

## 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.

PART III. *The lost MS. EE and its relation to MS. D, the Waverley Annals, the History of Henry of Huntingdon and the Poem of Gaimar.*<sup>1</sup>

In the previous papers I have tried to analyse the contents and history of the two latest copies of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle respectively known as MSS. E and F, and have, I hope, shewn that both are compilations of the twelfth century, the former in all probability the handiwork of Hugo Candidus, a monk of Peterborough, and the latter of an anonymous monk of Christchurch, Canterbury, and that the substantial part of both compilations is derived from another copy of the chronicle no longer existing, which once ended in 1121, where the first writing of Codex E terminates.

As we saw, down to that year, not only is the writing in Codex E in the same hand, but the language, with the exception of certain interpolations, is the same throughout, and shows no sign of change or growth, while the interpolations, which can be further distinguished by their altogether dubious contents, are written in a much later and more corrupt form of speech.

So far as we can judge the so-called Peterborough Chronicle, i.e. MS. E, contains a fairly good transcript of the earlier chronicle just named and now lost, which, as the mother of E, I have ventured to label EE. We will now turn to the analysis of this latter document, and in doing so must go somewhat far afield and first examine the important aids to its study contained in three other works, namely, the Waverley Annals, the Chronicle of

<sup>1</sup> Parts i and ii of this paper appeared in the *Archaeological Journal*, lxx, 141. and lxxi, 105 respectively.

Henry of Huntingdon, and the poem of Gaimar. And first the Waverley Annals.

The first Cistercian monastery in England was founded at Waverley in south-western Surrey in 1128, its monks having come from l'Aumoin, near Blois, a daughter house of Citeaux. In the chronicle generally but, as I believe, wrongfully attributed to John of Peterborough, under the year 1128 we have the entry: '*Ordo Cisterciensis primo venit in Angliam, abbatia de Waverlee fundata est, filia domus de Eleemosyna i.e. de l'aumone hoc est, transmissis illuc de Eleemosyna duodecim monachis cum abbate; ei subjectionem et obedientiam sicut filia matri debet.*' In the so-called Waverley Annals the foundation is put in the same year and attributed to William Giffard, bishop of Winchester, the foundation day being '*viii kal. Decembris.*'

The chronicle known as the Annals of Waverley is preserved in a single manuscript numbered *Vespasian A xvi* in the British Museum, nor is there any evidence that any other manuscript of it ever existed. The work begins with the Incarnation and ends abruptly in 1291, some leaves being lost.

These annals, although not specifically attributed to the abbey in the text, were clearly compiled there. This follows from the large number and the character of the notices of the abbey which they contain. I will give a list of the years under which these references may be found: 1128, 1176, 1179, 1181, 1182, 1187, 1194, 1196, 1201, 1203, 1210, 1212, 1214, 1216, 1218, 1219, 1221, 1222, 1223, 1225, 1226, 1227, 1229, 1231, 1232, 1233, 1236, 1237, 1238, 1239, 1240, 1244, 1248, 1250, 1252, 1263, 1265, 1266, 1269, 1274, 1276, 1278, 1279, 1280, 1283, 1285, 1289. This is not all. The annals contain a large number of very intimate notices of the abbey, and the writer speaks of it continually as '*our house*' or '*our church*,' as in the years 1221, 1226, 1231, 1236, 1245, 1248, while in 1240 there is a long description of the troubles arising from a homicide committed in the abbey, and specially noted as '*in sutrino nostro.*' The annals themselves end abruptly in 1291, in the middle of a notice of a letter addressed by Edward I to the abbey.

The first handwriting in the manuscript ends with

the year 999, but this, like so many similar instances which have misled people, is not the smallest guide to the date of the composition of the book, for in this first section of the annals various works of much later date are quoted. There is even one which was not written till the year 1277, namely, the chronicle of Martin Polonus, the first edition of which is dated in that year. Hence the portion of the annals ending in 999 cannot have been written till 1277 at the earliest, and I cannot understand how Mr. Luard, their editor, could speak of the writing of this first portion as written in a twelfth-century hand.<sup>1</sup>

This is not the only point on which I differ from Mr. Luard. He was of opinion that the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle was used by the compiler of the section ending in 999. In this view I cannot agree. It seems to me that the compiler of the first part of the annals makes no use of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, and the few entries attributed to "the chronicle" by Mr. Luard are derived from other sources. I propose briefly to analyse these entries.

The first entry refers to the martyrdom of St. Alban, which in the Waverley Annals is dated in 302. This is conclusive that it was not taken from the chronicle. In MS. A of that document it is dated in 283, and in MSS. E and F in 286. It has no doubt been derived by the annalist from Bede, whose work is used by him elsewhere, and who merely dates it generally in the reign of Diocletian.

The second entry is dated 311 in the annals and contains the obit of Avitianus, archbishop of Rouen, and a record of his presence at the Council of Arles. A notice of this no doubt occurs in MS. E of the chronicle, but in no other copy. The entry, however, in the latter is not in the vernacular but in Latin, and like similar foreign notices there, was no doubt an interpolation, and derived from the annals of Rouen, whence it was probably also taken at first or second hand by the Waverley annalist.

In 655 we read that 'Penda (a mistake for Peada) rex abbatiam Burgensem fundavit et Wulferus frater ejus magnis redditibus ampliavit.' In this reference we are then told

<sup>1</sup> Preface, xxxi.

that Penda built the abbey of Burgh, and his brother Wulfere granted it many gifts. In none of the original entries in any of the versions of the chronicle is this statement made at all, and it is only in the twelfth-century interpolation in MS. E that the founding of Peterborough there attributed to the year 654 is named at all, and in that notice it is assigned not to Penda but to Oswiu and his brother Oswald.

In the next year we read in another interpolation in MS. E of the chronicle that it was not Penda but Peada, the son of Penda, who founded the abbey, and that the many gifts given to it were by Peada's brother and not by Penda's, so that the notice in the Waverley Annals in the year 655, from wherever derived, could not have come directly from the chronicle, nor is it likely that it should, since we do not again meet with a passage assigned by Luard to the same source until the year 870, i.e. 215 years later. We then read in the Waverley Annals 'Hingwar et Hubba cum suo exercitu venerunt in Angliam et multa mala fecerunt; insuper Sanctum Edmundum regem interemerunt xii kal. Decembris, die Dominica.' It is notable that none of the copies of the chronicle mention Hingwar and Ubba here except MS. F, a late twelfth-century document, and there it is apparently an interpolation. The notice in the Annals may have come from Henry of Huntingdon where these names do occur in that year and whose chronicle was used at a later date by the Waverley annalist.

The next entry in the Waverley Annals assigned to the chronicle by Luard is in the year 931 and merely reports the obit of Saint Britstan, bishop of Winchester, and the succession of Alfeg, a notice which could be obtained much more easily direct from the neighbouring monastery of Winchester, and did not need a special reference to the chronicle. Not only so, but the only copy of the chronicle which mentions the obit, MS. A, puts it in 933 and not 931.

Lastly we have an entry in the Waverley Annals in the year 936, which reads as follows: 'Mortuo Athelstan rege Anglorum, successit filius ejus Edmundus et regnavit vi annis et dimidio, qui super Dacos v urbes cepit et eisdem victis Northumbriam in dominio tenuit.'

That this entry came from the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle as Luard urges seems incredible. In the first place it is dated in 936, while all the copies of the chronicle put the death of Athelstan in 940; secondly it calls Edmund the son of Athelstan, while all the copies of the chronicle call him his brother. Lastly the rest of the clause after 'Edmundus' (being the greater part of it), is quite unknown to any copy of the chronicle. I cannot therefore agree with Luard in attributing any of the entries in the part of the Waverley Annals before the year 1000 to the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, and it seems to me plain that when their author compiled that portion of the annals ending in 999, he either had no access to the chronicle or he did not care to use it.

The absence of the English chronicle from the sources of the Waverley Annals until the year 1000 is matched by another change in the sources of the same work at the same date, namely the fact that after 1001 we meet with no quotations from the late annalist, Martinus Polonus, so much favoured by the later English writers, while he occurs repeatedly in the portion before that date. This, combined with the change of writing, seems to me only explicable on the theory that the Waverley Annals originally began with the year 1000, and that it was not till nearly or quite a century later, namely the end of the thirteenth century that they were completed by an independent work dealing with the first ten centuries of the Christian era, which was appended to the already completed work, namely in that beginning with the year 1000 and ending in 1291.

Let us now turn to the part of the annals dealing with the period from the year 1000 onwards.

In regard to this part of the text it is clear that since the abbey of Waverley was not founded till 1128 no part of its annals could have been written till that year, but it is otherwise plain that they were not written till a long time after this. We only know of one manuscript of these annals, and have no reason to suppose that any others ever existed. From the year 1000 onwards the work is written in one hand till the year 1201, when it breaks off in the middle of the sentence 'Dunkewelle fundata est,' the break occurring between 'Dunkewelle' and 'fundata,'

which shows that the break is not in the composition but in the scribe. While the new scribe was engaged upon his portion he allowed a third one to intervene and insert a paragraph in the year 1216 in another handwriting about the water-works at Waverley. He then goes on to 1219 in the midst of which annal<sup>1</sup> he ends with a completed sentence. It is probable that the Waverley Annals were first composed in the latter year, and then written out by the several scribes as thus described. After the year 1219 till 1266, says Mr. Luard, the manuscript was written contemporaneously with the events described, from year to year. With this portion we have nothing to do, and will now limit ourselves to the original compilation probably made about the year 1219.

Nothing can be more remarkable than the immediate change that comes over the Waverley Annals with the year 1000. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle at once becomes the main source of the narrative. Its only competitor is the chronicle of Robert de Monte, and the two virtually make up the sources of the story until 1157, when Robert de Monte's chronicle comes to an end.

The next question is as to which edition of the chronicle was before the Waverley compiler when he wrote. About this we can have no doubt. There are only two known copies of the chronicle which extend into the first quarter of the twelfth century, and one of these greatly epitomises the common matter preserved by the two manuscripts. The only possible copy of the Chronicle from which the Waverley annalist could have derived his matter was substantially like MS. E.

So closely, says Mr. Plummer, does the Waverley compiler follow his original that he even translates literally the famous passage in 1086 E, which tells how its writer had himself looked upon and formerly lived in the court of the great Conqueror, which could not of course have been the case with the compiler of the Waverley Annals. The annals of Waverley agree with the Peterborough chronicle as against the other manuscripts, in peculiar readings, as in the following years :

<sup>1</sup> *op. cit.* ed. Luard, 284 and 285.

- 1007. xxx for xxxvi.
- 1011. Leofwine for Leofrune.
- 1012. viii for xlviii.
- 1016. Insertion of 'cix scipa.'
- 1022. Incident of abbot Leofwine.
- 1025, 1046, 1047, 1048, 1052, 1066 (peculiar to E).
- 1010, 1011, and 1014 in omissions.<sup>1</sup>

Notwithstanding these notable equations we must not suppose that the Waverley annalist actually copied MS. E, or some Latin translation of that chronicle, but only some manuscript resembling it and belonging to the same class.

There are a large number of places where MS. E differs from the Waverley Annals in minute matters of orthography, and sometimes in a more definite way, and where the several Waverley Annals disagree with our MS. E, and agree with F. It is plain, therefore, that although these annals substantially agree with the class of text represented by E where they depend on the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, they were not dependent for them on our actual MS. E. In this Mr. Plummer, who was the first to emphasise the fact, of course agrees.

It is plain, therefore, that the Waverley Annals must have had a common source with MSS. E and F of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle for a large part of the material they used between the years 1000 and 1121, and we can hardly hesitate to conclude that this common matter was derived not from E, but from that mother of E and F, which I have called EE, a view pressed with his usual skill and lucidity by Mr. Plummer.

Of a large part of this copy, from the year 1000 onwards, the Waverley Annals furnish us with a good translation into Latin, and afford very useful material for checking the Anglo-Saxon version of MS. E. Did the compiler of the Waverley Annals directly translate his text from the vernacular? I think this in the highest degree improbable.

In the first place we must remember that the abbey was not founded till the year 1128. Next that it was not an English foundation but a French one and was really originally a colony of French Cistercians, and it was

<sup>1</sup> Plummer, liii, notes 1, 2 and 3.

doubtless a long time, if ever, before it was largely recruited by English monks. Thirdly the Cistercians were not, like the older Benedictines, a learned order and collectors of books. Their chief rôle was devotion to asceticism. An English chronicle in the vernacular is the last and most useless thing that could find its way to their *new* library, and if they had it they could not have read it. Nor could it have been accurately read anywhere as late as 1219, when the annals were first compiled, and when the *old* vernacular had become obsolete. All this seems to me to make it plain that the compiler who wrote in 1219 had before him not a copy of the chronicle in the vernacular, which he abstracted and translated as he went along, but a Latin translation of it made at least a century earlier when there were people who understood the old vernacular, and this, it seems to me, is made quite certain by the excellent general character of the translation as incorporated in the Latin annals of Waverley. There are naturally occasional slips in the translation: e.g. on p. 165, 'filius' for 'Aetheling,' and on p. 174, 'exercitus' for 'pe flota,' etc.

This points to the earlier half of the twelfth century as the time when the translation was made; the same period when the Latin chronicles of Florence of Worcester and Henry of Huntingdon, and the Latin translation in MS. F of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle were also made. The question that now arises is, where did the Waverley chronicler find such a Latin translation of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle as he used in his work? We can only make a guess, for we have no direct information on the subject.

In the first place it seems almost certain that the compiler did his work at Waverley, and borrowed such materials as he needed from one or more other monasteries. In this way only could he have inserted at intervals so many notices about his own abbey and local matters in the course of the compilation. Whence did he get his books? Here a digression is necessary.

Sigebert of Gemblours was so-called from the Belgian abbey, where he became a monk about 1030. He wrote a chronicle beginning with the year 381 and ending in the year 1100 and died on 4th October, 1112. His chronicle was largely used, and was, in fact, the basis



of the first section of the Waverley Annals. Sigebert's work was continued among others by Robert of Torigny, generally known as Robert de Monte.

Robert de Monte was born at Torigny in Normandy, and became abbot of Mont St. Michel in 1154 (whence the name by which he is generally known), and there he died on 24th June, 1186. Hardy thus describes the mode of compilation of his chronicle. 'Having borrowed from the bishop of Beauvais a manuscript which contained Eusebius, Jerome and Prosper, he transcribed these writers without alteration, partly because he had few additions to make to the period of history which they embraced, and partly because he did not venture to meddle with authorities held in such high and general estimation. He also copied Sigebert of Gemblours, omitting nothing and changing nothing, but interpolating the history of the archbishops of Rouen and the kings of England.'<sup>1</sup> Sigebert's own chronicle, which extends from 381 to 1112, was continued by Robert de Monte himself. Robert's own continuation begins with the year 1100, and he was working upon it at the time of his death in 1186.

According to Hardy, 'Henry of Huntingdon furnished him, i.e. de Monte, with all his English history.'<sup>2</sup> Hardy says the latter not only continued the work of Sigebert, but made large additions to it, especially in those years which Sigebert had left blank. His chronicle is generally appended to that of Sigebert just named.

A manuscript of Sigebert's chronicle with Robert de Monte's continuation is now in the British Museum in the Harleian collection, no. 651, Pertz's E 3b. It is a magnificent manuscript of the twelfth century in folio. In a hand of the fifteenth century it is stated that this manuscript came 'de Monasterio S. Mariae Radyngiae,' and from a marginal note on fol. 153 it seems to have belonged to that monastery two centuries earlier. Hardy dates it in the thirteenth century, and says it follows closely the Royal MS. 13 C xi, which he assigns to the twelfth century. The latter ends with the year 1168, and is inscribed in a hand of the sixteenth century 'Liber domus S. Thomae de Accon' London, ex dno Domini Jacobi

<sup>1</sup> Hardy, *Catalogue of British History*, ii, 442.

<sup>2</sup> *ibid.*

Comitis Ormandiae.’<sup>1</sup> Luard, in his preface to the annals of Waverley, shows by a comparison of various details that the manuscript of Robert de Monte used by the compiler of the Waverley Annals was certainly this Reading one.<sup>2</sup> Among them may be mentioned those in the entries in the years 437, 452, 527, 561, 581, 669, 743, 770, and especially 895 (where, as Luard says, the Reading manuscript has the singular erroneous transposition of ‘ex Ber comite’ for ‘Bernō ex comite,’ which is followed by the Waverley annalist), 903, 907, 955, 999, 1007, and 1149, where for ‘nemora’ the Waverley manuscript reads ‘nec mora’ making nonsense of the whole sentence. Now in the Reading manuscript ‘ne’ is at the end of one line and ‘mora’ at the beginning of the next, and the transcriber has blundered into making two words of these syllables and writing ‘nec’ for ‘ne.’<sup>3</sup>

In addition to these extracts it may be noted that the manuscript of Robert de Monte here named, represents the first edition of the work ending in 1157. The extracts from that work in the Waverley Annals also end in the same year. So did the copy used by Roger of Wendover, who says, under the year 1157, ‘Hucusque Robertus abbas de Monte S. Michael chronica sua digessit.’<sup>4</sup> It is plain, therefore, that a large part of the annals of Waverley down to the year 1157 were copied from a book belonging to the abbey of Reading.

I think it very probable that the Waverley monks were similarly under obligations to some great and rich monastery for a loan of the Latin translation of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, which they so largely abstracted. What seems plain is that at no period of their history were the Waverley monks themselves in a position to translate the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. In regard to its provenance I once thought that probably it had also been borrowed from Reading.

The great abbey of Reading, consecrated with such pomp in the presence of Henry I, who was buried there, and also so magnificently endowed by him, was founded in the year 1126 for monks of the Cluniac order. Its im-

<sup>1</sup> Hardy, ii, 439 and 440.

<sup>2</sup> op. cit. xxxii, etc. etc.

<sup>3</sup> Luard, *Wav. Ann.* xxxi and xxxii.

<sup>4</sup> op. cit. 238, note.

portance may be gathered from the fact that it contained 200 monks.

We may be sure that in such a monastery it would be natural to have in the library a copy of the national annals, and as it was probably constituted very largely of foreign monks and the old tongue was now rapidly changing, such a work to be of much use must have been in Latin, and nothing therefore seems more probable than that the Latin annals from which the compiler of the Waverley chronicle drew a large part of his narration after the year 1000 were contained in the Reading scriptorium just as we know the corresponding work of Robert de Monte, also used by him, was quite certainly there. I do not however now think that this view is probable. If they had such a book at Reading, it is strange that it should not have been borrowed when the Waverley monks were compiling the supplement to their annals extending from the beginning down to the year 1000, since they had used it so very freely in the other part of their book which was written earlier. Nor can I find any reference to a copy of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle mentioned in the very interesting list of books possessed by Reading abbey in Henry III's reign, and published by Mr. Barfield in the *English Historical Review*.<sup>1</sup> The only book which at all answers to it is the *Historia Anglorum*, but that name rather recalls the *Historia Anglorum* of Henry of Huntingdon, which was certainly used by the Waverley annalist. I shall discuss the question of the probable provenance of the manuscript of the Latin copy of the chronicle used in the Waverley Annals later on. At present it will suffice to remember that it was itself a Latin translation and not written in the vernacular, and that, whencesoever borrowed, it was a document of the beginning of the twelfth century. Before we continue further the analysis of this matter in the Waverley annals we will turn to another document of the twelfth century, also containing a Latin translation of considerable parts of the same text of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, namely the chronicle of Henry of Huntingdon.

I shall collect the events of his life chiefly from Mr. T. Arnold's preface to his chronicle.

<sup>1</sup> iii, 113, etc.

Henry of Huntingdon was no doubt a native of the Fen country. Mr. Arnold thus speaks of him. The evident predilection with which Henry speaks of the Fen country ‘pulcherrimae paludes,’ his exact acquaintance with the churches that lay on and near the river Ouse, and his knowledge of the traditions of the district, make it almost a certainty that he was a native either of Cambridgeshire or Huntingdonshire. He speaks of Aldwin the abbot of Ramsey as ‘dominus meus.’ This suggests that his father Nicholas held land of that abbey, and he was probably born on the abbey lands. He also speaks of having seen with his own eyes archbishop Lanfranc, who died in 1089, and of his having flourished in his day,<sup>1</sup> and Mr. Arnold accordingly argues that he cannot have been born later than 1084. He went to Lincoln with his father. As Henry says he had never seen bishop Remigius, who died in 1092, his movement to the great city (emporium hominum terra marique venientium)<sup>2</sup> must therefore have been after that date. It must have been soon after, for when still a small boy (puerulus) he joined the household of Robert Bloet, that bishop’s successor. His father Nicholas had been a priest. Henry calls him ‘stella cleri,’ and he died in 1110, apparently in the position of archdeacon of Huntingdon. On his death Cambridge was transferred to the see of Ely, and Henry tells us he himself became archdeacon of the two provinces. For the next twelve or thirteen years, during which Bloet continued bishop, we hear nothing about him. Bloet’s successor was Alexander of Blois, a learned prelate to whom Geoffrey of Monmouth dedicated his prophecies of Merlin.<sup>3</sup>

It was to Alexander of Blois that Henry also dedicated his history. In the dedication he says it was written by order of the bishop (jussu tuo), and at his wish was devoted to the affairs of this realm and the origins of our people (hujus regni gesta et nostrae gentis origines). By the bishop’s counsel he had, as far as he could, followed Bede’s *Ecclesiastical History* and other authorities, including chronicles preserved in ancient libraries (ex aliis excerptens auctoribus, inde chronica in antiquis reservata librariis

<sup>1</sup> *De Contemptu*, par. 15.

<sup>3</sup> Arnold, *Henry of Huntingdon*, intr.

<sup>2</sup> William of Malmesbury, *G.P.* par. 177.     xxx, etc.

compilans), and had continued it down to his own day.<sup>1</sup> The history of Henry of Huntingdon occurs in several editions, each one bringing it down a few years later.

In his epistle addressed to Henry I entitled, *De Serie Regum potentissimorum*, etc. which was published according to Hardy about the year 1130,<sup>2</sup> he thus refers to his history, 'et laudes, autentice nonne haec scripta sunt in libro primo quem feci de Hystoria Anglorum,' etc. This shews that the first edition of the history had already been published in 1130. It was, in fact, written in 1129, as is proved by a copy of it among the manuscripts at Hengwrt.<sup>3</sup>

The first book of the history is headed *De Regno Romanorum in Britannia*, and brings down the story to the advent of the Saxons. It does not contain a single reference to the English chronicle, but shews that Henry had a very considerable library at his disposal. Thus he names Lucan's *Pharsalia*, Solinus, Virgil's *Georgics*, Eutropius, Aurelius Victor, Juvenal, *The Hist. Miscella*, St. Basil, St. Jerome (*adv. Ruf.*), Nennius, Bede's *Ecclesiastical History* and *De Rat. Temp.* Joh. Diac. *Vit. Greg.* Geoffrey of Monmouth, Florence of Worcester and Orderic Vitalis.

The next three books were respectively entitled, II, *de adventu Anglorum*, III, *de conversione Anglorum*, and IV, *de regno Anglorum*. The materials used in compiling these three books were few in number. The second book, with the exception of a quotation from Lucan, was taken from Nennius, Bede, Florence of Worcester, Geoffrey of Monmouth, and the English chronicle. The third book, with the exception of two quotations from Virgil, was entirely taken from Bede. In reporting the death of Bede in 735, Henry says that in his own history he had followed Bede's authority and notably in everything relating to ecclesiastical matters, but also in other matters so far as he was able. The fourth book, beside some extracts from Lucan and Virgil, was taken from Bede, Florence of Worcester, Simeon of Durham, and the English chronicle.

The only one of these various works which has any interest for us is the English chronicle, which Henry

<sup>1</sup> op. cit. 2 and 3.

<sup>2</sup> Hardy, *Descriptive Cat. etc.* ii, 181, 191 note, and 278.

<sup>3</sup> *ibid.* 169 and 191.

quotes very freely, and for the most part very faithfully, although he too frequently condenses the matter.

The next question that arises is as to which copy of the chronicle was used by Henry of Huntingdon. In regard to the larger number of his extracts it is quite plain that he used a manuscript resembling MS. E. As Mr. Plummer says, 'the close affinity of Henry of Huntingdon with E is obvious.' As in the case of the Waverley Annals, this is proved by the fact that he continues his extracts at least down to 1121, while every other manuscript of the chronicle except E and its satellite F ends in or before 1090. That the mother manuscript of the chronicle used by Henry of Huntingdon was close akin to E is again shown very plainly, as Mr. Plummer points out, by the fact that his narrative agrees with some of Codex E's most palpable blunders. Thus to give a few examples :

456. Henry of Huntingdon and Codices E and F agree in the phrase 'iiii werad' for 'iiii (i.e. 1111 millia) wera' in codices A, B and C. Henry of Huntingdon translates it 'quatuor phalanges.'
488. E and Henry of Huntingdon agree in giving 38 as the number of ships, where A, B, and C give 24.
508. Henry of Huntingdon agrees with E and F in writing 'Nazaleod' for 'Natanleod.'
527. Henry of Huntingdon, like E, has 'Certices ford' instead of 'Certices leag.'
530. Henry of Huntingdon agrees with E in putting 'feala manna' (which he translates 'innumerabilem stragem') for 'fea men.'
547. Henry of Huntingdon agrees with E and F in a phrase not contained in other chronicles. He writes 'Construxit autem Bebanburgh et circumdedit eam prius sepe, postea muro.' E has 'hege getimbrade. Bebbanburh sy waes aerost mid hegge betined and thaer aefter mid wealle.'
591. Henry of Huntingdon agrees with E in giving 'Ceolric' for 'Ceol.'
648. Henry of Huntingdon agrees with E in giving 'Eadrede' for 'Cuthred,' as in the other manuscripts. He spells the name *Aedred*.
692. Henry of Huntingdon has 'Nithred' in three manuscripts where E has 'Nihtréd.' In two other manuscripts he has 'Wihtred,' which is right. F also has 'Wihtred.'
710. Henry of Huntingdon has 'Higebald' and E, 'Hygbald.' D has 'Sigbald.'
740. Henry of Huntingdon agrees with E in giving 'Eadberht' for 'Cuthbriht' as in A, B, C, D, and F.
765. E and Henry of Huntingdon have 8 where D has 9.
766. E and Henry of Huntingdon have 36 where D has 37.
779. Henry of Huntingdon has 'Kinebold,' the Cynebold of E, instead of 'Cynewulf,' as in D.

890. The clause about Plegmund, which is in Henry of Huntingdon, and in Latin in E, is not in the other manuscripts.
891. There is a notable omission in E which is blank in this year. This is also the case in Henry of Huntingdon.
892. Henry of Huntingdon and E have 'Awdre' for 'Apuldre' in A, B, C, D, and F.
991. Henry of Huntingdon and E have 'Wic' for 'Gypes wic' in C and D.
1007. E and Henry of Huntingdon have 30,000 where C and D have 36,000.
1011. He also like E has 'Leofwine' for 'Leofruna' in C and D.
1012. E and Henry of Huntingdon have 40,000 where C and D have 48,000.
1018. E, Henry of Huntingdon and the Waverley Annals have 11,000 pounds. C and D with Florence of Worcester have 'endlifte healf þusend.'

Secondly, Henry of Huntingdon has many entries which either wholly or in part are peculiar to E or to E and F. Compare 547, 571, 933, 949, 952, 1023, 1025, 1031, 1036, 1039, 1040, 1041, 1043, 1046, 1047, 1048 ad fin. 1055, 1063, 1069, 1077, 1079, ff.<sup>1</sup>

These coincidences continue until and cease at or soon after the year 1121. There is no escape from the conclusion, which has been accepted by all the later critics of the work, including Mr. Luard and Mr. Plummer, and is amply confirmed by the continual textual equation between the extracts in Henry and the text of E. This makes it plain that Henry of Huntingdon in the matter he took from the Chronicle was in the main dependent on a manuscript of the type of E.<sup>2</sup>

While the Waverley annalist, however, seems only to have used one edition of the chronicle, i.e. that represented by E, Henry of Huntingdon, as we shall see, had also access to another manuscript, and had at least two copies of the chronicle before him.

<sup>1</sup> Plummer, *Bede*, lv and note I.

<sup>2</sup> I ought to add another argument which is very conclusive, and due to the acuteness of Mr. Plummer. He says "the printed texts of some manuscripts of Henry of Huntingdon under the year 1098 read 'Hugo consul Salopscyre occisus est ab Hiberniensibus.' This is an error, as the slayers of Hugh of Montgomery were Norwegians. Two manuscripts have the unintelligible reading 'apud Wilcinges,' two others have the intermediate and ungrammatical reading 'apud Hybernien-

bus.' A reference to E explains all these corruptions, 'Hugo eorl weard opslagen . . . foram ut-wikingan,' i.e. by the out- (or foreign) wikingis. What Henry of Huntingdon wrote therefore was 'ab Utwikingis'; from a wrong division of the words results the reading 'apud Wilcinges,' as the name of a place; from a wrong division and a misinterpretation of 'Wikingis' we get 'apud Hiberniensibus,' which the next scribe simply makes grammatical": op. cit. lvi-lvi, note 2.

It would be interesting to know where Henry of Huntingdon found the chief materials for his work. It is not improbable that it was at St. Albans. We are expressly told by him that he himself worked there. After describing the dedication of its church in 1116, and the translation of its relics in 1129 by the bishop of Lincoln, he continues 'De cujus (S. Albani) miraculis, exceptis his quae sequentes Bedam scripsimus, multa clarissima et vera in eadem scripta reperiuntur ecclesia.'<sup>1</sup>

We still have a third writer whose work was dependent in a very material way for its materials upon a manuscript of the type of E, namely the French rhymier Gaimar, in his poem *L'Estorie des Engles*. He flourished about the middle of the twelfth century and was probably a native of Lincolnshire, whence he derives several of his romantic stories. 'He cites the chronicle as *chronicles* (lines 954 and 2188), *cronices* (2111), *croniz* (2331), *la geste* (2233), *la vereie geste* (828), *la veille geste* (2527), *le livere* (3228), *li livre ancien* (990), *li ancienz* (1682, 1786).'<sup>2</sup>

The manuscript Gaimar used, says Mr. Plummer, was nearer to E than D; thus he omits 838 with E and F (G 2416-7). Like E and F he jumps from 893 to 901, though the other chronicles are very full just there (G 3437, ff). He omits the grant of Cumberland in 945 with E and F (= G 3540). He has annals which are only in E and F 906 (= G 3467), 921 (= G 3501), 949 (= G 3549), 952 (= G 3553).<sup>3</sup>

To return somewhat: while it is quite plain that both the Waverley Annals and the chronicle of Henry of Huntingdon in the main depend on a copy of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle of the type of MS. E, it is now generally recognised, as I have argued, that it was not MS. E itself that they followed, but the mother manuscript of that copy which I have called EE. This is clear for several reasons, one of them being that neither the Waverley Annals nor Henry of Huntingdon take any notice of the interpolations in MS. E, which have occupied us at some length in a former paper. More than one of these is of other than local interest. The fact that many of these

<sup>1</sup> Arnold, *op. cit.* 239, note a.

<sup>2</sup> Plummer, *Bede*, lix.

<sup>3</sup> *ibid.* lviii, lix, and notes.



interpolations refer to the affairs of Peterborough would not have excluded them, for annals referring to Peterborough occur in both. Again it is plain that the chronicle of Henry of Huntingdon, the first edition of which was published in 1130, could not have contained the later entries of the Peterborough chronicle, while the Waverley Annals exclude these later entries in E entirely.

From the year 1000 down to 1121, or a few years later, the paragraphs, which the two texts have in common, especially the later ones, are the same in matter, while after that time there are only some doubtful common clauses, which I shall discuss presently, and these occur only in a few years, after which the texts entirely diverge. It is impossible to believe that the Waverley annalist writing in 1201, having taken his material for so many years so faithfully from MS. E, should have ceased doing so quite arbitrarily about the year 1121, or soon after, and not used the latter in its later entries extending to 1154, which latter date was long before the actual compilation of the Waverley Annals.

That it was not directly from E but from a purer text of the same matter is clear from the number of places in which there is a mistake in E, where the fact is rightly stated by Gaimar. To these we shall revert presently. They point to the fact that when Gaimar used the chronicle, his source was EE and not E.

I have argued that the text of EE is represented very fairly by that part of E down to 1121 which is all in one handwriting and one dialect, that is, by the portion of it ending in 1121, divested of its Peterborough accretions. As thus defined, EE contains a series of entries which recur in Henry of Huntingdon, but more definitely in E, where it is very easy to separate them because they are all written in Latin and are imbedded in the Anglo-Saxon text like boulders in a bed of clay. They do not occur in A, B, and C, and are all excluded most absurdly by Thorpe in his edition in the Rolls series. They are very important in analysing the text, and I will now transcribe a complete list of them from E, marking with an asterisk those in Henry of Huntingdon where they are somewhat abbreviated.

114. Alexander hic constituit aquam benedictam fieri.
124. Syxtus papa; hic constituit ymnum decantare Scs. Scs. Scs. in officio missae.
134. Telesphorus papa; hic constituit ymnum angelicum cantari Gloria in excelsis Deo diebus festis.
202. Victor papa; hic constituit ut Pascha die dominico celebretur sicut predecessor ejus Eleutherius.
254. Cornelius papa; hic de catacumbas levavit per noctem corpora apostolorum et posuit Pauli quidam via Ostensi ubi decollatus est. Petri autem ubi crucifixus est.
311. Scs. Silvester papa xxiii. Hujus tempore celebratur Nicenum concilium. Arelatense quoque primum, in quo fuit Avitianus Rotomagi archiepiscopus.
379. Hoc tempore celebratur Constantinopolitanum concilium cl. patrum adversum Macedonum et Eunomium sub Damaso.
403. Innocentius papa; hic misit decretalem epistolam Victricio Rotomagensi archiepiscopo. Hic constituit sabbato jejunare quia eo die Dns iacuit in sepulchro.
425. Hujus temporis aetate exstitit exordium regum Francorum, primus Faramundus.
431. Hoc tempore diabolus in Creta Judeis in specie Moysi apparens ad terram repromissionis per mare sicco perducere promittit, sicque plurimis necatis reliqui ad Xpi gratiam convertuntur.
433. Celestinus papa; hujus tempore aggregata est Ephesina synodus ducentorum episcoporum, cui prefuit Cirillus Alexandrinus presul adversus Nestorium Constantinopolitanum episcopum.
439. Leo papa; hic sancivit Calcedonensem sinodum.
449. Hujus tempore celebratur Calcedonense concilium de dc. xxx episcoporum adversus Euticem abbatem et Dioscorum.
490. Hoc tempore beatus Mamertus, episcopus Viennensis, solennes letanias instituit rogationum.
528. Hoc tempore Dionisius in urbe R. circulum paschalem composuit. Tunc Priscianus profunda grammatica rimatus est.
591. Gregorius papa; hic augmentavit in predicatione canonem Diesque nostras in tua pace disponas.
596. Hoc tempore monasterium sancti Benedictia Longobardis destructum est.
625. Hic ciclus Dionisii quinque decennovenalibus constans, hoc est xcv annis, sumitque exordium a xxx<sup>o</sup> anno Incarnationis Domini, et desinit in dc. xxvi anno. Hic ordo decennovenalis quem Graeci Ennia Kaið Johannes papa Kaderida vocat, a Scis patribus in Nicea sinodo fuit constitutus, in quo xiiii luna Paschalis omni anno sine ulla dubitatione.
- \*769. Initium regni Karoli regis.
778. Karolus in Hispanias intravit. Karolus Saxoniam venit. Karolus Pampileniam urbem destruxit, atque Cesar Augustam, exercitum suum conjunxit, et acceptis obsidibus, subjugatis Sarracenis per Narbonam Wasconiam Franciam rediit.
788. Karolus per Alemanniam venit ad fines Bavariae.
- \*800. Karolus rex imperator factus est, et a Romanis appellatus Augustus; qui illos qui Leonem papam dehonestaverant morte damnavit,

sed precibus papae morte indulta exilio retrusit. Ipse enim papa Leo imperatorem eum sacraverat.

810. Karolus cum Niceforo imperatore Constantinopoli pacem fecit.  
 812. Cireneus Karolo imperatori legatos suos cum pace mittit. \*Karolus imperator obiit. [This last entry also occurs in Anglo-Saxon both in E and F with the additional statement that he reigned 45 years.]  
 \*876. Rollo cum suis Normaniam penetravit et regnavit annis liii. [This is translated in F, which makes his reign 50 years.]  
 \*928. Willelm suscepit regnum et xv annis regnavit. [This is also translated in F.]  
 \*942. Et Ricardus vetus suscepit regnum, et regnavit an. lii. [This is in F in Latin.]  
 \*994. Hic Ricardus vetus obiit et Ricardus filius ejus suscepit regnum, et regnavit xxxi an.

In MS. E, the Peterborough chronicle, we thus have a series of entries, all written in Latin, some of which are in Henry of Huntingdon, interspersed in the Anglo-Saxon text. They deal mainly with foreign affairs, and it is important to ascertain whether they were interpolated by the Peterborough chronicler or were present in the mother manuscript EE. For this purpose the Waverley Annals are useful, for they contain seven of these entries comprising all the Latin entries in MS. E after the year 1000. I will put them side by side.

They nearly all occur also in different words in Henry of Huntingdon, shewing that they were derived from the same Latin source. I will now extract the later Latin entries in MS. E and put them alongside those in the Waverley Annals, marking with an asterisk those also contained in Henry of Huntingdon.

#### MS. E OF THE CHRONICLE.

1024. Hic Ricardus secundus obiit. Ricardus filius ejus regnavit prope uno anno, et post eum regnavit Rodbertus frater ejus viii annos. [MS. F has the same entry in Latin without any corresponding Saxon.]

1031. Rodbertus comes obiit in peregrinatione, et successit rex Willelmus in puerili aetate.

[MS. F has translated this Latin phrase in its vernacular part thus: And Rodbert, eorl of Normandi, ferde to Jerlm and þar wearð dead and Willelm ðe was siððan cing on Englande feng to Normandi ðaeh he cild waere.]

#### THE WAVERLEY ANNALS.

\*1024. Hoc anno obiit Ricardus secundus, comes Normanniae, post quem Ricardus filius ejus prope uno anno regnavit et post eum frater Robertus ejus viii annis. [This annal is again repeated in the form it has in Robert de Monte in 1026.]

\*1035. Obiit Robertus dux Normanniae, pater Willelmi Bastard qui Angliam acquisivit.

[In Henry of Huntingdon the entry is put in 1031 as in MS. E of the Chronicle.]

1046. Bellum apud Uallium Dunas.

1054. Bellum apud mare mortuum.

1056. Hic Henricus Romanorum imperator obiit, cui successit filius ejus Henricus. [This and the entry in 1062 are the only two instances in which Thorpe has recorded these Latin entries in E.]

1060. Hic Henricus rex Francorum obiit, cui successit Phylippus filius ejus.

1062. Hoc anno subjugata est Cynomannia comiti Normanniae Willelmo.

1047. Hoc anno fuit bellum apud Valesdune.

\*1054. Hoc anno bellum fuit apud Mortuum Mare. Henry of Huntingdon says 'apud castrum quod vocatur Mortuum Mare.'

1056. Henricus imperator obiit, et post eum filius ejus Henricus imperat.

\*1062. Defuncto Henrico rege Francorum et [cum] Philippus filius ejus regnaret Willelmus dux Normannorum subjugavit sibi Cenomanniam.

It is perfectly plain, therefore, that these Latin entries in MS. E were contained in the common mother manuscript of E and F, the Waverley Annals, and Henry of Huntingdon. This is interesting because we know whence they were derived, namely from the annals of Rouen, as was first pointed out by Theopold in his *Kritische Untersuchung*.

The only early manuscript of these annals of Rouen which has been recorded is now lost. Wyon d'Haronval had seen a manuscript, possibly of the twelfth century, which was consulted by M. l'Abbé, after which he published the greater part of the annals. It was written in one hand till 1087, and is supposed to have been the original. We are now dependent for its text on two manuscripts of the fifteenth and sixteenth century respectively, now in the Paris library. M. Delisle, the best of judges, thinks that the annals were compiled early in the twelfth century, and explains (if the fact needs explanation) that none of the entries from them are contained in the earlier manuscripts of the chronicle, of which B ends in 977, C in 1066, A in 1070, and D in 1080. All the foreign Latin annals in question were taken over from the Rouen annals, and were no doubt all contained in EE.

Mr. Plummer raises a doubt about one of them having been a Rouen annal, namely that about Faramund in 425, but in this he is mistaken.

There are three other Latin annals in E, which relate purely to English affairs, and do not come from the Rouen annals, namely :

890 Hic Plegemundus archiepiscopus a Deo et omni populo electus est.

892. Hic obiit Wulfhere Norðanhymbrorum archiepiscopus.

964. Hic expulsi sunt canonici de veteri monasterio.

The first of these three annals occurs in A as an insertion, but it has been translated there into Anglo-Saxon. It also occurs in F, and in Henry of Huntingdon.

The second one occurs as an insertion in F, but not in Henry of Huntingdon. The third is contained as an original entry both in A and F with additional matter, and was doubtless a Canterbury notice. It is also contained in Henry of Huntingdon.

It is very probable that all three entries were contained therefore in EE. If so, they prove that EE must have been compiled at the beginning of the twelfth century, and add increased certainty to other evidence that down to 1121 MS. E is clearly a scribe's copy of a manuscript which ended in that year or soon after. The question whether EE ended in 1121 or a few years later has been debated, notwithstanding the fact that the writing ended in 1121, and it will be well to devote a few words to the issue which has been raised between Mr. Luard and Dr. Plummer on the subject.

I have discussed the question at some length in the first paper of this series,<sup>1</sup> but the matter deserves further treatment. Down to the end of 1221 MS. E, as we have seen, is written in one hand. That hand stops with the close of that annal, and it is virtually certain that when this scribe wrote, EE terminated at that point. There are reasons, however, for supposing that certain entries in the succeeding years in chronicle E are to be partially equated with those in the Latin chronicles above described, but this does not mean a common source for the two texts in these annals. In regard to the Waverley Annals there is a very notable change at the same point. While up to this period they follow the text of E very closely, this relationship gets very much less marked in the subsequent annals. Let us analyse these annals in E, etc. which follow the year 1121.

In the very long entry in MS. E, dated 1122, we only have one short sentence which is alike in it and

<sup>1</sup> *Archaeological Journal*, lxx, 124. et seqq.

the Latin annals, the rest of the annal is quite different. I will put side by side the parts which correspond :

## MS. E. OF THE CHRONICLE.

1122. On this geare weas se king  
Heanri on Christes maessan on  
Northwic and on Pasches he weas on  
Northhamtune and on thone lenten  
tyde þær toforen forbearn se burch  
on Gleaweceastre.

þeos ilce geares forðferde Raulf  
seo aercebiscop of Cantwarbyrig,  
*and waes on þæs dæies xiii<sup>o</sup> k.  
Novemb.*

1123. In this year again we have  
a very long annal in MS. E of the  
chronicle, only four short clauses  
of which correspond to the entry  
in the Waverley Annals, viz.

1. On þyssum geare waes se king  
Henri on Christes tyde aet  
Dunestaple.

2. The picturesque notice in MS.  
E of the death of the bishop of Salis-  
bury is told quite differently with  
quite different incidents in the  
Waverley Annals and by Henry of  
Huntingdon.

3. The same is true of the story of

## WAVERLEY ANNALS.

Henry of Huntingdon has a  
partial resemblance to E in this  
clause: MCXXII anno vicesimo secundo  
regis Henrici, rex fuit ad Natale  
apud Norwic et ad Pascha apud  
Norhamtune et ad Pendecosten ad  
Windleshores duobus diebus, et inde  
ivit apud Westmonasterium.

The resemblance of the beginning  
of this notice is of small moment,  
since both notices, doubtless, come  
from the official royal itinerary,  
which was common property, but  
the divergence of the concluding  
clause shews there was no real  
connexion between E and Henry  
of Huntingdon in this annal.

Eodem anno obiit Rodolphus  
archiepiscopus Cantuariæ.

This clause occurs in the same  
words in Henry of Huntingdon.  
In both cases the notable thing is  
the omission of the supplementary  
words as italicised in MS. E.  
The other clause must have been  
common form with all the an-  
nalists, dealing as it does with such  
a famous person as the archbishop.

In the Waverley Annals the words  
are :

Rex fuit ad Natale apud Dun-  
stapal et inde ivit ad Berchamstede.

In Henry of Huntingdon :

Anno vero huic proximo fuit rex  
ad Natale apud Dunstapele et  
inde perrexit ad Berchamstede.

Here again we have an entry  
from the king's itinerary, which is  
more complete in the Latin annals  
than in MS. E.

The story referred to in the  
adjoining column is told in the  
same way, and for many lines in  
the same words in the Waverley

William of Corbeil, as told in MS. E, while the two later annalists merely mention his appointment.

4. Later in the same year MS. E of the chronicle says: *Da hwile se aerceþ waes út of lande, geaf se kyng ðone biscoprice of Baðe þes cwenes canceler, Godefreid waes gehaten. . . .*

*Da sone paeraefter ferde se king to Winceastre and waes ealle Eastren tyde paere and þa hwile þ þe he þær waes þa geaf he þone biscoprice of Lincolne an clerc Alexander waes gehaten. He waes þes biscopes nefe of Searesbyrig. þis he dyde eall for þes biscopes luuen.*

The account of the king's troubles in Normandy is told in a different way, with different names among the chief actors in MS. E, which is much more full than in the Latin annals of Waverley and Henry of Huntingdon.

1124. The story of the capture of the count of Mellant, which is told at great length in MS. E of the chronicle, is reported in the baldest epitome, and in a different way in the annals of Waverley and by Henry of Huntingdon.

The obits of pope Calixtus and of Ernulf, bishop of Rochester, and previously abbot of Peterborough, are named in the Waverley Annals as in Henry of Huntingdon, but the latter do not give the days of their deaths, which are given in the chronicle.

1125. The story of the infamous cardinal, John of Crema, is told in a different way, and with variations in the Latin annalists.

Annals, and by Henry of Huntingdon. In both cases, doubtless, it also comes from Robert de Monte.

Here again the Waverley Annals and Henry of Huntingdon agree almost verbally.

The Waverley annalist says: *Et episcopatum Batoniae Godefrido cancellario reginae.*

Henry of Huntingdon says: *Dedit etiam rex episcopatum Bathae Godefrido cancellario reginae.*

In both cases the statement, differently worded, is imperfect, and the matter was one of common knowledge.

In the Waverley Annals we read: *Ad Pascha apud Wintoniam dedit episcopatum Lincolniae Alexandro, nepoti Rogeri episcopi Salisberi.*

Henry of Huntingdon says: *Ad Pascha vero apud Wincestre dedit episcopatum Lincoliae Alexandro venerabile viro.* This again lacks the detail of the story in the chronicle, and is a bald statement of what must have been a well-known fact.

The story in the Waverley Annals and Henry of Huntingdon is identical and is largely in the same words.

These were both famous men, and it is not likely their obits would be omitted by a chronicler. The mere mention of their deaths without a death-day points to their source not having been the chronicle.

The Waverley Annals say that John of Crema held his council at Westminster, while in the chronicle and in Henry of Huntingdon it is said to have been at London. The scandals reported about him by Henry are not mentioned in MS. E.

Later in the same year is the account of the visit of W(illiam) archbishop of Canterbury, T(hurstun) of York, A(lexander) of Lincoln, bishop J(ohn) of Lothian, and the abbot G(eoffrey) of St. Albans.

1126. In this year we have one phrase only in common between MS. E of the chronicle and the Latin annalists, and as will be seen the contents differ entirely in details. In MS. E we read of Henry the king: Mid him com se cwen and his dohter þ he aeror hafde given pone kasere Heanri of Loherenge to wife.

1127. In this long annal we have two sentences only which resemble either in form or matter the two Latin annalists. The first one reads: Des ilces gaeres on pone lenden tide waes se eorl Karle of Flandres ofslagen on ane circe, þaer he laei and, baed hine to Gode to for pone wæcfode amang þane messe fram his agene manne.

J. of Lothian is styled Johannes Glesgoensis in the Waverley Annals, which adds the abbot of Shirborne to the other names, while it also gives the names at length: the chronicle gives only initials, as does Henry of Huntingdon: the latter also omits the bishop of Lothian and the abbot of St. Albans.

In the annals of Waverley we read: Adduxit siquidem secum filiam suam Matildem imperatricem, tanto viro, ut praedictum est, viduatam. Quam cum vellent in patria illa animo libenti retinere dominam, noluit.

Henry of Huntingdon says: Adduxit siquidem secum filiam suam imperatricem, tanto viro, ut praedictum est viduatam. Here the exact equation of the words will again be noted.

In the Waverley Annals we read: Karolus comes Flandrensis occisus est in templo quodam ab hominibus suis apud Brige.

Henry of Huntingdon, from whom this statement is no doubt taken, says that Henry was holding a court at Wodestoke, ubi nuntius dixit ei, Karolus comes Flandrensis tibi dilectissimus nefanda proditioe occisus est a proceribus suis in templo apud Brige. It is quite plain that this could not have been derived from the statement in the opposite column, and that the two Latin Annals equate with each other.

This is the last notice in MS. E which has anything in common with the entries in the Waverley Annals and in Henry of Huntingdon. It will be seen that the facts will not support those who claim that either the Waverley annalist or Henry of Huntingdon took their annals, from 1121 to 1127, from MS. E, or its mother EE, and that the common matter they have, ends as Mr. Plummer has urged, in 1121. The few cases in which a resemblance occurs, refer for the most part to incidents of importance which were necessarily mentioned by every chronicler, while their details generally



differ. The identity of language in several cases between Henry of Huntingdon and the Waverley annalist is explained by the phrases quoted having been derived directly by the latter from the former. They also give us greater confidence in the closeness with which the Latin annals of Waverley follow their original in other cases.

It is plain, therefore, that MS. EE of the Chronicle ended in 1121, and we have no evidence that it extended any further, and we may be confident that it is substantially represented by E as far as the first handwriting of that manuscript extends.

It is plain, therefore, that in or about the year 1121 a copy of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle was compiled, which has been preserved for us (saving the interpolation and certain scribes' errors), in MS. E. Where this compilation took place we do not know. The internal evidence is very obscure on the subject. All we can say is that during its last twenty-five years this text is almost entirely concerned with affairs in the south of England, and hardly concerns itself with affairs in the north; and secondly that there are a few entries which seem to point to its having been put together by a man from Berkshire, even if written elsewhere. These entries show an intimate knowledge of local matters in that county, and I will quote them.

1098. Dises geares eac to þam sumeran innan Barrucscire aet Finchamstaede an mere blod weol, lswa swa manige trywe men sædan þe hit ge seon sceoldan.

1100. to þam Pentecosten waes gesewen innan Barrucscire aet anan tune blod weallan of eorþan swa swa maenige sædan þe ge seon sceoldan.

1103. On þisum geare eac aet Heamstede innan Barrucscire waes gesewen blod of eorðan.

Let us now turn to MS. D. A very cursory examination of MS. E makes it clear that in a considerable part of its text it is closely allied not merely in matter, but in language, to the manuscript known as Tib. B. iv in the Cottonian Library, generally called MS. D; while in the same portions of its text E is remote in its language, and varies considerably in its text from A, B, C and G. There can be no doubt of the close relationship therefore

of E and D, and it is necessary to examine and dissect the latter if we are to make due progress in our inquiry.

The most noticeable feature about MS. D is that it contains two lacunae, the result of mutilation, one in the midst of its text and extending for a great many years, namely from the end of A.D. 189 to the middle of A.D. 693, the other at the end of the manuscript where it ends in a broken sentence. It begins with an introduction like E and F, and goes on to 1079, and is written in several hands.

A final and detached entry, although dated by mistake in 1080, describes an event which really happened in 1130, namely the rebellion of Angus, earl of Moray.

The first change in the handwriting, says Mr. Plummer (on the authority of Sir George Warner), must have taken place somewhere in the middle of the present hiatus, for the handwriting before is different to that after the gap. Another alteration took place in 1016 where a new hand begins in D at the top of fol. 68 recto, in the middle of a phrase, *Daer ahte Cnut sige and gefeaht him wið ealle Engla-peode*,<sup>1</sup> which shows that the change of handwriting was merely that of the scribe. The next change is similar: it occurs in the annal for 1052, also in the middle of a sentence<sup>2</sup> and at the top of a page, fol. 73 v°. The next writer also begins a new page, i.e. at the top of fol. 74 v°, and also in the year 1052 and in the very middle of a narrative, and again ends in the middle of a sentence, almost at the bottom of fol. 75 v°, near the beginning of 1054. Here starts a new hand and takes it on to fol. 77 v° at the beginning of 1061, after the word 'pallium,' again in the midst of an uncompleted sentence. It seems that the hand changes again at fol. 78 v° in the annal of 1065, at a word which is only halfway through the sentence. Another change, also in the same annal, occurs at the word 'Westminster,' which is at an incompleted phrase. Lastly, there is a change again at 1071 on fol. 82 v° with the word 'cynge.'<sup>3</sup> This handwriting takes us to the end of the manuscript, except the last entry, which was made many years later. By a piece of good fortune it therefore turns out that every handwriting in this

<sup>1</sup> Plummer, *A. S. Cbr.* i, p. 152.

<sup>2</sup> *ibid.* p. 175.

<sup>3</sup> *ibid.* p. 204.

manuscript, except the last, affords us evidence that the scribes were only the transcribers of the document. All the scribes doubtless wrote it continuously at one time, after the work had been completed by the compiler. With the exception of the last three or four annals, the book, as it stands, was therefore clearly not composed contemporaneously, but was a compilation drawn from several sources, doubtless by the same compiler whose draft was written out by several hands.

Excluding the entry above mentioned, MS. D ends with a mutilated sentence, and the folio on which it is written is only half a leaf, the rest having been cut away. Mr. Plummer adds an interesting fact, viz. 'that the last entry on fol. 85 v<sup>o</sup>', 1078, is very imperfect, and as there is no defect or abrasion of the vellum this shows that the scribe had something before him which he could not read, possibly a manuscript of which the last page was partially abraded. This, as he says, further shows that D, even in its latest part, is not an original, but is copied from some other manuscript.

While MS. D practically ends in 1078, this is not the date when it was written. On this Mr. Plummer has some acute remarks. He refers to the evidence that the writer of D (or rather the mother of D) had access to some life of Margaret of Scotland. From this he says there is an evident insertion in 1067, where it breaks the connexion of the original annal, and has seriously misled chronologists who did not notice the character of the interpolation. The details in 1075 probably came from the same source, and probably also the account of Margaret's father in 1057. The evident anxiety of the compiler in 1067 to trace Margaret's descent from the royal house of Wessex shows that the insertion was not made until after the marriage of her daughter, Edith Matilda, to Henry I in 1100. It answers exactly to the remark of E on the occasion of that marriage that the bride was 'of the right kingly kin of England.'<sup>1</sup> This is not all. The same writer adds: another mark of late editing in this part of the chronicle is the reflection in 1065 D, 1064 E, that the shires, ravaged by the northern

<sup>1</sup> *op. cit.* ii, lxviii.

insurgents, were 'many winters the worse' 'wurdan fela wintra ðe wyrzan' and of the phrase 'á syððan hit yflade swiðe', in 1066 D, ad fin. which implies later experience. He also notes the use of the late words 'corona,'<sup>1</sup> where E has the native phrase, 'to cynge gehalgode,' and the territorial designation 'Englandes' in 1017 D, where C and E have preserved the older 'Angelcynnes'; the forms of names and words, he adds, are often later in D than E.

It is plain, therefore, that D, like E and F, instead of being in any sense a contemporary document, was not written until at least twenty and probably thirty or more years after the concluding sentence of its regular narrative as now preserved, and that like E and F it is a document of the twelfth century.

It is further plain that D is in no sense an original document, but from end to end (excluding the detached entry of 1130) it is a mere scribe's copy of a now lost manuscript. Not only is it a scribe's copy but a very bad copy, full of mistakes and of lacunae due to blunders and carelessness. On this subject Mr. Plummer is most emphatic, and I think he has made the conclusion unassailable. The lost copy I would call DD, as I named the mother of E, EE.

As I have said, there is a very close tie between a large portion of E and D. What was the nature of this tie? It will be noticed in a cursory examination that while down to a late date the text of E is incorporated largely verbatim in D, there are large sections of D covering the same period which have no place in E, and it follows inevitably that while the author of D or rather DD must have had a manuscript like E before him, it is not possible to suppose that the writer of E had a manuscript like D before him, that is to say, that E or EE was one of the sources of D, but neither D nor DD was a source of E or EE. It is therefore plain that for the criticism of the text of E that of D, which is written in the same language and even dialect as E, is invaluable. Especially does it become so if, as seems possible, we can correct the mistakes in D and thus restore its mother MS. DD

<sup>1</sup> Under the year 1066. See also the phrase 'sette on prisun,' 1076 D, compared with 'gefestnode hine' in E.

to comparative purity. In the first place then it would seem probable that the gaps in D, both in the midst of the text and at the end, already existed in DD, when the latter was copied, for, as we have seen, D was copied from a rubbed and frayed text, which alone existed in the beginning of the twelfth century when D was written. Originally DD was no doubt intact from end to end.

Let us now compare the two Anglo-Saxon texts of D and E, and also where necessary the Latin text of Henry of Huntingdon, to try and cure their several defects and thus attain a pure text.

The two begin with a preface written in the same language, in which they are followed by F, though the latter omits the last sentence in the other two. In this preface D condenses the 'Brittisc' and 'Wylsc' of E into 'Brytwylsc,' and it writes 'Scottysc' where E and F have 'Scyttisc.' E and D both add another language to those usually mentioned as used in Britain, namely Bocleden or book Latin, which is omitted by F both in the Anglo-Saxon and the Latin version. Inasmuch as all three manuscripts, however, speak of the peoples being five only, it shows that D is right in condensing Bryhtwylsc into one word. Both E and F omit a sentence contained in D, namely 'cwaedon þæt hi ne mihton ealle aet gædere gewunian þær and þa.' This is a mistake due to the repetition of the word 'cwaedon,' which immediately follows 'þa' in D, and it shows that D's text of EE was here more correct than E.

In the second section of the preface E and F have 'scipum' for 'ceolum,' and 'pilum' for 'staengum,' while E has 'faerstenum' (a clear mistake) for 'westenum,' in all three of which places D seems to preserve the earliest reading.

Let us now pass to the annals down to where the gap in D occurs.

In the year 1 Octavian is made to reign LVI years in E, as in F and A, while B, C, and D all have LXVI. On the other hand D is alone in saying that Christ was born in the year LII of Octavian, while all the other five manuscripts say XLII. Henry of Huntingdon says LV.

2. E condenses the entries distributed between the years 2 and 3 in A, B, C, D, and F, which, no doubt, preserve the older reading.
6. E has by mistake the number XI for VI, in the date of the annal.

12. E and F omit 'Lysiam' or 'Lissian,' which is contained in A, B, C, and D.
30. E and F omit the words 'and Philippum' which are in A, B, C, and D.
47. D has 'Octobus' in mistake for 'Actibus.' Both D and E have a passage about a famine in Syria and the succession of Claudius by Nero not found in any other copy of the Chronicle. The same two manuscripts omit the reference to Orcadus or Orcanie in this year, contained in A, B, C, and F.
71. E by omitting 'sunu' makes 'Vespasian' the *nomen* of Titus, a mistake avoided by all the other manuscripts.
155. D here has Aurelianus for Aurelius in A and E.
167. Here D, E, and F have an additional short clause about Diocletian which has been interpolated in A but is not in B or C.
189. E has 'Geza' by mistake for 'Geta,' which is rightly given in D. In D, E, and F, the clause about the Wall as contained in B and C is thus amplified: 'þa gewrohte he weall mid turfum and bred weall ðaer on ufon fram sae to sae Britwalum to gebeorge.' The passage about Geta is not in B, C, or F at all.

From the year 189 to 693 we cannot compare the two texts of D and E since, as I have said, there is a gap in D caused by the destruction of several pages of the manuscript. When D starts again we find the accordance of the two texts completely maintained except in slight details, and we cannot doubt that if we had D in a perfect condition it would in this gap be represented by the same text as we have in E, with two exceptions. The first is the series of notices derived from the Rouen annals, and occurring in Latin in that chronicle, but not in D; secondly the presence of a number of pedigrees in D, which, as we have argued, were struck out in EE. In these respects D no doubt followed C and E, in the portion of its text now represented by the gap, just as it does after the gap where the pedigrees occur in D, but are missing in E. It will be well to note the years in which these pedigrees occur (during the gap in D) in B and C: 547, 552, 560, 577, 597, 611, 626, 647, 670, 674, 676, 685, 688. In MS. A these pedigrees were also originally contained in all these years, but they have been erased in 547, and partially in 552, in 560, 611, and 626. They still remain in 597, 647, 670, 674, 676, 685 and 688.

It is curious that, while in MS. E the pedigrees have been omitted in all these years, the pedigree of the descendants of Hengist and Horsa of Kent is inserted

in that manuscript in a year (449) where it does not occur in B and C, and where it is only a later insertion in A. This pedigree, which is omitted by F, is preceded by a narrative taken from Bede, i, 15, not given by any of the other copies of the chronicle at this point, and with a legend about Wyrtegeorn and the Picts, once existing no doubt both in D and EE, which I think it well to transcribe here.

Se cynging Wyrtegeorn gef heom land on suðan eastan ðissum lande. wið ðan þe hi sceoldon feohton wið Pyhtas. Heo þa fuhton wið Pyhtas and heofdon sige swa hwer swa heo comon. Hy ða sendon to Angle, heton sendon mara fultum and heton heom secgan Brytwalana naht-scipe and þes landes cysta. Hy ða sona sendon hider mare weored þam oðrum to fultume. Ða comon þa men of þrim megðum Germanie. Of Ald Seaxum of Anglum of Jotum. Of Jotum comon Cantwara and Wihtwara þ is seo megð þe nu eardap on Wiht and þ cyn on West Sexum þe man nu git haet Jutna cynn. Of Eald Seaxum coman East Seaxa and Sud Sexa and West Sexa. Of Angle comon se a syððan stod westig betwix Jutum and Seaxum. East Engla, Middel Angla, Mearca and ealla Norphymbra. Heora heretogan waeron twegen gebroðra Hengest and Horsa. þ waeron Wihtgilse suna. Wihtgilse waes Witting and Witta Wecting. Wecta Wodning. Fram þan Wodne awoc eall ure cynecynn and Suðanhymbra eac.

MS. E has also a short pedigree of the Northumbrian kings under the year 593, not contained in A, B, and C, but once doubtless in D, showing that the absence of pedigrees in E in the other cases was accidental. It reads<sup>1</sup> 'Aedelferð feng to rice on Norðhymbrum se waes Aeðelricing, Aeðelric Iding.'

We will now turn to that part of manuscript E covering the gap in Tiberius IV (i.e. MS. D). I shall take it for granted that all the entries in E confirmed by F and Henry of Huntingdon, but not in B and C, were once in D.

In the following analysis I shall omit all reference to the annals in E which are written in Latin, which, as I have shewn, came from the Rouen Annals, and also all the annals which occur in E in common with B and C, and have limited myself to those in which E differs from both B and C.

286 This notice about St. Alban is both in F and Henry of Huntingdon.

343 This annal is only in F, and has been inserted in E by Thorpe by mistake.

<sup>1</sup> *A. S. Chr.* under the year 449.



- 379 This annal in E about Gratian is in Henry of Huntingdon but not in F.
380. The latter part of this annal in E about Valentinian and Maximus, is not in B and C, but is in F and Henry of Huntingdon and was doubtless in D.
- In E the name 'Pelaies' is given by mistake for 'Pelagies' as in F.
409. The annal in E is like F in the first clause, except that E speaks of 'Romana burh' where F has 'Rome seo burh.' E alone mentions the fact that the capture of Rome by the Goths was eleven hundred and ten winters after it was built. The next short clause about no Roman having since ruled in Britain is in B, C, and F. The last clause in E contains a mistake. It says of the Romans, 'Ealles hi ðaer rixodan 1111 hund wintra and hund seofenti wintra siððan Gaius Julius þ land erost gesohte.' The hundred and seventy years of this last phrase ought to be 'LXX geara' as in F. With this exception E's text probably represents what D was in this year. Henry of Huntingdon gives the two dates just quoted from Cod. E as 1164 and 470.<sup>1</sup>
423. This notice of Theodosius in E is in F, but not in Henry of Huntingdon. It was doubtless in D.
430. Here E has 'Patricius' where all the other manuscripts and Henry of Huntingdon have 'Palladius.' This was doubtless a mistake of the scribe of E.
443. This is not in F but is in Henry of Huntingdon (i, 46), and was probably in D.
449. E, A, and F, and also Henry of Huntingdon agree in calling the emperor Martianus instead of Mauricius, which is given in B and C. It was doubtless in D. The latter part of this annal with the pedigree of the Kentish kings, etc. is not in F, but is given by Henry of Huntingdon and was probably in D.
456. E has 1111 instead of 1111, i.e. four instead of four thousand as in A, B, and C. It is followed by Henry of Huntingdon, and was doubtless in D.
488. There is a mistake in E of 34 years instead of 24 as in the other copies of the chronicle. The mistake is also in Henry of Huntingdon and was probably in D.
508. In this year E, F, and Henry of Huntingdon have 'Nazaleod and Nazanleog' for 'Natanleod and Natanleag' in A, B, and C. This mistake was probably, therefore, in D, or at all events in EE.
519. E has an additional short clause not in any other manuscript, i.e. 'And siððan rixodan West Seaxna cynebarn of þam daege.'
527. E and Henry of Huntingdon have 'Certicesford' instead of 'Cerdices leag' as in A, B, and C, and the mistake was therefore doubtless in EE and in D.
530. Henry of Huntingdon agrees with E in the words 'feala manna' for 'fea men,' which occur in A, B, C, while E and Henry of Huntingdon agree together against A, B, and C in writing 'Wihtland' for 'Wihte ealand.' F has 'Wiht þ ealand.'

<sup>1</sup> op. cit. I, ch. 45.



534. The same use of *Wihhtland* again occurs in E. D probably agreed in both places with A, B, and C.
534. E and A make *Cynric* reign 27 years; B, C, and F have 26 years.
547. E agrees with A, B, and C in the first clause. It then continues 'And rixade xii gear and he getimbrade Bebbanburh sy waes aerost mid hegge betined and þær aefter mid wealle.' Eight words of this clause also occur in F. The entry is also in Henry of Huntingdon and in Gaimar (lines 930-934), and was doubtless in D. B, C, and Henry of Huntingdon have a pedigree of *Ida* in this annal. That of *Cynric* in 552 is omitted by Henry of Huntingdon; both were doubtless in D.
559. B and C have a pedigree of *Aelle* in this year which is not in E, but it is given by Henry of Huntingdon, and was doubtless in D.
560. The words '*Idan forðgefarenum and hyra aegðer rixade xxx wintra*' in E are in F but not in B and C and Henry of Huntingdon, and were perhaps in D.
565. The clause '*Her feng Aethelbriht to Cantwara rice*' in E is also in F, Henry of Huntingdon, and Gaimar (lines 951-955). The addition in E '*On his dagum sende Gregorius us fulluht*' is only in F and Gaimar. The rest of the clause in E has been interpolated in A and F. The substance of it about *St. Columba* and *St. Ninian* is contained in Henry of Huntingdon (iii, 36), and in Gaimar (961-971).
568. In E and F '*Oslac*' is given for '*Oslaf*' in A, B, and C; Henry of Huntingdon has '*Cutha*' where A, B, C have '*Cuðulf*.' In this Henry of Huntingdon agrees with E. Both also make *Cutha* the brother of *Ceawlin*, so also Gaimar (981). This annal does not occur in F. D doubtless here agreed with E.
571. '*Se Cuða was Ceawline's broðor*' only occurs in E and Henry of Huntingdon.
583. E and F alone give the accession of the emperor *Maurice*. Henry of Huntingdon does not mention it.
584. Henry of Huntingdon is against all the chronicles in giving '*Cuthwin*.' for '*Cutha*,' and is doubtless wrong.
591. E and A make *Ceolric* (called '*Ceol*' by A, B, and C, but '*Ceolric*' by Henry of Huntingdon) reign 6 years, while A, B, and C make him reign 5; so does Henry of Huntingdon, who makes him die in 590. There is no entry in F this year. In both cases D was doubtless like E.
592. '*Her Gregorius feng to papdome on Rome*.' This entry is not in F nor Henry of Huntingdon. It is from *Bede*, and was probably in D.
593. E has a pedigree of three links of the Northumbrian kings. This is not in F nor Henry of Huntingdon.
603. The first clause in 603 in E was once in A, B, and C. It was erased from B and C. E has '*Deolreda*,' where A has '*Daelreoda*.' The latter is right. It is not in F nor in Henry of Huntingdon. The annal is condensed in Gaimar (lines 1011-1021), and was probably in D.

604. This annal is in E and F but not in Henry of Huntingdon. In B and C there is only a short sentence about Augustine's mission. E has the additional clause about Rochester 'Seo is xxiiii mila fram Dorwitceastre.' It was probably in D. The annal is given at length in Gaimar (1021-1030 and 1059-1080).
605. The first clause in E occurs in the Anglo-Saxon of F; the rest only in the Latin text of the latter. The annal seems to be divided between chapters 2 and 3 in Henry of Huntingdon. It is given at length by Gaimar (1082-1094), who calls 'Scromail,' 'Brocmail,' which may be right. It was no doubt in D.
611. B and C have a short pedigree of Cynegils not in E, but it is in Henry of Huntingdon and was doubtless in D.
616. The first sentence only in E is in A, B, C, and F. This is followed in E and F by a long passage from Bede, and in different words in Henry of Huntingdon. It was doubtless in D. The annal is given in detail by Gaimar (1103-1140). Gaimar makes Ethelberht reign 63 years and not 55 years like MS. E.
617. This annal from Bede is only in A and E among the chronicles, but Gaimar gives it in full (1141-1154). Henry of Huntingdon has an amplified notice apparently taken directly from Bede. In E and in Gaimar alone have we the pedigree of Aethelfrid this year.
624. { These two annals are contained in F and amplified in Henry  
625. { of Huntingdon (iii, 22). In the latter E adds the date of  
consecration of Paulinus as xii kl. Augt. This was doubtless  
in D.
626. This long annal, which is in Gaimar (1168-1218), is not in F nor in Henry of Huntingdon. It was doubtless in D. Henry of Huntingdon merely gives the last clause with the accession of Penda and the length of his reign, and the attempt on Edwin by Cwichelme.
627. This annal in E is given in F and also in Henry of Huntingdon (iii, 28). E's concluding sentence 'And he sende Scottum gewrit þ hi scoldon gecerran to rihtum Eastum' is not in F, but is in Henry of Huntingdon (iii, 32). The whole annal was doubtless in D.
633. This annal is given in detail by Gaimar (1225-1254), epitomised by F, and given almost entirely in Henry of Huntingdon (iii, 33). Its statements are repeated by Henry of Huntingdon (iii, 33), except the date of the battle of Hatfield, etc. on the Ides of October. F epitomises the annal. It was no doubt in D.
634. E writes 'Dearne rice' where Henry of Huntingdon has 'Provincia Deirorem.' It adds a phrase not in any of the other chronicles, nor in Henry of Huntingdon, namely 'þone Paulinus aer gefullode se waes Aelfrices sunu. Aedwines federan.' E calls 'Baernicum' what Henry of Huntingdon calls 'regnum Berniciorum.' All the rest of this annal in E, except one sentence, is in Henry of Huntingdon. This sentence is the last one, and reads 'man

gotealde him þ̅ nigonðe for þan heðenscipe þe hi drugon þe hi þet an gear rixodon betwix him and Eadwine.' The annal is epitomised in Gaimar (1267-1272). It is clear that this annal in E was also in D.

639. There are two annals entered in this year by E. The latter one ought to be dated 640 as in A, B, C, and F. Eadbald's reign is given as 24 years in E and F and also by Gaimar. A, B, C give it as 25, and Henry of Huntingdon as 23. The annal is given in detail in Gaimar (1273-1289), and was doubtless in D.
641. The whole annal is in Gaimar (1290-1312). He calls Bebbanburh 'Burg.' The first phrase in this annal in E is also in F, while Henry of Huntingdon has also the second one. The next passage is about Oswald, and in E it reads 'and his lic was bebyrged on Bearðan ege þaes halines and wundor waeron syddan manigfealde gecyðde geond ðis (for þcs) eglanð and his handa sindon on Bebbanburh unge brosnode': it is peculiar to E and not in Henry of Huntingdon, but was probably in D. E makes Kenwalh reign 21 years, while B, C, Henry of Huntingdon and Gaimar make him reign 31, which is right. The building of the church at Winchester by Kenwalh is dated in 642 by A, B, and C, but F also puts it in 641, adding that it was dedicated to St. Peter. These facts are not mentioned by Henry of Huntingdon. The succession of Oswald by his brother Oswiu and his reign of 28 years are not mentioned in any other copy of the chronicle, but are mentioned by Gaimar and by Henry of Huntingdon (iii, 39). All this annal, except the mistaken date, was doubtless in D.
643. The death-day of Paulinus is alone mentioned by E among the manuscripts of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, and is not in Henry of Huntingdon. Henry of Huntingdon alone with E mentions the succession of Oswine to Deira and his reign of 7 years (iii, 39).
647. In this year A, B, and C have a short pedigree of Cuthred not in E or F, but doubtless in D.
648. E has 'Eadrede' for 'Cuthred' as in A, B, and C. It is curious that Henry of Huntingdon agrees here with E, and calls him 'Aedred' (ii, 32). H translates the 'landes' of E by 'villas.' Where B and C say 'hida landes' E says simply 'landes', which is probably a mistake. It seems very probable that Eadrede was the name in D, and it may be right. He is called the 'maege of Kenwalh' in A, B, C, and E, which Henry of Huntingdon translates 'cognatus.'
- From 650 to 656 inclusive E and F are one year behind A, B, and C, in the dates of the annals. E alone gives the days of the month when king Oswine and bishop Aidan died, making the latter twelve days later than the former. This last phrase, about the 12 days, is also in Gaimar (line 1321).
652. In E Penda is by mistake put for Peada, which is given by A, B, and C and by Henry of Huntingdon in 653 (ii, 34).

<sup>1</sup> op. cit. ii, 31. For the rest of the annal see *ibid.* iii, 38.

653. The death of Anna is given in 653 in E and Henry of Huntingdon, and 654 in A, B, and C. The death of archbishop Honorius is given in E as 11 kal. October. The death-day is not in F nor in Henry of Huntingdon. In the Latin of F the notice of the death of Honorius is followed by the words 'Et Thomas eps ob. in Domnoc.'
654. A clause in E, not in A, B, and C, has apparently dropped out of F, i.e. 'and þa waeron sume ciningas ðere sum waes Aedelhere Annan broðer East Engla ciningas.' It is in Henry of Huntingdon (iii, 41), but not in Gaimar.
655. In this annal E and F are alike. Henry of Huntingdon mentions the same facts but does not give the date of the month. The annal is not contained in A, B, or C.
664. A passage in E is not in any other manuscript of the chronicle, but its contents are in Henry of Huntingdon, namely 'And on þam cwealme forðferde Tuda biscop and waes bebyrged on Wagele and Ercenbriht Cantwara cining forðferde and Ecgbriht his sunu feng to þam rice und Coleman mid his geferum for to his cyððe.' This is contained in Gaimar, 1374-1376. He calls Wagele 'Paggle' and gives the whole annal. Henry of Huntingdon (iii, 44) says Tuda was buried at Weinalet or Wemalet. The death of king Erconberht and the succession of Ecgberht is told by him in ii, 35, the withdrawal of Coleman in iii, 44. On Ceadda and Wilfred see *id.* iii, 44 and 45, and on the death of Deusdedit, ii, 35.
667. This annal is not in A, B, and C, but is in F and also in Henry of Huntingdon (ii, 35).
668. The sending of Theodore by Vitalian is mentioned in F. It is also mentioned by Gaimar. Henry of Huntingdon also names it (iii, 46).
670. The death-day of Oswiu is given in E as xv kal. Mar. This date is not mentioned in F, nor in Henry of Huntingdon nor by Gaimar. A, B, and C give the pedigree of Oswiu, which is not in E in this annal but was doubtless in D.
673. The name of Theodore, which is here given by E, F, and Gaimar, is omitted in A, B, and C. It is curious that Henry of Huntingdon has no details of the Synod of Hertford. He refers to the Synod and says he means to give details elsewhere, but apparently forgot (iv, 50).
675. F and Henry of Huntingdon omit Aescwine's patronymic as in E, but it is given by Gaimar (1412). It occurs in A, B, and C in the previous annal, where Aescwine's pedigree is also given. This pedigree is not in F nor in Henry of Huntingdon, but was doubtless in D. The same is true of the pedigree of Centwine in 676. 'Bedan heafde' in the chronicle is called 'Al Chef de Bede' by Gaimar (1416).
678. F omits the month on which the comet appeared in this year, so do Henry of Huntingdon (ii, 38) and Gaimar. The contents of the latter part of the annal, which are not in any of the other chronicles, are given by Henry of Huntingdon (iii, 48). Except

- the last clause where E says of Eadhed 'Se waes on Lindissi aerost biscopa,' the whole annal is in Gaimar (1433-1462). He calls Eadhed, bishop of the Lindisfaras, Hecca.
679. E says Aelfwine was killed near the Trent where Egferth and Aethelred (called Saint Edeldried by Gaimar) fought. Henry of Huntingdon states the same (ii, 38). E also says that Coludes burh (i.e. Coldingham) was burnt by fire from heaven. This is also mentioned among the chronicles by F only. It is stated by Gaimar (1470), not by Henry of Huntingdon. It was doubtless in D.
680. E, A, F, Henry of Huntingdon and Gaimar, 1473 and 1474, all mention Streoneshale as the death-place of St. Hilda, which is omitted by B and C.
681. In this annal E has 'Wihtum' in mistake for 'Pihtum.' E and F mention the consecration of Trumbriht as bishop of Hagustaldes ea (i.e. Hexham) and Trumwine of the Pihts (i.e. Picts), adding 'forpan hy hyrdon þa hider.' Gaimar makes no mention of it, but it is all stated by Henry of Huntingdon (iii, 48), and was doubtless in D.
684. E has an annal not in any other manuscript of the chronicle. It runs : 'Her on ðissum geare sende Ecgferð here on Scottas and Briht his ealdorman mid and earmliche hi Godes cyrican hyndan and baerndon.' Henry of Huntingdon, who describes these events, understands the Irish by these Scots and calls them 'Hibern,' (iv, 4). Gaimar, who epitomises the notice, calls them 'Escoteis' (1480). The entry was doubtless in D.
685. In this annal we have several statements not contained in other copies of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. The first sentence says that Ecgferð commanded (haet) that Cuðberht should be consecrated bishop, and he was consecrated bishop of Hexham (Hagustaldesham, whence Trumbriht had been deposed) by archbishop Theodore. Gaimar states all this (1485-1491), except the deposition of Trumbriht. Henry of Huntingdon has a slight reference to the facts here stated (iv, 21). The next notice in E, not in the other chronicles, is in reference to king Ecgferð of whom it says he was killed, 'be norðan sae and mycelne here mid him on xiii kal. Junii.' Gaimar, who mentions all this, says he was killed by the Orkney-men (Orkenan) in 1496. E goes on to say 'He waes xv winter cining and Aldfrid his broðor feng aefter him to rice.' This is in Gaimar (1499-1500) but is not mentioned by Henry of Huntingdon. The next sentence, also ignored by the other chronicles, runs, 'And man gehalgode Jofis on Agust' to biscope and he þær waes oððe Wilfrif in com. Syððan feng Jofnes to Ceastre biscopdome, forðan Bosa biscop waes forðfaren. þa waes Wilferð his preost syððan gehalgod Ceastre to biscope and for to his mynstre on Derawuda.' Gaimar precedes this statement, which is given at length, by the line 'En icel tens Heota' (i.e. Eata) and concludes it with the lines, 'E Seint Jon s'en est alé a Berverlai a son muster. Tant servi Deus que mult l'out cher'

- (op. cit. lines 1501-1514). None of this is in Henry of Huntingdon, but I have no doubt, like the rest of the annal, it was in D. A, B, and C all give a pedigree of Ecgferð this year.
686. In this annal E is like F, and also Henry of Huntingdon, but not Gaimar, mentions that it was pope Sergius who baptized king Ceadwala.
688. The latter's death-day, according to E and Henry of Huntingdon, was xii kal. Mar. It is also in Gaimar, E adding 'under Christes claðum', which in the Latin of F is translated 'Cum adhuc esset in albis.' This is not in the Anglo-Saxon of F. F speaks of St. Peter's 'mynstre,' where E calls it 'cyrican.' E concludes thus, 'And Ine feng to rice on Waest Saexna aefter him, se rixade xxvii wintra and syððan gewat to Rome and þær wunode oþ his ende daeg.' F also gives the reign of Ine as 27 years, while Gaimar gives it as 37 (1541), Henry of Huntingdon as 38, which is, of course, right. This annal without the mistake was doubtless in D. In A, B, and C, and also in Henry of Huntingdon, but not in E, there is a pedigree of Ine, which was doubtless also in D.
692. In this annal E has by mistake 'Nihtred' for 'Wihtred' in the clause 'Da waeron ii ciningas on Cent Nihtred and Waebheard.' This clause is only in E and F among the chronicles. It is rightly given in F and Henry of Huntingdon. Gaimar calls Waebheard Sunheart (1551). The annal is in F, Henry of Huntingdon, and Gaimar, and was doubtless in D.

We have now examined in some detail the entries in MS. E which correspond to the gap in MS. D between the years 189 and 693, and have seen no reason to doubt that with perhaps a few scribes' errors, or verbal changes, the text of E and EE during these years was like the mother text of D, almost verbatim. From the middle of the annal 693, MS. D is again intact, and from this point to 837 inclusive the texts of E and D go on side by side with scarcely any variation. The only variations are in fact scribes' errors or small omissions, and these I will now collect.

693. D has 'Drythelm,' and Gaimar 'Drothelm' (1554), for 'Brihtelm' in E, which last is wrong.
694. D has the pedigree of Wihtred, E as usual excludes it. Henry of Huntingdon also gives the pedigree, as do A, B, and C. Wihtred, according to E, reigned 23 years, Henry of Huntingdon says 32 years, and B, C, D, F, 33 years. E is clearly wrong.
697. The murder of Ostryde is only given in D, E and F. There is no annal in A, B, C, this year.
705. The death-day of Aldfrid and the succession of his son are only in D and E.

710. D has 'Sigbald' for 'Hygbald' in E. Gaimar (1633), also has 'Sibald.'
716. D has 'cining' for 'cininga' in E. Later on the latter omits the necessary word 'gecyrde.'
718. D has 'forferde' for 'forðferde,' which is right in E, and E has 'heo' for 'heora,' which is wrong.
725. D has 'xxxiiii wintra' for xxxiii in E and F. Gaimar also has xxxiiii.
726. E and Gaimar omit 'þy ilcan geare gefuhten Aepelheard and Oswald se aepelin,' and the pedigree of Oswald which occur in D, and also in A, B, and C. The statement and pedigree are both in Henry of Huntingdon (iv, 11). Gaimar by mistake has Ethelbert for Ethelheard.
- 729 & 731. D has two entries of the death of Osric and the accession of Ceolwulf, one in 729 worded as in E and F, and the other in 731, as in A, B, and C, showing that he had a manuscript of each class, doubtless E and C, when he wrote these two entries. Gaimar does not say Osric was killed but 'Oric li reis idonc fu mort,' (line 1723) and adds that he reigned eleven years: otherwise he gives the passage as in D, which is also in A, B, and C. Henry of Huntingdon mentions these events (iv, 11). A, B, and C also give Ceolwulf's pedigree, which is omitted by Henry of Huntingdon as well as by E. D in this annal, and in the annal of 734, calls Tatwine 'Tacwine' by mistake; Gaimar calls him 'Cathwine' (1740), Brihtwald's archbishopric is made to last 37 years in D and E, and 38 in Henry of Huntingdon.
737. 'Aepelwold' is written for 'Aethelbald' in E as in F, and also in D, Henry of Huntingdon (iv, 16), and Gaimar 1749.
740. E has 'Eadberht' for 'Cuðbryht' in A, B, C, D, F, and 'Saint Cuthbert' in Gaimar (1767). Henry of Huntingdon also has 'Eadberht' here.
743. D has 'gefulton' for 'gefuhton.'
744. E has 'Wilferð' for 'Hunferð' in A, B, C, and D, and also in Gaimar.
745. E has 'xlvi wintra' for xliii in A, B, C, and D. Henry of Huntingdon (iv, 17) also has xliii.
752. E has xxii instead of xii as in A, B, C, and D and Gaimar. Henry of Huntingdon has 'decimo tertio anno.'
755. E has several small verbal variants marked by Thorpe (p. 85 margin) affecting the syntax.
765. D has 'viii wintra' for E's 'eahta winter.' Henry of Huntingdon has viii, but Gaimar says 'nof anz' (1971).
766. D has xxxvii for E's xxxvi wintra. Henry of Huntingdon also has xxxvi.
768. D has xiii for xiiii in E, the death-day is not in Henry of Huntingdon.
774. D has 'Ortanford' for 'Ottanford' in E, so in Henry of Huntingdon, and 'Otteford' in Gaimar (line 1899).
779. D has 'Cynewulf' for 'Cynebald' in E. Henry of Huntingdon has 'Kinebold,' Gaimar has 'Kenewolf' (2010); E gives the same name as Cynewulf in A.D. 737.

785. D has five additional words not in E or F, 'And mid sibbe ongaen saende.'
788. D has 'Wincanheale' for 'Pincanheale' in E and F, Henry of Huntingdon has 'Wincenhale.' D adds that abbot Aldberht died 'in Hripum.' This is not mentioned elsewhere.
794. D has 'Wraen' for 'Praen' in A, B, C, D, E, and F. Gaimar calls him 'Edelbrith prist' (2210).
796. D has 'iiii kl. Agst.' for 'iiii idus Augusti' in E. Henry of Huntingdon does not give the death-day. E has 'Oþerbald' in mistake for 'oþærne Eanbalde.' D again has 'Wraen' for 'Praen.'
797. D has a concluding clause not in A, B, C, E, or F, 'xviii & Nouemb Heardred man gehalgode on his steal to biscop on iii kl. Novembris.' The obit is mentioned by Florence of Worcester in 798 but without the death-day. This is not in Henry of Huntingdon nor in Gaimar.
799. E has by mistake 'Aepelred' instead of 'Aepelheard,' as in all the other manuscripts of the chronicle and Henry of Huntingdon. D has 'for' for 'foran' as in E and other manuscripts.
800. D has 'Porr' for 'Worr' in A, B, C, and E.  
D has by mistake two entries in 801 and 802 of the election of Beormod to the see of Rochester. A, B, C, E, and F put it in 802. The first notice in D is dated in 801 like C. It is in form like that in A, B, and C, while the second is like that in E and F with more details.
801. {
802. {
838. E is vacant this year, and D borrows an annal from C, but it contains three errors. Ecgbryht is given as the name of the ealdorman, instead of Herebriht, 'aepenum' instead of 'haepenum,' and 'Myrcwarum,' instead of 'Merscwarum,' all bad mistakes and doubtless due to some more or less illiterate scribe. Gaimar has no trace of this annal. Henry of Huntingdon has it, and calls the hero of it Herebertus (v, 1). It was doubtless derived from MS. C.
- After this interlude D and E again continue with slight variants close together down to 890, and I will now point out these small differences.
855. D contains a long pedigree of Ethelwulf which is not in E, except the concluding clause, which, as it stands in E, is incomplete and contains a serious mistake, since it makes Ethelbald the son of Ecgbriht, and calls him Ecgbrihting, confusing him with Ethelwulf, and shewing that it was a mistake of the scribe which resulted from his cutting out the pedigrees. Mr. Plummer has omitted this phrase but it is given by Thorpe. The pedigrees are not in F, which otherwise state the facts quite rightly. Henry of Huntingdon does the same.
871. E has 'Basecg' in mistake for 'Bagsecg.' D omits the clause 'weard Sidrac eorl ofslægen se ealda.' This was doubtless due to a confusion between the two Sidrocs. E also omits a necessary 'weard,' and calls Wiltune, 'Witune.'
877. E omits ne before 'mihthe,' and has 'seo heora' for 'se here,' and 'yst' for 'myst.'



878. E has 'raefen' for 'hraefn.' Henry of Huntingdon says 'Raven' (v, 8), and E by mistake has 'Wealwudu' where D, like A, B, and C, have 'Sealwyda.' Gaimar has 'Selewode,' and Henry of Huntingdon has 'Selewude' (v, 8). E also has 'cyn' for 'cynning.'
885. E has two notable omissions in this long annal, both relating to the Frankish empire and to the genealogy of its rulers, and supplementary to a notice in its own text. In both, D follows MS. C. They occur in A, B, C, and D, and one sentence about Louis occurs in Gaimar, although not in E. They were perhaps omitted from E like the genealogies of the English kings because they were considered uninteresting, and irrelevant to English history. They were, however, very probably in EE. Henry of Huntingdon has further details like A, B, C, and D (v, 10) in an epitomised form. This points to the longer passages having been in EE, although absent from E.
886. D has 'paes' for 'paer.'
887. In D, 'and V', which are necessary words, are omitted. Both D and E have 'pa' for 'pam' as in A, B, and C.
890. E has a Latin sentence about Plegmund not contained in any other copy of the chronicle nor in Gaimar. As it occurs verbatim in Henry of Huntingdon, it was doubtless contained in EE, and was inserted by its compiler.
892. At this point we have another instance of D forsaking E in favour of C. The annal dated by D in 892 deals with king Arnulf the Frank, and with Scottish affairs. This annal is entirely wanting in E. The story about Arnulf and his struggle with the Trans-Rhenane Franks is told in Henry of Huntingdon, while that about the Scots is omitted by him and by Gaimar. It occurs, however, in epitome in F, which is curious. It is possible that it is absent from E intentionally, and it may have been in EE, since it occurs in epitome in F. What is clear is that D, except for two of his usual mistakes viz. 'Dublasne' for 'Dubslane,' and 'Swifreh' for 'Swifneh,' follows C at this point, including the date of the annal, which in A, B, and F is put in 891. It is further curious that while E omits this annal it inserts one in the year 892, which it equates with an identical annal of a year later in all the other copies of the chronicle. F also puts this last entry in 892, while A, B, C, and D put it in 893. In describing the Andreds Wood, E and F speak of it as a hundred and twelve miles long, where A, B, C, and D and Henry of Huntingdon say cxx. Gaimar says: 'Icest bois est de long conte, quarante dous liwes mesvre; et trente liwes ad de leise' (3417-3419). In this annal E has 'Awuldre' in mistake for Apuldre. It also inserts a Latin notice of the abbot Wulfhere of Northumberland, which is not in any other chronicle except as an interpolation in F. It was probably inserted by the compiler of EE.

During the years 894-920 E has scarcely any entries. D in consequence takes over very ample materials from C. The scribe of D was a careless one, thus in the annal for 894 he left out

the sentence 'oþe siðe þa hi aerest to lānde comon aer seo fyrd gesamnod waere,' which is contained in A, B, and C. Later in the same annal he writes 'Betimflote' for 'Beamfleote,' later still he has 'oft' for 'of.' Directly after which he drops out another phrase, i.e. 'Mid his herge þe aer aet Middeltūne saet and eac se micla here waes ða þaerto cumen.' This again is found in all three manuscripts A, B, and C. A third omission is also found still further on, 'And ða scipu eall oþpe tobraecon oððe forbaerndon oððe to Lundenbyrig brohton.' A little later we have a few words in D which are not in B or C, but are contained in an enlarged form in A, i.e. 'foron þa up be Temese and be Saeferne.' This shews that a manuscript like A must also have been before the scribe of D at this point. The rest of this annal has been taken from C by D.

- In reference to this period Mr. Plummer says of MS. D: At this point D is very carelessly written, and has many omissions.
895. Here again we have an omission in D, i.e. 'Ða hi eft of Norð Wealum wendon mid þære herrehype þe hi þær genumen hæfdon.' In 896 D has 'Brycge be Saefern' for 'Cwatbrycge be Saefern' as in the other manuscripts.
897. This is also taken from C. D has 'Wiltunceaste' for 'Winteceastre' in the other three manuscripts.
898. D has taken this annal from C. In 899 and 900 there are no annals in any of the manuscripts.
901. With the year 901 E again has an entry, although a very small one. The compiler of D duly incorporates it at the beginning of his annal in this year, taking over its exact language, except the substitution of 'pone' for 'pet,' which is a mistake. He then adds to it the annal from the same year in C, altering its leading phrase and changes the 28 years of Alfred's reign in MS. E and in Gaimar to 30 years, to equate it with the entry from C. As usual the scribe of D has made several verbal errors in copying his text (see Thorpe's ed. margin). Gaimar exactly follows E and passes directly from the account of Hasting building a fortress at Apuldre in 892 in line 3436 to the death of Alfred in 901 in line 3437. Again MS. E contains no entries from 902-905; no more does Gaimar. D supplies the vacancy by some further passages from C, as in 903, 904, 905.
906. MS. E again has a short entry, which is also contained in other words in A, B, and C, in which it forms a clause. D transfers the whole entry from C, in the same words, preceding it by an extract from the Mercian chronicle about St. Oswald.
- 907 & 908. Neither E nor D has any entry.
909. D by mistake gives an extract from the Mercian chronicle about the battle of Teotanheale, which it repeats in 910. This is taken from C with an addition of the date. In B and C the battle is entered in 910 (as in the short reference in E), as is also the building of Bremesburh by Aethelfleda which is put by D in 909. The death of Denewulf, bishop of Winchester, is put in this year both by C and D.

910. D follows C with the slight change of one word, 'ofer' for 'of,' and, as I have said, adds a second reference to the battle of Teotanheale. It also by mistake adds a paragraph about the king's visit to London and Oxford, which *more suo* he repeats in the same words in 912. He also mentions the visit of a fleet to Lidwicum i.e. Brittany, and to the Severn. This he takes from E, which puts this event in 910. Thorpe corrects the date to 915. Gaimar still follows E at every point, and omits all the long notices of the other chronicles.
911. This annal in D is taken from C. Six of the names of the Danish chiefs as given in B and C are omitted by D. There is no entry in E this year.
912. As I have said the king's visit to Oxford is repeated this year in D. With it is named the death of Aethelred of Mercia; both are taken from C. The same facts are mentioned in 912 in E, and by Gaimar in the same way.
913. E has no entry in 913 and 914. The annal in D is taken from C, and includes a sentence from the Mercian chronicle.
- 914 & 915. D merely copies the two annals of the same year in C.
916. Neither D nor E have an entry. This is also the case with E in 917, where D simply copies C as it does in 918. In this annal the death of Aethelfleda is described in both MSS. In E we have only her simple obit reported this year.
919. D again copies C, and E is vacant.
920. Both D and E are vacant. Up to this point every statement in the scanty annals reported by E is also contained in D, but in a form generally derived from a fuller and more detailed source, namely C.
921. E, which is followed by F, has for the first time an entry not incorporated by D, namely the murder of Nial, king of Dublin, by Sihtric, which the writer of D probably thought would not interest his readers. Gaimar, as before, faithfully follows E in reporting the murder of Nial, the Irish king, by his brother, merely adding that king Edward revenged his death. In this year D follows C in giving an entry from the Mercian chronicle.
923. D agrees entirely with E; this annal, which is about Regnald, king of York, does not occur in any other manuscript of the chronicle. They are followed by Gaimar, who says he was half a Dane and half English, and that his father was a Danish king, 3518-3510.
927. D follows C completely in its language, and like it ends in the same broken sentence. E merely mentions the obit of king Edward, and the succession of Aethelstan. Gaimar adds that the king was buried at Winchester, but avoids the other details in D.
925. E duplicates the entry in the previous annal about the death of king Edward. It also mentions the consecration of Wulfhelm, not named in the other chronicles, and probably inserted by the compiler of EE. Turning to D in 925 and 926 it has two annals, not in any other manuscript of the chronicle, but which are also contained in Florence of Worcester. These

are very notable entries, for down to this date, except a doubtful excerpt from A, these are the very first entries in D which we cannot trace to some other source, either to the mother of E or to C, or to the Mercian chronicle. The entries in D. of which we do not know the source, become more frequent presently as we shall see.

927. E has an annal about the driving out of Guthfred by Athelstan and the visit of archbishop Wulfhere to Rome, which is not contained in D. The former is given by Gaimar (3518). E has very few entries at this time, and none at all from 929 to 933 inclusive. D also is vacant from 926 to 934. The drowning of the Aetheling Aedwine in 933 is only mentioned by E. In 934 D and E have the same notice. It is referred to by Gaimar (3520). Neither D nor E has any notice in 935 and 936.
937. The four manuscripts A, B, C, and D insert the famous poem about the battle of Brunanburh. The scribe of E probably could not understand it and could not read it. He contents himself with the single sentence: 'Her Aepelstan cyning laedde fyrde to Brunanbyrig,' while F in the Latin text has 'Hic factum est illud magnum et famosum bellum in Brunanbyri.' Gaimar gives a single line, 'El Bruneswerce out le desus' (3524).
940. D follows C entirely, the statements in E are however included in C's longer narrative. D alone among the chronicles mentions Gloucester as the place where Aethelstan died.
941. There is no entry in E. D has an annal not found elsewhere in the chronicles about Anlaf's succeeding to Northumberland. It is in Henry of Huntingdon.
942. D has a poem taken from C. E and F merely give the obit of king Anlaf, possibly from DD, which probably did not contain the poems.
943. E is vacant. D has again a long annal, of which only one sentence is in C and Florence of Worcester. The rest is not found elsewhere.
944. D follows C. E and F do the same in the one sentence they have  
& in common, the rest of the annal in A, B, C, and D is wanting  
945. in E as it is in Gaimar.
- We now meet with a divergence in the dates. E and F have no entry in 946 and 947, and they equate the annal entered by them in 948 with that given in A, B, C, and D in 946. The text of A, B, C, E, and F is the same. D adds a sentence from the Mercian Annals not in the other manuscripts. The annals in 947 and 948 in D are entirely peculiar to it among the chronicles. The former is given in Florence of Worcester in 949, and the latter in the same work in 950.
949. E and F mention the arrival of Anlaf Cwiran in Northumberland. This is not in any other copy of the chronicle, but it is mentioned by Gaimar (3550).
- 950 & 951. Are vacant in MSS. E and F as they are in B, C, and D.
952. E and F have a notice of the expulsion of Anlaf from Northumbria and the succession of Eric. These are not known elsewhere.

D, while it omits this annal probably by accident, has an entry which is not in any other chronicle, but is given by Florence of Worcester.

953. All the manuscripts of the chronicle are vacant.
954. D and E come close together again. They have a common notice in the same words about the Danish kings of Northumbria. D adds a sentence about archbishop Wulstan not contained in the chronicles, but derived from Florence of Worcester. A, B, and C are vacant this year.
955. D has an annal, a portion of which is common to the other chronicles. This former part is not exactly like any of the other manuscripts, differing from each in certain words as they differ from each other. As far as E's narrative goes D resembles it, but from Florence of Worcester he inserts the fact that king Eadred's body lay in the old minster, i.e. Winchester (which was interpolated in F). D then follows with the following sentence: 'Eadgar his broþor feng to Myrcena rice and hi waeron Eadmundes suna cyninges and Sċs Aelfgyfe.' This is taken from Florence of Worcester. Gaimar, as usual, follows E (3562 and 3563).
956. Is vacant in D while, like B and C, it equates the annal of 957 with that of 956 in E and F. In E and F we have merely the obit of Wulfstan. In D we have mention of his death-day, of his burial at Undelan, and of the expulsion of Dunstan, all of which are taken from Florence of Worcester. D, as so often, makes a mistake. He makes the death day xvii instead of vii kal. January. This annal is dated 956 by Florence.
958. D has an entry not contained in the other chronicles, all of which are vacant this year, but which is in Florence of Worcester.
959. There is a remarkable agreement between E and D in a long poem not in A, B, or C. In F it is epitomised.
- 960-962. Are vacant in B, C, D, and E.
963. An annal in E is not in the original script, but is an insertion. It is not in D (see Thorpe, 221).
965. D has an annal in the same words as E and F not in any other manuscript.
- 966, 969, 970 and 972. D and E agree precisely in language, while they differ almost entirely from the other manuscripts.
975. D and E have a common poem which greatly differs from that in A, B, and C. This is followed by a piece of prose in the same language in both. The next piece is given in verse by D and paraphrased in prose by E, showing that D here followed E's source and not E. At the end of the poem is a sentence in D precisely like one in E.
- 978, 979, 980, 981, 983 and the first part of 984. D and E again agree completely and verbally in the first sentence, but E has the additional words in 984, 'and her waes Eadwine to abb gehalgod to Abbandune.'

- 985 Are alike in D and E. The short notice in 987 in E and F is represented by a blank in D, but it occurs in the latter in 988, together  
&  
986. with the contents entered in E in the latter year.
989. E agrees in the clause about archbishop Siric with D, but the latter probably accidentally omits the death of abbot Aedwin and the succession of Wulfgar, which are in E and A. Florence of Worcester gives both notices, but dates them in 990.
- 990, 991, 992, 993, 994, 995, 996, 997, 998, 999, 1000, 1001, and 1002. D and E are alike.
1000. With the year 1000 we get a new and first-rate help in analysing MS. E, namely the Waverley Annals. In this year it copies the first sentence of the annal common to C, D, and E.
1001. It also copies the earlier part of this annal, leaving out the mention of the Devon men, where the other manuscripts give them with those of Somerset.
1002. Here again the Waverley chronicler only copies the first part of the common annal. The coming of Emma, mentioned by the annals and not in E, is in F.
1003. B, C, and D are again alike, with them are the Waverley Annals, which put 'Salopesbiria' for 'Searbyrig.'
1004. C and D agree with E, except that the last leaves out the sentence about Ulfcytel in the other two, namely 'þ hi næfre wyrsan handplegan on Angelcynne ne gemitton þonne Ulfcytel him to brohte.' The Waverley Annals follow E closely.
1005. This annal is the same in C, D, and E and in the Waverley Annals.
1006. B, C, and D are alike. The Waverley Annals give the first sentence, and then condense the long account of the Danish devastations in the words 'Et fecerunt sicuti soliti erant; prædaverunt, occiderunt, combusserunt ubicumque venerunt.'
1007. C and E are alike. D adds a clause about the journey of Aelfheah to Rome for the pallium which I cannot trace, viz. 'Her for Aelfheah bisceop to Rome, æfter pallium.' The Waverley Annals are like E, but omit the appointment of Eadric to Mercia.
1008. C, D, E, and the Waverley Annals are alike.
1009. C, D, and E are alike. The Waverley Annals only contain the first sentence of this very long annal.
1010. C, D, and E are alike. The Waverley Annals again, only have the first section of this long annal as far as 'East Engle gewæld,' even in this they leave out a date and the word 'Myranheafodd.'
1011. C, D, and E agree together in this annal, both in its prose portions and its poetry. The Waverley Annals agree with the prose but leave out the poetry.
- 1012, 1213, and 1214. B, C, and D and the Waverley Annals all agree.
1015. C, D, and E agree. The Waverley Annals leave out the first half, but agree with the second.
1016. C, D, and E agree in this very long annal, except in a few verbal cases. Thus Deorhyrste is in D, but is left out in C and E. It is also in Florence of Worcester, while a sentence about Abingdon, which closes C and E, is not in D. The Waverley Annal seems to be a verbatim translation of E. By mistake the author,

- however, has inserted the name Edwin Dux among those killed at the battle of Assandune.
- 1017 These annals are virtually the same in C, D, E, and the Waverley & Annals. E adds the obit of Aedelſige, abbot of Abingdon, and
1018. the succession of Aedelwine.
1019. E in this annal is like the Waverley Annals, C and F, and the first clause of D. The latter gives in this year the obit of archbishop Aelfstan also called Lifing, which is put in 1020 in A, E, and F, adding 'and he waes swiðe raedfaest man aegder for Gode and for worulde.' There is nothing of this in Gaimar or in Florence of Worcester. D also says that Cnut took 12 ships with him when he went to Denmark.
1020. The Waverley Annals omit the king's visit to Assandune and the outlawry of Aedelwald, otherwise they are like E. The greater part of D and E are alike, except that D adds that Thurkyl went with the king to Assandune, and gives the day of the month when Aedelnod was made a bishop. D adds 'And Wulfstan arceþ and oðre biscopas and eac abbodas and manege munecas and gehalgodan þ mynster aet Assandune.' This paragraph is like Florence who, however, says that it was the king and Turtullus who built the church.
1021. The Waverley Annals omit the day of Thurkil's exile. E is like C, D, and F, but D adds 'And Aelfgar ʒ se aelmesfulla forðferde on Xpes maesse uhtan.' This is not in Florence or Henry of Huntingdon.
1022. E is like the Waverley Annals and also like D with some variation in the language, but it has a paragraph not given in the other manuscripts of the Chronicle about the expulsion of abbot Leofwine from Ely, which is not in Florence. It is mentioned by Henry of Huntingdon (vi, 15), but not by Gaimar.
1023. The Waverley Annals are exactly like E. D here has a long annal, and E a very short one. The latter gives the obit of Wulfstan and the succession of Aelfric, not mentioned in C or D, and the removal of the relics of St. Aelfege the archbishop of Canterbury, which is mentioned both in D and C. All this is in F, but none of it in Gaimar. In D there is a long additional notice, including an account of the translation of Aelfege's remains, which is not in the other chronicles, nor in Florence, Henry of Huntingdon, or Gaimar.
1025. E and F are the only chronicles which have a notice this year about Cnut's unfortunate expedition to Norway. The Waverley Annals contain the whole entry except the words 'And þær waes swiðe feala manna forfaren on Cnutes Cynges healf.' The notice is also in Henry of Huntingdon, but not in Florence or Gaimar.
1026. D among the chronicles alone has an annal in this year about Aelfric's going to Rome for the pallium. This is in Henry of Huntingdon.
- 1027 is vacant in all the chronicles.

- 1028, 1029, and 1030. D and E and the Waverley Annals are exactly alike in these years.
1031. The Waverley Annals omit the names of the two Scotch kings. D omits all the kings' names. Henry of Huntingdon follows E. There is nothing of all this in Florence. Gaimar mentions Cnut's journey to Scotland, and the negotiations with the king there, whose name he does not give. He states the result in two or three lines (4751-2).
1032. This year E and F alone have an annal which is in the same terms. This is exactly as in the Waverley Annals. It is not in Henry of Huntingdon, nor in Florence.
1033. The Waverley Annals completely agree with E. D entirely differs. D has the obit of Leofric, bishop of Worcester, who was succeeded by Brihteh. This is mentioned in Florence with greater details under 1033.
1034. The Waverley Annals entirely agrees with E in the death of the bishop, but D differs. D calls him wrongly Aelfric instead of Aëðeric like E and C and Florence, and he adds that his body lay at Ramesige, and that Maelcolm, king of Scotland, died this year. The whole annal in D is from Florence, except the mis-spelt name.
1035. This year is blank in E by a mistake.
1036. This annal in E and F and the Waverley Annals is equated with 1035 in C and D. The annal in D agrees verbally with that in C. The greater part is also in Florence who, however, has a much longer story. In E the first half alone is in the Waverley Annals, in F, and in Henry of Huntingdon. The second part I cannot trace, and it reads like a polemical sentence.
1037. E is like the Waverley Annals. Henry of Huntingdon follows the same lead. C and D are alike, and resemble Florence of Worcester.
1038. The Waverley Annals only have a single entry which is like E, and contain the obit of archbishop Aethelnod and the succession of Eadsig. They omit as in many cases the other uninteresting obits in E. They are all given, however, by Florence of Worcester. In C and D the annal is practically identical, only with an additional and rhetorical passage in D.
- 1039 & 1040. D is quite different to E and like C. Henry of Huntingdon agrees very closely with E in this and the following annal, which it puts under 1040 and 1041, but it divides the matter differently between them. In his statement about the gold he gives the number as 21,089 pounds, where E makes it 21,079. The Waverley Annals leave out the figures, and only give the first sentence in E down to 'xvi wucan' and the succession of Hardacnut. Florence of Worcester, like D, says the latter came with 60 ships, while E says 62.
1041. In D the annal is like that in C in the same year, except the concluding clause about the hallowing of Aegelric as archbishop of York. The annal in E is equated with 1042 in C and D. The two latter agree together, but only have the obit of Harðacnut in common with E. The first clause in the former agrees with the



- Waverley Annals in 1040 and also with Henry of Huntingdon. The rest is not in these annals nor in MS. F.
1042. This annal in E equates with 1043 in C and D. E agrees with C here, except that C has an additional clause. Both differ from D. E has only a small tie with the Waverley Annals in this annal. D follows Florence of Worcester. Henry of Huntingdon only has a very short and colourless notice of the arrival and consecration of Edward, and Gaimar is the same (4859-61).
1043. E is like C, except that E has a notice about Stigand's appointment as bishop. Henry of Huntingdon has a short extract from this common annal. D is vacant this year. Florence merely mentions the appointment of Stigand as bishop. The Waverley Annals omit the references to the appointments of Aethelstan and Stigand and the king's voyage to Sandwich with 35 ships, but contain the rest. There is a second entry of the same date in E, which F dates in 1044. E and F have the same annal. There is no corresponding annal in C or D. Henry of Huntingdon only has one common sentence about king Edward's marriage to Godwin's daughter. There is nothing like it in Florence or in Gaimar. The obit of Brihtwold, given this year in E, is given in 1046 by D and 1045 in C.
1044. This entry in E is omitted by the Waverley annalist, which must have been an oversight. The obit of bishop Living in E and the succession of Leofric, is told in D with more details, as also the expulsion of Osgod Clapa. The obit of Aelfstan, abbot of St. Augustine's, is told in E but not in D. D is the same as Florence of Worcester. Both date the events in 1047.
1045. Only the concluding sentence in E is in the Waverley Annals under the year 1046. The rest referring to the obits of two bishops of the South Saxons and of Winchester and their successors is not there. The whole annal, however, is entered in D in 1048. It has an additional clause about king Magnus. The whole of D and E is in Florence of Worcester and dated 1047.
1046. This year E has two entries. The earlier one is not given in C and D, and only in epitome in F, except the first clause. The first sentence containing the obits is absent from the annals of Waverley, which give all the rest of the annal; it is also epitomised in 1048 by Henry of Huntingdon. The second clause in the same year in E is a very long one, and also occurs in the Waverley Annals in 1048, omitting only the obit of bishop Eadnod, the succession of Ulf, and a sentence about Tosti's ships being 42 in number. The same events are also told in E and Henry of Huntingdon in the same year, and also by C and D, the former under 1049 and the latter under 1050, very largely in identical words, but with some short sentences omitted from each. The story is also very closely followed by Florence of Worcester *sub an.* 1049.
1048. D has an annal not contained in any other manuscript of the chronicle, but largely the same as the annal of the same year in Florence

of Worcester. E has a long annal contained also in the Waverley Annals under the year 1051 and somewhat epitomised in F in 1050. E, after reciting the appointment of Sparhavo to the bishopric of London, adds a sentence not in the Waverley Annals, 'And se cyng geaf [þ] abbotrice Roðulfe þ his mæge.' The Annals also by mistake substitute 'Dorobernia' for 'Dofran.' In C and D the entries differ entirely from each other and from E. A large part of D is like Florence of Worcester, but varies in some details.

1051. This is vacant in E.

1052. This entry is the same in E and the Waverley Annals, except in the last clause of E, which is a Peterborough interpolation, and in some details: thus the former makes Godwin sail from Bryege and the latter 'a Flandria.' In speaking of the Nesse (Dungeness) the latter glosses it as 'In australi parte Rumenea' (Romney); 'Portlocan' in E is 'Portland' in the annal. Henry of Huntingdon is also, like E, epitomised. After the first 12 lines, which are quite different, the rest of the annal in D is like C, except in one place where the former has 'East-sexan,' the latter 'Sud-sexan,' which is no doubt right. The whole annal in D greatly resembles Florence, but differs in some details.

1053. E has a short notice, which is in the annals of Waverley with some small additions from Henry of Huntingdon. The language of the whole entry in the Waverley Annals is like that of Henry. D and C differ almost entirely, but D and Florence have a certain number of obits and appointments to monasteries in common.

1054. E and the Waverley Annals are alike, and E's short annal is added to that in D, which has some things in common with Florence, but more in common with C.

1055. E and the Waverley Annals are alike. D is an epitome of C. The latter and Florence are very much alike.

1056. There is nothing in the vernacular in E, but the death of the emperor is entered in it in Latin. It is given in a queer way in both C and D, 'And Cona se Casere forðferde.' All D, except the first sentence, which comes from Florence of Worcester, is taken from C. There are no entries in C from 1057-1063.

1057. E and the Waverley Annals are alike. D is like Florence, only in a different order. Henry of Huntingdon has a clause like the last one in E about Aelfgar, son of Leofric.

1058. E and the Waverley Annals are alike. The latter part of D is like Florence.

1059. D and E are alike, except for an addition in D, stating that this year the steeple at Peterborough was hallowed on the 16th kal. Nov.

1060. All the entries in E are in D. In the Waverley Annals these entries are put in 1059. The rest of the annals in D are in Florence, except the first notice 'On þisan gere waes micel eorðdyne on translatione Sce Martini.'

1061. E is like the Waverley Annals (1060), with an additional sentence, 'And on þam ilcan geare forðferde Godwine þ aet Sce

Martini on vii idus Mar., and the obit of Wulfric, abbot of St. Augustine. They are both in D; one of them has the dates reversed thus *iiiix kl. April.* The rest of D is like Florence, but with more details.

1063. The short annal in E is repeated almost verbatim in the Waverley Annals in 1064. The only difference is that the latter states that the Welsh killed their own king Griffin: this agrees with D, while E says he was killed by Harold and Tostig. Henry of Huntingdon follows the same lead as E in the main, but attributes Griffin's death to his own people. D has a much longer annal, which is largely taken from Florence of Worcester but not entirely; the last 10 lines are from some other source unknown to me.
1064. In this annal, which is equated with 1065 in C and D, E and the annals of Waverley almost completely agree, except that the former has an extra sentence, 'On Sce Simones and Judan maesse aefen and kydda heom þ̅ ilce and heom þet on hand sealdon and he niwade þaer Cnutes lage,' not in the latter. This annal in E is introduced in D between two sections of an extract from C. A third section in C is omitted. A good proof that D was not the original of the matter of E at this point is that in it the corruption 'Ryðrenan' stands for 'norðerne men' in E, which is right. Henry of Huntingdon follows E, but is somewhat epitomised. C and D conclude this annal with a long piece of poetry.
1066. C and D agree for about 18 lines in this long annal and then entirely disagree; both are quite different to E. The latter part of E is a Peterborough insertion, and not in the Waverley Annals. The former piece is in those annals. A very long piece from the annal in C is given with a few variations by Florence of Worcester.
1067. In this year the Waverley Annals are like E, except that the former tell us that William, on returning to England, was coming from the dedication of the church at Jumieges, which is not mentioned in the chronicle, and it calls Christchurch Canterbury, Trinity church. The short annal in E is split up and incorporated in that of D, which is very long. Whence the compiler of the latter obtained the rest of this long annal I do not know. D now loses the aid of C which continues no further.
1068. This annal in E is precisely like that in the Waverley Annals. It is like the first part of D. The second part of D is given by Florence of Worcester.
1069. The annal in E this year is exactly like the Waverley Annals, except for a small notice of Peterborough at the end. The first sentence in E is like the last in D, otherwise D is quite different. I cannot find whence the rest of D was derived.
1070. This annal in E is very long, but the greater part of it is a local interpolation about Peterborough. It is, however, a very interesting one, and the fact that so little of what it tells about the Danish doings at Ely and in the Fens is found in other sources,

which largely depend on matter from E, shows most plainly that their real source was the mother of E, namely EE, which had nothing to do with Peterborough. If we remove this long local narrative, the rest is the same and very largely in the same words as the annals of Waverley. These give the annal before it was interpolated in E in its original form at length, clearly in a more correct shape than in D, where it also occurs, and add some notable words; thus they call Baldwin, 'Consul Flandrie,' while D (sub an. 1071) merely says 'Baldawine eorl.' Robert is called simply 'Rodbeart' in D, while the Waverley Annals call him 'Robertus Frisensis.' The Waverley Annals say 'occidit Arnulfum cognatum suum et dapiferum regis Willelmi,' which seems a mistake, since both MSS. E and D and also Henry of Huntingdon (who agrees with the annals in regard to the epithets Flandria and Frisensis) say it was earl William himself, i.e. William FitzOsbern, who was killed on this occasion. Florence of Worcester has nothing about the matters in this annal. D dates the annal in 1071.

1071. This annal is in the same words in D and E. The Waverley Annals agree almost verbatim with E, while in one case D has a different order in the sentence. The former, like D, omit the fact that bishop Aegelwine died in *winter*. D dates the annal in 1072.
1072. In this annal D and E are quite alike except that the date in D is over a year later. The Waverley Annals follow them verbally, except that by mistake they translate 'aet þam gewaede,' i.e. 'at the ford' by 'apud Scodwade,' and call bishop Aeglicric 'Cilricus.'
1073. D and E are verbally the same, except that E adds the two words, 'to Englande,' not in D. D dates this in 1072.
1074. D and E differ greatly in this annal, which is much longer in D. The first clause is the only one in which they agree. D, which dates the entry in 1075, says Eadgar 'cild com of Fleminga lande into Scotlande,' while E says 'com of Scotland to Normandige.' The two again only agree in the last clause of each, and this not verbally. D interpolates a long story about Scotland and Malcolm, etc. On the other hand the Waverley Annals follow E literally in all its statements, and then add a clause from Robert de Monte and Sigebert. Henry of Huntingdon epitomises the story, but agrees with E against D.
1075. D and E very nearly agree verbally. D, however, dates the events in 1076. Both say that earl Ralph took his wife to Nordwic; the Waverley Annals agreeing with E, say 'ad Nordfolc.' E says earl Ralph went on ship at Norðwic, while D omits 'at Norðwic,' the annals agree with E. Further on we read that Cnut, Swegen's son, and earl Hakon were afraid to fight the English king. E says they went to Flanders, in which the Waverley Annals agree, while D says 'ferdon to Eoforwic and braecon Sce Petres mynster and tocon þærinne mycele aehta and foron swa aweg ac calle þa forferdon þe aet þam raede waeron.'

Nothing of this is in the Waverley Annals nor in Henry of Huntingdon, which both agree with E. Florence does not mention the facts of this annal at all.

1076. Here again the two chronicles D and E agree almost verbally. D (1077) calls Vithele, abbot of Westminster, 'Fipele,' and calls earl Waltheof's death-day 'Sce Petronella maessedæg,' which is not given by E. The Waverley Annals follow E, but omit the expedition of William to Brittany given in both the chronicles.
1077. This annal is entirely different in E. D's entry is equated with 1076 in E.
1078. This is a blank in E. In D the annal is largely peculiar to that copy. It is, however, much mutilated in the part relating to Malcolm. It may when whole have been partly equated with E 1079.
1079. The language and some of the events in E and D are different, but some of the latter are related in different words in both. In D the annal is mutilated.

This is a good point at which to close this stage in a very long and laborious analysis of our documents, and it may be well to sum up the results so far obtained.

I have tried to strengthen the view that the Peterborough chronicle known as E is, as it stands, a compilation made at Peterborough in the twelfth century, and that down to 1121 it consists of a copy of a chronicle derived from elsewhere, interpolated with a number of local entries in a late dialect, and written out by one scribe who completed the transcript in or soon after 1121.

The manuscript from which this scribe's copy was taken is no longer extant, and I have ventured to call it EE, as being the mother of E. It was doubtless put together in or soon after 1121 since its text extended to that year, and it differed from the actual text of E written out by the latter's first scribe, by not having the Peterborough notices incorporated in it and in having been free from certain scribes' errors.

So far as known there is no ancient work existing which was derived directly from E and containing its interpolations and scribes' errors, but all the manuscripts with a similar text are derived directly or indirectly from EE, the mother of E.

One thing seems pretty plain, namely that in its final shape, as copied by the Peterborough scribe, EE contained a considerable number of Latin entries dispersed in the vernacular text which were derived from the

annals of Rouen, themselves compiled in the earlier part of the twelfth century. It was also divested of the greater part of the pedigrees of the Anglo-Saxon kings which form such a feature of the text of the earlier chronicles, although it preserved certain shreds and fragments of such pedigrees, showing they had once been present in its ancestral text. In this form that part of EE which began with the year 1000 became the mother of a Latin translation probably made early in the twelfth century but now lost, which was abstracted in large part and incorporated by the author of the Waverley Annals. This translation was for the most part admirably done, and very often preserved the whole text of each annal complete and intact, so that if MS. E had been lost we might have recovered a large part of its mother, the text of EE, from the Waverley Annals. The latter work contains a number of the entries from the Rouen Annals as preserved in E, while the genealogies already named are absent from it, pointing to the genealogies having also been absent from EE. A great advantage for our purpose in this Waverley book is that it preserves the text of EE after the year 1000 unmixed and unsophisticated with other copies of the chronicles. The same edition of MS. E, namely EE, was also used by Henry of Huntingdon in his history. This is clear from the presence in that work of a number of extracts from the Rouen Annals already named.

While the Waverley annalist used only one recension of the chronicle, namely EE, Henry of Huntingdon certainly used two, namely EE and the manuscript known as C. To these he was probably limited, and he used both of them freely although he had recourse to the former to a much larger extent than the latter. It is pretty certain that the pedigrees in his text were derived from C. Henry is very useful because his extracts from the chronicle are not limited to the later period like those of the Waverley annalist, but occur over the whole length of his history, although they are not nearly so ample or so valuable in contents in the years after 1000 as those in the Waverley Annals.

While Henry of Huntingdon's Chronicle is very useful, it is necessary to remember a fact about him which has not been appreciated by Mr. Freeman and other historians

of his class, and has led them into perpetual mistakes. Henry had a picturesque pen and a lively imagination. He loved to write in Homeric fashion about battles and other romantic events. The colour which suffuses so many of his descriptions comes largely from the poet's palette. It has been mistaken by the authors in question for the genuine language of ballad writers which had survived for centuries through changes of language, sentiment, etc. etc. for which there does not seem to me to be any warrant whatever. Those who want to write history had better go to the authorities which we know Henry had before him (prosaic as their narratives look when confronted with his) and leave his pretty stories and inspiring rhetoric for the nursery.

Another document previously described is the poem of Gaimar, which very largely supplements the text of the Waverley Annals, since its extracts from the Chronicle, which are often full and intelligent, mainly cover the earlier period down to the end of the first millennium, when those of the Waverley annalist begin. They have a similar value to the latter work in another respect, namely that Gaimar, like the annalist, was dependent on one manuscript of the Chronicle only, namely EE. It may be that his copy of it was of an earlier edition than those used by the Waverley annalist and Henry of Huntingdon, since it does not contain any of the Rouen annals, but this may be accidental, or due to the poet not thinking them relevant to his subject. On the other hand it does not contain the pedigrees, which were not, so far as we know, contained in EE, any more than in the Waverley Annals. It will be seen that the three works here quoted afford very valuable materials for the criticism of the lost manuscript EE. We still have another helpmate in MS. D of the chronicle, a document which has occupied us so much in this paper. As I have shewn, it has been misunderstood, and its value and interest are not quite those generally attributed to it.

I have given a careful analysis of its contents, which has involved more labour than might appear, and the conclusion which seems inevitable from the facts about it is that it is in no sense an original document, but a scribe's copy taken from another manuscript of the same

class, which had itself been mutilated and worn when copied, thus accounting for the great gap in its text between the second and the seventh centuries, for its broken ending and for its many blunders and omissions. The original which had thus suffered was itself a late production, and was not (except, perhaps, in its latest portion) a serial chronicle written up in a monastery at various dates, but a compilation put together from several documents, whose contents we can for the most part recover. As we have called the mother manuscript of E, EE, so we may call the mother of D, DD. The most important source of DD was a manuscript of chronicle EE. Saving mistakes occurring in both, it followed EE for a long distance in the same language, and, since it was written in the vernacular, it becomes the best help for criticising the original text of EE. As it most certainly followed EE in the greater part of its text it is plain that DD must have been compiled after the year 1121, when EE was itself put together. From the beginning down to the year 731 the tie between D and E is unbroken save for the mutilation in D between the second and the seventh centuries, and it is clear that before its mutilation, DD, the mother of D, was, down to 731, virtually identical with EE; and further, the former was derived from the latter.

In the year 731 for the first time D breaks away from E, and does so in an interesting way. As we have seen, it contains a notice of the death of Osric, king of Northumbria, and the succession of Ceolwulf, with the length of his reign, not mentioned by E in that year but in 729, where it also occurs in D, as it does in A, B, and C in 731. This double entry in D shows that at this point he had two manuscripts of the Chronicle before him, C and EE. D then proceeds to give the pedigree of Ceolwulf which is not in E, but is in A, B, and C. This seems to show that D derived its pedigrees from one of these manuscripts, doubtless C, a view which is strengthened by the fact that the pedigree in D is followed by a second notice of the death of archbishop Brihtwald derived from C, caused no doubt by the conflation of the texts of EE and C.

From 731 E and D keep entirely together, save for



small scribes' mistakes in both, and without interpolation until we come to 797, where, after reporting with E the death of Aethelberht, bishop of Whithern (Hexham), D goes on to say that Heardred was hallowed in his stead on 111 kal. November. This notice is derived from Florence of Worcester and is the first evidence in D that in addition to MSS. C and E of the Chronicle its compiler also had the work of Florence of Worcester before him.

The double notice in D in 801 and 802 of the election of Beornmod is no doubt again due to conflation. The first one exactly follows C in date and wording. The second is a year later and its language is that of E.

From this point D and E again keep company together until we reach the year 838, when MS. E has a gap, and D accordingly turns to C, which he copies exactly, except with some characteristic verbal errors. D and E again keep inseparable company till we reach 855, when D turns to C for the pedigree of Aethelwulf. E has a curious mistake in its last clause, where, by a lapse, it says of Aethelbald, 'and he was Ecgbrihting,' pointing to some scribe's error when the type of manuscript now represented by E first discarded the pedigrees. We again find D and E running exactly together until we reach 892, except for scribes' errors and two omissions in 885 in E, which I have explained in an earlier page as probably due to both being foreign notices uninteresting to English readers.

At the end of 891 we again have a slight break in our story. In the first place, E omits, apparently purposely, the annal contained in D, dealing with French and Scottish matters, which was almost certainly in EE, since its faithful follower F epitomises it, and it was probably excluded like other foreign entries because it was supposed to be uninteresting. E is not content, however, with excluding this annal, but it puts in its place in the same year another annal which, as in F, is equated with 893 in A, B, C, and D. A proof that this exclusion was accidental is the fact that in 892 D and C again come together.

We have seen how in several cases D abandons E in favour of a manuscript belonging to another class, namely C. This practice now becomes very marked for a while, and is easily explained. At this time, perhaps due to the ravages

of the Danes, the entries in E become very scanty indeed. There are none at all between 892 and 901, when we have one of barely two lines; we have a second in 906, a third in 910, a fourth in 912, a fifth in 915, and a sixth in 918, each limited to one line or two, that is to say, six short sentences in 26 years. It is not wonderful that the compiler of D, who had followed the lead of the text EE from the beginning, should have turned elsewhere to fill this void. This does not mean that he did not use the fragmentary annals in E just referred to, which he seems to have incorporated, but that he turned to MS. C for the great bulk of the materials he needed, and it is quite plain that while at this time a manuscript like E was among the materials used by D, *no manuscript like D could have been among the sources of E*. It is incredible that the compiler of E should have been content with the notices he alone gives in the 26 years just mentioned, if the text of D or DD had been available for him, for it must be remembered that this period was the period of the great exploits of Alfred and Eadward the elder. It is a very notable fact in the history of the text of the chronicle that at this point, where the annals in E are so slight, Gaimar exactly follows MS. E. From 893 to 901 his history is a complete blank.

The only cases in which D, while appropriating the ample materials he took from C, omitted any facts reported by E between 892 and 923 was the death of Sihtric, king of Dublin, in 921. This as a foreign notice would not be interesting to his readers, and was, like other similar notices, excluded by him. On the other hand, that D had E constantly before him during this interval is shewn by the fact that in the year 901 D gives the death-day of Alfred, which is not given by C, but is contained in one of the short notices of E.

It is quite clear, therefore, that during all this barren period of E, that manuscript, or rather EE, as well as MS. C, was before the compiler of D. With 923, D and E come together again in an annal in which they agree word for word and which is not in C.

The next entry is taken by D from C. It is curious that in this annal where, as so often, B and C are alike, they are both mutilated in the concluding sentence, and D gives it complete, pointing to its compiler having had

some other manuscript of C before him than that which has come down to us. We now reach a point where D begins to make continual use of another source, namely Florence of Worcester, and I think it well to postpone analysis of the rest of his text to the next paper, when we shall discuss the very important chronicle of the Worcester historian.