicti patris mei percipite
 regnum, quod vobis paratum est ab
 origine mundi . . . nisi ante pleniter
 emendaverit judicio Episcoporum . . .
 irrefragabilis . . . metropolitanum
 capud . . . omnibus ecclesiis Dei quae
 in hac Cantia morantur . . .

The witnesses consist of Uuihtred, his wife Uuerburga and his son Alric, or Aluic, Berhtuald the archbishop, Aethelberht for himself and his brother Eadbert, Tobias the bishop (of Rochester), five abbesses and nine presbyters.

The witnesses consist of Wihtried, his wife Warburga, his son Alric, the archbishop, and no one else.

It seems clear that the document we are discussing was represented in its original form in the Stowe and Harleian MSS. above described, that this was completely sophisticated, and that the copy in MS.F, i.e. Dom. A, viii, was afterwards altered by erasure and the subsequent insertion of certain clauses conferring enlarged privileges in conformity with the forged alterations. In several instances, however, in Dom. A, viii, there are no signs of such expunction and subsequent fresh insertion, but new and deliberate alterations are inserted in the original body of the text; some of them are slight grammatical and verbal changes, others are more important, as the first insertion of *episcopus*, the insertion of Aethelberht, the second insertion of *episcopus* that of *archiepiscopus* and *archiepiscopi* all involving increased status for the archbishop, and it would seem that the original scribe of the Latin charter in Dom. A, viii, had already begun to sophisticate it. It is remarkable that some of these changes also occur in the Anglo-Saxon copy, *inter alia* the reference to Aegelberht, as he is there called, in the phrase "cinges, and thara ðe him after fyligdan," in which the clause closely follows the Latin; also the insertion of bishops, as well as abbots and abbesses, among

¹ "Statuimus" here expuncted.

² Erasure of the clause about Kent.

those concerning whose lives the archbishop was to inquire into and who were not to be appointed without his counsel, and similarly the clause, *Cynges sceolan settan eorlas and ealdermen, scirir-euan and domes-menn and Arb. sceal Godes gelaðunge wissian and raedan and biscopas and abbodas and abbedessan, preostas and diaconas*, etc. etc. Still more remarkable is the exclusion of the clauses giving the names of the Kentish churches and monasteries to which the privileges were limited in the original draft, and their extension to the whole province over which Wihtred ruled (in regno nostro).

The only explanation of all this that I can suggest is that the person who concocted these sophistications originally, was no other than the compiler of MS. F, i.e. the MS. Dom. A, VIII, who inserted some of them in his original draft of the *Chronicle* and afterwards carried the falsifications further by alterations. He went further in his original draft of the Anglo-Saxon copy, which would not be so likely to be noticed as the Latin one which he afterwards accommodated to his more advanced views. It is very likely that it was from his copy in the *Chronicle* (so altered) that all the authors of the second series of drafts derived their text as they derived their date, thus still further sophisticating it in the process.

It is clear, therefore, that as at Peterborough, so at Christ Church, Canterbury, forgery of documents was in the air at the beginning of the twelfth century. We showed, in the case of the Peterborough documents, that not only was the text in the *Chronicle* sophisticated, but that the original Latin texts from which it was taken was also forged. I have no doubt it was so also here. Let us shortly examine in this behalf the text of the Stowe copy, the oldest one extant. It contains, as we have seen, on the same parchment two documents following close on one another in the same handwriting, one professing to be a pronouncement of a council at Baccancelde, held in 694, and the other of a second council held at Clovesho in 716. It is perfectly plain that, if genuine, these cannot be the originals, which must have been written on separate parchments. No such separate parchments exist so far as I know.

Secondly, it is remarkable that the synod referred to as held at Baccancelde, is not only not mentioned in any other copy of the *Chronicle*, but is not named by any of the genuine Latin chroniclers, nor by Bede, who has a good deal to say of archbishop Behrtwald and bishop Tobias.¹ Not only so, but we have no other acts or proceedings of such a synod except this alleged grant of privileges. Nor is Baccancelde mentioned by any other early writer than the compiler of MS. F, nor do we know where it was situated, for the identification of it with the modern Bapchild in Kent (which is quite another name) is most arbitrary.

It is again very strange that such a document should not be dated. Several of its clauses again are very rhetorical and unusual. It is professedly signed by Wihtred the king, not only on his own behalf but on that of his wife, Werburga, and his son *Alric*. An *Alric*, son of Wihtred, is mentioned by Bede, *Hist. Eccl.* v, 23, but we know of no wife of Wihtred called Werburga. In a spurious charter, dated 17th July, A.D. 694, Wihtred's wife, who joins in the grant, is called Kynygitha (Birch 1, p. 122), while in genuine charters of 696, she is called Ethelburga (Birch, 1, 142 and 143). This Werburga seems to have been made up out of Werburga, the wife of Wulfred, king of Mercia, who died a century later.

The signatures of Aethelberht, the king's son, on behalf of himself and his brother, at this time is also incredible. The next time that Aethelberht's name occurs in a charter is in 724, when his father was still king of Kent, and he did not die till the next year. Aethelberht himself did not die till 760. Lastly, the other attestations are most suspicious. The deed contains the signatures of five abbesses and not of a single abbot. Haddan and Stubbs remark further that the source of the documents, namely, St. Saviour's, Canterbury, is not above suspicion.² It seems, therefore, on every ground that this document is a sophistication, the object of which is quite patent.

Let us now pass on to the second document in the Stowe charter. This is dated in July, 716, the

¹ See *Hist. Eccl. Lib.* v, cap. 9.

² See Wake's *Criticisms on the State of the Church*, app. 1.

thirteenth indiction, and in the first year of Aethelbald, king of the Mercians; it professes to be a confirmation at a council held at Clovesho, of the privileges granted by the document already cited, and naturally shares its fate. Haddan and Stubbs were of opinion that the copy of this document in the *Canterbury Chartulary*, from which they take the text,¹ was the only one known. They did not know of the Stowe manuscript, which was followed by Birch. In this last copy, as in that in the Canterbury book, the two documents occur together, one following the other immediately. It is curious that it does not occur in MS. F, which is a most suspicious fact. Its conjunction with the previous document on the same parchment is also very suspicious, nor is there any mention elsewhere of any council held at Clovesho in this year or at this time. This is extraordinary, for it must have been famous since the two archbishops and thirteen bishops are declared to have signed the confirmation. How did Bede come to overlook it? Secondly, the indiction in it is wrong, as Haddan and Stubbs show: it ought to be xiv instead of xiii. Thirdly, both Headda and Wor sign the document as bishops. The former, on the other hand, preceded the latter as bishop of Lichfield, and it seems arbitrary to suggest without any proof that the latter may have been consecrated bishop in his predecessor's lifetime, and signed as such. This kind of hypothesis will support any conclusion.

Acca again was the bishop of a northern diocese and belonged to the northern province. Stubbs suggests possible reasons, all based on conjecture, for his being at a southern council, but none for what is the important difficulty, namely, his taking part in such an important administrative act largely affecting the Canterbury province as this one. How did he come to interfere officially in the doings of another province? Again, it seems curious that, in a matter relating so directly to the churches of Kent, as this document is, it should be dated not in a regnal year of Wihtred, king of Kent, but in the first year of Aethelbald, king of Mercia.

It is also clear, apart from all these sources of suspicion that this deed must stand or fall with the grant of 694

¹ *Op. cit.* iii, 300-302.

which it supports and which we have seen is not a genuine document. It seems clear, in fact, that, like the document last cited, it was one of a set of forgeries connected with the names of Wihtred of Kent and his archbishop, of which another example, not noticed by the chronicler, occurs in Thomas of Elmham, who dates it on the sixth of the Ides of April, in the twenty-eighth year of Wihtred, in the second indiction. This would be quite inconsistent with its attesting witnesses. The place where it professes to be signed is called Cillinc. A much more respectable authority for the text of this document is MS. Stowe, 636, fol. 26, which was discovered subsequently and is printed by Birch.¹ Its text is the same, but the date is given as the eighth year of Wihtred and the twelfth indiction.

Wihtred, in every copy of the Anglo-Saxon charter, is said to have become king of Kent in 694, so that his eighth year would be 702; and Gefmund (here called Gemmund), who joins in the deed and signs it as bishop, is said in the so-called *Worcester*, as well as the *Peterborough Chronicle*, and in Dom. A, VIII, to have died in 693. This is fatal to the document, which is marked as spurious by Haddan and Stubbs.

Let us now turn to another document inserted in MS. F, i.e. Dom. A, VIII. A large piece of the original text of the manuscript, containing the annals from 742 to 754, has had to be erased to find room for it, which points to its not having been before the writer when he compiled the manuscript, and at once arouses suspicions as to its validity.

This document also professes to be a confirmation of previous grants by Aethelberht and Wihtred, kings of Kent, to the churches of Kent and by Aethelbald, king of Mercia, and his magnates, made at a council held at Clovesho. No such council is mentioned by the continuator of Bede, nor in any of the other copies of the *Chronicle*, nor are any other of its acts recorded, which would be incredible facts if such a council had really been held.

The document is also preserved in several copies, the oldest of which, the professedly original charter, belongs to the dean and chapter of Canterbury.²

¹ *Op. cit.* 143-145.

² Published in facsimile by the Ordnance

Survey Commissioners, i, 1, and reprinted by Birch, i, 233-235.

This is no doubt the oldest form of the charter and alone contains the attestations at length. It is in bad condition and many words are wanting and it is, we can hardly doubt, the same "faulty MS. at Canterbury" from which Wharton derived the list of attestations afterwards published by Wilkins and subsequently by Kemble.

The other copies of the text all differ materially from this one at times in phraseology and are clearly quite loose copies. They comprise an old charter at Canterbury, numbered M. 363, used by Kemble.¹

The document professes, as we have seen, to be a confirmation of grants of privileges previously cited, and its legitimacy is of course bound up with the previously described grant of Wihtred, which it specially refers to, and which we have found good reasons for treating as spurious. It has also special frailties of its own which compel us to treat it as a fabrication. These come out, as usual most prominently in the signatures of the witnesses.

As Haddan and Stubbs point out, three successive bishops of Elmham, Huetlaec, Ethelfrith (who succeeded the latter in 736) and Eanfrith, and two of Dunwich, Egclaf and Redwulf (apparently a mistake for Eardulf), occur in it as witnesses. This statement, as the two authors last referred to say, shows that the signatures were added after the lists of the East Anglian bishops had become obscure, and is fatal by itself to the authenticity of the attestations.² It seems further plain that Cuthbert, the archbishop, who had previously been bishop of Hereford, as is attested by the excellent authority of Florence of Worcester, is the same person who signs here as bishop, four signatures below that of the archbishop; another signature which occurs among those of the "duces" is very suspicious, namely, Aethelmod, who signs as "indolis Merciae." There can be no doubt, in fact, that the document is a sophistication. Nor can we attach any credit to the statement that there was a council at Clovesho in 742 at all. The deed, in fact, as the two authors just cited say, labours under the suspicions common to every record that notices the above quoted Privilege of Wihtred.

¹ MS. Cott, Claudius D, II, fo. 30 b,
MS. Lamb, 1212, fo. 308, and our text
Dom. A, VIII.

² *Op. cit.* 342.

It is very remarkable that while Dom. A, viii, reports the meetings of spurious councils at Baccancelde in 694 and Clovesho in 742, it has nothing to say of the great council held at Clovesho in 747, which was quite genuine and whose acts we possess.

Let us now pass on again. Under the year 796 we are told in Dom. A, viii, that archbishop Ethelhard appointed a synod and confirmed, by command of pope Leo, the various privileges granted by Wihtred and other kings, and then proceeds to give an abstract of the confirmatory grant in Anglo-Saxon and a somewhat longer copy of it in Latin, from which it has, in fact, been translated. Neither of them tell us where this council was held. The Latin copy is itself, however, a mere epitome, and is entered under the wrong year, and, as Haddan and Stubbs show, was taken from some imperfect copy of the act of the council of Clovesho of 803. The number of bishops mentioned answers to that at Clovesho and the number of abbots answers within two.

Before we turn to this grant of 796, it will be well to consider another document of the same kind, with which the draft in the MS. Dom. A, viii, has been associated by Birch. This document occurs in several copies, namely, in MS. Lambeth, 1212, p. 311; Brit. Mus. MS. Cott, Claudius D, II, fol. 25b; MS. Reg. C. C. Cantuar A, fol. 885, which omits the signatories; MS. Harl, 1757, fol. 170b. In this edition, which is dated in 798, the council is also said to have been held at Baccancelde, whose site cannot be ascertained, and where Wihtred's first council is said to have been held. In it Cenulf, king of Mercia, is associated with Athelhard, and there is no direct reference to Wihtred's grant, as there is in the copy in the *Chronicle*, but the intervention of pope Leo is mentioned. This edition is really a concoction, the purpose of which is not quite obvious. It is attested by the archbishop and by seventeen bishops, two abbots and an archdeacon.

This list of witnesses, according to Haddan and Stubbs, is derived from two sources, the first column is from the act of the council of Clovesho of A.D. 716, the second from the act of the council of Clovesho in 803. All this makes it clear that the document is spurious.

Let us now turn to the more promising charter of 803; this is a perfectly genuine act, passed at a genuine council, prohibiting the placing of laymen or seculars over monasteries. The original charter is still at Canterbury (c. 195). It was by altering and sophisticating this document that the spurious grant entered in Dom. A, viii, in 796 was built up. That document does not name the witnesses, but merely says it was attested by archbishop Athelhard, twelve bishops and twenty-three abbots.

Let us now pass on again. Under the year 870 we have a long entry in MS. F, not contained in any of the other manuscripts of the *Chronicle*, and which appears there both in Anglo-Saxon and in Latin. It professes to relate how, on the death of archbishop Ceolnoth in that year, Aethelred, and Aelfred his brother, went and took Aethelred, bishop of Wiltonshire, and appointed him archbishop of Canterbury because he had formerly been a monk of the same minster at Canterbury. When he arrived there and was duly established in his archbishopric, he determined to expel the secular clergy whom, it affirms, Ceolnoth had put there. Ceolnoth's reason for having done so was that in his first year of office there had been a great mortality among the monks, and only five remained, so that he ordered his chaplains and the parochial clergy to help the monks to perform the services, and this was to continue until there was peace in the land, when either the priests must become monks or fresh monks must be brought in; but the disturbed state of things continued, and he was not able to restore matters to their former position, so that the priests continued to live with the monks. Then comes a notable sentence: "Nor was there ever a time that monks were not there within, and they ever had lordship over the priests . . . nor was there ever a time when the church was without monks; nor could that Aethelred the archbishop carry the matter through. Sed nec iste Aetheredus archiepiscopus ponit facere."

This, it must be said, is a very suspicious document. Why should the two brothers, Aethelred and Aelfred, be associated in the appointment of the new archbishop? Aethelred was then sole king. The fact that Aelfred fought at Aescesdun beside his brother is a very different

matter to making him join in an administrative act like the appointment of an archbishop; then we are told that Aethelred the archbishop had been bishop of Wiltonshire. This is not said anywhere else nor, as has been pointed out by Petrie, Haddan and Stubbs and others, was there any bishop of Wiltonshire, so far as is known, until the next century. The contents of the documents are very singular, and are unconfirmed by any genuine deed. They clearly were concocted to give some advantage to the monks over the seculars at Canterbury at a time when one of the recurring struggles between the two kinds of clergy was rife, and to try to justify the subsequent replacement of seculars by monks at Christ Church.

In the year 995, F contains a second long notice, referring to the same subject and apparently qualified by a similarly doubtful character. As before, this insertion occurs both in Anglo-Saxon and in Latin. This addition, according to Price,¹ is written partly on the margin and partly on a small inserted leaf, which shows it was an afterthought.² The Anglo-Saxon is mutilated and partly illegible, and a large part of it is taken from Bede, whose *magnum opus* is quoted as *Ystoria Anglorum*. Its whole purpose is to show that monks and not seculars ought to dominate the establishment of Christ Church at Canterbury. It also recites the facts mentioned in the previous document about the mortality among the Canterbury monks, and how Coelnoth had been consequently constrained to replace them in a large measure by seculars, and how, on the accession of Aelfric to the archbishopric in 996, he determined to restore matters to their original condition, and was recommended by the king to discuss the question at Rome, when he went thither to get his pallium. Some of the seculars, we are told, also went to state their case, and tried to forestall him, but he succeeded in his plan and, further, was ordered to restore the constitution of the place to the condition it was in when founded by Gregory and Augustine. On his return, he proceeded,

¹ *Mon. Hist. Britt.* 403, note.

² The texts, both of the Anglo-Saxon and Latin, are given in the *Mon. Hist.*

Britt. loc. cit. by Thorpe, *op. cit.* 1, 244 et seqq, and also by Plummer, 1, 128 et seqq and 285 et seqq.

as he had been instructed, to eject the seculars and to reinstate the monks.

As Mr. Plummer says, suspicions in regard to this statement arose long ago; thus William of Malmesbury refers to it in the words "verisimile non videtur; constat enim monachos in ecclesia S Salvatoris fuisse a tempore Laurentii archiepiscopi."¹ Again, Florence of Worcester attributes the eviction of the seculars not to Aelfric, but to his predecessor, Siric, of whom he says, "Clericis a Cantuaria pro turbatis monachos induxit." Mr. Plummer also notes that no plague is mentioned in the *Chronicle* during the years when Ceolnoth is said, in this annal and in that of 870, to have put seculars instead of monks into the establishment to make up for the mortality. It must also be noted as confirming the spuriousness of these statements, that certain documents, known to be spurious, were concocted apparently to support them. Kemble has published one of these and numbered it 715. It is professedly dated in 1006, and claims to be a grant of privileges by "Æðelred gratia summi tonantis Angligenum Orcadarum necne in gyro jacentium monarchus" at the instance of archbishop Aelfric, to the monks of Canterbury, and says *inter alia* "substantiam ecclesiae monachorumque nouiter inifi locatorum perpetualiter in hujus libelli corroboracione priuilegioque confirmo."²

No reference to this document is given in Dom. A, viii. Let us now pass on. In MSS. A and F (in the Latin text), both Canterbury documents, and in these alone, we have, under the year 1031, an entry which is mutilated and runs as follows :

¹ Her com Cnut a (gan to Englande) Sona swa he becom to Englande he geaf into Xpes cyrican on Cantwarabyri tha haefenan on Sandwic and ealla tha gerihta tha thaerof arisað of æiðre healfre ðare haefene swa that loc whenne that flot byth ealra hehst and ealra fullost beo an scip flotigende swa neh than laude swa hit nyxt (maege) and thar beo an mann stande on than scipe and habbe ane taper aex on his hande.

This entry in A, according to Plummer, is in the same handwriting as the last clauses of 1070, the concluding annal of MS. A.³ It is there followed by the Latin *Acts of*

¹ G. P, 32.

³ Plummer, i, 206, note i, and ii, xxvi.

² Kemble, iii, 346. He marks it as spurious.

Lanfranc, in what seems, says Plummer, "at first sight are obviously distinct hands, but I do not feel sure that they may not be one and the same, the difference in appearance being due to the difference between writing Saxon and writing Latin."¹ This view is confirmed by the fact of the entry being based on a spurious charter concocted, as we shall see, very probably in the twelfth century. If so, it shows that the scribe of F not only interpolated A, but actually wrote its concluding sentences.

The Saxon entry of 1031 in A just quoted is given in an enlarged form in the Latin of F, thus :

Et dedit ecclesiae Christi Cantuariæ portum de Sanduic, et omnes exitus ejus aquae ab utroque parte fluminis, ita ut natante nave cum plenum fuerit, quam longius de navi potest securis parvula super terram proici, debet a ministris aeccliesiae Christi rectitudo navis accipi; nullusque omnino hominum aliquam consuetudinem in eodem portu habet exceptis monachis aeccliesiae Christi. Eorum quoque est transfretatio portus et navicula et theoloneum naviculae, et omnium navium quae ad Sanduic veuerint, a Pipernaesse usque Northmuthæ. Si quid autem in magno mari captum fuerit delatum Sanduic, medietatem ecclesia Christi habebit, reliqua vero pars conventui ibi remanebit.

The text of this is given by Petrie and by Thorpe, but not by Plummer.

This Latin entry has been epitomized from a document which occurs in several copies, some of which have been known a long time.² Another text which is dated in 1028, occurs among the Crawford charters in the Bodleian Library, and is described by its learned editors, Napier and Stevenson, as written in reddish brown ink in a twelfth century hand and entirely in Latin: the editors say that while Kemble marks it as spurious, Thorpe seems to consider it genuine. Haddan and Stubbs say "The principal objection to it, apart from the lateness of the copies, is that there is no exact parallel in O. E. charters for the grant of such privileges and immunities. . . . It is therefore difficult to resist the conclusion that this is a post-conquest forgery, or at all events, an expansion of a simple O. E. charter, manufactured for the purpose of obtaining charter evidence for the exercise of jurisdictions and privileges that were

¹ *Ibid.* II, xxvi, note.

² See Kemble, *Cod. Dep.* iv. 737, and vi, 1328.

probably enjoyed by ancient customs. The charter is, however, a very skilful imitation of a genuine O. E. one, so skilful indeed that we must conclude that it was founded upon a genuine charter of Cnut's. This supposititious original may have been a grant of the port of Sandwich, or may have been the vehicle of some entirely different donation."

It is quite plain that here again we have a spurious charter, as it is called by Mr. Plummer II, 208, who says of its insertion in Dom. A, VIII, that it is on a level with such Peterborough additions as 852 E. This completes the list of the forged documents inserted by the scribe of Dom. A, VIII, in his copy of the *Chronicle*, and which ought to be printed separately in the next edition of the document, since they are most misleading products of the twelfth century, and in no sense either contemporary or genuine.

Having sifted out the inserted sophistications and suspicious passages from F, clearly the work of the compiler, let us now turn to the main part of his text. This consists of two different portions, one derived from other copies of the *Chronicle*, or from Bede's works, and another of additions made from various sources by the compiler himself, and not found in the other copies.

So far as we know, the only copies of the *Chronicle* used by the writer of F were MS. A and some manuscript like E. It will be more convenient to first consider certain later interpolations, both in E and A, which are either in the margin of those manuscripts or written over erasures. So far as I know there are no *old* insertions in E, except those of the compiler himself. What additions there are in that manuscript are late ones of the sixteenth century, after it had passed out of the hands of the monks into those who did so much to revive Anglo-Saxon learning. They consist for the most part of collations by William Lisle (who died in 1637), taken from MS. A, which he refers to as "Benet." On the blank paper leaves at the end, says Mr. Plummer, Lisle has also inserted from A the annals 894-924, 937, 941, 962, 973 and 975 and a pedigree of Woden from B, 855¹.

¹ *Op. cit.* II, xxxiv.

These modern collations are, of course, of no interest or importance for our purpose, and what it is really important to remember is, that there are no *old* collations in E. If we turn to A, matters are very different. In A are a considerable number of marginalia, while in several instances the text has been erased and another text substituted. So far as we can gather, the greater portion of these insertions, both on the margins and on the erasures in A, are in the same hand, and that, as Mr. Plummer argued, was the hand which wrote Codex F.¹ For the most part they have been taken directly from Bede from a manuscript like E, or are the compositions of the scribe of F himself.

I will first give a list, which I have carefully revised, of all these insertions in A which are found in duplicate in E or F, and are due directly to the scribe of F, and will place an asterisk after those years in which the whole annal in A is an insertion and leave plain those in which only a portion of it has been thus derived: 27*, 47, 99*, 101*, 167, 189, 283*, 379*, 381, 409, 423*, 430, 443*, 449, 519, 534, 547, 560, 565, 583*, 591 or 592, 593, 595 or 596, 603*, 604*, 606 or 607, 616, 654, 710*, 725, 760, 768*, 784, 860, 870, 890, 925, 943*, 955, 959*, (see Plummer) 961*.

In addition to these insertions in A, corresponding either wholly or in part with E or F, we have certain others in the same interpolator's handwriting, which do not occur in any other copy of the *Chronicle*, i.e. II, "Her onfeng Herodes Antipatres sunu to rice in Judea;" 200 and 300 merely summing up the close of the centuries; 508, two inserted words "than" and "wearð"; 530, "la" inserted; 591, "ric" inserted, and "V" converted into "VI." 640, He haefde twegene sunu Ermenred and Ercenberht and ther Ercenbeht rixode aefter his faeder And Ermenred gestrynde twegen sunu tha syððan wurðan gemartirode of Dunore. 688, and he getimbrade the meoster aet Glaestingabyrig. 748, and Aethelbryht Wihtrades sunu cinges feng to tham rice. 941, Tha was Wulfhelm arcebiscop on Cent.

Among the references here given the entry "to

¹ Plate xxiii of the *Mon. Hist. Britt.* is a facsimile of a page of A, showing these interpolations.

bodianne Scottum fulluht," in the year 430, is omitted entirely by Plummer, but is given as an inserted phrase by Thorpe. Similarly the words "aet Icanho," in 654, are treated as an insertion by Thorpe but not by Plummer. Similarly with the words "and abraecon Wintanceastre," in 860. On the other hand, the annal which Plummer dates in 155 and gives as an insertion, is dated in 161, and marked as part of the text by Thorpe.

I will now separate the entries above named derived from some manuscript like E from those derived directly from F. From the former it is clear are derived 47,* 99, 101, 167, 189, 283, 379*, 381, 409, 423, 443*, 449, 519*. In 534, A and E agree in giving Cynric a reign of twenty-six years, the other manuscripts give him twenty-seven; 547, 560, 565, 591 or 592. The clause in this last year in A is given in E in 592* and V as given in B and C for the reign of Ceolfric, has been changed to VI in A as in E; 593*, 596*, 603*, 604, 606* or 607*, 616, 710*, 890*. I have marked with an asterisk the annals just named which do not occur in F; in all the rest the phraseology follows E more closely than F.

Turning to the insertions in A, which are either only contained in F or follow its text more nearly than that of E, we have 725, 760*, 784*, 870*, 925, 943. The clause in question is omitted by Thorpe but given by Plummer; it relates to the appointment of St. Dunstan to Glastonbury. 955, 959*, 961*.

As E and F are exactly the same, word for word, in the annals for 583, 768 and 860, we cannot say which of them the insertion in A came from. In the annal for 725 the insertion is really a paraphrase of the other two entries, but is slightly more like F.

Again, certain insertions in A made by the scribe of F were omitted by him in his own chronicle, as for example 155, 379, 519, 530, 539, 591, 593, 603, 607, (only in the latin of F) 640, and 748. This has been already pointed out by Mr. Plummer.

It will be noted as curious how few of the insertions in A come from a manuscript like E and at what an early date they stop; on the other hand, while nothing comes from F before 725, the extracts from the latter go down to 961.

The *insertion* in A, under the year 27, which is in the same hand as the rest, I cannot explain, since the same entry occurs in the text of all the other manuscripts, in B, D, E, F, under 26, and in C under 25. Perhaps it had originally been wrongly dated, and was erased and rewritten under its proper year.

Having sifted out the entries made in A by the scribe of F, we will now turn to the latter manuscript and try to analyze its composition, apart from the sophisticated entries I have already discussed. The entries in F, as I have said, are for the most part bilingual, Anglo-Saxon and Latin, but certain of them occur only in one or other of these languages. What is perfectly plain after a very short inspection and what is not contested is, that both in its Anglo-Saxon and its Latin form, F is in the main an epitome of some manuscript like E, with a number of additions and insertions from other sources. Its entries and its phraseology are not only like those of E, but in sentence after sentence the same words in the same order occur. Especially noteworthy is it when both E and F have the same gap from 892 until 901, while in other places where E becomes very scanty and for a while is limited to a few bald annals, it is the same.

MS. F, like A, has a number of insertions and interpolations in a later or rather in later hands, due to collation with other copies of the *Chronicle*, to corrections, and in some cases containing additions from sources we cannot always trace, and for which it is the prime witness. These are put between brackets by Thorpe and Plummer, but they do not always agree as to whether the statement is from the original script or from the reviser and collator. It is clear that the corrector of F had two of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* manuscripts before him, A and a manuscript like E.

The insertions of the years 6, 81, 490, 501, 534, 547, 764, 800, 924, 925, 931, 934, 935, 938, 940, 951, 963, 972, are more like A in certain words than E. 676, 685, 687, 688, 789, 890, 892, 928, 942 are more like E than A. The insertion under 955 is more like D than E, but E here seems curtailed. The insertions under 677, 680, 703, 817, 830, are alike in all the copies, and it is not, therefore, possible to say whether they came into F from

A or E. Speaking of 964, Plummer says the text of F is here an evident compilation from A and E. These insertions prove that the person who interpolated F had access to MS. A and to some manuscript like E, whence he derived his corrections and additions, and makes it probable that both A and a manuscript like E then existed at Canterbury. Let us now turn to the insertions and additions in F not found in any other copy of the *Chronicle*.

In the first place, it is plain that the scribe had direct recourse to two of Bede's works for some of his annals, since in some cases the matter is not contained in any of the other manuscripts of the *Chronicle* but is in Bede, and in others it is nearer to Bede than the other manuscripts. These extracts in F from Bede are taken from his tract *De sex aetatibus saeculi* and from his *Ecclesiastical History*, and I have tried to trace them to each of these sources respectively, and differ somewhat in conclusions about them from Mr. Plummer. The references to the former work are taken from the edition of it in the *Mon. Hist. Britt.* They begin with the year 12 A.D. and go down to 482 A.D., as follows :

- 12. F alone has the word tetrarch in its original form : the other copies translate it. (See *Mon. Hist. Britt.* 84).
- 38. Pilate's suicide. (*Ibid.* 85).
- 40. Matthew's gospel written in Judaea. (*Ibid.*)
- 47. Mark's gospel written in Egypt. (*Ibid.*)
- 50. Paul sent bound to Rome. (*Ibid.*)
- 69. Peter crucified and Paul beheaded. (*Ibid.*)
The word beheafod in this account is an insertion.
- 116. The emperor Hadrian began to reign in this year, "et regnavit xxi annos." (*Ibid.*)
- 137. Antoninus began to reign, "et regnavit xxi annos." (*Ibid.*)
- 343. The death of St. Nicolas. Bede dates it in 341. Thorpe has also given this annal to E by mistake. (See Plummer, ii. cxxxv).
- 448. The finding of John the Baptist's head. (*Ibid.* 94). The rest of this annal in F is taken directly from Bede and not through E, thus the term langan scifan is a direct translation of longis navis etc.
- 482. Notice of abbot Benedict. (*Ibid.* 95). The *Chronicle* follows Bede in referring to Gregory's dialogues as its authority.

Let us now turn to the *Historia Ecclesiastica* :

- 167. "Eleutherus viriliter regit." This seems to be an echo of Bede's phrase "gloriosissime rexit." (*Ibid.* vi, 24).

- 188. The details about the Roman wall in the Latin of F dated by Bede after 189. (*Ibid.* i, 5).
- 200. The finding of the Cross; but put by Bede in the reign of Constantine. (*Ibid.* v, 15 and 16).
- 565. Dating of Ethelbert's accession in the thirty-second year of pope Gregory's reign. (*Ibid.* i, 23). This is an insertion.
- 597. The coming of Augustine to England. (*Ibid.* i, 25).
- 601. "and betwynan ðan was Paulinus" slight variants in this annal shew that F was derived directly from Bede, i, 29.
- 614. Death of Augustine and succession of Lawrence. (*Ibid.* ii, 3 and 4).
- 616. Statement that Ethelbert was the first christian king of England and the son of Eormenric. A repetition of the annal of 552. (*Ibid.* ii, 5). An insertion.
- 619. Death of archbishop Lawrence, dated in E 616. (*Ibid.* ii, 6 and 7).
- 636. Account of the mission of Felix. (*Ibid.* ii, 15, and iii, 18). [This is in another hand and is in the Latin only and in the margin]. An insertion. Thorpe has wrongly placed it in 633. (See Plummer, i, 26, note 1).
- 653. Death of Thomas, bishop of Domnoc, in the Latin of F. (*Ibid.* iii, 20). Domnoc, however, is not mentioned by Bede, but is an inference of the compiler of F.
- 693. Gifemund is called bishop of Rochester, as in Bede, i, 8. This is the last separate extract from Bede in F, but from the continuation of Bede we have two other entries in that MS.
- 733. The account of the eclipse in this year and in the following year.
- 757. The phrase "suscepit clericalem tonsuram," written on a blank erasure, and corresponding to the entry in 758 in the continuation of Bede.

Having thus traced the matter derived directly from the other *Chronicles* and from Bede, we will now turn to the statements in F not traceable directly elsewhere.

- 3. And the cild Christ wearð geboren agean of Egyptan: probably derived directly from the Bible.
- 45. F calls St. James, "Jacobus, Jofis broðer." (*Ibid.*)
- 71. The number cxi in the other copies is translated "hund ðusande" in F.
- 444. Death of St. Martin.
- 509. Death of St. Benedict. He did not die till 542.
- 519. F has Cerdicesfora for Cerdicesford in the other manuscripts.
- 547. "of him com Norðhumbra cyne cynn."
- 552. Birth of Ethelbert, called Egelbirht in F. Apparently an invention of the scribe of F.
- 565. In the Latin of F Columba's name is everywhere erased and that of Columbanus substituted.
- 625. F has archbishop for the bishop of E.
- 641. A double entry in F about the building of the church at Winchester.
& F alone says it was built on St. Peter's day. Bede does not
- 648. mention the building, and the other manuscripts put it in 642.

650. Aegebert, who succeeded Birinus at Winchester, is styled "of Galwalum" in the other manuscripts of the *Chronicle*, and "se Frencisca" in F; Bede, iii, 7 calls him "natione quidam Gallus." This is a good proof of the lateness of F. It says of him "wes gehadod." Plummer says this is a mistake, as he was already pontifex when he came from Ireland.
676. The Latin of F has "super occidentales Anglos" with "Saxones" underlined, while E has "West Seaxna rice." F is clearly wrong here.
685. "Her wearþ blodi ren on Brytene and meolc and butere wur don gewend to blode." This is not mentioned in Bede or any other copy of the *Chronicle*. In the *Annales Cambriae*, however, as Plummer points out, we read *sub anno* 689 "pluvia sanguinea facta est in Britannia et lac et butirum versa sunt in sanguinem." See *Mon. Hist. Britt.* 833; see also Brut y Tywysogion, *sub anno* 690, *ibid.* 842. F in this same annal says, "Hagustaldes ea," where E says "Hagustaldes ham."
- 686 F wrongly makes Mul the brother of Ine. In the latter year is the & 694. first of the sophisticated documents above described.
714. "Pipinus cing." In the Latin of F "Pipinus rex." This was Pipin of Heristal, and is the right date, says Plummer.
715. Her forðferde Dagobert se cing: Dagobert III. This is the right date.
725. The succession of Eadberht to Wihtred as king of Kent (an insertion). In the Latin "obitus Wihtredi gloriosi regis Cantie" clearly a Kentish man's phrase.
726. F has "Her forðferde Ine cing obiit Ina rex," while other manuscripts merely mention his going to Rome.
731. "(Taetwine) hæfde the arþrice iiii year." This is merely a conclusion from 734, where his death is mentioned (an insertion).
736. In the latin of F, "et tenuit v annos" As Plummer says F is here inconsistent with itself since it puts Nothelm's death in 640.
740. "Nothelm erceþ forðferde." This entry is not mentioned by Plummer.
742. A statement, not confirmed by any other source, concerning a synod held at Clovesho. The Latin text goes on to set out the alleged confirmation of Wihtred's charter by Athelbald (*vide supra*). To make room for this document all the entries in MS. F as far as 754 have been erased.
755. Instead of "mon ofsloh Aepelbald Myrcene cyning on Secandune his lic restað on Hreopadune," F has "man ofsloh Aedelbald and Myrcena cing on Reopandune." This is no doubt a mistake due to a scribe's omission in F. In the Latin we read also "fugato Bernredo rege herede Adel[baldi]."
757. Before "scaere" on a blank erasure, "Suscipit clericalem tonsuram."
758. "And he heold the arþrice xviii gear" (an insertion).
759. "And heold hit feower gear" (an insertion).
760. Her Aethelberht *Wihtredes sunu cinges* forðferde. The words italicized are not in the other *Chronicles* and clearly come from a Kent source (an insertion).

762. Her forðferde Bregwine arþ . . . and heold hit xxvi gear (an insertion)
780. "Alwold" for "Aelfwold."
In the Latin of F, Lindisfarana qui fuit apud Soccabyri . . . ad opus Eanboldi archiepiscopi sui.
784. Hic tunc temporis fuit in Cantia rex Ealhmundus. Thes Ealhmund cing was Egberhtes faeder. Egberht was Aðulfes faeder. Thorpe says of the Latin "by a third hand in the margin." Plummer says of the whole "later hands" (an insertion).
787. "To wiue" in F omitted in all the other copies.
"de Danis" after "Norðmanna."
"Primae fuere quia nunquam ante has postquam Angli intrauerunt Britanniam uenerunt aliae."
789. "forðan he was Alwoldes neua" (an insertion).
790. After "Aðelhard," in Latin, "Hludensis monasterii" (an insertion),
"et Aedeldredus Aðelwolding recepit regnum" (in the Latin).
791. "To Hwiterne."
793. "drehtan" for "bregdon" "Terram rapinis et homicidiis sci Albani Martyris" (in the Latin).
795. "Inter gallicantum et auroram," vi kl. Jun." F. Latin.
796. "Cent" for "Cantware"
"and let him pytan ut his eagan" ("euulsis oculis" in the Latin.)
"and ceorfan of his handa" (an insertion. These atrocities are also mentioned by Simeon of Durham, ii, 59.) Ond Aðelard arþ of Cantwareþ. sette synoð and getrymde and gefaestnode ðurh ðas papan haese.
Leones ealle ða ðing be Godes mynstran ða waeron gesett be Wihtgares daege and be oðra cinga daege.
Then follows the spurious charter as given by Thorpe, 102 and 103 (*vide supra*).
798. This annal is dated in the other manuscripts under 797.
And Alfhun þ forðferde on Sudberi and he wearð bebyrged on Domuce and Tidfrið wearð gecoren aefter him and Siric East Sexana cing ferde to Rome. Her on þysum ylcan geare Wihtburge lichama wearð gefunden eal gehal and unfor d (*Sine corruptione* in Latin) a Deorham after fif and fifti gearon pas ðe heo of ðysum liue gewat. (This is an insertion).
801. After "Egcbyrht" is the phrase "filius Ealhmundi regis" in the Latin of F (an insertion).
802. "Tunc temporis extitit Cuthredus rex Cantie." This is inserted in the Saxon, not in the Latin of F.
806. "Eac on ðys ylcan geare ii kl. Jun. rode tacn wearð ateowed on ðam monan anes Wodnesdaeges innan ðare dagenge. And eft on ðis geare an iii kl. Sept. an wunderlic trendel wearð ateowed abutan ðare sunnan" (this is an insertion).
"Hoc anno etiam ii kl. Jun. luna xiiii signum crucis mirabili modo in luna apparuit feria v. aurora incipiente hoc modo. . . Eodem anno iii, k Sept. luna xii die dominica hora iiii corona mirabilis in circuitu solis apparuit."
"This entry," says Plummer, "is identical with entries in Pertz, iv, 6; xv, 1294; Liebermann, 63."

809. "Her seo sunne aðestrod on angynne ðare fite tide ðas dages, xvii kl. Aug. 11^a feria. luna xx^{ma} ix^a." Plummer says this is correct for the solar eclipse of this year, i.e. July 16, 809.
827. There are two small insertions in the Anglo-Saxon of F: after "Aelle" we have "Suðsex cing," and after "Ceawlin" "West-Sex cing." In the Latin after "Dore" we have the clause "quod est in aquilonari parte Humbræ."
829. "And Felogild aþþ wearð æfter him gecoren to ðan arþ stole vii kl. Magi and he wearð gehalgud v Id. Jun anes Sunnandages, and he wea[rð] dead iii kl. Sept." (an insertion).
830. After "gecoren" in the Latin, "iii kl. Jul." This shows the local knowledge of a Canterbury monk.
836. Of Egberht we are told "and syððan he com agean," of which the last three words are an insertion.
840. "And Lothwi se casere forðferde." An insertion in the Latin.
845. F has "eorl" where A, B, C have "ealdorman," and D and E have "dux."
- The use of "eorl" at this date is of course an anachronism. In the Latin F translates "pedridon muthe" by "O. S. Pedredon."
855. Aelfred his þriddan sune he hæfde gesend to Rome, and þa se papa Leo ge hyrde seggan þ he was forðfaren . . . þa bletsode he Alured to cinge and heold hine to þ handa eal swa his faeder Aðewulf hine ðyder sende and baed."
- Thorpe dates this insertion in 856. After "handa" we have, in the Latin, "benedixit et unxit eum in regem, et eum ad confirmandum tenuit."
- 856 & F says of Ethelwulf's wife, in an insertion, "seo was gehatne leothete."
858. Plummer is mistaken in speaking of the double entry of Ethelbald's burial in the annal. The annal is quite right. The second death was that of Ethelberht.
861. "Her forðferde S. Swiðun b."
867. "Her wurdon of slagene ii cingas at Euerwic."
868. In the Latin "a Danis securitatem acceperunt."
870. In an insertion: "þa heauod manna naman þa ðane cing ofslogan waeran Ingware and Ubba." At the end of the annal is inserted the spurious document already discussed.¹
871. "þa Deniscan ahton sige," instead of "da Deniscan ahton waelstowe geweald. . . ."
- þa Deniscan waeron ouercum" instead of "hie waeran on twam gefylcum," "hi haeddian ii cingas hæðene . . . eorlas fela."
- In the Latin is the phrase "ad Basingas. Sed peccatis exigentibus Dani campum ceperunt." . . . "nouies bellatum sit apertis bellis contra Danos." "Healfdene" is called "Halden" in the Latin.
876. "Her Rodla ðurhferde Normandi mid his here, and he rixade fifti wintra, and on þysan ylcan geara ðare Dena here on Engla-lande Aelfrede cinge . . . and eac gislas sealdan þa þe on

¹ See page 124.

- þan here wurðost waeran to ðan cinge ꝥ hi woldon hraedlice of his rice faran and hi niþes ꝥ to braecan."
- " . . . jusjurandum super sacrum armillum fecerunt." F, Latin.
878. "Quos iterum sequenti anno insequitur rex usque Exoniam, et iterum sacramenta magna et obsides plures prioribus accepit; et non post multum temporis a regno ejus, uidelicet Occidentalium Saxonum discedunt." F, Latin. "There is no corresponding Saxon," says Plummer.
880. "here" in Saxon is translated in the Latin by "Piratae."
882. "twa aet burstan": "et duas fugauit. F, Latin.
883. "Marinus se maera papa sende Aelfrede cinge of Cristes rode;" the last two words are given as the equivalent of "lignum domini" in the Latin.
- "Rex Aelfredus misit elemosinam, quam uouerat dum sederet contra exercitum cum paucis, cum multi, essent inimici, Romae." F.
884. "Her forðferde se welwillenda ꝥ Aedelwold" . . . "Hic obiit Aedelwoldus episcopus Wentoniensis, et electus est in loco ejus Alfegus qui alio nomine vocabatur Godwinus." F.
- "Inserted wrongly," says Plummer, "between the lines and on the margin by a later scribe; the original scribe has the entry rightly under 984."
885. "mycele giua on halidome" "plura donaria, scilicet de cruce Domini et reliquiis sanctorum."
890. "Inter Brittanen [altered from *Bryttas*] et Francigenas. Audientes hoc Brytones exeuntes dimicabant contra eos et uictis Danis propulsabant in quandam aqua (m), ubi plures eorum demersi sunt." The last part is not in the Saxon.
891. In the Latin of F the small boat is described as "facta de duobas coriis et dimidio," and the phrase is added "sine omni gubernatione humana." It also describes the death of Suifne differently to the other versions, with which the Saxon of F agrees; thus " Maelinmun. Nam quartus socius eorum obiit nomine Suifneh qui fuit peritissimus doctor." The Saxon of F also omits the mention of the comet referred to in A, B, C and D, but not in E. The Latin of F says "et eodem anno apparuit cometa stella circa Ascensionem Domini." In the Saxon of F we have "Yrlande" for "Hibernia" in A, B, C and D.
892. The Latin of F gives the length of Andredes Wood as 124 miles, while in the Saxon it is given at 120, and in the other MSS. at 120 miles or longer.
903. "And þys ylcan geares was ge halgod Niwe mynster on Wincestr and S. Judoces to cyme." "Aduentus S. Judoci, et dedicatio Noui Monasterii Went."
928. The Saxon of E has "Willelmus feng to Normandi." E has "Willelm suscepit regnum." Willelmus does duty both for the Saxon and Latin versions.
931. This is clearly taken from A, but the writer of F has mistaken the reading. Friðestan, as Plummer says, resigned his bishopric, and his successor was appointed before his death, as A rightly states. (See A, 931 and 932).

934. "et Byrnstanus episcopus Uentoniensis obiit." This is only in the Latin of F. It is dated in 933 in A. It is not mentioned in the Saxon.
935. "to ð stole on Winc." "Here," says Plummer, "half a page is left vacant in F."
938. A very short abstract in Saxon in prose of the long poem about the battle of Brunanburgh contained in MSS. A, B, C and D. In the Latin the battle is called "illud magnum et famosum bellum in Brunanbyri."
943. "Her Eadmund cing betaehthe Glaestingaberi S. Dunstane ðar he siððan aerest abbod wearð," inserted on the top of the margin of F.
951. The entry in A in this year only occurs elsewhere in the Latin of F.
955. There are three insertions in this annal in F, "and his [i.e. Eadric's] lic restap in eald mynstre," "and S. Aelgiue," "and Eadgar his broðor to Myrcena rice. Hi weron . . ." These three insertions were taken from MS. D, or a copy like it, in which alone they occur. In the text of F we have the phrase, "he [i.e., Eadmund] aflymde S. Dunstan ut of lande," and in a footnote: "Her was Dunstan abbod (*fram Eadwie cinge*) adriuen ut of Englalande." The words in italics are inserted in a footnote in F.
956. "Of Euerwic." These words have been overlooked by Plummer. They occur in F after the word "arþ."
958. "Ouer eal Brytene," instead of "to rice," as in A, D and E, "and of Wessex, Mercia and Northumberland," as in B and C. A shortened copy of the poem than that which as it appears in D and E, is given in F, which also has a Latin translation of the shortened form (see Plummer, I-II4, note 3). It is dated a year later in the other two manuscripts.
959. "Her Eadgar sende aefter S. Dunstane and gif him the ð rice on Wigarceastre and syppan the ð rice an Lundene."
961. "Her forðferde Oda se goda arþ and Dunstanus wearð gecoren to arþ."
972. "That ys at Baðam" (an insertion from A). F has "xxix wintra," where all the other copies have xxx.
975. "Her Eadgar cing forðferde," which is from the first clause in the poem in the other copies.
979. "Eodem anno Aedelredus successit fratri suo in regno. Tempore suo multa mala uenerunt in Angliam et postea semper huc usque euenerunt."
980. "And S. Dunstanus." These words are not in any other copy. In the Latin we have "cum beato Dunstano." There is also an insertion in the Saxon of the name "Eadwardus" after "cinges." In the Latin "Scaftes byrig" is called "Sceftoniam."
984. "Of Wincestre" (an insertion).
986. "Aegelred cing" for "se cyning" in the other copies.
988. "Abbod on niwe mynstre" inserted after "Aegelgar," "viii monþas" altered from "iii monþas," as in the other copies, says Thorpe. Plummer adds the Latin has "octo" over an erasure.

989. "Her sippan ferde to Rome aefter his pallium." In the Latin is the insertion "Hic iuit Roman pro pallio."
992. "to ðan þ man [scolde] fandian. gif man mihte betraeppan þane here ahwar wiputan." Later on the words, "se sylfa Aelfric" are inserted.
995. Of the comet, F says that "þ ys seo fexode" (an insertion). A second insertion says, "On Easterdaei on Ambresbyri fram Aeðelrede cinge and fram eallan his witan." This is followed by the long passage previously discussed, which I have suggested is spurious and which is written in a very small hand on the margin and on an inserted leaf.
996. "Her was Wulstan gehadod to ð into Lundenberi."
997. "Her Aelfric arþ ferde to Rome aefter his arce."
The word "arce" is glossed with "pallium" written above it
1001. (to genealaecan) underlined.
1002. "Ymma Aelfgiua" (the latter word inserted).
"butan aelcre wiðcweðenese" inserted at the end of the annal.
1004. "To Heortfordan" instead of "Theodforda," as in the other manuscripts.
1005. Sona angean cyrde.
1006. In the Latin of F, instead of "Brihtuuold" being appointed to the bishopric of Wiltonshire, he is said to have been appointed "ad episcopatum Serberiensem."
In F the see of Brihtuuold is called "ð stole"; in E it is called "rice." F has "prutne here" for "rancne here" in E. In the Latin "strenuum et nichil timentem exercitum. . . . To þare ylcan Xþes maessan was se cinge at Scropesbyri."
Somewhat lower we have, in the Latin of F, "optimi (qq) seniorum principum Orientalium Saxonum."
1008. In the Latin of F we have "unam magnam navem quae Anglice nominatur scegþ."
1009. F calls "Wulnoth," "Godwines faeder eorles." In the Latin, "quendam nobilem uirum nomine Wlnoðum patrem Godwini ducis." The last three words are an insertion; again, "Tunc cogitavit Brihtricus adquirere sibi laudem," etc. . . . again, "ac hit to nahte gewearð eal swa hit oftor aer gelamp." Again, "ða ðis gehyrde se cing ðe mid þan oðran scipan beliuen was þa ferde he ham and ealle ða ealder-men."
1011. The short poem in E is rendered in prose in F. Then follows a Latin paraphrase, thus: "Tunc fuit preda Paganorum qui paulo ante fuit caput totius Brytanniae et Xþntatis. Potuit tunc maxima miseria uideri ubi pridie habebatur maximum gaudium, et unde nobis pullulauit fides uera."
1012. In the Anglo-Saxon of F we have "Saeterdaeg" for "Saeternesdaeg" in the other copies. The closing phrases differ considerably in phraseology. In the Latin "in concilium suum" is the translation of "heora hustingae."
1013. After "Waetlinga straet" we have, in the Latin of F, "populus Aquilonarium Anglorum stratam quae nominata Uueclinca Strata . . . quia non curabant quaerere pontem."

- Lower down we have "siððan sona eal ðeod hine pellaes under finq . . . and se cing Aegelred sende his cwene Aelfgiue Ymma to hyre brøðer ofer sae Ricarde (sic) . . . and se cing sona him sylf ferde aefter and waes þar begeondan."
1014. Before "Cnut," at the beginning of the annal, we have in the Latin of F, "Principes autem regis et qui cum eo uenerant in Angliam."
1015. "Magnum placitum" is the Latin translation of "Witan." Instead of "Morcaer" F has Marcer.
 "Into Seofon burgum" is translated "vii civitatibus" and "into his bure" "in camera sua" in the Latin of F.
1016. In the Latin of F we have "et iterum foderunt (fecerunt ali) alium fossatum (contra civitatem) . . . Sed cum peruenisset rex ad Aegelesford, dux Eadricus per dolum fecit exercitum Anglorum redire. Non fuit peius concilium factum in Anglia de tali re."
 Plummer says that in the Anglo-Saxon form of this annal another hand wrote the part from "fengon" to "S. Andreas," when the former hand was resumed again: the phrase "his cyne hlaforde" is translated by "natalem dominum suum." At the end of the Anglo-Saxon annal is added in Latin, "et Cnut postea regnavit super Angliam totam."
1017. Of Eadric, F says, "wearð ofslagan on Lundene swyðe rihtlice," "justissime occisus est" in the Latin, a comment not contained elsewhere than in F.
 Of Richard's daughter this annal says, "Aelfgiwe (on Englisc), Ymma (on Frencisc)." The words in brackets are insertions.
1020. In speaking of Cnut's visit to Assandune, F says, "and let timbrian ðar an mynster (of stane and lime,)" "de lapidibus (et cemento)" in the Latin ("far ðare manna sawle ðe ðar ofslagene waeran, and gief hit his anum preoste þas nama was Stigand.") The passage between brackets is an insertion. In speaking of Archbishop Lyuing, the Latin of F adds "qui et Aelstanus." E and F say that "Aeðelnoð munuc and decanus" was this year consecrated bishop. F, which calls him "Aegelnod," says further that he was " . . . gehadod to arð fram Wulstane areb." The Latin of F says, "a Wulstano arebo Eboracensi."
1022. F adds to the account of Aegelnod's consecration by the pope that he "gecyrde to his arð stole." In the Latin we read that Liofuuinus, abbot of Ely, cleansed himself from the accusations against him "ante apostolicum teste arcpo Aegelnodo."
1023. F says Aelfric was consecrated archbishop and "Aegelnod arð hine bletsode on Cantwareberi." F translates the "reliquias" of E by "lichaman," which is also used by D.
 The notice of the Norman dukes in E, which is in Latin, is given in the Latin, but not the Saxon of F.
1028. F reads "Her for Cnut cing to Norðwegum of Englande mid L. scipum Englisra þegena," "de nobilibus Anglie" in the Latin. E has it, "Her for Cnut cyng of Englande mid fitig scipum to Norwegum."

1031. "And Rodbert eorl of Normandi ferde to Jerusalem and þar wearð dead and Willelm ðe was siððan cing on Englalande feng to Normandi, ðaeh he cild waere." In E the sentence reads "Robertus comes obiit in peregrinatione, et successit rex Willielmus in puerili aetate.
Under this date, in the Latin of F, is inserted an abstract of certain spurious deeds about Sandwich, already described.
1032. "Cinges preost" is translated "capellanus regis" in the Latin of F.
1036. In F, "Godwine eorl and ealle ða betstan men on West Sexan Wiðcwaedon ac hi naht na gespeddan" represents "Godwine eorl and ealle þa yldestan menn on West Seaxon lagon ongean swa hi lengost mihton" in E.
1037. F mentions that Aelgife was Eaduardes moder," as well as "Hardcanutes." E does not mention "Eaduard" at all. F says "Baldwin grið on Flandri." E that he "grid be suðan sae."
1038. Eadsige is called "ðaes cinges pr" in F, and b̅ (i.e. bishop) in E. In the same annal F calls archbishop Aedelnoð "Aegelnoð," and bishop Aedelric of the South Saxons "Aegelric."
1040. "Sororis Ricardi junioris, filiae Ricardi senioris" in the Latin of F.
1041. Speaking of Hardacnut's death, F says: "And his moder for his sawle gief into niwan mynstre S. Valentines heafod ðas martires" . . . "pro ejus anima mater sua dedit caput S. Valentini martyris *eidem* ecclesie," referring to the old minster so that the Anglo-Saxon and Latin contradict each other here.
1042. "Edsinus . . . docuit eum . . . ea quae sibi facienda erant ad honorem suum, et ad utilitatem sibi subjecti populi."
1043. "A rege aut pretio aut seruitio illud quereretur," Latin of F.
1044. F calls Liuing "b̅ of Exceastre"; E "b̅ on Defenascire." Speaking of bishop Brihtwold, F adds "þ was þ b̅ rice of Scirebure."
1046. "And mani wis man gehadodre and laewedre."
1048. "Sed fere perdidit ibi baculum suum, quia nescivit ministerium suum."
This annal is wrongly dated 1046 in E. F has an additional sentence, "and swa þat hit [þ hine] man het ut binnan feower nihtan and he ferde ða and spaec wið his faeder ðe laeg at Peuenes ea and wið Beorn eorl, ðe ðar was mid Godwine and he baed, etc." . . . "ut si post triduum inueniretur in Anglia, deberet poni in custodia. Later on, "anre cirican" is translated "in ecclesiola," and "b̅ be norðan, episcopus Aquilonarium Saxonum."
- To the notice of the appointment of William, a king's priest to the bishopric of London, given in E, F adds in the Latin (only) "et consecratus est a Rodberto archiepiscopo."
1050. "Hic Eadwardus rex dedit Rodberto, qui fuit abbas Gemeticae, archiepiscopatum Cantuariæ . . . per superbiam uoluit ui accipere hospitium, et uulnerauit dominum domus etc ccc praecepit . . . ut congregaret exercitum et intraret Cantiam, omnia devastando, et maxime Dofras" (on the margin

"et devastaret Dofras") "sed Godwinus nolens destruere comitatum suum, dissimulavit ire illuc."

Later on "pa Waelisce men" is translated "quidam de Normannis."

1051. The facts mentioned in F in this annal are assigned to 1052 in E. F says of Stigand, "He was this cinges raedgifa and his hand-prest." This is inserted. Another insertion consists of the words "and swa scolde se freondscipe beon gefaestned."
1055. "Aelfgar" in E is written "Algar" in F. "Et Algarus comes exul factus est propterea quod debuit esse delator patriae, quod ipse (ante) cognovit ita esse, licet verbum illud improuiso exprim [eret]."
1058. "Aegclric" is termed "mo" (i.e. "monachus") in E, and "abb" (i.e., "abbot") in F. This is Thorpe's reading. Plummer reads "Aegclric on Xþes cirican" only.

This completes my survey of the parts of F which belong to it alone, and are not found in any other manuscript of the *Chronicle*. I hope they will be found fairly complete with the exception of verbal changes. When we have sifted out these additions, together with those previously collected from Bede, we shall have left what is really the foundation and matrix of the whole work, which is, as everybody admits, and as is in fact perfectly plain, a bilingual epitome or abstract of some text like the *Peterborough Chronicle*, and following its language very closely, many of their paragraphs being precisely alike and differing chiefly in omitting certain annals or cutting out portions of them.

The next question that arises is whether the *Peterborough Chronicle* was itself the mother manuscript of both, or whether they were derived from a common source.

It seems plain, in fact, that the latter is the only alternative, as Mr. Plummer has concluded, and this for several potent reasons.

In the first place, F does not contain any of the local insertions of E. Now it is true that in epitomizing E, the scribe of F was very arbitrary in rejecting or omitting such matter as he no doubt thought would be interesting or the reverse to his Canterbury friends, and that he omits a large number of complete annals contained in E (see Plummer, *op. cit.*, ii, xxxviii, note 3). It remains a singular fact notwithstanding, that not a single one of these insertions in E should be contained in F, not even that of the year 870, which, as Mr. Plummer says, "is so closely connected with the general history of the

country that there seems no reason why the scribe of F should omit it any more, e.g. than he has omitted the ravaging of Lindisfarne in 793."

The omission of these insertions in E is, however, not the most remarkable divergency of F from E. This is much more marked in matters which it seems impossible to explain by any theory which makes the matter of F be taken directly from E.

The divergence of the text of F and E in small particulars where they generally agree, make it impossible in fact to suppose that the former could have been copied directly from the latter. In 381, F has "Pelagies" where E has "Pelaies." In 430, E has "Patricius" where A, B, C have "Palladius," which is right. F, which otherwise follows the text of E, has "Palladius" like the rest. In 625, F has "archbishop," which is right, for "bishop" in E. In 692, where F has "Wihtred," which is right, E has "Nihtred," while the other copies of the *Chronicle* have no entry. In 694, F has "xxxiii" with A, B and C, where E has "thre and twenti." In 725, E has "Ealdberht" where F, with A and D, have "Eadberht." In 740, archbishop "Cutberht," so-called in A, B, C, D and F, is wrongly called "Eadberht" in E.

In 856, F has "he rixode xx geara"; E has "ix gear"; A, B and D "nigonteoðe healf gear," and C "xix healf gear." In 887, F and all the other manuscripts have "Oda" or "Odda"; E has merely "tha." In 892, F and the other manuscripts have "Apuldre"; E has "Apultre." The long and very interesting annal of 891 is entirely wanting in E, while it occurs at full length in A, B, C, D and F. Its absence from E seems due to some lapse in the scribe only. In F, in 1045, the death of Liuing, bishop of Exceastre, is given in E, as "b on Defenascire."

There is one notable fact which seems to render this contention conclusive. In the year 965 F has an annal corresponding to one in MS. D, but not in E. It is virtually impossible on every ground that the scribe of F had D before him when writing, the texts are very far apart; but E and D are very close together and, in fact, almost facsimiles of each other at this point, and we can hardly doubt that the omission of this annal from E was

accidental. Its occurrence in F, however, points clearly, as the variants and the other facts above mentioned point, to Mr. Plummer's conclusion, of which this is additional evidence, namely, that the scribe of F did not take the matter found both in E and F from the former, but from the common mother of both, which I have called EE, and Mr. Plummer has called η or ϵ .

I have no doubt, therefore, that when the compiler of F did his work at Canterbury, there were within ready access and probably in the library at Christ Church, copies of Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*, and of his tract *de sex aetatibus*, and two copies of the *Chronicle*, A, or a chronicle like it, and a second chronicle, which was his principal source, which was also the source of the greater part of E. This copy of the chronicle which no longer exists, at any rate separately, bringing down events to 1121, will occupy us in the next paper of this series.