

Un-Editing Alfred: Rethinking Modern Editions of Pre-modern Texts from a Post-modern
Sensibility

Christopher J. Martin

A dissertation
submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

University of Washington

2016

Reading Committee:

Paul G. Remley, Chair

Míceál F. Vaughan

Stephen E. Hinds

Raimonda Modiano

Program Authorized to Offer Degree:

English

University of Washington

Abstract

Un-Editing Alfred: Rethinking Modern Editions of Pre-modern Texts from a Post-modern Sensibility

Christopher John-Francis Martin

Chair of the Supervisory Committee:
Professor Paul G. Remley
English

This dissertation investigates the relationships of texts that have contributed to the reception and authorization of the Anglo-Latin monument studied here under the title *Vita Ælfredi regis* ("The Life of King Alfred"), including the eleventh- and twelfth-century witnesses, sixteenth-century transcriptions, and editions that have appeared since the sixteenth century. Since the destruction of the bulk of the (ostensibly early-eleventh-century) Cottonian witness by fire in 1731, it has become clear that the uneven reporting of the texts transmitted by the early printed editions, and in their associated transcripts, has permanently eliminated the possibility of definitively reconstructing the Cottonian text, let alone a pre-Cottonian exemplar. The extracts from the *Vita Ælfredi* reproduced in the eleventh-century Byrhtferthian redactions and *Encomium Emmae reginae*, as well as multiple twelfth-century chronicles also offered imperfect representations of their exemplars. Even here, however, important aspects of the transmission-history of the *Vita*

Ælfredi emerge with close consideration of the readings in these sources and in neglected texts such as the variant versions of the *Vita S. Æthelberti* associated with Giraldus Cambrensis. It is well known that the author-question has framed the bulk of existing scholarship on the *Vita Ælfredi*, particularly as it relates to the historical ninth- and early-tenth-century Welsh bishop Asser of St. Davids and Sherborne. Nevertheless, this dissertation presents a more detailed account than has been achieved previously regarding the recovery of the Cottonian text and the attribution to Asser by the antiquary John Leland, as well as the role of Leland's associate, John Bale, as well as the subsequent undertakings of Parker, his circle, and the eighteenth-century scholar and editor Francis Wise. Regarding Wise, for example, it becomes clear that there is conflicting evidence relating to that editor's claims, and that his collations largely were the work of his assistant, to the extent that it appears that wise may never have seen the *textus receptus* at first hand. The main focus of this dissertation, however, is on the application of textual theory to the case of the *Vita Ælfredi*, specifically as it relates to scholarly discourse about ontology, the *Vita Ælfredi* is here evaluated in the context of three major resistances (a resistance of meaning to medium, a resistance to the "work" to its constituent "texts," and a resistance to hermeneutics). The dissertation outlines a scholarly discourse of textual ontology and then places the *Vita Ælfredi* within that framework with the purpose of examining the ideological aims of its translators and editors. Finally, it offers a supplemental collation, for the first time since William H. Stevenson's 1904 edition, of the first thirty-five chapters of the *Vita Ælfredi*.

© 2016
Christopher J. Martin

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Chapter 1. Introduction..... | 1 |
| Bridging the medieval and the post-modern..... | 7 |
| Social contract theory and the socialization of texts..... | 8 |
| Arguments for anti-traditionalism..... | 12 |
| Who wrote the <i>Vita Ælfredi</i> ?..... | 13 |
| Chapter 2. The Resistance to Ontology: Pre-Modernity, Hypertextuality, Nabokov, and the <i>Vita Ælfredi</i> | 17 |
| Acts of socialization..... | 26 |
| Texts resisting themselves: texts as events and events as texts..... | 31 |
| Whose textual event is it?..... | 35 |
| From work to text and back again..... | 44 |
| "Works" acting and organizing..... | 47 |
| The role of texts in the socialization of ontology..... | 50 |
| Resisting hermeneutics..... | 52 |
| Hermeneutics through medium: resisting ontology for an edition based on manuscript evidence..... | 55 |
| Editing ontologies: <i>The Original of Laura</i> and multiple authorship..... | 61 |
| Simulation, copy, and the authorship in the <i>Vita Ælfredi</i> | 67 |
| Author's final intentions and generative socialized ontologies..... | 73 |
| Ontologizing the <i>Vita</i> , identifying the texts..... | 80 |
| Chapter 3. The Life of the <i>Life of King Alfred</i> | 91 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Titling the work of the <i>Vita Ælfredi regis</i> | 91 |
| Biographical and annalistic contexts of the <i>Vita Ælfredi</i> | 97 |
| Identifiable periods in the transmission of the <i>Vita Ælfredi regis</i> | 106 |
| On the historical value of the <i>Vita Ælfredi regis</i> | 110 |
| Scholarship post-destruction..... | 112 |
| Sources and witnesses: tracing the legacy of Cotton Otho A.xii..... | 114 |
| Byrhtferth's relationship to the <i>Vita Ælfredi</i> | 115 |
| Traces of <i>Vita Ælfredi</i> in the <i>Encomium Emmae reginae</i> | 119 |
| The <i>Vita Ælfredi</i> as a source for the <i>Chronica chronicarum</i> | 121 |
| The <i>Annales S. Neoti</i> and its excerpt from the <i>Vita Ælfredi</i> | 124 |
| William of Malmesbury and the <i>Vita</i> | 125 |
| Giraldus Cambrensis: concerning the <i>Vita S. Æthelberti</i> | |
| preserved in Trinity College, Cambridge, MS B.11.16..... | 128 |
| John Leland, John Bale, and other sixteenth-century use of the | |
| historical Asser..... | 135 |
| Transcripts of the Cotton Otho A.xii..... | 153 |
| Chapter 4. Publication and Woe: the Pre-destruction Editions of the <i>Vita Ælfredi regis</i> | 158 |
| Validity in publication: Alfred's preface to the <i>Pastoral Care</i> , | |
| law-code, and <i>Ælfredi regis res Gestae</i> | 175 |
| Controversy after Parker: Editions of the <i>Vita Ælfredi regis</i> , 1602-1731..... | 182 |
| Chapter 5. Un-Editing Alfred: An Argument for a Parallel-Text Edition | |
| on Diplomatic Principles..... | 186 |
| Subduing Guthrum: three campings and the centrality of Easter..... | 190 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Accommodating heterogeneity: translations and editions | |
| after Stevenson..... | 197 |
| The future of the Alfred dossier: a case for a digital edition..... | 199 |
| The Alfred dossier of diplomatic texts: <i>Vita Ælfredi regis</i> | 203 |
| Bibliography..... | 355 |
| Appendix A: Notes to the Alfred Dossier with Corrections | |
| to Stevenson's Apparatus..... | 368 |

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to my committee Chair, Prof. Paul Remley, for his invaluable comments, attention, and support during the entirety of this project. The dissertation came with much doubts and frequent speed-bumps along the way, such that it would not have been possible without his help and supervision. I am also grateful to my committee readers: Profs. Míceál Vaugan, for his suggestions and comments, Stephen Hinds, for his support, and Raimonda Modiano for her tutelage. I would like to thank those readers of drafts, late-night conversationalists, stress-reducers, and friends who were my support group in no particular order: Brian Hardison, Erik Jaccard, Leisl Sackschewsky, Christopher Patterson, Gibran Escalera, Heather Hill, David Holmberg, Danny Nelson, Daniel Sears, Ahron Kachik, Emily George, Alissa Bourbonnais, James Brothwell, Emily Riley, Danielle Magnusson, Sue Shon. I express my eternal gratitude to the librarians who aided on my research trips, especially Dr. Suzanne Paul, currently Keeper of Manuscripts at the University Library, Cambridge, for her aid at the Parker Library. Special thanks to Kathy Mork, who was the torch-bearer throughout this long, difficult process: this was bearable, largely due to your efforts. Finally, I would like to express my deepest thanks and love to my family: Raymond, Mary Ann, Melissa, Andrew, Royal, Patricia, Timothy, Margo, Kimberly, and Mike, and especially to Diana, my partner of ten years, who has been unflinchingly at my side throughout the process: I love you with everything that I am.

Dedication

For Cordelia.

Chapter 1. Introduction

When the research began for this dissertation—called by myself and members of my committee, "The Asser Project"—I was admittedly not ready for what I was getting myself into. The conceptual issues regarding authorship, historical accuracy or inaccuracy, and Latinity, that have come to define the work known as the *Vita Ælfredi regis* had all been largely picked through by many of the world's best Anglo-Saxonists, including Anglo-Latin specialists, and Welsh historians. The goals of the project were set out broadly in the very beginning: primarily, to "discover things" regarding the textual history and transmission of the *Vita Ælfredi regis* that have been neglected or missed altogether, and, secondarily, to address the question of whether the *Vita Ælfredi* can convey any sense of its authenticity through a study of its transmission history.

The work treated here as the *Vita Ælfredi* is transmitted to us primarily through its exertion in eleventh- and twelfth-century composite chronicles, and secondarily through sixteenth-century transcriptions deriving from a manuscript that contained a copy of the *Vita* up to the earlier eighteenth-century. Today, the *Vita Ælfredi* is a staunchly debated topic between two dominant groups: firstly, we have the traditionalists (who view the work as an authentic and integral work by a ninth-century Welshman, Asser of St. David's who became bishop of Sherborne in the late-ninth century), and, secondly, we have the anti-traditionalists (who view the work as a later forgery). By the time I had arrived at the most recent translation by Alfred's Smyth, published in 2002, though I greatly disagree with his controversial claims (as set out in its introduction and in an earlier book¹), I sympathized with Smyth's assertion that scholarship on the *Vita Ælfredi regis* "had been allowed to develop into a scholarly black hole [...] that has

¹ Smyth, *King Alfred the Great*.

drawn far too much scholarly energy into its destructive vortex, precluding progress in other aspects of Anglo-Saxon studies and stifling constructive debate and a free exchange of ideas."² It would be a heroic, if foolish, task to take on an entire body of scholarly investigating by offering another exercise in polemical discourse. It is my sincere hope that I have neither turned this exploratory study of the reception of the *Vita Ælfredi regis* into some kind of scholarly crusade, and that I have not thrown it even further into the spiraling blackness of Smyth's vortex.

I soon came to realize, in scholarship—as in life—it is often easier to get oneself into a jam than out of one. It quickly became evident to me during the research for this project that the textual problems that surround the *Vita Ælfredi regis* might easily lead me one down a Carrollian rabbit hole. Regarding the question of authenticity, it turned out, it was easier to reach a conclusion than it was to offer a critically fashionable presentation of my discoveries. After several years spent examining and re-examining the relevant texts, it is my firm conclusion that the text in British Library Cotton Otho A.xii, lost tragically in 1731, had indeed preserved a version of an authentic work that at least partly goes back to the ninth century that detailed the achievements and offered some personal impressions of King Alfred the Great (r. 871-899). I am also of the opinion that the purported first-hand accounts deriving from the received text (the cited Cottonian version) are likely to be the historical work of a bishop Asser of Sherborne. Whether or not the entirety of the work as we have it has been derived directly from the hand of Asser is another, more problematic issue, one involving modern assumptions regarding completion or wholeness, concepts which are frequently problematized in medieval manuscripts. This leads us to a textual *sic et non*, where any conclusions are more held up by belief than they are concrete evidence. Contributing to the problem with conclusivity is the fact that the Cotton

² Smyth, *The Medieval Life*, pp. xviii-xix.

manuscript and its text was known to have been altered by Parker (or a secretary) to the extent of effecting physical interpolations, even beyond the changes in his printed text, and that many of the first-hand accounts of Alfred are not reproduced in any of the eleventh- and twelfth-century sources. After the destruction of the bulk of the Cottonian manuscript, the accuracy of reporting the entirety of the transmitted text through the Cottonian manuscript had been lessened significantly, and, furthermore, the possibility of reconstructing a pre-Cottonian exemplar in any extended form had been eradicated. This *textus receptus*,³ the version transmitted in the Cottonian manuscript, was at its core an imperfect authority on the matter of authority, and the *Vita Ælfredi* passages copied into eleventh- and twelfth-century chronicles were, it would appear, imperfect representations of their exemplars. Even before the near-destruction of the Cottonian manuscript, it is evident that accounts of the physical manuscript were of dubious or ambiguous quality.⁴ The eighteenth-century scholar and editor Francis Wise reported, for example, that the Cotton Manuscript was the product of at least two hands, but in our time it is clear that there is conflicting evidence related to Wise's claims, and that his collations largely were due to his assistant, to the extent that becomes evident that he did not see this *textus receptus* first-hand.⁵

I arrived at the conclusion that, in the absence of incontrovertible proof for the work's integrity, let alone its authorship, the textual evidence must be placed before the author-question. Queries such as "What did Asser write?" would be dismissed in favor of "What has been transmitted, and when, and how?" and (especially given the destruction of the Cottonian

³ The term "textus receptus" refers to a historical, verbal artifact—essentially full extent of Alfredian material that was once contained in BL Cotton Otho A.xii. It is regarded firstly as an *authored* text, comprising an inscription (authored moment) on a medium. Secondly it is seen as part of a "textual event," comprised of both inscription and reception. This reception is an "interpretive-event," as I call it in Chapter 2—a moment when the artifact is made to mean, and "be," by an interpreter. It would be perhaps too ambitious to use the term to describe both the collaborative historical matter and the historical action of reception (for which a better term is our "interpretive-event"), even if a *textus receptus* is not a "received text" until it has been so received by someone.

⁴ Stevenson, *Asser's Life*, p. xliii. Also see chapters 2 and 4.

⁵ See below, Chapter 2.

manuscript) "Where precisely *is* the 'work' of the *Vita Ælfredi regis*?" While part of this project seeks to chart the history of the ascriptions of authorship and how the text was authorized, and while another portion is generally invested in a discourse surrounding qualifications of textual authority regarding the *Vita Ælfredi*, ultimately, this project seeks to reject the author as organizational construct for the *Vita*'s texts and readings and to prioritize the manuscript evidence and their complex interrelationships.

The last concern, regarding issues of textual ontology—what is the work, what comprises it, and where does it exist?—is the focus of Chapter 2. Chapter 2 engages with a broader discourse of textual ontology as well as placing the *Vita Ælfredi* into this discourse. This chapter investigates the three major resistances that constitute a discourse of textual ontology. The *ontology* of a work in this dissertation is defined as a reception of the representation of the work's physical forms through a discourse community. The term "ontology" derives from but departs with the thinking of Martin Heidegger, who asks:

What in the thing is thingly? What is the thing in itself? We shall not reach the thing in itself until our thinking has first reached the thing as a thing.⁶

For Heidegger, the "thingness" is experienced through the nearness of objects, which we then understand in their relation to the worldly context of that nearness. Things are both objects, in and of themselves, and they are also chimeræ viewed by humans in their contexts. He goes on to say that "[things] do not appear by *means of* human making. But neither do they appear without the vigilance of mortals. The first step toward such vigilance is the step back from the thinking that merely represents—that is, explains—to the thinking that responds and recalls."⁷ Heidegger's sense of the relationship between an object and one's thinking of it, in this example, is an

⁶ Heidegger, "The Thing," p. 165.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 179.

important jumping-off point for this study. It is clear that the viewer determines the meaning-making process and shapes the ways in which text may be said to exist (spatially, temporally, and mentally). However, where Heidegger views ontology as a static objectivity for all all "things," ontology in this dissertation is viewed as a sociologically determined "thing"—rather, *things*.

Such discussion of the physical representations of these ontologies ultimately may be taken to include the editions of the *Vita Ælfredi*. That is to say, an edition may participate in questions of what a text is by "editing toward," the point where meaning comes from (that is, with a possible bias toward the author, text, or reader). This project engages closely with both manuscripts of the textual transmission of the *Vita Ælfredi regis* and its Latin editions.

Chapter 3 investigates the history of the *Vita Ælfredi* in close detail, including its relationship to eleventh- and twelfth-century chronicles. It begins with a close examination of the *Vita's* given titles, which might parallel the history of the *Vita's* perceived genres. Following this, the chapter examines the reception history of the alleged genres present in the *Vita*. This chapter additionally identifies several significant periods of textual transmission regarding the Alfredian material, beginning with the *Vita's* self-attested origins as the product of a Welshman and up to the Cotton manuscript's destruction in 1731. "Sources and Witnesses: Tracing the Legacy of Cotton Otho A.xii," investigates the available evidence for the *Vita's* relationships to its eleventh- and twelfth-century copyists and witnesses. "Giraldus Cambrensis: concerning the *Vita S. Æthelberti* preserved in Trinity College, Cambridge, MS B.11.16," interrogates a previously ignored manuscript of Giraldus's *Vita S. Æthelberti* that might participate in the tradition of the *Vita Ælfredi*, or, at the very least, might offer a witness to one of its copyists. The following section, "John Leland, John Bale, and other sixteenth-century use of the historical Asser," investigates the likely location and years of the Cotton Otho A.xii manuscript's discovery by

John Leland, and charts the history of authorization of that *textus receptus* by Leland, Bale, and Parker.

Chapter 4 analyzes the first published edition of the *Vita Ælfredi*, overseen by Matthew Parker, in greater detail. The chapter highlights the alterations to the Cottonian manuscript made by Parker (or his secretary), offering detailed explanations regarding the time frames in which these alterations might have been made. This chapter concludes that Parker's publication program, while propagandistic in its general aim, printed the *Vita Ælfredi* with commentary emphasizing the text's relationship to Parker's contemporary moment.

Chapter 5, "Un-editing Aflred: an Argument for a parallel-text edition on Diplomatic Principles," which is the bulk of my contribution to the field of Asser scholarship, embodies at its core a collation of the significant manuscripts and editions of the *Vita Ælfredi regis*—Parker's printed text, however, as it is derivative from his transcripts, is not given (as is Camden's edition, as it is derivative almost entirely from Parker's printed text).⁸ This collation of the first thirty-five chapters of the *Vita* is organized around Stevenson's 1904 edition, largely for the more urgent purpose of correcting Stevenson's apparatus and setting a precedent for future editions of the Alfredian dossier. This chapter, however, first examines some of the structural implications of Stevenson's edition and then makes a case for the digital future of the dossier. The project's research required my consultation of over half a dozen manuscripts. This dissertation is not, I must state bluntly, interested in the reconstruction of an "original" Asserian text, or even the reconstruction of a pre-Parkerian text going back to Cotton Otho A.xii. That kind of edition, in my opinion, is not desirable for Asserian scholars, although it might facilitate further public consumption of a general translation. The outcome of this collation, I hope, is to achieve the

⁸ For a comprehensive list of Parker's inclusions, consult Stevenson, *Asser's Life*.

publication of a comprehensive Latin edition in the near future with an emphasis on its use for scholarly study.

Bridging the medieval and the post-modern

The prospect (to which the title of this project refers) of defining a text that most plausibly goes back to a ninth-century exemplar as "post-modern" might seem entirely audacious if it weren't for the work of David Greetham, particularly in his essay, "Romancing the Text, Medievalizing the Book." In this essay, Greetham bridges the history of the medieval codex and the emergence of post-modern hypertext by emphasizing the fundamental disconnect between medieval "works" as they were composed and medieval "bound" (with a nod toward the medieval bookbinder's boards) texts as we have received them. That is to say, "pomo Romanticists" (as Greetham calls them) have largely ignored the complex intertextual interactions of the codex, and they have instead, most frequently considered the medieval codex as they would just about any published book, that is, as an object possessing an institutionalized linear coherency. Greetham argues that this linearity is only superficially evident as a result of the medieval manuscript's binding, and instead he suggests that such linearity ultimately "may turn out to be non-existent" (265). While a reader can follow the narrative of Alfred's life through any translation or edition, the representation of the *Vita* in question will always be incomplete. Keynes and Lapidge's translation, which is the most accessible of the available translations, acknowledges that it may silently correct evident narrative inconsistencies that were evidently verging on outright error, even when they were present in the text transmitted in Cotton Otho A.xii (230, fn.11). It is my contention that we cannot now know the *Vita Ælfredi regis* as a textual artifact except through full consideration of the productions of its medieval scribes, its

early modern copyists, all of the published editions (and translations), and, above all, through the cultural work that each of these artifacts individually, but collectively, has done and (in a sense) is still doing. To view the *Vita Ælfredi regis* as a post-modern textual artifact is to look at the interwoven relationships of early pre-Conquest and post-Conquest excerpts and the writers who consulted the *Vita*. Arguably, such a rhizomatic approach, where a text's reading is a node in a vast latticework of intertextual relationships, better simulates the ontological problems faced by scholars of the *Vita Ælfredi*. By collating the readings of all available textual artifacts, it may prove possible to "read between the scribes." Furthermore, I contend that it is not now possible to reconstruct the sort of "genuine" text that Dorothy Whitelock has famously defended from the status of forgery.⁹ Such positivism oversimplifies and misrepresents the text as a cultural event, while simultaneously becoming a cultural event in and of itself.

Social contract theory and the socialization of texts

[T]o the social textual critic, any *textus receptus*, no matter how far removed from a demonstrable authorial intention—indeed, even if it contradicts such an intention—acquires primary evidentiary status as a cultural artifact. ("Textual Forensics" 75)

The texts that comprise the Alfredian dossier, along with the activities of their medieval copyists and modern transcribers and editors, are evaluated below (especially in chapters 3 and 4) in the context of both contemporary editorial practice and social contract theory. The activities of Matthew Parker and his associates (and other editors), individuals who were responsible for the earliest print publication of the *Ælfredi regis res gestae*, can be evaluated with respect to the "contract" between the individual and state (in the sense that the editor may function as a

⁹ This defense can be found in Whitelock, *The Genuine Asser*.

mediator for state authority). It might seem misguided to apply this approach, which emerged in the early- to mid-seventeenth century, and, further, to apply it to an artifact that evidently saw minimal circulation around the time of its composition, and down to the invention of the printing press. Social contract theory, however, may prove useful, in that it can draw on the publication of a text as a source for textual and cultural authority. This approach has been carefully considered in the course of my research. Social contract theory offers medieval manuscript scholars perspectives on textual ontology that may serve to deproblematize, but not correct, the loss of the leaves of manuscripts, or the destruction of entire texts. Such an approach effectively conceptualizes texts as multi-voiced witnesses of moments of actualization (not as actualizations themselves), views text as process—moments of irreducible textual corruption and contamination—and articulates the "unfinished" state as a natural state of the textual condition.¹⁰

Broadly, this study attempts to answer a crucial question: What is our critical responsibility when editing a work, such as the *Vita Ælfredi*, that is no longer extant in reliable copies? I will argue that the editions of the *Vita Ælfredi*, from the first print publication of "Asser" in 1574, overseen by Parker, to the recent translation by Alfred P. Smyth (which still adverts to the activities of a holistic "forger"), have trended toward a bias that prioritizes that author as the validator of the *Vita's* historical characteristics. This view is deeply reminiscent of editorial theories relating to concern with author's final intentions. There are, generally speaking, two ideologically informed views of the *Vita Ælfredi*. The first view is that the *textus receptus* goes back to a text that is authoritative, integral whole, and the product of a single author. The second view is that the text is integral, but is non-authoritative, insofar as it is the product of a forger. Yet, both of these schools of thought depend absolutely on the status of an author, whether

¹⁰ For a close examination of the use of social contract theory and its relationship to textual ontology, especially in the work of Stanley Fish, see below, Chapter 2.

the declared Alfredian contemporary or a later forger. To deny the role of an author to the extant text altogether would be to declare it unsound for scholarship: not a textual artifact.

The *Vita Ælfredi regis* has now come to be known through multiple editions whose apparatuses serve to naturalize "the text itself" while presenting it as unproblematically self-contained. Much error has in fact arisen in criticism ascribing the *Vita* to a single author, whether or not this individual bore the name Asser. This emergence of the author as a unifying (and, in the end, mystifying) characteristic in the history of the *Vita* had begun by the sixteenth century with the antiquary John Leland, who was the first to attempt to publicize¹¹ that it was a Welsh bishop named Asser who should be credited with the authoring of the work. It is often claimed that Parker, Leland's contemporary, would go on to misidentify Asser as the author of the *Annales S. Neoti*,¹² an attribution of authorship that went largely undisputed up to the middle of the nineteenth century.¹³ The discourse that began silently with the promulgation of the author slowly evolved into a received truth of modern scholarship, culminating in multiple recent editorial representations presenting and explicating an unfragmented version of the *Vita Ælfredi*.

Arguments alleging a fragmented framework of the *Vita Ælfredi*, however, have their own challenges, as may be seen in the criticism of D. P. Kirby, who advances the position that the *Vita Ælfredi*, in some form reminiscent to the text contained in the Cotton manuscript, is an "evolution out of a series of separate compositions dating to 885-6, 886-7, 888-9, and 893-4" ("Asser and His Life of King Alfred" 33). Though somewhat speculative at times, and while built upon the status of the historical Asser, the majority of Kirby's argument is founded in the writer's

¹¹ As opposed to publish, used in this study to refer to the issuing of a medium, publicization is the act of making an artifact, action, or event publicly known for the purposes of promotion.

¹² For the counter-argument, Chapter 2.

¹³ Macray, *A Manual of British Historians*, p.xviii; Macray lists Asser as the author of the *Ælfredi regis res gestae* and the *Annales S. Neoti*.

awareness of historical Welsh conflicts during the ninth century, and the apparent literary repetitions that occur in the *Vita* at difficult-to-reconcile intervals. In the notes to their translation, Simon Keynes and Michael Lapidge dismiss Kirby's claim that the *Vita* is a fragmented work made up of three separate treatises, some separate material, and the translations from the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* on the basis that "it does not seem that such a complicated theory is really necessary" and invoking the logic of Occam's Razor suggest that its status as a draft supplies us with enough explanation for its often criticized, ostensibly muddled presentation.¹⁴ Marie Schutt essentially presents the *Vita* as a fully formed work and alleges that the narrative focus of the *Vita*, Alfred's dedication to learning and literacy, may serve to smooth out the jumbled, sometimes arbitrary digressions into the annalistic material.¹⁵ In construing the status of the text with its received presentation so closely, one concern shades into the other. To give the *Vita* the status of a draft is to see it, to parody a famous line by Stanley Fish, through draft-seeing eyes, and to recognize in it the qualities that one associates with a draft produced by a single author. It thus becomes impossible to judge whether the work is finished, whether its author ever intended to return to it, or whether he, or someone else, actually did so. It becomes difficult to disregard the author-question if rhetorical continuity forms the basis for an evaluation of the text's integrity. Likewise, the assumption that one's perception that the text's authorial status, as well as its physical and textual qualities, coheres underlies Alfred Smyth's statement that "[o]nce we abandon the notion of the *Life* of Alfred as being a contemporary account, we also, in effect, relinquish the idea of Asser's scholarship" (271). In other words, if we stop seeing the text as being formed by Asser, we will start to see it as formed by someone else (a statement that is self-evidently true), including an Author-forgery and, to some extent, the reader. The

¹⁴ Keynes and Lapidge, *Alfred the Great*, p. 222, fn. 118.

¹⁵ Schutt, "The Literary Form of the *Vita* Alfredi," pp. 216-217.

allegation that the *Vita* is a forgery, for Smyth, overlaps with what he sees as the unchallenged coherence of its received presentation: the mixture of *Chronicle* materials and “folkloric and hagiographical elements” (271).

Arguments for anti-traditionalism

It is briefly worth reviewing the origins of the "forgery debate" as well as some of the major contributors to the "anti-traditionalist" cause. In a letter written to Sir Henry Ellis in 1841, Thomas Wright¹⁶ called into question whether a ninth-century author of the *Vita Ælfredi* could have known the text of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* from which he was drawing at first hand. He claims that though the *Vita* attests internally to its composition in or around 893, the section of the *Chronicle* rendered there “was not composed before the beginning of the tenth century, and [so] it is more probable that [the *Vita*] is the work of a later period” (194). Wright's specific arguments on this subject, however, hold no authority today. Stevenson points to MS. A of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, which do indeed go back to the period of Alfred (cii).¹⁷ Several articles by Howarth (cited by Stevenson, cx-cxxv) fanned the flames of the arguments about the *Vita*'s authenticity, and, finally, in 1964, V. H. Galbraith contended that the text transmitted by Cotton Otho A.xii, on the whole, was a forgery made by Leofric around the middle of the eleventh century.¹⁸ Galbraith's claims were effectively countered by Dorothy Whitelock four years after they were advanced.¹⁹ Most recently, the hypothesis of forgery was re-excavated by Alfred Smyth in his controversial book, *King Alfred the Great* (1995). Put simply, Smyth's claims are deeply problematic on a compositional level, though his arguments briefly re-established an

¹⁶ Wright, "Some Historical Doubts," pp. 192-201.

¹⁷ Wright's other arguments are equally baseless and dismantled by William H. Stevenson in *Asser's Life*, pp. cii-cx.

¹⁸ Galbraith, *An Introduction*, pp. 85-128. Also, Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England*, p. 268.

¹⁹ Whitelock, *The Genuine Asser*, p. 3.

interest in the value of the *Vita Ælfredi regis* as an historical document and occasioned re-statements of the most significant concerns by a range of scholars. On the whole, the accusations of forgery remain unconvincing.

Within the context of its editorial tradition, then, the *Vita Ælfredi regis* may be seen to perform largely unexplored cultural work. It links the English Reformation to a celebrated period in the distant past, which was characterized by strong regal presence that retained ties to papal authority.²⁰ The *Vita* also occupied a central (if honorary) position within an emerging English print culture, and it also came eventually to participate in the early modern process of British empire-building, supported by the veneration of its subject. As an edited and widely recognized textual artifact, and without the unnecessary complication of having to be viewed as either "forged" or "genuine," its earliest publication (followed by its early modern circulation) amounted to a significantly influential cultural event.

Who wrote the *Vita Ælfredi*?

The text is ascribed on evidence internal to the Co transcript, and to the hand-drawn facsimile of the Cotton Manuscript's first page, to *Asser*, a name which does not recur after its initial salutation, but which has been identified critically with the name of Asser, bishop of Sherborne,²¹ whom Alfred mentions in the preface to his translation of Gregory's *Regula pastoralis*.²² What we learn from several passages in the *Vita Ælfredi* is that their narrator served Alfred, having been summoned from his religious house in Wales to Alfred's kingdom during the later ninth century.²³ He would return to Wales at regular intervals each year, while concurrently

²⁰ See below, Chapter 3.

²¹ See Keynes and Lapidge, *Alfred the Great*, p. 93; Stevenson, *Asser's Life*, p. 63 (ch. 79).

²² See Keynes and Lapidge, *Alfred the Great*, pp. 269-270, fn. 218.

²³ See Stevenson's ch. 79. Also see Keynes and Lapidge, *Alfred the Great*, pp. 93-94.

composing some accounts of Alfred's daily activity, domestic policy, and character.²⁴ Many of these accounts are not satisfying to the modern historian, who might like to know more about Alfred's military strategy or the extent of his educational reforms. As we might expect with a text that has come to be known to contemporary scholars solely through indirect witnesses, mainly through transcripts of a lost primary source, itself a copy of a copy in a chain of exemplars, claims regarding textual integrity and single authorship have been made almost by default as *argumenta ex silentio*.

Much of the skepticism expressed by historians emerges from the fact that the narrative voice of the *Vita Ælfredi* may seem at times to be an unreliable source of credible documentation. For example, the *Vita Ælfredi*'s apparent exaggeration with regard to Alfred's illnesses presents formidable challenges to the modern mind.²⁵ Galbraith's argument, in one broad stroke, rested on two main issues: first, dissatisfaction with the narrative's description and exaggeration of Alfred's illnesses, and, second, an apparently anachronistic use of the term *parochia*. Smyth, who reproduces Galbraith's emphasis on the accounts of Alfred's illnesses, arrives at the conclusion that the text in the Cottonian manuscript was written (or "forged") by the later tenth- and earlier eleventh-century hagiographer and chronicler Byrhtferth of Ramsey (c. 970-1020) or someone in his circle.²⁶

Even for the traditionalists, who accept Asser as the author, wrestling with the narratological turns of the *Vita* has been difficult. While offering a defense of the text's attribution to Asser, Dorothy Whitelock accepts that the ostensibly exaggerated passages are due

²⁴ For a reading of these intervals, as well as their relationship to Anglo-Saxon and Welsh relations during Alfred's reign, see Kirby, "Asser and His Life of King Alfred," pp. 13-25.

²⁵ Galbraith's charges and their counters can be revisited in Whitelock, *The Genuine Asser*.

²⁶ Smyth: "The *Life* of Alfred was compiled to hagiographical specifications, and that being so, the scholarly Alfred's precocity for learning as a child has to be demonstrated, as was his superiority over all his brothers. Alfred's superiority in looks and in learning all sprang from a higher level of superiority, which the author of the *Life* construed as being essentially moral" (*King Alfred the Great* 197).

to Asser's "love of rhetoric" (Whitelock here quoting a phrase of William H. Stevenson). She suggests rather that more scholarly familiarity with the homiletic literature of the Anglo-Saxons would alleviate this overemphasis on rhetorical exaggeration.²⁷ Whitelock comes close to Marie Schutt's perspective that these hagiographically resonant passages reflect the narrative structure of the *Vita Ælfredi* and the implementation of non-linear narrative.²⁸ For Schutt and Whitelock, the narrative's occasional indebtedness to a hagiographical style does not invalidate the historical value of the text. Whitelock's assertion that the depiction of Alfred here does not widely depart from other homiletic literature known to the Anglo-Saxons, reflects Gransden's point that in one of the alleged models for the *Vita's* Alfred, Einhard's *Vita Karoli*, the Frankish emperor is depicted similarly in many respects.²⁹ Whitelock continues that "[i]f one prefers to believe that Asser greatly exaggerated the story [of Alfred's illnesses], perhaps inspired by a wish to make his hero more like a saint, the fact remains that exaggeration is not necessarily a sign of later writing" (*The Genuine Asser* 16-17). In other words, the concerns of skeptical critics regarding narratological exaggeration may ultimately be dissatisfaction with the genres that comprise the *Vita Ælfredi*.

All told, there are at least five major medieval genres represented in the tradition of the *Vita Ælfredi*. In order of appearance these are: the epistolary formula; genealogically based passages; annalistic passages; biographical narrative (which subsumes both non-saintly biographical narrative and quasi-historiographical narrative); and a genre known as the synchronism.³⁰ Some critics have gone further seeking to define even more specialized forms to

²⁷ Whitelock, *The Genuine Asser*, 16.

²⁸ Schutt, "The Literary Form," pp. 209-220.

²⁹ Whitelock, *The Genuine Asser*, p. 16; Gransden, *Historical Writing*, p. 41: "The author was influenced by Einhard's *Life of Charlemagne* and by the hagiographical tradition. The one gave him a model for a great Christian ruler, the patron of scholars, himself with intellectual interests. The other provided models for an exemplary Christian through whom God demonstrated his power."

³⁰ See Thornton, *Kings*, pp. 59-63.

which the *Vita Ælfredi* was indebted. Alice Sheppard, in her book *Families of the King: Writing Identity in the "Anglo-Saxon Chronicle,"* makes the claim that the Alfredian biographer, whom she accepts is the historical Asser, is indebted to Frankish genre of the *specula principum* ("mirrors for princes" or exemplary narratives for aristocrats), which "turn inwards to focus on morality, virtue, and the private realm, consistently positioning the king as an example for the faith life of his subjects" (52). Sheppard, in other argumentation, advances Asser's apparent interest in effecting a reconstitution of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* as a possible explanation for the heterogeneity of the *Vita*. This may be acutely visible in the *Vita's* use of the *Chronicle's* depiction of the reign of Æthelwulf. Sheppard writes that "in addition to separating the *Vita* [*Ælfredi*] from the conventions of Christian historiography, the narrative of Æthelwulf's exemplary character also distinguishes Asser's account from the ideals of kingship expressed in certain Carolingian mirrors for princes" (57).

Neither characterization, "genuine work" or "forgery," wholly obviates the critical problems that have arisen in addressing the underlying form of the *Vita Ælfredi regis*. It is either an integral, albeit irregularly shaped text or several well-shaped texts that have been stitched together in an ultimately unsatisfying way. The history of the *Vita's* print-publication, moreover, demonstrates the need for caution in adopting any unduly holistic approach to the *Vita Ælfredi regis*.³¹

³¹ The question work's ontology, of how its status as text has been and is still viewed, will be raised in the following chapter, with a discussion of the Cotton manuscript's patchwork quality, a view aimed at challenging the predominant view of a contiguous text.

Chapter 2. The Resistance to Ontology: Pre Modernity, Hypertextuality, Nabokov, and the *Vita Ælfredi*

[...]if we destroy a painting or a piece of sculpture or a building, we destroy it completely, though we may preserve descriptions or records in another medium and might even try to reconstruct what has been lost. But we shall always create a different work of art (however similar), while the mere destruction of the copy of a book or even of all its copies may not touch the work of art at all.

-Rene Wellek and Austin Warren, "The Mode of Existence of a Literary Work of Art" (71-72)

There is (to parody the now-famous formulation of Wellek and Warren) a "Mode of *Resistance* in the Literary Work." The resistance appears as the work's patent designs of self-attention, the many ways it turns into itself (in both senses of "into"). Textual scholars register these forms of self-attention as the inseparability of the medium and the message, the advent of meaning as a material event which is coterminous (in several senses) with its textual execution. Literary works do not know themselves, and cannot *be* known, apart from their specific material modes of existence/resistance. They are not channels of transmission, they are particular forms of transmissive interactions.

-Jerome McGann, *The Textual Condition* (11)

The struggle for the text is the text.

-R. Cloud, "Information and Information" (279)

It has long been held that textual ontology is governed by the wholeness of the "work"³² in respect to imperfect physical manifestations that approximate to the work as a whole and give an idea of what that wholeness might be. As may be observed in the criticism of Jerome McGann—whose epigraph above, though it comes second in the sequence, strongly frames the discourse in this chapter—this assumption gave rise to eclectic editing (among other practices), drawing from New Critical methodology, and elsewhere, the idea that the author, like a god, works mysteriously, and that the editor does his reader a service by making interpretive choices, performing editorial exegesis, from multiple exempla. It is, of course, a complicated process to separate the "work" from the manifestation of that work, as the above epigraph by Wellek and Warren highlights. Some media, they explain, allow for the "work" and an instance of that work to coexist in one physical object, because any attempt to produce a new version of that work would result in a new work altogether. Wellek and Warren utilize the term "work" where "original" is more accurate. To destroy a painting, they declare, is to destroy "the work" (rather, the original), but to destroy a copy of a work leaves the original uncorrupted. What defines these media is the inability for the author to reproduce the actions taken during the creating-process: even making a copy of a painting is to create a new painting that just happens to look nearly identical to the "original." What we should understand from Wellek and Warren's formulation isn't that they've given too much status to the concept of "work" but that they haven't given enough to that of the copy.

A copy is, by its very definition, derivative. It is derived from another object by a person, machine, or program. The copy of a textual object has its own material existence and may be

³² This chapter prefers Peter Shillingsburg's definition of "work" in *Scholarly Editing*, pp. 42-44. In Shillingsburg's argumentation, a "work...has no substantial existence. Nor is it a Platonic ideal, that is, one fixed ideal form" (43). See also, Peckham, "Reflections," p. 127.

experienced, distributed, or copied in turn. The copy may in turn acquire the status of "original" to any copies made from it. Nevertheless, a textual object (book, song, sculpture, film, etc., whether an original or a copy) has its own ontological status. That ontology may be construed in a number of ways, but that status develops from a position of authority (usually reader and author) and keeps developing as the artistically rendered object is experienced. This chapter does not engage how textual ontologies differ, but rather how they are socialized, how shifting editorial views of textual ontology have affected the *Vita Ælfredi*, at times viewed it as a "copy" and at other times, "original."

This chapter sketches three types of resistance that have informed and in some cases inhibited a critical discourse of textual ontology. The first resistance is visible in the way a text³³ resists itself, or, rather, how meaning of a text resists the medium on which it is inscribed. This has been written on extensively by Jerome McGann in his theoretical work, *The Textual Condition* (1991). In the second epigraph to this chapter, McGann argues that bibliographical meaning is not disconnected from one's interpretation of the words on the page. Textual ontology is represented (that is, made present) through observable moments of "transmissive interactions" (11). Whereas Wellek and Warren are concerned with a work's relationship to its texts (that work's physical or performative manifestations),³⁴ McGann is interested in how a work is

³³ While there have been several definitions of "text" used in textual criticism, this chapter takes Peter Shillingsburg's definition from *Scholarly Editing in the Computer Age*. That is: "the actual order of words and punctuation as contained in any one physical form, such as manuscript, proof, or book" (46). A text has "no substantial or material existence, since it is not restricted by time and space" (ibid.). This definition might be pedantic on some level (as Shillingsburg himself is willing to admit), but it is necessary to distinguish between this immaterial text and the inscription of the text's linguistic signs (which Eggert calls "text" in "Document and Text"). The distinction, I argue, is necessary for editorial theory and bibliography because inscriptions and texts perform different ontological actions. However, Eggert and Shillingsburg's definition of "document" is identical and used here, defined as the material object that incorporates the text and the linguistic signs. Shillingsburg's definition of "text" does not exclude subsets of oral performance that have non-iterable (improvisational) qualities. In his view, a text "can exist simultaneously in the memory, in more than one copy or in more than one form" (ibid.); Therefore, a "text" of an improvised oral performance, may be contained by a storage medium and then iterated through a subsequent telling—producing a new text.

³⁴ For Wellek and Warren, a "work" is an ideal concept that its texts enact, evident in our first epigraph, where they

observable through "specific material modes of existence/resistance" which are present in those physical manifestations (11). In his words, the "text's" medium is "coterminous (in several senses) with its textual execution" (11). Meaning is only observable, for McGann, with reception of the linguistic and bibliographic signifiers in relation to each other and the reader's awareness of authorial intent: he describes this relationship as a "double helix of perceptual codes" (77) that ought not to be separated from each other. Doing so would de-historicize the text.

McGann's double helix offers a useful model for the discourse of textual ontology. Like another, better-known double helix, Deoxyribonucleic Acid, the helices interact through observable bonds but never themselves touch. In *The Textual Condition* McGann imagines these helices as different textual codes. The first code is the bibliographic: the material object on or in which language is inscribed. The second code is the linguistic: those inscriptions that are the property of language. These interwoven bibliographic and the linguistic codes are, he explains, in a state of constant resistance. A reader cannot apprehend both the material object and the story together unless one such helix prompts such a meta-awareness of its counterpart. Even then, this awareness is incomplete and only partial. This awareness (or resistance) is what separates literary works from other, non-literary works, but this distinction is, in many ways, a matter of opinion. To McGann, all writing is, in one way or another, literary.

Bibliographer and critic Randall McLeod argues that in consequence of this resistance a book's bibliographic form and literary meaning are implicitly separate. For McLeod, meaning is a matter of language and the bibliography is another kind of language. In "Tranceformations in the Text of *Orlando Furioso*" he puzzles over the interaction of these codes, declaring: "I can't I I I can't simultaneously read I can't *read* a book I can't *READ* a book and **LOOK** at it at the same

describe the non-perishable quality of a work.

time" (61). The resistance of each "perceptual code" to the other, for McLeod, prevents the reader from experiencing both languages at the same time.³⁵ Ontology, in this way, inhibits McLeod from editing in a traditional sense but instead enables him to "un-edit": to show how a document's textual transmission and bibliographic codes underpin editorial efforts. As he says at the end of one of his essays, "meaning permeates all aspects of text (...). Text and reading are distinct. In this way the text resists being made to conform to its interpretation" ("Un-editing Shak-spear" 52).

Both McGann and McLeod agree that the resistance of lexical codes with respect to bibliographical codes emerges out of a reader's interpretation of the material object viewed through acquired cultural awareness. All literary texts, McGann states, "turn readers back upon themselves, make them attentive to what they are doing when they read" (*Textual Condition* 11). In this, McGann may not explicitly state that readers are made aware of the medium of the artifact as much as they are made aware of the genre of the literary text and the ways in which we participate in genre creation; however, he suggests that the meaning making acts during reading are, specifically, material acts. The literariness of texts or, more plainly put, a narrative's self-referential qualities, make the text (story), not just text (words), but *the text* (material object), visible.

McGann's claim raises several questions of the extent to which a narrative must be paired with its intended medium in order for this literary quality to function. This quality may be glimpsed in many literary texts, but is most apparent, perhaps, in contemporary historiographic metafiction, in which genre, medium, and message are inherently made visible by the writer. In

³⁵ In David Greetham's reading of this resistance, the "weighing of one type disturbs the value of evidence of another type" (*The Pleasures of Contamination* 71). This has led McLeod to "not read" the *Orlando*, with the book placed upside down so that he can see the nuances of print. With the sign-signifiers sufficiently defamiliarized to McLeod, reading the material object can take precedence.

the last section of Aleksandar Hemon's short story, "The Life and Work of Alphonse Kauders," titled "Notes," its author (breaking from the voice of the narrator) states "Now keep reading the book." The reader of Hemon's book, *The Question of Bruno*, is jarred momentarily, told that it is, after all, a physical object that he or she holds, and that this story's composition is contained within the physical object. Additionally, if one does as the voice suggests and keeps reading "the book," the reader is introduced to several characters, events, and documents mentioned by the narrator in the "Notes" section, emblems of the object's book-ness.

This compilation can be compared against "The Life and Work of Alphonse Kauders" as reproduced in the *Anchor Book of American Short Stories* (2004), edited by Ben Marcus. In this compilation, the story and "Notes" section are reproduced in their entirety. The chronicler's meta-cognitive gesture, "Now keep reading the book," does not prompt the reader to realize the interwovenness of the material (which is no longer present as no other stories by Hemon are included). The editor, perhaps unwittingly, changes the meaning of "book": literary form to archive. The gesture allows recognition of the materiality of the collection, insofar that it is a collection, and also recognition of the missing literary form, to which the story has been orphaned. It is to McGann's credit that he has shaped the way editors and textual critics have approached this split between bibliographical codes and linguistic codes: in this, he is correct in directing critical attention to the ignorance of the material document in defining textual ontology. However, the interconnectedness of bibliographic codes and linguistic codes become codified, as Paul Eggert has rightly pointed out (and can be observed in the Hemon example), as scientific-sounding euphemisms for the usual term: author's intentions ("Document and Text" 24). Eggert's objection is that McGann's theoretical perspective changes the terms used, but not the practice of editing. McGann is acutely aware of this, and so Eggert's critique is partly blunted. McGann

describes in both *Critique* and "What Is Critical Editing?" that the author's intentions are useful to editors as long as they are not set as the ultimate criterion for the creation of an edition (*The Textual Condition* 62). This suggests that his terminology has not so much revolutionized an understanding of textual ontology (it has not), but it has shifted the focus of signifier/signified from the author to the linguistic inscription—a critical shift much in the vein of Barthes,³⁶ Foucault, and Derrida. In other words, Eggert perhaps failed to appreciate that it is not the author's intentions regarding the work that determine the text's linguistic and bibliographical resistance, but rather the linguistic and bibliographic resistance that governs the socialization and reception of the author's perceived intention.

The second kind of resistance this chapter will discuss is the work's resistance to its physical documents or performative manifestations. This kind of resistance is most visible in editorial criticism, and it is often discussed in scholarly editions, but it is ignored in "hard" literary criticism. This resistance questions the status of the "work of art"³⁷ being discussed: which texts constitute it, and how are they related (hierarchically, stemmatically, rhizomatically) to the work? This chapter will focus primarily on the theoretical discourse surrounding the explanation and application of textual ontology. Below, this resistance will be discussed in relation to the *Vita Ælfredi*, and how its extant witnesses are related. It is problematic, I will argue, to view the received *Vita*—uncritically—as the work of a single author. It has been transmitted in multiple, incomplete physical witnesses in both chronicle extracts and in continuous, self-standing scribal copies. Also, it reveals its performative manifestations as both

³⁶ Though Barthes's essay "From Work to Text," published in 1977, effectively inverts the familiar definitions of the terms "text" and "work" used here, his explanations are similar to Peter Shillingsburg's. There are distinctions to mention: particularly, Barthes' "work" (Shillingsburg's and our "text") is not the linguistic codes but "a fragment of substance, occupying a part of the space of books." When referring to his essay, then, our terms will cohere with Shillingsburg's.

³⁷ This term is severely outdated. This chapter uses "work" derived from Shillingsburg. This can be found in Shillingsburg, *Scholarly Editing*, pp. 42-44.

chronicle (reminiscent of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*) and biography (reminiscent of continental, regal biographies, such as Einhard's *Vita Karoli*). Furthermore, textual evidence of interpolation, of scribal "borrowing" emerge as essential parts of its identity, which the proposition of single authorship denies.

These multiple witnesses (mentioned above) of this construct—*vita*—force editors to confront the text as a copy, and to disassociate the term "original" from its source of authority. When commenting on a debate between Nelson Goodman and Richard Wollheim, Joseph Grigely states that Goodman is hard-pressed to allow that identical acts of inscriptions (i.e. copies) are instances of different works because this would imply that individual iterations of the same inscription³⁸ are ontologically distinct ("The Textual Event" 103). It is Grigely's contention that they must certainly be different works (this is also the contention of this chapter) since they occupy different historical spaces which "arise not from the moments of our reading (though this may be so), but from the moments of their respective inscriptions, and only later from our investigation of those moments" (ibid. 103). Grigely importantly stresses that the historical events comprise separate textual ontologies. His claim challenges the view that lexical content must necessarily regulate bibliographical organization (a text's status as part of a work), and offers that a possible solution is in how we view the "event" of text-making. Problems of the textual event have long followed the Alfred dossier, notably as a result of as editorial assumptions about the work's ontological status that have been based on hypothetical versions that now have no material substantiation (if they ever did). This assumption is due to a confusion

³⁸ Grigely highlights two senses in which "inscription" is used. The first sense is an inscription as a copying of linguistic codes and placing them within a new context. In that sense the codes can be read and compared to an original—implying social values to the material objects in question without allotting for sociological forces. This is the core position held by Goodman, in his book on iterability, *Languages of Art: an Approach to a Theory of Symbols* (1968). The second sense is thinking of an inscription as an utterance, the view taken in McLaverty, "Issues of Identity and Utterance," pp. 134-51.

of the *Vita Ælfredi* for its material documents. From this resistance, this chapter will put forward that all copies or texts that constitute the *Vita Ælfredi* embody intrinsic ontological actions insofar as they indeed are "ontologized ... by the temporal history that surrounds their composition" (ibid.: 103) and that these texts can be (and often are) given another ontological status upon reception.

The third manner of resistance is to ontology in a broader sense. This resistance is hermeneutic in nature and it is evidenced by a critical shift from intention-based editing to editing based on sociological, bibliographic, and documentary biases.³⁹ This third category of resistance, generally speaking, has developed as a reaction to ideals arising in the Enlightenment in the wake of the dissolution of New Critical scholarship. This resistance confronts the problems of assuming a single hermeneutic center, and makes the case for interwoven meaning-producing events, observable in the recent debates over the status of hypertext. With the advent of hypertext, its advocates, such as David Greetham, have rethought textual ontology to more adequately account for the social, multivoiced characteristics of language's many forms. Hypertextuality has been instrumental in challenging assumptions of finality and fixity. Its effect on post-New Critical text-reception is widespread, altering approaches to medieval manuscripts as well as (and in some cases better than) printed texts. David Greetham is certainly correct that the philosophical discourse of textuality must be disassociated with modernity⁴⁰; his argument that medieval textuality foreshadows and recontextualizes hypertextuality (and perhaps that hypertext reconstitutes medieval textuality) will be examined more fully below. As he argues,⁴¹ the New Critical resistance to ontology has led editors to prioritize Platonic, ideal forms of text,

³⁹ I do not contend that meaning and editorial bias are synonymous, but that the shift away from positivistic ontological views is the result of a philological determination as to where meaning, and thus authority, lies.

⁴⁰ Greetham, "The Philosophical Discourse of [Textuality]?" in *The Pleasures of Contamination*.

⁴¹ The argument is laid out in "The Philosophical Discourse of [Textuality]?" in *The Pleasures of Contamination*.

eschew the historical and particular for the timeless and universal. It has, in other words, caused medium to be misconceived as meaning (as in the first type of resistance) and the document of the work to be confused for the work (as in the second type).

Acts of socialization

These three resistances constitute a theoretical discourse of textual ontology. Given the complex interactions of these discursive acts, textual ontology should be understood as the interpenetration of these resistances and their multiagents,⁴² to co-opt a term from Daniel Allington. Concepts such as "text" or "work" and indeed more broadly constituted theories of ontology are as socially constructed as are the objects they contextualize.

How then is ontology socialized? And what are the actions of this socialization? This chapter demonstrates that textual ontology is not an implicit, "natural" state of texts, but that it is a social *reaction*: ontology is not stasis, but it arises out of a continuum wherein readers (i.e. imagined communities), in the process of reading, process and reify the three categories of resistance sketched out above. Much like Foucault's "author function," essentially a tautology which organizes specific works around an author that simultaneously helps shape that same author function, textual ontology is in effect a tautological social phenomenon.

We must, therefore, tread cautiously, with the intention of illuminating the sociological construct that has come to be known as the *Vita Ælfredi regis*. This label, to be discussed more

⁴² Allington never officially defines the term, but he offers that these kinds of actors are "...those involved in or otherwise able to influence the process of editing and production" ("How to Do Things With Literature" 476). This specifically indicates the actors that influence the work's course before and during the socialization of the text. However, Allington expands the scope of his inquiry from that to readers and other actors after the publicization of the text. Drawing on Ron Scollon's discussion of non-literary, textual social interactions, Allington writes, "[i]n this conception, reading is understood in terms not of receiving a message, but of carrying out social actions made possible by the text" and that these kinds of actions are "by no means trivial" (477).

thoroughly in Chapter 3, is the result of years of critical debate—both rejection and acceptance—over the generic forms of the received text—the damaged manuscript British Library Cotton Otho A.xii and its transcripts set against the various eleventh- and twelfth-century witnesses. This generally accepted label, "*Vita Ælfredi regis*," describes not the text (the order of the words in Cotton Otho A.xii) but the work (the general organizing concept that determines what scholars may include in the "Alfred dossier"). Furthermore, it is evident that Cotton Otho A.xii is but one text of the *Vita* and not *the* text. Because it is difficult to determine the entirety of the text that was present in the Cotton Otho A.xii, it is difficult—if not impossible—to determine a singular text of the work. It is easier to define the boundaries of the document (the material object and version of the text). With the aforesaid version, the Cotton Otho A.xii manuscript, badly damaged from a fire in 1731, critics are left with the choice of attempting to reconstruct the manuscript from incomplete and interpolated transcripts, or critics must be resigned to accept the transcripts themselves with their early modern trappings, errors of transcription, and interpolated portions from post-Conquest chronicle fragments. As will be further argued in Chapter 3, the stages of interpolation that plagued the sixteenth-century editing of the *Vita* during Matthew Parker's publication program became dominant factors of its early critical reception and circulation. The BL Cotton Otho A.xii, due to the singularity of its existence (and the lack of other exemplars), has the effect of being called uncritically *the Vita Ælfredi regis*, despite its tenth-century composition and known interpolations until the sixteenth century. Let us be clear: there is no text called the *Vita Ælfredi regis* that was written by an author or authors during the reign of King Alfred—that title was given to the work in the modern period, shortened from lengthy, descriptive titles starting in sixteenth-century editions. The lost document, that at some point contained a version of the text of that work, is not recoverable with the present materials

and manuscript evidence. What scholars mean about when we say *Vita Ælfredi regis* is an idea of a work: a biography of King Alfred written by the Bishop Asser exalting the king's characteristics. In this, the use of the term is a necessary evil, and it is used here to refer to the work, where appropriate. The term implies to an imagined whole, which manuscript evidence ardently complicates.

This chapter shows that the question of authorship is also a question of textuality. It is problematic, moreover, to discuss authorship of the *Vita Ælfredi regis* without acknowledging uncritically how its authorizing came about, and how concepts regarding authorship have governed scholarship.

The dedication speaker, Asser, wishes Alfred prosperity, yet it is not, of course, an introduction in same way Byrhtferth's introductions to the *Vita Oswaldi* and *Vita Ecgwini* are introductions to their respective *vitae*. As a point of comparison, holding Asser's dedication up to the salutation at the start of the epistle by William of Malmesbury to Robert, Earl of Gloucester included in the *Gesta regum Anglorum*, may illustrate the context and genre from which this writing may be drawing.⁴³ In both cases, what we are discussing is a familiar epistolary form. Malmesbury's epistle to Robert, it is widely known, is extant in some manuscript witnesses at the end of William's *Gesta Regum* Book 3, in others at the commencement of the *Gesta Regum*, and still in others not at all.⁴⁴ Asser's dedication, due to the singularity of the Cotton Otho A.xii, is given its position at the start of the *vita*. Asser's dedication resembles Einhard's prologue to his *Vita Karoli*,⁴⁵ in some ways, but Einhard's prefatory matter is more developed, extolling the

⁴³ "Domino venerabili et famoso Comiti Roberto, filio regis, Willelmus Malmesbiriæ monachus salutes [sic], et, si, quas valet orationes."

⁴⁴ Noted by Hardy, *Willelmi Malmesbiriensis*. The epistle, "*Epistola Auctoris, Roberto Consuli Gloecestrensi, Henrici Regis Filio, Dicta*," is printed on an unnumbered page in his edition, fn.1.

⁴⁵ "Karolus gratia dei rex Francorum et Langobardorum ac patricius Romanorum Baugulfo abbati nec non et omni congregationi, fidelibus oratoribus nostris, in omnipotentis dei nomine amabilem direximus salutem."

greatness of his subject and the truth of that which the reader is about to experience, and it is integrated more seamlessly into the biographical material. Einhard, unlike Asser, places himself at the center of the telling. The strangeness of Asser's work is in how it begins immediately with an essentially unfiltered *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, a strong counterpoint to Einhard (whom Asser knew and utilized in his work⁴⁶), who summarizes the line of regal power from which Charlemagne descended. This dedication, therefore, occupies a significant place in the status of the authorship of the work. The premier authorizing moment, which precedes the accounts of the Anglo-Norman historians and informs the reification of the author by the Tudor antiquaries (and also by later scholars), emerges out of the silence between the epistolary dedication—in which Asser is named—and the following information of Alfred's birth and version of the West Saxon genealogy in the *textus receptus*. This silence, to put it more clearly, has shaped the authorizing of the Alfred dossier. Keynes and Lapidge state unambiguously in the introduction to their translation that "The *Life of King Alfred* was written by Asser in 893 (see Stevenson's chapter 91). It is crucial, for, apart from Asser's *Life*, we have no more than a handful of manuscripts of uncertain origin on which to base any assessment" (53). Keynes and Lapidge tie the authorship question to the *Vita's* relevance as an historical document. This is an important assertion, as it also establishes the stakes of the authorship question. The important chapter in parenthesis, ch. 91, is notable for the writer switching to the present tense and stating unambiguously that the year of the account is the year presently in course. The epistolary dedication, mentioned above, and the internal references found under the years 885 (when the narrator states he was summoned from Wales) and 893 (when the narrator declares the present year) are the best, and only, known internal sources for the authorship of a biography of King Alfred.

⁴⁶ Schutt, "Literary Form"; Stevenson, *Asser's Life*, pp. lxxi, lxxii, 224, 294, 315; Plummer, *Life and Times of Alfred the Great*, pp. 14-15; Lees, *Alfred the Great*, pp. 115, 119, 385.

The authorizing of a *Vita Ælfredi regis* becomes codified with Leland,⁴⁷ and preserved by Parker during his publication programme, and continuing to this day. This chapter contends that all of the versions of the *Vita Ælfredi regis* that survive in post-Conquest manuscript may be approached much as we have approached Hemon's "Alphonse Kauders." The new contexts in which these texts appear obscure the status of the work have led to confusion over the relationship between work and material object. The difficulty of such an application, however, is that in *The Question of Bruno* there is a basis for understanding "Alphonse Kauders" through its resistance to ontology; yet, we have no such grounding for the *Vita Ælfredi regis*, except for what has been defined by editors and scholars. The *Vita Ælfredi's* bibliographical and linguistic codes may aid in understand how editors have socialized its authorship, yet perceived intentions cannot precede those codes. In sum, what this chapter attempts to highlight are how different ontological observations have manufactured two (or more) visible *Vita*: the first as a product of an author and the second a product of authorizing.

Some resistance to textual ontology is inevitable for editors who read through multiple texts in order to construct rhetorical forms of an already received text. The previously received text has the benefit of engendering critical discourse that new editions extend for the purpose of challenging or strengthening existing epistemologies. For the *Vita Ælfredi*, "textual ontology"—I should say, a broad critical understanding of what the work is and where it came from—is a response to incomplete bibliographical and linguistic information in the presence of hermeneutic bias: this reaction is shaped by a tendency to see authorial intervention and the concept of finality as products of the text's historical relevance (as in the Keynes and Lapidge example, above). For a concept that is so necessary to textual studies and to editorial theory specifically (but—perhaps

⁴⁷ See Chapter 3.

less so—to literary criticism and rhetorical analysis), it has yet to be made absolutely clear what critics mean when they say textual ontology.

Texts resisting themselves: texts as events and events as texts

To the interpreter, texts often appear as images of time; to the maker of texts, however, they are the very events of time and history itself.

-Jerome McGann, *The Textual Condition*, (186)

Jerome McGann's *The Textual Condition* (1991) was instrumental in rethinking a long-standing textual ontology that had been exclusively bound up in what he calls "romantic hermeneutics" (12). Romantic hermeneutics, McGann explains, views imaginative literature as a transmitter of information that allows meaning to be extracted by the reader who uses the correct tools (12). This ontological rigidity was problematic, leading as it did to concepts of finality, completeness, originality, and to an editorial positivism that accompanied the New Bibliography (bibliographical counterpart to the literary analysis of the New Criticism) during the middle of the twentieth century. McGann's goal, as I have stated, is to rethink how literary works (as opposed to informational works) are conceived of by linking linguistic and bibliographic codes. To sum up his case, McGann argues that that the previous age's "romantic hermeneutics" often confuses "meaning" for "message" (15) by failing to imagine the text as a social act (14) and material object (15-16). Imaginative texts, McGann contends, resist informational models of "transmissive interactions" (11) since imaginative texts "operate to display their own practices" (10-11). McGann sees this as the defining characteristic of literary texts. Ideally, a text will only possess a literary quality if its mode of communication differs from its mode of "meaning." (It remains beyond the scope of this current chapter, however, to define unambiguously what

constitute a literary or non-literary text.) To put this in the terms of rhetorical theory, with the help of Daniel Allington, a literary text is understood with the help of illocutionary intentions while locutionary intentions may imply an overarching meaning for which the text is often confused. As McGann states, "[t]he vehicle of transmission is thereby sharply distinguished from its 'message'" (11).

The conclusions of this chapter on the basis of its examination of the *Vita Ælfredi* will be favorable to McGann's insistence on the specificity of the textual inscription and the historicity of meaning: several critical comments, however, address his use of socialization to generalize textual ontology into a kind of obscurity. The challenges of socialization are apparent most clearly in his aim that *The Textual Condition* attempts to "sketch, through close and highly particular case studies, the general frame-work within which textuality is constrained to exhibit its transformations" (16). One is left to assume that textuality is constrained by an author, and that it only exhibits such transformations when aided by an interpretation, but it is equally clear that McGann is not suggesting these conditions occur in a New Critical-like vacuum. This is to say, in effect, that these textual transformations only emerge *through* interpretation. Yet, by the end of the book, McGann's position seems to have been flipped: "interpretation," states McGann, "is an act which gets carried out only as a response to a given textual condition" (184). Critics may accept that both of these statements are true, and that the tautology rather highlights complications that firmly serve to distinguish a text from that text's interpretation. The problem lies not so much in the validity of the statements, but in how they tend to mystify the process of socialization. The trouble continues when McGann warns of notions of "perfection" and ideal forms, stating that the concepts of perfection are "a function of the specific world(s) in which [its subjects] live and move and have their being" (8-9); yet, in the very next paragraph states that the

"reality" of this perfectness "must be sharply located within the sociohistorical particularities which the perfection defines" (9). If the socialization must be located in itself, then have we made much progress at all? This seeming tautology is emblematic of (and problematic with respect to) McGann's general theory of socialization as a recoverable event, as well as his conceptualization of textual ontology on the whole. I am reminded of a passage from Heinlein's *Stranger in a Strange Land*: "Random chance was not a sufficient explanation of the Universe—in fact, random chance was not sufficient to explain random chance; the pot could not hold itself."

Let us consider the pot. The tautological relationship between interpretation and the textual condition is concomitant with these now-popular metaphors of text-as-event. In this conceptualization, the text is not an object; rather, it is an intentional creation that is experienced in time. The comparison is an attractive one to theorists, as it accounts for the ontology of oral storytelling as well as written. The connection between McGann's theory and the theorization of textual events was pointed out first by Joseph Grigely (1995: 92), but several aspects had been developed earlier by theorists Austin, Derrida, and Barthes. In Derrida's controversial essay "Signature Event Context," the written "event" involves the process of inscription in a medium (in effect, a kind of alterity), as well as the verification of the fact of the text's origin. Derrida argues that the basic fact of all writing is its iterability (179), and that this fact is only held together by the reader's conceptualization of any individual text's context *vis-à-vis* its source. It is this context that allows any inscription or utterance to mean. According to Derrida, any intentional meaning of the physical inscription (which Derrida calls a "mark"), is reliably understood in the absence of the writer,⁴⁸ ripped from its context during reading (a rupture

⁴⁸ Cf. Foucault: "[T]he essential basis of writing" is that "it is primarily concerned with creating an opening where the writing subject endlessly disappears" (*Language, Counter-Memory, Practice*. Donald F. Bouchard. Ed.

implicit to the nature of any form of inscription), and then recontextualized ("grafted" [182]) as a new locution. Meaning is created by the receiver of the inscription because, according to Derrida, each mark brings with it the signature of its creator(s), the fact of his or her once-presence-but-now-absence, and because it retains (in Grigely's words) the "residue of that moment" (96) of the inscription or utterance event. Derrida states that in order for this contextual connection to occur "what must be retained is the absolute singularity of a signature-event and a signature-form: the pure reproducibility of a pure event" (194). Accordingly, it is only through the reader understanding that this event is pure and reproducible that any communication happens at all.

This contradiction of the pure event-moment, however, Derrida contends, is not recoverable.⁴⁹ A new inscription (or, in the case of spoken communication, utterance) can only be grafted onto other "contextual chains" (182) and not onto the signature-event from which it is torn due to rupture. But nevertheless, the inscription carries with it the so-called "citation marks" of the originator. This has turned some textual critics toward a sort of positivism, with the operating (albeit problematic) assumption that this originator could be glimpsed through those inscriptions—that is, through literary exegesis. Though Derrida was writing some years after the rise of the eclectic edition, his implicit claim that editors can recover and preserve a moment of "pure reproducibility of a pure event" underpins the early scholarship of Fredson Bowers. In "Textual Criticism," Bowers states, somewhat idealistically, that "[t]he recovery of the initial

Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1977 p. 116). Derrida gives absence as an effect of the writing-event, but goes further to suggest that it is marked by the signature as "having-been present in a past *now* or present [*maintenant*] which will remain a future *now* or present" (194).

⁴⁹ Derrida: "[T]he sign possesses the characteristic of being readable even if the moment of its production is irrevocably lost and even if I do not know what its alleged author-scriptor consciously intended to say at the moment he wrote it, i.e. Abandoned it to its essential drift" (182). The mistaking of this readability for the recovery of intentions (cf. Bowers "Presidential Address") is to mistake, in Derrida's terms, the signature-event for the force of rupture.

purity of an author's text and of its revision (insofar as this is possible from the preserved documents), and the preservation of this purity despite the usual corrupting process of reprint transmission, is the aim of textual criticism" (24). It is in Bowers' opinion (and, while he never explicitly discusses editing, it is certainly visible in Derrida's phrasing) that critical editing organizes itself around dichotomies of the pure and impure, and that the text is in a state of "gradual progression of corruption" that gets "passed on from edition to edition" (27). The conclusion that the theory informing Bowers' and others'⁵⁰ establishment of a critical edition (which involves culling multiple authoritative signature-events to construct an "eclectic" edition) is Platonic in nature would seem to be unavoidable. It is one thing to position an authorial moment as the force behind an inscription and another thing entirely to suggest that this moment is in some way recoverable, as Morse Peckham has argued.⁵¹ This system of *editing* has become *the* system of *editing*, to recast Derrida,⁵² although there have been efforts to dissuade editors from taking this path,⁵³ the results have often been mixed.

Whose textual event is it?

So far I have been discussing textual ontology with respect to a product (or products) of an author (or authors) which may be stored in a medium (or media) or, in some cases, lost. Yet, even here, the text-as-event shares a tenuous relationship with that event's interpretation. For

⁵⁰ See Thorpe, "The Aesthetics of Textual Criticism," for a look at a positivistic analysis, and then see Peckham's response to it in "Foundations of Modern Textual Editing" pp. 136-139. Peckham's argument, in part, is that "[l]iterary humanists employ the term 'author' in a way that cannot be distinguished from the language of hagiology" (136).

⁵¹ Peckham, "Foundations of Modern Textual Editing," p. 135.

⁵² In discussing how interpretation has become institutionalized, Derrida writes that "The system of this interpretation (which is also, in a certain manner, *the* system of interpretation, or in any case of all hermeneutical interpretation), however currently accepted it may be, or inasmuch as it is current, like common sense, has been *represented* through the history of philosophy" ("Signature" 175).

⁵³ McGann led the effort, and G. T. Tanselle has since turned from eclectic forms.

Derrida, the event is separate from the act of interpretation, but the event does not exclude interpretation. Derrida describes the event as *creator* action (signature-event) and storage in or on a medium (signature-form) and that the interpretive process is not a part of the signature-event but implied as separate action by its disidentification with the signature-event. This new *interpretive-event*—let us call it—is the negative of the signature-event. Derrida explains that

[T]hose [interpretive] effects do not exclude what is generally opposed to them [i.e. authority], term by term; on the contrary, they presuppose it, in an asymmetrical way, as the general space of their possibility. (193)

While the poststructuralist *différance* of the possible and impossible effects of a signature-event suggests the signature's heterogeneity, Derrida's explanation of the double-event highlights the hierarchy implicit in his terminology regarding the text-as-event. The signature has status as original, and the iteration, while individual outside of its relationship with the original, retains its "sameness" only through the interpreter's corruption of the original. Martin Heidegger makes a similar case his essay, "The Origin of the Work of Art," that "[t]o gain access to the work, it would be necessary to remove it from all relations to something other than itself" and later that these creations "belong to the covert throng of a surrounding into which they are inked" (167, 170). The goal of the poststructuralist has been to undermine the Gallilean view of text, to reposition the hierarchicalization of origin and interpretation as heterogeneous, decentered (as opposed to the Gallilean *recentered*) contexts into which all made-objects are placed. Even so, to ascribe a type of force to a text that rips it from context and origin is to require that originator passively accept this decontextualization. Rarely has it been true, except in the rarest of cases (Nabokov had willed that his *Original of Laura* be incinerated upon his death, for fear that it might give readers the wrong impression of his authority, though this did not transpire [*Original*

xii]; and there are similar circumstances surrounding the work of Emily Dickinson), that a signature-event relinquish the inscription as though a planet launching its probe out of orbit and into the infinite reaches of space. Even then, these signature-events are only partially decontextualized, and they remain tethered to their origins only as long as critical reception recognizes that origin. For example, when Dmitri Nabokov, against his father's will, publishes *Laura* with his introduction and directly confronts the desires of his father to have the manuscript burned before it is ever read by the public. *Laura* has gained contextualization to this new interpretive-event (publication), and has not lost its tethering to its author. I rather hope it would not be succumbing to hagiolatry to point out that the text's origin hasn't historically been the problem for critics; the problem has emerged out of the view that the origin is also the validator of inscription and meaning. Morse Peckham has stated this is the case with Thorpe's emphatic acceptance of Bowers' concepts of purity (Peckham 137). One can discuss origin and authorship without resorting to dogmatism.

McGann's conceptualization of the textual event relies on a similarly residual relationship between original and iteration, as it expresses the relationship in terms of the text and interpreter's inextricability. McGann defines imaginative texts, drawing from Barthes,⁵⁴ as "autopoietic mechanisms operating as self-generating feedback systems that cannot be separated from those who manipulate and use them" (15). This is an insightful formulation insofar as it admits to both ontological and critical confusion over where the text ends and its interpretation begins. Texts (and here McGann refers to the bibliographic and linguistic codes—Shillingsburg's "text" and "document" have been fused) have material lives that exist against and in concert with

⁵⁴ Barthes' essay, problematically, uses alternating senses of both terms "text" and "work" throughout. McGann's formulation seems to be derived from Barthes imagining of an individual text as "the image of an organism which grows by vital expansion, by 'development' (a word which is significantly ambiguous, at once biological and rhetorical)" ("From Work to Text" 161).

their uses; the social actions that produce them are as much interior to the publication as they are exterior. This definition, on the one hand, suggests that texts cannot be fixed and that they are self-sustaining (auto-poietic). In his formulation, texts are ideas created through non-iterable social actions, and any interaction with a given text is part of that, and this produces another non-iterable social act *ad infinitum*. This is desirable because imaginative texts do not seek to convey a "message" but to "mean" on a higher level than mere message-transmission. On the other hand, McGann argues that there is a fundamental textuality to this social act. That is to say, though these systems are inseparable from their users, they are able to be used and interacted with, even if interaction consists of attempting to repeat a verbal utterance (re: Derrida), such as a recited poem or song. A text's ontology is strongly connected, in this view, to its reception and interpretation. We cannot reproduce any social act; we can only enclose it in quotation marks. This relationship is reiterated clearly in McGann's "Conclusion" when he states, "[p]roperly understood, *this* text, every text, is unique and original to itself when we consider it not as an object but as an action. That is to say, *this text* is always a new (and changed) originality each time it is textually engaged" (183). There are two important senses of "the" text that McGann's work serves to invoke. The first involves the produced action (the signature-event or *action* from a source) that occurs when McGann identifies the text that is being written: "*this* text." In this he means the order of the words on the physical page, both its syntax and materiality (linguistic and bibliographical codes). Nonetheless, in his next sentence, the nature of McGann's text has been transformed; no longer does McGann refer to the linguistic and bibliographic codes through which socialization occurs, but the experience of the text by the reader. Text, from this perspective, is something that can be recontextualized (i.e. "grafted") and expressed as an iteration (interpreted). It is in this way that McGann envisions two separate but entangled *events*:

the first an authorial one, the second an interpretive one.

In the last forty years, literary critics have placed a heavy emphasis on the reception of the text in relation to ontology. Stanley Fish has gone further than McGann to say that a text's ontology only exists when the text is experienced by the reader. Fish has written, famously that "all objects are made and not found, and they are made by the interpretive strategies that we set in motion" (*Is There a Text In This Class?* 331). In Fish's well-known schoolroom experiment, his students are given a list of names on a chalkboard that they are told (by Fish) comprise a religious poem (these are, in actuality, six names of critics—mostly linguists—that were written on the board during the previous class to use it). His students are then instructed to interpret the list of names as a poem. Fish notes that they interpret by using techniques that they know are conventional for poetry interpretation. The various interpretive acts were able to be performed by the students in spite of the list's origin. Fish concludes that his students

did not proceed from the noting of distinguishing features to the recognition that they were confronted with a poem; rather, it was the act of recognition that came first – they knew in advance that they were dealing with a poem – and the distinguishing features then followed. In other words, acts of recognition, rather than being triggered by formal characteristics, are their source. It is not that the presence of poetic qualities compels a certain kind of attention but that the paying of a certain kind of attention results in the emergence of poetic qualities. (326)

What is most important to the present explanation of socialized ontology is Fish's assertion of the creation of texts via interpretation through his contested concept of "interpretive communities."⁵⁵

What is apparent from this example is that 1) the text was not a poem until Fish made it a poem

⁵⁵ On this topic, see McCormick, "Swimming Upstream with Fish," pp. 67-76; also Scholes, "Who Cares About the Text?" pp. 171-80.

for the purposes of the assignment, 2) that his students were comfortable with performing exegesis on a religious poem, 3) that the context for any Christian poem is so large that interpretation becomes a method of myth-association, and 4) that authorial intention is not ignored but given through the genre bestowed on the text by Fish.

There are two main critical interpretations of Fish's above example that are important to connect Derrida's Signature-event to McGann's textual condition. The first is that both texts (list and poem) constitute *separate* literary events. Taking this view, there is no original/fake dichotomy (or if there is, it is a nonissue) since each version of the text (the list and the poem) is legitimate or *has been legitimated* through its reception. This theorizing is echoed by Grigely's conclusion to "The Textual Event." Grigely states, "the differences that texts reveal amongst themselves [due to iterability] and that distinguish themselves from each other are the product of an uncentered alterity: there is no correct text, no final text, no original text, but only texts that are different, drifting in their like differences" (118-19). Here, Grigely cleverly uses the poststructural *différance* to undermine itself; for Grigely, the hierarchy that Derrida has set up between original and iteration is not satisfactory. Just because the poem was, during one moment, a list, doesn't mean that the list-as-poem-event ceases to exist. The poem does most certainly happen; it becomes an "event" through a very narrow shaping of the readers' interpretive lenses. The list-turned-poem-turned-list has been authored twice (at least!) and may be authored again. Authoring, used in this way, is the making of a text's interpretive significance through the reconstruction of origin (the scribe to Fish). The source is only relevant insofar as the poem-event retains its genre: that is to say, the classroom assignment. This is acceptable, as long as hermeneutical bias does not equate "truth" and "original." Grigely again:

[the phenomenological experience] constitutes *the moment of recognition* of the

signifier/signified, a process of relational discourse in the reader's mind. Discussing Stanley Fish, for example, Stephen Mailloux writes that a sentence is not "an object, a thing-in-itself, but an event, something that happens to, and with the participation of, the reader." The event is a moment of encounter: the text meets the reader, and the reader in turn decides (or as Husserl puts it, "reduces") the text's essence. In a way the text is absolved of its textuality; it becomes absorbed by (and by default possessed by) the reader, which in turn gives rise to Fish's lemma: "[T]he reader's response is not *to* the meaning; it *is* the meaning." (114)

In this selection, Grigely describes two entangled events, one that shades into the other. He describes the linguistic aspect of the text, after Mailloux and Fish, as an event, as response by the reader to the signifier/signified. He also describes the textual event as the *moment* of encounter, in which the reader determines what the text is and what it is not. That is to say, the response to the text *is the text* and *is its meaning* (via Fish's lemma). The textual event is, according to Grigely, both *what the text is* and *what the text is made to mean*.

The problematic of Grigely's assertion of the interpretive event should be apparent: Grigely is creating a *conflation*—similarly to what McGann has argued is the fault of the romantic hermeneutics—of meaning and medium (through which a message is uttered). And this results in the germination of an authorial function. The confusion over what the text is by delimiting its formal boundaries and what it means is difficult to resolve if we are not really sure what comprises the "event," whether that event happens during the act of inscription (or utterance) or whether the event happens during the moment of reception.

So, what is *the* event? A better question might be: if there is so much critical confusion over which event we're discussing and defining, why use the metaphor at all? Grigely's answer is

that "[a] physical text, say, the holograph of Keats's nightingale ode, occupies, simultaneously, different dimensions of space: literal, mental space, and [...] historical space—and none of these locations is entirely discrete" (115). In other words, the "event" allows us to multiply the lenses through which a text has often been perceived by allowing us to engage with different contexts of importance.

Another answer would maintain that the dichotomy of signature-event and reception-event is a false one that emerged from post-structuralism and has not yet been reincorporated sociologically. It is not certain what we gain from a dichotomy that recenters an author-center for a reader-center, the origin of inscription for the origin of interpretation. Grigely attempts to clarify how events function, by explaining that "[b]ecause such events are *articulatory*, their phenomenology is oriented toward *the production, not the reception, of signifiers*" (114; my italics). Rethinking textual events as moments of production (with whatever moments we imagine constituting these) might unravel the web of medium and meaning, but the introduction of the event's counterpart, the "outcome" (i.e. "If writing is an event, the recording of it...is an outcome" [116]), threatens to re-highlight that conflation. The text-document and text-signifier might be part of an event, which is ontological, but their combination is not synonymous with *the* event (whichever that is).

A second approach to Fish's example is to view the list of names as an *original* from which the exegesis of the poem amounts to a distortion. Taking this view, the poem is an illusion created only momentarily, and it will only revert to its list-form after the pseudo-author relinquishes his control over it. The list retains (and, indeed, never lost) its original author (or authors) as a static fact that a reader might discover: either through interpersonal communication (perhaps seeking out the instructor) or by careful study and identification of the scribe's hand (if

our hypothetical student was skillful enough). The genre of this text is disguised by its pseudo-author (Fish), and it returns to its non-poem status once the fact of its construction is revealed. The literariness of the "poem," such as it arises in the minds of the students, amounts to a trick by its pseudo-author that returns to its natural state once the spell has been lifted.

The above is the argument of Robert Scholes's review-essay (1983) addressing Fish's *Is There a Text In This Class?* He makes the case that Fish does not

admit that making a poem from a text is a different activity from making a text in the first place. The issue here is the extent to which a text may be said to guide or offer resistance to the things one makes of it, whether we call these products poems, works, or interpretations. (172)

Later in the review-essay, when discussing Fish's example of Pat Kelly and his born-again Christian assertion of divine intervention for his achievements playing in the outfield for the Baltimore Orioles, Scholes explains that this resistance between language system (baseball) and Kelly's interpretation (Christian exegesis) is due to a differentiation between "the primary system in which a text is encoded and secondary systems that can be brought to bear only by an interpreter who comprehends the primary system" (178). Scholes's distinction interrogates how texts are encoded in language systems onto which other language systems can be superimposed. The primary system, described this way by Scholes, is *identical* to McGann's definition of "text." However, Scholes ignores the bibliographic text when articulating the distinction between medium (here regarding the intention of transmission) and message, which, as he explains, involves "the linguistic text, the verbal outcome at every level (from the most elementary forms of single letters and punctuation marks up to the most complex rhetorical structures that comprise the particular linguistic event)" (77). The apparent difficulty with McGann's definition

is that a primary system is apparent only through the "outcome" (to again borrow Grigely's term) of the verbal reception of a text, whereas in Scholes's argument the primary system is the *input* of the linguistic system. I am not suggesting that this primary system and its reception are the same as the interpretive acts; this would be confusing one system for another—signature-event for interpretive-event. Instead, what McGann's doubled-text clarifies is how the signature-event and the interpretive-event contextualize one another; two events neither co-exist nor operate with exclusion to the other. The pot holds itself.

From work to text and back again

The second resistance identified above involves the resistance of the work to its material (and/or performative) instances. This resistance is necessary for a discourse of textual ontology because it is through the enactment of the work/text relationship that editors identify and delimit the evidence that is available to be used for an edition. Furthermore, it is with this resistance in mind that editors make the case for intertextual relationships. Joseph Grigely has imagined the relationship between work and texts as a kind of non-sum-of-its-parts, in which the work is constituted by many variant texts (or texts with variants). He views the work as an

assemblage of texts, a polytext of seriated texts and versions. This formulation can be expressed by the equation

$$W \longrightarrow T1, T2, T3 \dots TN$$

where *W* = work and *T* = text. It is important to note that the work is not equivalent to the *sum* of its texts (which would create some kind of hybridized eclectic text), but instead is an ongoing—and infinite—manifestation of textual appearances, *whether those texts are authorized or not.* (99)

This is an important formulation that has influenced and steered much of the theory of the work. Firstly, Grigely's concept of the "polytext" offers an appealing way to rethink the problem of the "text itself." If each text is, actually, a site of many "texts," then it is impossible to separate the one-correct-text from its siblings. Secondly, Grigely's formulation highlights the problems associated with eclectic texts. He acknowledges that works (not solely the *texts* that comprise them) are sites of cultural debate and discourse. Finally, in this formulation one can observe Grigely's agreements with McGann, specifically the ways in which his view of the text/work resistance adheres to McGann's definition of text. Yet, there are strong reasons for objecting to or, at least, revising, Grigely's view of the "work."

Ontology, Grigely states, specifically refers to the individual text's resistance to the "work," and not to the ontology of multiple individual texts. Current critical debate has tended to de-emphasize the work and to emphasize the text, favoring individual material inscriptions over "the text itself" (a phrase that implies that the "work" can be articulated, usually in a critical edition, in a form better than the author ever actually managed to articulate). The concept of the work is used in some circles to articulate a rationale for changes made to the copy-text, or even to justify the selection of the copy-text. For critics such as Grigely, Shillingsburg, and McGann, this practice is emblematic of the New Critical editorial efforts centered on the concept of author's final intentions. It becomes problematic when critics utilize this view of the work in the editing of texts. Even Grigely, whose separation of the work from the text attempts not to wholly and completely descend into Platonism (in that it is "ideal in its implicit acknowledgment of the impossibility of the ideal" [99]), cannot, to my mind, articulate a non-Platonic ideal form.

Before going much deeper into my objections to Grigely's formula, it might be advisable to touch briefly on what is meant here by the term *work*. Though the use of the term has become

convoluted, it is important to explain how the definitions have derived and changed. Early on, the work is imagined to be comprised of material/immaterial dichotomy, in which certain art-forms (sculpture, painting, writing) involved the production of material objects and others (song, dance) involved acts of performance. These divergent types of art are separated by Nelson Goodman into categories that are more or less responsive to his terms of notation, which ultimately serve to characterize whether a text is capable of being forged. Goodman's interest in the ontological status of a work's inscriptions (or utterances) has to do with the art-form's history of production. A text that is able to be forged, and whose likeness is unique in its appearance and production, is the sort of text that Goodman calls "autographic." Paintings, manuscripts, and hand-made sculptures fit neatly into this category because they are one-of-a-kind, he argues. Like Benjamin's concept of "aura," which is independent from an art's modes of reproduction,⁵⁶ Goodman's autographic arts do not merely represent the concept standing behind the art, rather they *are* the concept. He writes that "[l]et us speak of a work of art as *autographic* if and only if the distinction between original and forgery of it is significant; or better, if and only if even the most exact duplication of it does not thereby count as genuine" (113). Texts that are "allographic" (incapable of being forged) are aligned generally along lines of mechanical or performance-based reproduction. Here, the "original" is not the work in question but a score from which the work is enacted, copied, or otherwise reified. Such is the case with live music and performances of plays, which vary with each iteration, and with novels and poems, which in Goodman's terms only need to reproduce the basic spelling of an authoritative text to retain the status as a version of the work. Goodman finally defines a work as "a compliance class of performances" (210); simply put, a work is concordant with its compliant texts; a work is each text of the work,

⁵⁶ Benjamin, "The Work of Art," pp. 214–218.

whether inscribed or uttered. Regarding the status of a written work, Grigely's response to Goodman, which I am in agreement with, is that by defining the work as the sum of its compliant texts he ignores how variance shapes the life of that work and instead condemns works to anarchy where only perfect linguistic copies fulfill the promise of compliance. He states that,

The proliferation of culture depends not so much on an author's explicit intentions, but on the tension between those intentions and the subversion of them. It is thus impossible to say that the work of, say, Shakespeare's *Tempest* exists as anything more than a Platonic form or **idea**; and it is ideal in its implicit acknowledgment of the impossibility of the ideal. It is a concept, but not a concept limit; a class, but not a compliance class, for its boundaries are not prescribed. (99)

The discourse over a text's relationship to its "work" has been, then, a debate over whether the "work" is a Platonic ideal or whether it involves some other kind of ideal form that has yet to be articulated. G. Thomas Tanselle's definition of work was called Platonic in nature by Paul Eggert.⁵⁷ Tanselle's claim that the work will necessarily be represented imperfectly by the documents resembles Shillingsburg's (if only in terminology), but Tanselle's claim that the work is singular and static, Eggert claims, exposes the editorial aim of attempting to *complete* that singular ideal.

"Works" Acting and Organizing

As mentioned above, the definition of *work* that is preferred here comes from Peter Shillingsburg's *Scholarly Editing in the Computer Age*. Shillingsburg here maintains that there are two actions that a work may perform, a conclusion which serves to alleviate many of the

⁵⁷ Eggert, "Document and Text," p. 5.

problems of earlier conceptualizations of a work. The first action is that the work enacts its constituent texts when the author is participating in the creation process. The work, informed by memory, imagination, and other sources (notes, drafts, etc.; themselves versions of "texts" of the work), aids the writer during composition. At this stage, the work does possess a certain conceptual status, insofar as it may maintain its course, or it may change, or even be destroyed completely through authorial intervention. Its written representations provide indications of this conceptual status, but are always inadequately and only partially realized by its author (or authors).⁵⁸

The second action Shillingsburg describes is one in which the work enacts its "wholeness"; since the work is a "product of the imagination" (42) that is made manifest by "available evidence" such as "manuscripts, proofs, and books" and, performances,⁵⁹ it is only always partially represented by the evidence. Shillingsburg's definition is largely drawn from the language of G. T. Tanselle, but there are also striking points of divergence. Though the author and readers' perspectives on how this evidence is organized may vary, and though, strictly speaking, the work undergoes more significant growth and development before publication, Shillingsburg's "works" are not *identical* to their "texts."

A similar position is also articulated by Barthes. In his view a work is not an archive of its "texts"—or to use Goodman's term it is not made of up "comlicants." Barthes states that the "work" is not an object to be hierarchized: "it is not a question of drawing up a crude honours list in the name of modernity and declaring certain literary productions 'in' and others 'out' by virtue

⁵⁸ It is beyond the scope of this dissertation to speculate about an author's intentions; nevertheless, I conjecture that an author's texts may also give the reader the impression that a work has unintentional, imperfectly conceived textual forms. It is not hard to imagine multiple "concepts" of a single work that resist each other, those understood during the interpretive-event, and the one (hypothetically intended) during writing.

⁵⁹ Shillingsburg's work is primarily concerned with print publication, though his theory of ontology allows for performance and song to stand besides print, digital, and manuscript traditions.

of their chronological situation" ("From Work to Text" 57). One might say that there is an organizational quality of the "work," as there is an organizational quality to Foucault's author function. But unlike Grigely, who views the work as a Platonic ideal that recognizes the impossibility of its own Platonism, and unlike Tanselle, who views the work as a bull's-eye at which editors should aim their editorial arrows, Shillingsburg recognizes that the ontological qualities inherent to works are also the actions they perform on their readers, not just the actions their readers perform on them.

A necessary distinction for Shillingsburg, is that a work should not be *enacted* (by editors or by readers) as a Platonic ideal. Regarding the editorial construction of a work as a Platonic ideal, Shillingsburg's criticism is that

[m]any editors pursuing the author's final intentions fall into this way of thinking, and most literary critics, more is the pity, buy the argument. There is a pleasing simplicity in the notion that texts grow or develop or are shaped toward a final form—rather like a potter shaping a vase on a wheel. But the analogy is misleading. A book does not come in final shape directly from the artist's hands like a vase. (43-4)

In other words, to edit by the concept of an author's intention is to declare an author's intentions to have been understood, or at least approximated: that a single physical representation of the work *is* the work as best as it could be assembled: the Christian view of "word made flesh" is here reconstituted as "idea made artifact." For these editors, critical editions are essentially definitive editions that attempt to reconstruct the most authoritative (or intentional) form of the work. Shillingsburg states that the dangers of the "definitive edition" are not just their practice, but the allure that a "work" can be contained (or even approximated) in a singular, empirical form. A definitive edition, to put it one way, is an attempt to make the concept of work, text, and

document fuse together into one authoritative version, as though the medium of the codex functioned similarly to that of the medium of clay. The difficulty inherent to approaching different mediums, as Shillingsburg warns in his analogy to pottery, is that the vase encompasses version, text, and artifact (these terms themselves not being synonymous) and is thus closer conceptually to the concept of the work, while critical edition, contained in the codes, falls short in this respect. The work may appear to be conceptually "whole," yet this wholeness is only ever partially manifest. A "work" delimits the documents which are (or come to be) associated with it, and those documents in turn help the work achieve its "completeness of form" (42).

There is a third "action" ascribed to a work that is discussed by Shillingsburg, one in which a work might be taken to shape meaning of its representative texts. Such is the case with Fish's example of Pat Kelly, in which the interpreter understands his current linguistic "text" (i.e. baseball) to be a textual manifestation of a greater, religiously-based "work" (i.e. the whole of creation). This is similar to the so-called "broad" and "narrow" constructionism inherent in American constitutional interpretation, where an understanding of what the work was *intended to be* or the resistance to that intention shapes the interpretation of the text. This chapter offers simply that this type of action is impossible without the experience of one or more of the works' representations, and that the action of construing the work in this way variously prefigures an ahistorical, Platonic, and divine model.

The role of texts in the socialization of ontology

It is Grigely's and Tanselle's expositions of the work along the lines of a Platonic model that this dissertation explicitly rejects, and yet I remain optimistic, if but cautious, about Grigely's formulation of the "work." One objection is to the (perhaps necessary?)

hierarchicalization inherent in Grigely's formula. It is partly due to the linear, and limited, nature of writing that Grigely allows a numerical hierarchy to persist. While Grigely is imagining a work as "a nontangible idea represented by a sequential series of texts" (101) he is still imagining a linear sequence of texts (experienced linearly, perhaps, or ultimately somewhat dictated by canon).

Grigely's criteria for organization are even more unclear. Is authorial intention, date of inscription, date of publication the standard for organization? What, in other words, is *TI*? He clarifies:

...a work of literature is ontologized by its texts; it is identified as literature, or as being of a particular genre, by its particular textual manifestations. Literature does not define itself as literature; it is rather we who undertake this task of defining what we come to know as the highbrow and the lowbrow, the good and the bad, the canonical and the non-canonical. (110)

The act of ontologization, for Grigely, is carried out through the work's various artifacts. If we were to schematize Grigely's process of ontologization, it might look something like this: Work > relationship between all discovered texts > [genre(s)⁶⁰] > linguistic text > signified > signifier > discovered material text > undiscovered material or performance > material in one or many medium. In this schema, ">" constitutes an event-of-mediation by reception and/or production, and where "material" is shorthand for any made object, idea, or performance. In this view a work is "ontologized" by the participation of its reader (a word that is, perhaps, itself too limiting with respect to a particular mode of communication), notably his or her participation in generic and contextual identification. Grigely paraphrases McGann as follows: "textual boundaries are

⁶⁰ It might be contested, on rhetorical theory grounds, that genre is only understood and shaped through the reception of the linguistic text.

projections of our social and political identities; [and] they are in a sense mental conceptualizations of historical spaces" and "textual boundaries are not the product of reality, but of our reading of representations of reality" (106). In the formulation of Grigely and McGann, reception *produces* a work's ontology, but it does not produce its various texts.

Ontology, in the terms I have been outlining, is partially enacted as a reader's response to the signature-event, which in itself is inherent in what I have been calling the interpretive-event. These two "events" are at times indistinguishable and interconnected, interwoven like a kind of fabric, which is evident by the critical discussion that surrounds them.

Resisting hermeneutics

The third resistance which I have identified above is hermeneutic in nature: it involves the resistance of several (for lack of a better phrase) meaning-producing forces. Traditionally, a text's meaning is thought to have three possible sources: the author (who is understood to have intended a meaning), the text (in which that meaning is inscribed), and the reader (who interprets those inscriptions). But these divergent views, in recent years, have been eschewed for more moderate alternatives (such as Mailloux's "inferred intentions"⁶¹). The resistance to hermeneutics, I contend, moderates the other two resistances and to some extent designates editorial views of textual ontology.

As McGann has argued, the resistance between meaning and medium is a convention of literary texts that are closely tied to an author's intentions.⁶² The characteristics of this resistance strongly evoke Quentin Skinner's (1972) term "illocutionary intentions." Skinner derives the term

⁶¹ Mailloux, "Textual Scholarship and 'Author's Final Intention,'" pp. 93-125.

⁶² Because the *Vita* is not a "literary" work that meets McGann's criteria, it is difficult to connect this discourse of ontology to the author's intentions therein.

from J. L. Austin's performative utterances,⁶³ and it forms part of his Speech Act Theory. He describes an illocutionary intention as the character the linguistic text has when it is understood in relation to its speaker. Daniel Allington, in a more recent essay, expands illocutionary intentions, calling them "*explanatory redescriptions* of works in terms of their origins" that are not, unlike informational texts, a message to be received by the reader (489). Departing from the expected message/meaning paradigm, these works are understood through their locutions (senses) and further interpreted by means of illocutions (known conventions). Skinner writes that to discuss these intentions is "to characterize what the writer may have been doing—to be able to say that he must have been intending, for example, to attack or defend a particular line of argument, to criticize or contribute to a particular tradition of discourse, and so on" (402). In other words, if we can identify the conventions in which a work is participating, we may acknowledge that there are conventions that the author *intends* the work to be situated in. However, these intended conventions can be disrupted through processes of socialization. In our earlier example, Aleksandar Hemon's story "The Life and Work of Alphonse Kauders" has been taken from its intended bibliographical context and placed in a new one. To place the narrative's gesture in a new bibliographical situation (that of a newly edited collection of short stories) creates a tension between certain linguistic signs and their signified intention. The text is no longer able to reference itself. The reader is thus able to infer that this new context was not one intended by the writer, and that the story's impact is influenced by a certain bibliographic presentation. Allington suggests that this conventional participation can be as broad as identifying the author meant to write a particular form.⁶⁴ For Hemon, it is the necessity of the

⁶³ Austin, *How to Do Things with Words.*; Skinner, "Motives, Intentions, and the Interpretation of Texts," pp. 393–408.

⁶⁴ Skinner's example of Machiavelli is that he was " 'situated in' the 'enterprise' of the writing of a book of the aforementioned genre, 'in relation to which he has a purpose or a point of view'—which, given the ideas in the

text's interconnectedness to its other stories as well as its book-ness.

Allington does not apply the term "illocutionary intention" directly to bibliography, but one must conclude that it is applicable (and to some degree implied) when he argues that Penguin's publication of *The Satanic Verses* has rhetorical locution (and illocution) that does not conform to Rushdie's intentions with the novel. Indeed, the anger of some Muslims over the publication, he implies, becomes a matter of not what the book says, but that those sayings are made physical in the form of a book. As Allington explains: "Most strikingly, Rushdie was sent into hiding not by the people who threatened his life, but by himself, through the performance of the speech-like actions of mockery, insult, and allegation that, in this version of events, constitute the writing and publication of *The Satanic Verses*" (508). The mockery, insult, and allegation is constructed by those angry over its misconceived message about Islam; it is communally constructed meaning. Allington states that taking into account both the author's intention, the work's publication history, and its reception history, in the case of the *Satanic Verses*, but not strictly limited only to Rushdie's novel, "...implies a multiagentive view of the production and reception of literature that might be thought incompatible with an interpretation of *The Satanic Verses* based on reconstruction of the author's intentions" (514). A multiagentive view, according to Allington, requires that critics take into account the "argumentative context" of the work (ibid.), which he argues is essential in mediating critical interpretation of meaning, and, therefore, what the text is meant to do (for example, to persuade, or to entertain). The social participation in the construction of illocutionary intentions enables readers to "expose the textuality of meaning" (McGann 15), but more specific to the point of this chapter, it exposes the textuality of the interpretive-event.

book and the moral conventions of the genre, we take to have been that of antipathy to the genre's moral conventions" (490).

If interpretive-event has textuality, then it also has tactility. Texts are coded linguistically and the meanings produced by those codes are "collaborative events" (McGann 60) participated in by author and audience, and they can themselves be read or experienced as texts. They, furthermore, produce social responses, like this one, which in turn have the potential to be *shaped* by their reception.

Hermeneutics through medium: resisting ontology for an edition based on manuscript evidence

By interpreting the relationships of texts delimited according to these categories, medievalists are able to approach manuscript textuality in one of two ways: they may view manuscripts as "linear" repositories of linguistic information, or they may view a manuscript heterogeneously as "radial" sites of intertextuality (McGann 1990). The first approach involves reading the text linguistically, as an object mediated through a social construction of authority: the medievalist would have to separate the "text itself" from any superfluous mistakes, apparatus, notes or interlined comments, or corrections (the so-called essential bits from non-essential). Texts, for this type of reader are, as David Greetham puts it, "narratively encoded codices with entirely fixed Aristotelian beginnings, middles, and ends" (162). A text in this sense has been momentarily stabilized; or rather it is *viewed* and presented by an editor as having been at some lost moment stabilized.

The concept that relates most immediately to textual stability, a defining trait of the linear reading, can be expressed in terms of imagined forms, with boundaries that are, as Grigely states, "not the product of reality, but of our reading of representations of reality" ("The Textual Event 106). This is the concept that I am calling the interpretive-event. The interpretive-event is both

imagined and tactile; It is a moment of received social action and of new produced social action, but it is, in point of fact, a stabilizing moment and the setting up of textual boundaries. The setting of textual boundaries—determining what is in the text and what is *not* in the text (and therefore; determining what enables meaning)—is taken to its extreme by advocates of the New Criticism. We need go no farther than Wimsatt and Beardsley's famous essay, "Intentional Fallacy," to see this important designation. Here are two axioms that serves as pillars of their argument:

One must ask how a critic expects to get an answer to the question about intention. How is he to find out what the poet tried to do? If the poet succeeded in doing it, then the poem itself shows what he was trying to do. And if the poet did not succeed, then the poem is not adequate evidence, and the critic must go outside the poem—for evidence of an intention that did not become effective in the poem. (4)

Moments later, they state:

Judging a poem is like judging a pudding or a machine. One demands that it work. It is only because an artifact works that we infer the intention of an artificer. "A poem should not mean but be." A poem can be only through its meaning—since its medium is words—yet it is, simply is, in the sense that we have no excuse for inquiring what part is intended or meant. Poetry is a feat of style by which a complex of meaning is handled all at once. Poetry succeeds because all or most of what is said or implied is relevant; what is irrelevant has been excluded, like lumps from pudding and "bugs" from machinery. (4)

That the poem "works," and whether meaning is intentional and recoverable, is always precluded by the critic's setting of the object's boundaries: its meaning-making or meaning-holding

spectrum—however we wish to describe it. It "simply is," they write. The pot holds itself. The chaos of cultural influence is mute so that from order the object can speak. It is Keats' Grecian Urn and Shakespeare's *Lear*. It is Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* and Crane's *Red Badge of Courage*. It is, also, Asser's *Life of King Alfred*, frequently given this title, and similar titles, which imply a critical awareness of the genre(s) that constructs it. What I hope to have conveyed through my analysis of several hotly-debated textual issues (from McGann, Grigely, and others) is the inherent difficulty of separating the object from the interpretive-event. The pot can hold itself only if we *say* that it can.

But the impact of the linear reading is not limited to delimitation of text. As Hayden White has demonstrated in connection with nineteenth-century Enlightenment "realism" and its reaction to eighteenth-century skepticism,⁶⁵ historical representation can be given similarly deterministic characteristics. Similarly, as David Greetham has argued regarding the alleged schism between hypertext⁶⁶ and the medieval codex, the delimitation of historical periods for purposes of progress shifts the view of codex from the premodern radial site to the stable, determinate, and, eventually, New Critical verbal icon.

The schism that some hypertextuists tend to see between manuscript codex and hypertext is not dissimilar to the way in which print editors often view the manuscript as a nonessential corruption of the "text itself." This editorial perspective is the result of an approach in which the editor views a medium as quintessentially "linear" instead of "radial." Historically, this approach is strongly linked to the hermeneutic claim that a text contains inherent meaning that the shrewd reader must set out to uncover. In this view, interpretation precedes the construction of the text,

⁶⁵ See White, *Metahistory*.

⁶⁶ Greetham is speaking specifically about the hypertextuist who views the medieval codex as a break with the present, this chapter takes aim at the modern editor of pre-modern manuscripts who pleads the fifth on how medium affects (or becomes) message.

and, in fact, *constructs* it before the reader has even shifted from *langue* to *parole*. "Linear" adherents, whose ideological bias lead ultimately the theory of "author's final intention," are most interested in, as Bowers has put it, "ideal" forms; a concept such as "the author" or "the text itself," which is used as a basis for an authoritative edition, emerges out of fundamental dissatisfaction with McGann's "transmissive interactions." Hershel Parker suggests—though not specifically in these terms—that this sort of dissatisfaction is what led Fredson Bowers to follow the Appleton edition of *The Red Badge of Courage* instead of the author's manuscript, or to attempt to "wrest meaning from a meaningless text" ("The Text Itself" 49).

The "radial" critic views the codex as, again to quote Greetham, "in both composition and reception, a fluid, unstable, and constantly shifting series of entities" (262). This is a point of view which may prove attractive to a medievalist, for whom the codex embodies a spectrum of complex interactions, voices, and scripts. The "radial" critic rejects the hierarchical in favor of a rhizomatic view of text. That is to say, as Greetham argues that hypertextuists have done with those post-modern texts from the digital era, the text's constitutive parts, discursive acts, and its versions of text, are viewed as coequal. Authority, in this perspective is a product of social interaction, and thus the difference between the author's intentions and the reader's interpretation emerge as a matter for the hermeneutic theorist—social reception follows the act of inscription or its performance. Broadly speaking, adherents of the radial approach denounce ideal forms of the text as bases for editions. They maintain that the linguistic text and the medium are *in dialogue*, and may, as do sociological editors, locate authority in the compromise of author and editor. Also, like bibliographical editors, for whom the historical artifact is all there is, radial editors may locate authority in transmitted textual forms, and also in textual idiosyncrasies that cannot

be explained by genetic editing.⁶⁷ Unlike "linear" editors, "radial" editors admonish the "text itself." The basis of finality and fixity for texts, as Stephen Mailloux has pointed out,⁶⁸ emerges from a hermeneutic bias towards authorial intention and requires that the author's good-will (to *mean*) should be reified as this fixed text.

Greetham is careful that his argument in which he reconciles the New Critical manuscript/hypertext schism does not become as ideologically driven as the "pomo Romanticist" hypertextuists that he criticizes for their belief that the medieval codex functioned as a fundamentally linear medium. He writes that "as is well known and well documented (by medievalist codicologists if not by hypertext enthusiasts), the medieval book is almost a complete misnomer if by that term we mean a stable, uniform, unchanging string (rather than web) of textual relations" (263). As is the case with the *Vita Aelfredi regis*, which remains a received dossier of voices (written in various tenses and genres) and intertext, with gaps and interpolations: The medieval manuscript keeps changing—"The text moved," Greetham states of his editorial work on Bartholomaeus Anglicus's *De Proprietatibus Rerum*. "I did not realize it then, but this continued mobility and interchangeability, both within a supposed work and within the codex collection in which that work was enshrined, were testimony to the permeability of the textual and bibliographic membranes [...] that typically went into the *ordinatio* and *compilatio* of the medieval intertext" ("Romancing the Text" 264).

A question that is relevant for textual theorists is whether these two views of textuality, having brought with them two very different views of authority, must be mutually exclusive? Simply put, it is not at all clear that they are (or have ever been). In his definition of "text,"

⁶⁷ See Greetham, "Phylum-tree Rhizome," pp. 153-180.

⁶⁸ Mailloux states that "the question about when a work was finished is a question about an author's *final* intentions" (97).

Gunter Martens offers a semiotic grounding for a perspective incorporating both "linear" and "radial" views of the codex. He defines text as

a complex sign, as an inseparable relation of *significant* and *signifie* (Saussure), or as a dynamic structural relationship of sign carrier, interpreter, and sign object (Peirce), is always in fluid motion, and, from the point of view of the interpreting recipient, is never completely fixable. (216)

While Martens begins specifically with the edited, printed text, not the medieval codex, he ends by claiming that the definition of text is not exclusive to any one textual stage or medium but must accommodate "the entire interrelationship of all textual stages and levels with all variants, and the versions resulting from it" (223). For Martens, the relationship between linear and radial (which, drawing on semiotics, he aligns with syntagmatic and paradigmatic⁶⁹) necessitates a view of ontology that is unfixed, while at the same time the relationship between this system and the "text carrier" (the medium) is *dialectic*. It is this tension between the openness of textual paradigms and its fixed syntagmatic forms that the editor captures in an edition; the editorial goal, he states, is "the genetic representation of the total transmission of the work" (224).

It is through varying perceptions of the role of the medium that Greetham's radiality and Martens' perspective on textual ontology disassociate. Medium, for Greetham, is not incidental to the text's linguistic composition but is essential to it. Martens concludes in an essay on ontology that establishing the form of the text "also wholly corresponds—in a motion contrary to that of the flow of writing—to the tendency of texts toward fixity and final form. Almost every author will conceive of a literary work with a thought to relinquishing it, and during composition will

⁶⁹ Briefly, a syntagmatic relationship in a sentence, for instance, is that of the surface relationship between words (syntax); a paradigmatic relationship is the relationships between syntagms by identifying their constituent paradigms. One may think of it in literature as, for example, recognizing the connections of passages that produce connotations or allusion.

intend a text sufficiently achieved to be published" (224). This assertion vividly recalls Randall McLeod's view that lexical and bibliographic codes are unable to be "read" simultaneously.

Editing ontologies: *The Original of Laura* and multiple authorship

Editorial choices do not always *result* in a clear bias for assuming material or non-physical origins for the text. Nabokov's posthumous work *The Original of Laura (Dying is Fun)* can serve as an important example of the resistance between linguistic material and medium and between "work" and "text," and offers a medieval solution to a modern problem. That problem here is to provide an answer to the question: What is the text of *Laura*?

The 2008 posthumous publication of *The Original of Laura* not only self-consciously addresses the ontology of the edited text, but due to the nature of the reproduced note cards from which it is created, the textuality of the edition is the primary focus of the reader's experience. In the "Note on the Text," the editors state their intentions to preserve the material nature of the handwritten cards on which Nabokov scribbled while providing an editor's transcription of the (sometimes unclear) cards below them. They note: "[t]he photos of the cards that accompany the text are perforated and can be removed and rearranged, as the author likely did when he was writing the novel" (xxi). This delightful edition, detachable photofacsimile and transcription of the written material, simulates for the reader the experience of the document as it existed in the hands of its author: unfinished, fragmented, and movable. Yet, it is not the text as the author would have likely intended it to be published, as Nabokov intended the draft to never be published at all if he died before finishing it (*Original* xii).

There are, however, additional, and important, interactions here between work and text that need to be mentioned. First, the edition prefigures that the "work" of *Laura* exists in ideal

form which arises from experiencing the physical document (more specifically in an incomplete working-draft), but that this document is *not* the work. It is, put simply, an edited collection of draft 3x5 cards of a work-in-progress that was never intended to be read. This becomes most clear when Dmitri Nabokov describes in his introduction that the draft is

liv[ing] on in a penumbra, emerging only occasionally for my personal perusal and the bits of editing I dared perform. Very gradually I became accustomed to this disturbing specter that seemed to be living a simultaneous twin life of its own in the stillness of a strong-box and the meanders of my mind. (xvii)

In this "twin life" Dmitri Nabokov unambiguously highlights the relationship of "work" and "text": that is, there is a material-textual life of the text and a conceptual life of *Laura*. It is on this basis that the edition of this "novel in fragments" constructs its own ontology. There is, so to speak, only one "original," and it is not the book I bought in 2009 from Powell's Books in Portland, Oregon, which contains the arranged photo-facsimiles of the note-cards. Second, reproducing the note-cards and their handling—the edition gestures at bibliographic *écriture*—freezes the draft's ad-hoc textuality and about-to-be-incinerated fate, which immortalizes it for perusal, experimentation, and reorganization. Indeed, the "novel" encourages its reader to interact with the materiality of the published version, as the editors *intend* for the note-cards to be separated from the codex. (I can imagine, years from now, a colleague grabbing for my copy from my library only to open the book to experience this materiality only to see the deep cavity where the note cards once were.) Yet, it is certainly an "edition" in the traditional sense: a text of the work has been edited, made into a material document and supplied with an apparatus. It is, in many ways, similar to Fredson Bowers' facsimile edition of the *Red Badge of Courage*.

Third, *Laura's* simulation of the "text" through the use of note-cards creates a certain

tension with the material codex that contains it; the edition creates its own transmissive interactions that are not necessarily congruent with what we must assume would have been Nabokov's intentions for the book. Indeed, as you turn the pages, the edition draws attention to the problems of its materiality in a very real way. Accidentally punching out the corner of one of the cards elicits the fear that the codex would somehow become incomplete if it were separated from the whole. The discomfort with the codex is emblematic of a fascinating dilemma of form, function, and the New Critical view of wholeness. The cards do not appear wanting without the codex, but the codex does appear wanting without the cards. It is as though the inevitability of losing the cards is the edition's "natural state" (a phrase which resembles editorial fascinations with "purity"), and only through the physical removal of the cards do we experience *Laura*. One might counter that this edition is not a novel *per se* but an archive of a photo-facsimile, a temporary solution to a syntactical construction with the potential to be liberated from the constraints of the codex. This view is also not satisfactory. The cards, like any leaf from a codex, might exist without its source, but the cards, popped from their rectangular perforations, retain provenance; rather the edition's context gives the cards their berth and their ability to appear to stand on their own. Dmitri Nabokov had editorially sequenced some of the cards (as several are disconnected from those within the numbered narrative), so that before the cards are punched out, the reader has one possible "best" sequence. Even though Dmitri Nabokov pairs each removable card with a transcription of the handwritten text, so that one may return a punched-out card to its origin, should this be desired, the ordering, from a linear view of text, is wanting. On page 221 of the edition we find a card with the title "Wild B," which is followed by the card "Z" and then "Z2." The reader must make it to page 267, before reaching "Wild D." One wonders what happened to "Wild C"? Was it lost, or did it ever exist? Why do so many other cards

precede "Wild D"? Nevertheless, before the reader reaches any firm conclusion she is confronted with the complications of adhering ideologically to a linear view of textuality. This illusion that the text can (or rather does) become whole and fixed is part of the illusion of the "text itself."

Furthermore, *Laura's* use of the non-static perforated cards conflicts ontologically with the linearity of the printed book. On the one hand, the cards can be read "radially" as sites of multiple voices, through Vladimir Nabokov's draft making a critique of romantic love and through Dmitri Nabokov's perforated photocopies, as a critique of ontology. The cards are mostly numbered, but notes that accompany those numbered cards are given semi-sequential order. The edition can be read, on the other hand, as an uncomfortable relationship between medium and message, with textual meaning shaped by the context of Nabokov's manuscript, that is, burning, whilst shaped by the narrative that Dmitri Nabokov had set down.

Dmitri Nabokov, as editor, thus recontextualizes this narrative in his introduction and through the apparatus. *Laura* remains tethered to its material origins, shaped by author, editor, and material efforts to reproduce those relationships. *This* is the text of *Laura*: not the words on the cards or its author's intentions for the work, but its construction as a material object through the actualization process of publication, a process that continues with the next publication and so on.

This recontextualization of material and meaning is mentioned in the criticism of Marijeta Bozovic, who argues that the parodic narrative depends so much on its author's oeuvre for context:

Some of the content is there in the fragments, but without the confession frame of *Lolita*, the poem and commentary diptych of *Pale Fire*, or the *Xeno's* arrow trajectory

of *Ada*, the peculiar contract between author and reader is gone. (4)

It is Bozovic's claim that Nabokov was aware that *Laura* (when finished) would only function in the presence of those iconic novels that had made him a household name. As incomplete as it is, we can view clearly the theme of death, "dissolution" (that one notecard refers to as "a miraculous appropriate noun!" [273]) used repeatedly, the overblown parenthetical title "(Dying is Fun)," Wild's obsession,

That test—though admittedly a trivial affair—confirmed me in the belief that I was working in the right direction and that (unless some hideous wound or excruciating sickness joined the merry pallbearers) the process of dying by auto-dissolution afforded the greatest ecstasy known to man. (171)

and skipping ahead,

A process of self-obliteration conducted by an effort of the will. Pleasure, bordering on almost unendurable ecstasy, comes from feeling the will working at a new task: an art of destruction which develops paradoxically an element of creativeness in the totally new application of totally free will. Learning to use the vigor of the body for the purpose of its own deletion, standing vitality on its head. (213)

One can see Freud's concept of the "death drive" from *Beyond the Pleasure Principle* (1920) in Nabokov's sights. Where not clearly an attack on both Freud and the Romantics, "Wild's note" reads, fragmentedly, but transcribed,

self-extinction

self-immolation, -tor

As I destroyed my thorax, I also destroyed [] and the
[] and the laughing people in theaters with a not longer

visible stage or screen, and the [] and the [] in the ceme-
tery of the asym[m]etrical heart
autosuggestion, autosugetist
autosuggestive (*Laura* 111)

Nabokov's intention with this theme is anyone's guess, though he does seem to, at times, augment his notes with critique, observable, perhaps, in a sentence that points to the *Times Literary Supplement*: "Nietz[s]che argued that the man of pure will...must recognize that there is an appropriate time to die" (265). Bozovic reads this interest as Nabokov's own challenge to Romanticists and psychoanalysts (Flora [the original] is said to have read *A Quoi Revent les Enfants* "by a certain Dr. Freud, a madman" [89]), when she states that *Laura* is an attack on "the banal cruelty of viewing love as always, at heart, a longing to die" (17). Even in fragmented, incomplete form, a hyperparody of romantic love is visible in *Laura*. Like his *Pale Fire*, which draws attention to the illusion of the wholeness of the edited poem "Pale Fire" through its dubious commentator's notes, Vladimir Nabokov's *Laura* is the pre-modern set in the modernity of the printed-book.

To those familiar with codices reproduced in print editions, the editorial efforts in publishing *Laura* might appear as an exercise in mere simulation, but I contend that it is much more than this. We have seen how Dmitri Nabokov's edition ontologizes the text *Laura*, creating a work of ideological cohesion. It is as much an incomplete work of Vladimir Nabokov as it is a complete edition organized by Dmitri Nabokov. The subtitle, "A Novel in Fragments," highlights its editor's hand, not its author's. It is, then, both their text, multi-voiced, with the work of the son shaping the father's.

Simulation, copy, and authorship in the *Vita Ælfredi*

Nabokov's *Original of Laura*, on the one hand, is similar to the *Vita Ælfredi* in that both traditions are represented by incomplete, manuscript documents at stages in their composition. Both traditions have also been edited with the concept of the author in mind. On the other hand, unlike Dmitri Nabokov's *Laura*, which has been edited in order to emphasize its editor's ideological conceits, the various editions of the *Vita* are not as explicit with their ideologies. The simulation (or rather, reconstruction) of the textual content of BL Cotton Otho A.xii, from which all portions related to Alfred and many others have been lost, has been the focus of much scholarship since the time of Matthew Parker. For editors of the *Vita Ælfredi*, the attribution of authorship has been, since Parker's 1574 edition, the predominant method of approaching the work's ontological construction. Whether William Camden knew it or not, by reproducing Parker's edition almost wholesale, he was producing an edition that would be steeped in Parker's ideological conceits. It isn't until Stevenson's 1904 edition where the concept of the author is partially sidelined. In its place, Stevenson is primarily concerned with problems of textual completion. He states in his introduction that

[t]he first step in our task is obviously to ascertain, so far as the imperfect materials at our command will allow, what was the text of the lost MS. This is the main object of the present edition, in which the interpolations, some of which have become so embedded in our commoner histories that they possess an interest that forbids their being ignored, are for the first time unmistakably distinguished by the use of a smaller type. (xiii)

Stevenson subsequently separates what is genuinely Cottonian (or, at the very least, what was not written prior to Matthew Parker's publication efforts) from what is appended (matter that was

added by Parker, William Camden, and others). Yet, Stevenson's edition is not yet a turn toward radical thinking. This is not a rebuke Stevenson's scholarship, which is praiseworthy, but an awareness of the reconstruction efforts as accounted for in his edition: the separating of the pre-Parkerian matter of Cotton Otho A.xii from what had been added to it in modern times.

Stevenson's introduction offers an even-handed analysis of the manuscript evidence. In his edition, he differentiates between the validation of the pre-Parkerian readings of Cotton Otho A.xii and the proof of Asser's authorship. He states in his Preface that "[t]he net result [of approaching the surviving fragments without bias] has been to convince me that, although there may be no very definite proof that the work was written by Bishop Asser in the lifetime of King Alfred, there is no anachronism or other proof that it is a spurious compilation of later date" (vii). Stevenson, however, does not explicitly address the possibility of multiple authorship, even if he acknowledges on Wise's authority that the readings in Cotton Otho A.xii may have been the product of at least two scribes (xxxix) and that it is difficult to ascertain whether the passages verified only by the early witnesses—in the *Historia Regum, Chronica* of John of Worcester, and the *Annales S. Neoti*—were not post-Asserian. In fact, it is the text's likelihood of multiple voices that the concept of the genuine deproblematizes. That does not mean that every part of the Cotton manuscript must either have been derived from Asser or else must be regarded as a forgery. It means that authorship, whether attributed to a ninth-century Welsh bishop or to an eleventh-century forger (as Galbraith once did), has become entrenched in the scholarship of the Alfred dossier, and has shaped scholarly reproduction in post-Parkerian editions. The question of the *Vita's* authenticity, then, is answered by the prefabrication of authorship, whereas the question of whether Asser is the writer of a biography of King Alfred is answered through a process of authorizing.

The myth of the deproblematized "authored" work has continued in spite of William H. Stevenson's acknowledgment that the authorship of the received fragments (whether single or multiple) is unverifiable. The modern English translation by Keynes and Lapidge, the most accessible translation of the work to date, following Whitelock, maintains the certainty of single authorship throughout its analysis. In their notes, they remark of Henry Petrie's *Monumenta Historica Britannica*, which included the third printed edition of the *vita*, that "Petrie marked the passages that were not present in the Cotton manuscript by enclosing them in square brackets, and thus gave a reasonably clear impression of Asser's genuine text" (226). This critical choice of placing the authorizing action in the hands of Asser, again following Whitelock, is central to the translation's editorial orientation, bolstering the importance of the author. The translation focuses on "Asser's genuine text" as it aligns itself with Petrie's tradition of textual reconstruction. This tradition, as I shall show, demonstrates a bias toward author's final intentions and, while attempting to return to the form and content of an "original," ultimately produces an interpretive-event that is more correctly a "copy."

Furthermore, there seems to be a perceptible trend in Keynes and Lapidge's translation to normalize generic and voiced phrases in order to bring the text more closely into-line with modern expectations regarding an authored work. Throughout the portions of the *textus receptus* indebted most pervasively to the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, Keynes and Lapidge frequently translate the collective first person plural as a first person singular. The inscribed "we" comes to be read as an implied "I." These editorial changes obscure the nuances of the *textus receptus*. That is to more directly say, as Dmitri Nabokov had done with his father's incomplete manuscript cards, placing them into an edited order relevant to the edition's own ideological aims, the Keynes and Lapidge *vita* constructs its ontology through the perceptible changes and allowances

it makes to the Alfred dossier to be an "authorial" copy. Unlike *The Original of Laura*, however, which attempts to make its reader aware of the edition's artifice and the problems associated with clear editing, the Penguin *vita* makes attempts to downplay its artifice.

In ch. 21, the *Vita Ælfredi* switches number between singular and plural as though it were code-switching.

Sed, ut more navigantium loquar, ne diutius navim undis et velamentis concedentes, et a terra longius enavigantes longum circumferamur inter tantas bellorum clades et annorum enumerations, ad id, quod nos maxime ad hoc opus incitavit, nobis redeundum esse censeo, scilicet aliquantulum, quantum meae cognitioni innotuit, de infantilibus et puerilibus domini mei venerabilis Ælfredi, Angulsaxonum regis, moribus hoc in loco breviter inserendum esse existimo

The section, which is evidently unique to the witness of Cotton Otho A.xii, begins with "ut...loquar, ne"—that is, a first person singular present active subjunctive. It would translate as "so that...I might/may say/speak," in the first person singular, and occurs at a point of departure from the chronicle material. Here, the scribe acknowledges that the work is being directed (rather captained) by him, but that the work, as a whole, is not just his as is expressed in its juxtaposition to the third person passage "ad id, quod nos maxime ad hoc opus incitavit." That is to say "to that which roused most of *us* to this work." Is this a return to the chronicler's voice, or are we still in the voice of the originator of the surrounding passage? Moments later, the voice reverts back to the first person singular: "quantum meae cognitioni intuit, de infantilibus et puerilibus domini mei venerabilis Ælfredi," ("as far as my knowledge concerning the infancy and childhood of my venerable lord Alfred") differentiating his personal feelings from either professional or communal work. In ch. 22, the voicing returns to the first person plural: "sicut et nos saepissime

vidimus" ("as we have often seen").

It has been generally accepted that the use of the first person singular is due to the "author" who "speaks as a contemporary" (Stevenson lxxiv) to Alfred. This may be the case, but if so, they speak in several voices. The use of the collective voice is a common rhetorical device in chronicles, in Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum* and in Einhard's *Vita Karoli*, texts with which the writer was certainly familiar. But the present passage, in which both plural and singular alternate, is uninterrupted and unique. Its exclusion from the *Chronica chronicarum* and from the *Annales S. Neoti* speaks to its need for critical attention and that these irregularities should not be merely argued away as compositional idiosyncrasies.

The exemplar standing behind the Cotton Otho A.xii copy (witnessed through the Co transcript) often distinguishes between personal experience and that of the collective work's aim when referring to contemporary events or witnesses. In ch. 12, the *Vita* uses the first person plural "audivimus" ("we have heard"; in the Penguin, "I have heard" [70]) when referring to a report of King Æthelbald, in ch. 13, the rhetorical "ut diximus" ("as we have said"; in the Penguin "as I have said" [71]) followed closely by the personal "ut opinor" ("I think"; retained in the Penguin) and "Quod a domino meo Ælfredo, Angul-saxonum rege veredico, etiam saepe mihi referente, audivi" (Penguin: "I have heard the explanation from my lord the truthful Alfred, king of the Anglo-Saxons, who still often tells me about it" [71]). In ch. 15, the *Vita* returns to the collective "audivimus" ("we have heard"; in the Penguin as "I have heard" [72]) when discussing Eadburh's encounter with Charlemagne, and in ch. 16 "decrevimus" ("we have decided"; in the Penguin as "I have decided" [73]) when stating the purpose of recording the policy of King Æthelwulf during his final years.

The instances of singular and plural forms do not strictly highlight past versus present-

time events, as these examples might initially suggest. Ch. 21, the subjunctive "loquar" (singular) begins a selection in which the writer mixes the singular and plural forms as the writer desires the subject matter to return to the subject at hand.

ad id, quod nos [we] maxime ad hoc opus incitavit, nobis [us] redeundum esse
conseo, scilicet aliquantulum, quantum meae [my] cognitioni innotuit, de infantilibus
et puerilibus domini mei [my] venerabilis Ælfredi, Angulsaxonum regis, moribus hoc
in loco breviter inserendum esse existimo.⁷⁰

The Penguin translation reads:

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

In standardizing the pronoun usage of the Co transcript, and in so doing, downplaying the interweaving of its voices, the translation participates in the culture of authorization that began with Leland. Here, the voice is codified by means of excising the first person plural and replacing it with the singular. Firstly, the metaphor of the text as ship, which has been, in the Latin, carrying not only the writer(s) but also functionally the reader (quod nos maxime ad hoc opus incitavit) with the waves and sails doing the navigating, is altered in the translation so that the navigation is captained by the author, the waves, and the sails, with the reader reduced to an observer. The plurality of the voice is not insignificant, as the code-switching between singular

⁷⁰ From the Co transcript.

and plural indicates two different modes of speech: the plural voice is that of the chronicler and the singular is that of the individual. In the translation, the author—as a writer and as a voice—is made clearly the sole actor, while at the same time the medieval qualities of the received text, which seem to obfuscate authorship, are modernized.

Following this, in ch. 22, when discussing the character of Alfred and his hunting prowess, the tradition of the *Vita* returns to the first person plural: "sicut et nos saepissime vidimus" ("As we have often seen"; in the Penguin as "as I have so often seen for myself" [75]); In ch. 24, similarly: "sicut ipsi vidimus" ("as we have seen for ourselves"; in the Penguin as "as I have seen for myself" [75]). In ch. 25, speaking of Alfred's past sexual desires, the *Vita* states that Alfred did not relinquish those desires "et, ut credo, usque ad obitum vitae suae."⁷¹ Moreover, it is not clear that the selection of number (or voice) is divided between material indebted to the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* and the portions of the *Vita* concerned primarily with biography. They appear to be integrated in order to distinguish the present writer and perhaps the work of various other scribes during different stages of composition.

Author's final intentions and generative socialized ontologies

It is evident, in light of these facts, that the interpretive gestures of removing first-person plural phraseology from translations of *Vita* passages deproblematizes the textual tradition.⁷² The result of this gesture is an emphasis on the author-as-cohering-agent, a single promulgator who speaks rhetorically for himself through others. Furthermore, these shifts in voice imply particularity in the translators' intents with regards to the text's perceived wholeness. It might be

⁷¹ "and, I believe, until the end of his life."

⁷² Any translation fundamentally deproblematizes its source's textual tradition by mere fact of it being a translation. Language alters. However, interpretive gestures to normalize a text's readings is directly engaging in alterations of a different kind.

a more convincing narrative, had the narrator stuck to the biographer's voice, and perhaps he intended as much. Yet, the exercise with which we are engaged is invested in how this perceived wholeness speaks to the translator's understanding of the author's (or authors's) intentions toward a finished work.

The concept of "author's final intention" became popular through the CEAA (Center for Editions of American Authors) begun by the Modern Language Association in 1967. In its Statement of Editorial Principles and Procedures, the CEAA prioritized the adoption of the earliest version of a text in an ancestral series along with the latest authorial revisions: the efforts of which frequently produced eclectic "critical editions" that had no historical counterpart. A CEAA editor would be assigned to each potential edition and would award the seal that the edition was "An Approved Text" to those that met the specific requirements of the Center. This method of culling authoritative text from early accidentals and late substantive revisions was borne almost entirely from what is now called the Greg-Bowers school of editing. W. W. Greg's famous essay "The Rationale of Copy-Text" (1950, read before the English Institute on Sept 8, 1949 by J. M. Osborn for W. W. Greg), in which its author, whereby differentiating the editing of modern printed texts from classical texts, argues that editors should distinguish between accidental (formal) attributes of a text and substantive (intention-carrying) attributes. Greg's aim was not, as has often been claimed, the production of eclectic editions that drew haughtily from multiple independent authorities. His rationale was and had always been to aid the editor's choice in selection of copy-text, but while his essay offers examples of choices editors might make when confronted with multiple authorities, he leaves emendation on a case-by-case basis. Commenting on McKerrow's view that one ought to insert into the earliest "good" text corrections that have been derived from the author, Greg disapproves when McKerrow

"relapse[s] into heresy in the matter of the substantive readings" that set rules for choices in revision (25).

In one of the most frequently cited portions of Greg's essay, Greg writes that "the copy-text should govern (generally) in the matter of accidentals, but that the choice between substantive readings belongs to the general theory of textual criticism and lies altogether beyond the narrow principle of the copy-text" (26). Greg's bias was not toward the concept of author's final intentions; his narrow examples of printed editions allowing for the emendation of substantives based on authorial revision are taken broadly by Fredson Bowers to mean that one should afford the practice of "bringing an earlier printed edition into general conformity with a manuscript by means of scribal interlineation, marginal annotation, attached slips, and so on" (29). Bowers' rule-set for constructing copy-text, that multiple sources be synthesized "wherever necessary" was accompanied by the idealistic view that each textual change to a work in an ancestral series deteriorates the author's original intentions, but that intervention by the author re-authorizes the text and validates its substantive readings (26). In the same essay, Bowers contends famously that "[t]he recovery of the initial purity of an author's text and of any revision (insofar as this is possible from the preserved documents), and the preservation of this purity despite the usual corrupting process of reprint transmission, is the aim of textual criticism" (24). To invoke the sustained contamination of texts by the progress of time—such that the original is considered closest to the author's final intentions but are simultaneously unattainable—is to place Lachmann's theory of the ancestral series in a dogmatic proto-religious context: that is, with the production of each work we initiate a Fall. Broadly speaking, it is Bowers' contribution to the development of Greg's inquiry that defined these editions as eclectic mishmashes of early authoritative accidentals and revised substantives, and has overshadowed Greg's noble

intentions, such as they were. In addition to this, it was Bowers' editorial practice in all essentials that the CEAA chose to codify in 1967.

Advocates of the Greg-Bowers school still persist today; specifically, G. Thomas Tanselle, who, in his early essay "The Problem of Final Authorial Intention," adopts the perspective that an author's intentions in a work do change, but that final intentions can (and likely will) conflict over the course of a revised work's life. Thus, it can occur that "final" intentions of a revision might be present in a work that still exhibit traces of the author's earlier "final" intentions. To quickly sum up Tanselle's many complex points, it is in his view that the purpose of the editor to discover the words that the author actually wrote, to edit those words based on their own criteria suitable for their project at hand, determining which variants, for instance, are most authoritative for a particular reading. Subsequently, and importantly, Tanselle puts forward that the previously separated faculties and duties of the "critic" and the "editor" are not distinct: editing is, in point of fact, a critical act. Editors construct editions based on their own perceptions of authorities, textual variants, and I do not suspect there are many people who would deny that editing is also an interpretive act and, therefore, critical—it may be concluded that editing is, furthermore, an enactment of an ideology regarding the status of the "work."

This discussion of "author's final intentions," so far as it may relate to the editions of the *Vita Ælfredi*, then, must be tempered with caution. Parker's intentions, it would appear on the basis of a close reading of his preface, were to create, through the additions of extra-textual narratives related to Alfred (such as the legendary story of Alfred and the cakes), a work achieving a certain "fidelity" to the image of Alfred, one that to this end sought to present a fuller version of the *Vita Ælfredi*—that a writer might have set-down, but not in any single, uncorrupted

source—than the one that had been contained in his base manuscript, Cotton Otho A.xii.⁷³

Parker's interpolations of materials drawn from the *Annales S. Neoti* and other sources broadly indicate that he had been attempting to correct the BL Cotton Otho A.xii against the derivative sources in order to create a more comprehensive work.

It may be helpful to add several additional points regarding the concept of author's final intention. The first point is that the concept of an author's final intention was not consciously articulated during the life of Parker, and it is unlikely that Parker thought of his publication of *Ælfredi regis res gestae* in precisely these terms. His edition participates in polemical and preservational efforts to solidify Elizabeth's Protestant authority, as both head of state and of the Church of England, and to qualify that authority through a reflection to the Anglo-Saxon past, in the form of Rome's involvement during the period of history in which Anglo-Saxon educational and military efforts aided in the development of the early English nation. Parker's continuing attribution of the *Vita Ælfredi* to the historical bishop Asser clearly follows in the footsteps of John Leland and John Bale. Leland sought earnestly to highlight and publicize the work of Asser.⁷⁴ Bale, working in the tradition of Leland, sought to augment the corpus of the historical Asser by ascribing various texts to his name, erroneously from our perspective. Leland and Bale may not have been the first, chronologically, to ascribe to the historical bishop Asser the *Vita Ælfredi* (the sources of a twelfth-century hagiographical work, the *Vita S. Æthelberti*, may, in fact, contain the earliest extra-textual ascription). Leland and Bale, however, initiated

⁷³ For the fuller argument, see Chapter 4. Parker's edition interpolated material primarily from the work known as *Annales S. Neoti*, which he believed to have been written by the author of the *Vita*, but he also interpolated material from the writings of Matthew Paris and Henry of Huntingdon, seemingly to complete the senses of the *Vita*'s passages.

⁷⁴ See Chapter 3.

bibliographical labors, through their interests in the *Vita*, that directly impacted Parker's *editio princeps*, the *Ælfredi regis res gestae*.

The second important point to be drawn from this discussion of author's final intention is that the *textus receptus* of the *Vita Ælfredi*, once preserved in BL Cotton Otho A.xii, is considered by most scholars to represent a copy of a draft of the work at some stage in its composition.⁷⁵ We do not know whether the mostly-destroyed manuscript contained a version that was "final," in the modern sense of the word—but it would be unusual if it did. If our understanding of the author's final intention is based solidly off Stephen Mailloux's explanation of the concept,⁷⁶ then we are investigating an imagined finishing point of an ideal work, one whose form was partially contained in the copy preserved in BL Cotton Otho A.xii. That is to say, we are looking for imagined "new intentions," as Tanselle has described⁷⁷ them, which may imply finality more than represent historical accuracy of a fixed, finalized textual form. These imagined intentions are not incompatible, however, with the editorial efforts to reconstruct a more comprehensive version of the *Vita* undertaken by Matthew Parker and his secretaries.

Furthermore, is difficult to reconcile "final" intentions of a work whose textual tradition has come to be represented by a single, circulating copy. We are not able to identify, as Tanselle might wish, variant manuscript readings deriving from authoritative manuscript sources. Our only other sources to present variant readings, besides post-Cottonian variants are composite chronicles whose witnesses to the text of the *Vita Ælfredi* whose value is not always clear. These

⁷⁵ This important observation came from Whitelock, *The Genuine Asser*, pp. 19-20. See Chapter 3.

⁷⁶ Mailloux, "Textual Scholarship," p. 97. "[t]he question about when a work was finished is a question about an author's final intentions."

⁷⁷ Tanselle, "The Editorial Problem," p. 211. "Recognizing "finality" of intention, in turn, depends on [an editor's] ability to distinguish revisions which develop an intention in the same direction from those which push it in another direction: the former represent final intentions, the latter new intentions. Whether the editor rejects such "new" intentions or edits a separate text embodying them will vary with the particular situation. But so long as he is producing an edition of an author's writings, he must choose among the author's uncanceled variants or published revisions in the light of his total understanding of the work and its author."

witnesses may be considered by some editors as substitutes for variant authorial readings, as they apparently had been by Parker, though they are not clearly products of a single identifiable author. Nevertheless, we obviously should not expect medieval manuscript textuality to conform, nor should we seek to force it to conform, to modern editorial standards.

Even with these points in mind, the issue of "finality" has certainly circumscribed much of the editorial work surrounding the *Vita Ælfredi* to date. Finality was clearly instrumental in the foundation of both Parker and Camden's interpolations. The Cottonian manuscript was being viewed as an artifact that was wanting, a work that might be completed by modern hands, notably through the correlation of related sources.

This study has been engaged in the ongoing theoretical debate over the ontology of the "work," specifically, this study has been detailing the relationships between the three resistances that constitute a discourse of textual ontology. These resistances, I hope to have shown, are visible in any edition's attempt to present a particular arrangement of a "work," in that its reproduction of that work's material conditions, in its identification and interpretation of what constitutes the its texts' relationships, and in its inclusion of linguistic (or semi-linguistic) signifiers that may be implied by that edition to constitute the a "text," including any paratextual and contextual information that ultimately may be germane to a reader's understanding of the work. It is in this way that editions construct the ontology of their subject and offer their readers a momentary snapshot of a socialized, generative textual artifact and its ongoing tradition: what I have called the "interpretive-event." The later sections of this chapter will argue that the desire and practice of reconstructing the text once preserved in BL Cotton Otho A.xii, for the ostensible purpose of restoring the *Vita Ælfredi*, may be approached with these resistances firmly in mind. That is, the reification of an author's final intentions by the editing of texts participates in the

discourse of the resistances to ontology. Specifically, we may observe that the publication effort of Matthew Parker and his secretaries, which resulted in the publication of the *editio princeps*, *Ælfredi regis res gestae*, did not seek to conform to any specific medieval tradition of the *Vita Ælfredi* as they had received it. That edition, as will be argued in Chapter 3, constituted an editorial action of construing a version of the *textus receptus* that was viewed by its editor, Parker, as more textually authoritative than any of the surviving witnesses, although it was, in the end, evidently, neither.

Ontologizing the *Vita*, identifying the texts

Up to this point, I have been generalizing the status of Parker's *editio princeps* as one that may have been intended to present a more comprehensive version of the *Vita Ælfredi regis* than the version that was available to him in the Cottonian manuscript. Explicitly, his edition comprises a significant mediation between the work of the *Vita* and its (then) recognized texts' relationships. Additionally, that edition greatly influenced the perceived ontology of the *Vita*. As Joseph Grigely has put it, a work's ontology is partially defined by the relationship between the work's texts with regards to their historical contexts (and paratexts). Regardless of Parker's own interpretive errors, these acts of socialization by identifying texts that represent readings of the *Vita Ælfredi* generate new interpretive-events that further expand and complicate the network of texts that make up the work. At the same time, these acts are embodied in the transcripts, Co, B, and Ar. For Parker, the *Vita* evidently was an ideal, immaterial collection of variously related, but not always authorial texts. The addition of a non-authorial passages that may have been aimed at augmenting Alfred's mythology had been treated by Parker as merely a brick in the wall of the text he called *Ælfredi regis res gestae*. The resistance to ontology observed in Parker's included

passages may therefore be said to be a produced-condition brought on by the promulgation and ongoing reception of his edition. It may thus be concluded that Parker's editorial efforts and interpretive engagement were ontology-defining, non-reproducible events.

What this investigation of the reception of Parker's edition tells us is that, much like Stanley Fish's authoring of a classroom poem, a text's ontological status—specifically, a text's relationship to an authoring force—may be viewed as having been altered due to the interventions of an interlocutor. This socialization of ontology constitutes not a shift from a "true" form to a "false" form—since hermeneutic discourse governs the reception of whether an artifact is viewed as authorial or not—but a shift from "authorial" to "authorized." The authorization of texts and passages can be explicitly seen in the critical movement that has purported to identify and illuminate the "genuine Asser."

The concept of the Author was viewed as eminently desirable by sixteenth-century bibliographers (from the time of Leland's "Scriba Ælfredi") for establishing the delimitations of the work of the *Vita Ælfredi regis* and for organizing a corpus of related or semi-related texts.⁷⁸ This kind of authorization—that is to say, the ascription of authorship for the purpose of popularization—participates in the third resistance, in that editorial construction of authority determines that edition's orientation toward authorial or authorized readings. This authorization is also in conversation with the second discussed resistance, in that the perception of the Author role delimits authorial readings and authorial sources. With regard to the editorial efforts of Parker, the delimitation of sources resulted in the *Annales S. Neoti* to be designated as authorial, warranting its matter taken for use in his edition.

⁷⁸ For a comprehensive look at the way Parker utilized the Cottonian manuscript, see Chapter 4.

The complex transmission history of the *textus receptus*, as completely as we are able to follow it with the available evidence, has been ignored by many of the editors of versions of the *Vita Ælfredi*. Editorial efforts, as I have said, followed in Parker's footsteps, and ultimately depended on Parker to a greater or lesser extent. Camden's invention in the a section related to the founding of Oxford reinforces an age-old academic quarrel between two of England's oldest academic institutions, and his intervention is demonstrative of his general editorial aims—to qualify his institution—and his view of the status of his sources—that he reproduced the manuscript "in the very same forme as there I found it, and in none other."⁷⁹ Nevertheless, it is worth mentioning in the context of the history of the Alfredian dossier as it has clearly contributed to certain aspects of the authorization of the *Vita*. The critical interest in Camden's *optimum exemplar*,⁸⁰ which Camden claimed was the source for his edition's chapter 83b, also participated in an interpretive event that (albeit briefly) defined the status of the work with regard to the relationship of its texts. Besides the interpolation, Camden's edition essentially reprints Parker's and offers no new information about BL Cotton Otho A.xii that is relevant to the historian. Offering a hybrid of its own authorizing ideology and the ideology evidently governed the production of Parker's edition, Camden's edition draws almost slavishly on Parker's notions of authority. In almost entirely ignoring the question of variant texts, and other possible contexts for the *Vita*, Camden's edition reproduces wholesale Parker's ideological interests. Camden did not seem concerned with whether he was creating an edition that represented his views of the Cottonian manuscript in any way, and it is not even clear that he was intending to be faithful to the authority of Parker. Camden's contribution to the discourse of authority, in the end, amounted to little more than his passively reproducing the culture of authorization that Parker had initiated.

⁷⁹ Stevenson, *Asser's Life*, p. xxvi.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*

Camden's edition would, in turn, become a crucial focal point for Wise's edition, insofar as Wise included, as an *apologia*, an appendix in which he explains the controversy that had arisen from Camden's interventions. Wise's edition thus made an attempt to distinguish authentic and inauthentic readings in Parker's and Camden's editions. Wise, however, implicates himself separately in the problem of authorization of the Cottonian manuscript, as he mistakenly confuses Parker's interpolations (chapters 50b, c, d) as a "*recentior manus*," a term which he also uses to describe later chapters that were not the result of Parker (ch. 88, 11 to end of ch. 98), and later he defines that Parkerian hand a "*nova manus*."⁸¹ While this misidentification somewhat damages Wise's authority regarding paleographical and bibliographical traits of BL Cotton Otho A.xii, it does not do disservice to the edition as a whole, which had the noble goal of differentiating variant readings of some of the texts of the *Vita Ælfredi*. Wise's edition is known to be based largely on the collations of his colleague, James Hill, who worked with the manuscript directly. The errors in Wise's edition frequently seem to have been a result of his distance from the sources with which he claims to have worked.

Not until the early-twentieth century would Wise's errors come to be recognized as errors. The mid-nineteenth-century edition *Monumenta Historica Britannica*, by Henry Petrie (1848), mainly comprises a reissue of Wise's edition. It reproduces his errors and readings, and mislabels two of the transcripts (Co and B) that were made towards the end of Parker's publication efforts. Petrie's edition it is the first to collate the Parkerian transcripts, but its effort here is careless, producing discrepancies between the collation and the actual readings in the transcripts.⁸² And yet, we should be careful to separate Wise and Petrie's editions from earlier versions, as they were not strictly interested in the finalized or authorial work. Wise, specifically, doubts the

⁸¹ Ibid., p. xliii.

⁸² Ibid., pp. xxxi-ii.

ascription of Asser's name to the work that Bale has called *Annales Britanniae*,⁸³ and criticizes Leland's errors regarding the "scriba Alfredi."⁸⁴

Even if there had been no authorial leanings in editions of the Alfred dossier up to and throughout the nineteenth century, there would still be no guarantee that those editions would embody the sort of pragmatism that would come to be discussed in the early-twentieth. At the start of the twentieth century, students of the Alfred dossier benefited greatly from the scholarship of William H. Stevenson, fellow of Exeter College, Oxford, who published an edition of the Alfred dossier through Clarendon Press in 1904. Stevenson's edition identifies the sections of the Co transcript absent from the *Chronica chronicarum*, one of the important twelfth-century witnesses to the Cotton Otho A.xii. In doing so, Stevenson seems to assume the *Chronica* scribes' dependence on a then-circulating copy of the ninth-century text. He also identified a significant passage from the Co transcript that had not before been given the status interpolation (ch. 17b). Further, Stevenson compares the *Vita*'s text to passages in the *Annales S. Neoti*. It is important to mention that a great deal of Stevenson's commentary was informed by a desire to address the accusations of the Alfred dossier's alleged forgery, an argument put forth by Thomas Wright in 1841. Stevenson's arguments for authenticity are found primarily in the sixth part of his introduction (§61-§89) and continues throughout his conclusion. The edition has since served as (to the present day) the standard edition for students of the Alfred dossier. The edition's primary textual value resides in its collations of many of the major witnesses and in its generally dispassionate treatment of the evidence. His apparatus treats all of the witnesses that were known: it compares Transcripts Co, Ar, and B against Parker's printed edition, measures

⁸³ Wise, *Annales Rerum*, pp. xxvi-xxx.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, p. xxviii.; Wise's information derives from Leland, *Commentarii de Scriptoribus Britannicis*. Ed. Anthony Hall; also Leland, *De viris illustribus*, Ed. Carley. p. 252.

chapter inclusions in Parker's printed edition by Wise's testimony (and by the authority of his secretary James Hill), exposes Camden's reprint of and interpolation into Parker's edition, and demonstrates the value of the Northumbrian copyists of the composite chronicles *Chronica chronicarum* and the *Historia regum*. The printed portions of the *Annales St. Neoti* allow scholars to compare some of that text against Co and Parker's printed edition. Stevenson has, perhaps more than any scholar of the Alfred dossier, influenced current and continuing textual arguments and approaches to critical editing of the Alfred dossier through the model of its own scholarship.

Stevenson's edition, one hundred and eleven years old at the time of this writing, ultimately provides evidence for the difficulties that will always be present in the editorial reconstruction of the textual evidence. Many of Stevenson's errors appear to involve errors in collation: some involve misidentifications of sources and others present erroneous manuscript readings in the apparatus.⁸⁵ (These have been identified and explained in the diplomatic edition offered in the next subsequent chapter.) Yet, as there has been no comprehensive effort to collate and edit the sources of the *Vita Ælfredi* since Stevenson's edition, it has remained, in spite of some whispers of a new edition,⁸⁶ the standard. But the main difficulty with Stevenson's edition, notes David Dumville, is that while Stevenson compares many of the copyists that contain matter of the *Vita Ælfredi* (I use the title for the archive of related texts), we have no guarantee that those copyists had utilized the Cottonian manuscript or whether they had another like it.⁸⁷ Our ability to determine whether these copyists had or had not utilized the Cottonian manuscript is,

⁸⁵ For the identification of these manuscript readings, and for a discussion of Stevenson's use of Cambridge, Corpus Christi MS 92, which contains the "Florentius Wigorniensis," see Chapter 5.

⁸⁶ Dumville and Lapidge, *The Annals of St Neots*, p. xlii.

⁸⁷ Dumville and Lapidge, *The Annals of St Neots*, p. xli.

he concluded firmly, "slight indeed."⁸⁸ Stevenson had made the case that the promulgators of both the *Chronica chronicarum* and *Historia regum* drew directly on this specific manuscript (Cotton Otho A.xii), and this is a viable hypothesis. In the end, however, Stevenson's edition only provides an introduction to the available textual evidence for the manuscript's circulation. Even so, it remains useful, with appropriate caveats, in the sections where Stevenson discusses the relationships between various surviving texts of the *Vita Ælfredi*.⁸⁹

Stevenson, above all, set out to identify the passages of the *textus receptus* that scholars might accept as "genuine." He writes that

[w]hen I undertook this task, I had little idea of the labour it would involve. The reign of Alfred is a dark period of our history, illuminated only by the Old-English Chronicle and a few charters, preserved in much later chartularies <sic>, of a more or less suspicious nature. This paucity of evidence, while it adds greatly to the importance of the Life (if it can be shown to be genuine), renders the task of sifting and checking the statements of the work very difficult. (v)

Stevenson's edition was successful in that it was able to identify many sixteenth-century interpolations that derived from the Parker and his contemporaries. Throughout his notes, passages that have no prior analogues or sources are said to be "due to the author"; by which Stevenson certainly means they are the authentic work of the ninth-century bishop Asser. The organization of the inclusion or exclusion of passages around an Author, as I hope to show, ultimately constitutes a holistic rendering of the textual evidence. Stevenson's opinion, after his detailed examination of the evidence, was that the great bulk of the *textus receptus* is "genuine" (or not spurious). And despite "very definite proof that the work was written by Bishop Asser in

⁸⁸ Ibid.

⁸⁹ For Stevenson's errors up to ch. 35, see Chapter 5 for our collation.

the lifetime of King Alfred" the *textus receptus* is, "despite its difficulties and corruptions, really a work of the time it purports to be."⁹⁰ The question whether the *Vita Ælfredi* offered a "genuine" historical witness arose, during the time of Stevenson, from claims that the text in Cotton Otho A.xii was a forgery.⁹¹ Stevenson is surely correct in maintaining that some of what the Cotton manuscript preserved does in fact go back to the ninth century—the chronicle renderings would seem to settle the matter—but it is difficult to say with certainty how much of it does.⁹² Stevenson's overriding concern with the claims of forgery, moreover, set the tone for discussion of the authorship question throughout his edition and in future editions.

Dorothy Whitelock also turned to the concept of the "genuine," here in order to answer later claims by V. H. Galbraith that the *textus receptus* was a forgery by bishop Leofric. Stevenson had been careful with in his references to authorship, frequently referring diplomatically to the promulgator of the *Vita* as "the author" and to the historically referenced bishop Asser as "Asser." Whitelock, however, makes no such distinction in this regard. Her analysis describes a chapter as "Asser's chapter," the narration as "Asser's account," and the work as a whole as "Asser's *Life*." A voice is not designated as a "chronicler's" or a "biographer's" but, very simply, "Asser's"—a reductive practice that, as I have shown in Chapter 2, may be cause critical for concern. At the outset of her essay, Whitelock evaluates Stevenson's impact on the reputation of the work: "Until 1904, it was difficult to separate the text of Asser's *Life of King Alfred* from sixteenth-century interpolations which had brought it into disrepute" (3). Stevenson's edition, in this view, is not only notable for its defense of the authenticity of the *Vita*, but for its

⁹⁰ Stevenson, *Asser's Life*, p. vii.

⁹¹ See Chapter 1 for a more comprehensive explanation of the claims leveraged against the *Vita* that Stevenson addresses, see Stevenson, *Asser's Life*, pp. xcv-cxxxi. Also, Whitelock, *The Genuine Asser*.

⁹² Keynes and Lapidge argue that ch. 51 is also a later interpolation into the Cottonian manuscript due to chronological confusion. *Alfred the Great*. pp. 246-247, note 94.

having established the text that was written by Asser. Each "genuine" utterance that was identified by Stevenson represents a passage that was indeed present in the *textus receptus*, these passages having been separated from sixteenth-century interpolations through his apparatus. Each such passage is, according to Whitelock, an authoritative statement by a single author, Asser. Whitelock's view of Asser, then, can be seen as an explicitly hermeneutical formation of Stevenson's "genuine" Asser, one which has the effect of homogenizing the voices, the genres, and the sources present in the *textus receptus*. It implies that evident errors of transcription are indeed not due to the Author. They are the contribution of scribes who misrepresented an earlier, wholly authoritative, version of the *Vita*. This homogenization effects a critical oversimplification of the *textus receptus*'s relationship with author's intentions. One must accept that these intentions still reside within the work, albeit submerged at times behind textual corruptions and a complex transmission history (going back, that is, to an *ur*-text, the so-called "genuine Asser"). Or one must wholly reject all of the readings in the text and, with them, the authorization (Whitelock uses the term "value"⁹³) that the concept of "the genuine" offers.

The Penguin paperback translation of Stevenson's edition by Simon Keynes and Michael Lapidge, published in 1983, is an important text for the student of the *Vita Ælfredi*. It allows a range of difficult textual materials to be understood through a useful English rendering of the materials associated with the *Vita Ælfredi*. In the tradition of Whitelock, however, Keynes and Lapidge generally reify the readings in Stevenson through the figure of the Author, Asser. In this and other respects, their translation largely serves to consolidate the arguments of Whitelock. It is perhaps a matter of some small regret that the introductory sections of the translation offer no

⁹³ Whitelock, *The Genuine Asser*, pp. 3; 16, fn. 5; 21.

detailed critique of either Stevenson's edition or Whitelock's hypotheses regarding the "genuine" Asser, but might well have been out of the scope of a mass-market publication.

In his controversial book, *King Alfred the Great*, Smyth revives the arguments first set out by Galbraith, maintaining that the *textus receptus* is, on the whole, a forgery, and Smyth directs his arguments largely against those of Whitelock. But Smyth's use of constructs of authorization in order to deny the historical value of the Cotton Otho A.xii—here championing a solitary, and essentially historical, "pseudo-Asser"—does not greatly distinguish from attempts to posit the historical Asser as the source of the *textus receptus*'s homogeneity. Late in the book, Smyth derides the widespread critical acceptance of Alfred's illnesses. He states: "Adherents of the 'Genuine Asser' lobby have inevitably been cornered into adopting what was a late tenth- and early eleventh-century invention of King Alfred's sanctified neuroses" (600). Smyth's inability to accept those generic attributes in the tradition of the *Vita Ælfredi* that participate in the forms of royal biography and saintly *vita* is one of the most insurmountable faults of his critique. What Smyth is saying here is that those who believe there to be a "Genuine Asser" have placed the cart before the horse, believing firstly in the authenticity of the author and secondly the unification of his text. Yet, Smyth's argument differs little in point of method, asserting firstly Pseudo-Asser's authenticity (for even a forger can be "genuine"), and, secondly, the homogeneity of the text he created to deceive posterity.

I would like to conclude this chapter by highlighting two related theory-related arguments in Bede studies with regard to the negative evidence of the incompatible genres of the *Vita Ælfredi* alleged by Smyth. These positions are compatible with my view of the alteration of genres within the *Vita Ælfredi*. Furthermore, these points call into question Smyth's views of the impact of the hagiographical passages in the *Vita*. They demonstrate that Smyth's views of the

credibility of the *Vita's* use of genres are wholly anachronistic. In fact, it lends further credibility to the possibility of the later ninth-century origin of the bulk of the matter in the *Vita*, as well as the possible integrity of the bulk of the dossier transmitted in the Cotton Otho A.xii. The first argument was put forth by Bertram Colgrave in 1969 and pertains to the authenticity of generic conventions in Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica*.⁹⁴ Colgrave argues that Bede's narratological shifting between historical narrative and hagiographical passages reflect his ability of, rather than his shortcomings in, writing in multiple medieval genres. Bede's writing did not necessarily undermine the evidence offered by the historical passages—they were essentially separate exercises. Furthermore, John McNamara contends in a more recent article that the "truth value" of oral sources used by Bede has been based on the false dichotomy of "elite" and "folk" cultures.⁹⁵ McNamara raises the point that oral texts in Bede's narrative are no less credible than written sources.

What these arguments intimate is that dissatisfaction with a medieval writer's inability to compose in genre, or with his questionable sources, is not a credible basis for claims of forgery. It is, in fact, more an indication of that particular critic's tastes than it is a reflection on the validity of the text under scrutiny.

⁹⁴ Bertram Colgrave, and R. A. B. Mynors, eds. *Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1969. pp. xxxiv-xxxvi.

⁹⁵ John McNamara, "Bede's Role in Circulating Legend in the *Historia ecclesiastica*," *ASSAH* 7 (1994): 61–9.

Chapter 3. The Life of the *Life of King Alfred*

This chapter examines the *textus receptus* that now informs, surrounds, and enfolds the editing and critical reception of the work (or, as we shall see, dossier of texts) known as the *Vita Ælfredi regis* (Life of King Alfred), or, more simply, *Vita Ælfredi*, which may contain the earliest known first-hand account of time spent with an Anglo-Saxon king. This work survived until the early-eighteenth century in a single manuscript, now British Library, Cotton Otho A.xii, when it was mostly destroyed in a fire.

Titling the work of the *Vita Ælfredi regis*

Vita Ælfredi is a strictly honorary title. The history of its given titles may offer us a look into its editors' assumptions regarding various forms of the work. John Leland, the first post-medieval witness, who had come across the text of the *Vita* in his travels to catalogue British authors, describes the *textus receptus* in his massive work, *De viris illustribus*, as "Id quod ex Asserii Menevensis Historia liquet, qui Alfredi res gestas accurate perscripsit" or "The history which, by Asser of St. Davids who accurately wrote of the deeds of Alfred, may be made clear" (my trans).⁹⁶ Leland's descriptions of the work (which he sometimes calls "Asser's Annals"⁹⁷), writing around 1536, constitutes a major authoring act by a scholar in which the name Asser is ascribed to the *Vita Ælfredi*, and it is a landmark moment, as Leland refers to the *Vita* as a vehicle for the clarification of historical events.

While Leland exclusively describes the *textus receptus* in terms of *historia*, *res gestas*, or *annales*, his interlocutor, John Bale (d. 1563), was the first to hint at its future description relating to the royal biography and saint's life. In his *Summarium*, Bale uses the term *res gestas*

⁹⁶ Leland, *Commentarii*, p. 148; and Leland, *De viris illustribus*. pp. 242-243.

⁹⁷ Leland, *De viris illustribus*, p. 248-249.

for the text of the *Vita Alfredi*, but in his later work, his *Index Britanniae scriptorum*, he uses the term "*vita*" once when describing it.⁹⁸ Bale's classification appears to be the first written instance describing the text of the *Vita Ælfredi* in terms of a royal biography (or saint's life). These early distinctions of the work as either an historical document or a personal account of Alfred, reveal the editorial concerns that emerge in the late-sixteenth century, and, subsequently, the ways in which the *textus receptus* will be viewed by scholars.

In 1574, the *Vita Ælfredi* was given the title *Ælfredi res gestae auctore Asser* (The Deeds of Alfred by the author Asser) in a sixteenth-century transcript (known as the Cotton transcript, or 'Co') made for Archbishop Matthew Parker. Parker used the transcript—now Corpus Christi College, MS. 100—in the edition that formed the capstone of his publication program. Parker would give the published edition the title *Ælfredi regis res gestae* (The Deeds of King Alfred), dropping the ascription to Asser from his title. In his Praefatio ad Lectorem, however, Parker ascribes the information and praise of Alfred to Asser's epistolary dedication.⁹⁹ Parker refers to the received work in the Praefatio as *historia*. The second published edition, produced by William Camden in 1602-3,¹⁰⁰ contains a reprint of Matthew Parker's edition. Camden doesn't offer a title, though the section headings, which span recto and verso throughout the Alfredian material, read "Asserus de Ælfredi" / "Rebus Gestis" (Asser on the Deeds of Alfred) Camden seems hesitant to title the Alfred material, as may be evident in his omission of any comprehensive designation. Following Parker's example, he often refers to the received work as a history.

Evidently, these late-sixteenth-century "titles" avoid the associations and potential

⁹⁸ Bale, *Summarium*, fo. 65; Bale, *Index*, p. 34

⁹⁹ "ab Johanne Assero Antistite Shyreburnensi [...] Latinis literis luculenter expressam" (with a Latin letter by John Asser, bishop of Sherbone having been excellently copied.)

¹⁰⁰ Camden, *Anglica, Normannica, Hibernica*.

implications of the now-common term *vita*—either royal biography or "(saint's) life." This resistance to identifying the *Vita Ælfredi* as a "life" may be consistent with the practices of editors and scholars who did not wish the Alfred dossier to be further misidentified with hagiography. This approach to handling the Alfred dossier continues throughout the eighteenth century. In 1722, Francis Wise titled his edition *Annales rerum gestarum Ælfredi Magni, auctore Asserio Menevensi* (Annals of the Deeds of Alfred the Great, by the author Asser of St. David's). As with the first two editors of the dossier, Parker and Camden, Wise's title continues to emphasize the circumstance that material alleged to contain first-hand accounts of Alfred is embedded in annalistic passages and, by implication, that all of these are of an historical nature. The titles disassociate the manuscript from the *vita* tradition (royal biographies like the *Vita Karoli*, which may shade into hagiography) and from hagiography altogether.

A significant shift in editorial approach occurred at the turn of the twentieth century, in the form of William H. Stevenson's *The Life of King Alfred, together with the Annals of Saint Neots Erroneously Ascribed to Asser*, which was published in 1904. In his Introduction, Stevenson utilizes the English title the "Life of King Alfred" for those passages he has edited maintains that the material has the form of the royal biography. Stevenson gives his text a more formal title at the start of the edition of the Latin text proper: *Asserius de rebus gestis Ælfredi* (Asser on the Deeds of Alfred), following Camden and Wise. While Stevenson is not willing to include the term *vita* in his title, he acknowledges the difficulties inherent in labeling this kind of work. The early aversion to highlighting the biographical or even hagiographical affinities of the dossier in the titling of the work might be due to the fact that those materials, as J. A. Giles describes, "are inserted at random in various parts of the [received] work" (*King Alfred* 4). Stevenson seems acutely aware, or even wary, of placing too much emphasis on any possible

hagiographical influence on the *Vita*. He writes toward the end of his introduction:

The account of Alfred's early illness, of his cure, of his praying for an infirmity that should keep him in the paths of chastity, of the cure of the illness thus acquired at his marriage, and of his being then stricken with a compensatory infirmity immediately afterwards [ch. 74] are hard to believe literally. The morbid feelings here ascribed to the king read more like a chapter from a saint's life than a tale that had been told to the author by a man of action and intelligence such as Alfred proved himself to be. That the king did suffer from illness we know from his own testimony, and the mortality table of his house shows that it was not very robust. We may perhaps venture upon the explanation that the author had been misled by his love of rhetoric into greatly exaggerating the bodily sufferings of the king for the purpose of heightening the colours of his picture or of emphasizing the difficulties under which the king performed his life's strenuous work. (cxxx)

Alfred's demeanor on the whole is clearly not saintly. Yet, by raising the question of the authorial credibility, a consequence of the evident rhetorical exaggeration, Stevenson recognizes (and perhaps preempts reactions to) doubts about the status of the material as annalistic or more generally historical testimony. (Stevenson may even have suspected that the apparent exaggerations might one day be used by critics, as they would be in the writings of V. H. Galbraith and Alfred P. Smyth, to argue that the *textus receptus* assigned to the *Vita Ælfredi*, on the whole, may be viewed as a forgery.)¹⁰¹

¹⁰¹ See Lapidge, "Asser's Reading," pp. 44-47. The various claims of those championing forgery highlight problems of textual veracity posed for scholars by the *textus receptus* of the *Vita Ælfredi*. The various anti-traditionalist conclusions echo Stevenson's concern that the Cottonian manuscript, when evaluated as a witness to historical fact, undermines its claims to verisimilitude through the inclusion of difficult embellishments surrounding the character of Alfred. Stevenson, *Asser's Life*, p. cxxx.

Before 1904, we have seen, the naming of the work is largely patterned on the reception of the BL Cotton Otho A.xii as a document of primarily historical veracity. Prior to 1904, editions largely avoided explicit reference to the work's hagiographical tendencies. Titles (utilizing terms such as *Annales* and *Res gestae*) minimized hagiographical overtones. This tradition continued in Stevenson's edition, where these hagiographical traits were acknowledged as problematic for how they may have been viewed as a challenge to the text's legitimacy. The scholarly discourse emerging from Stevenson's edition of the *textus receptus*, it can therefore be said, shaped the scholarship that was primarily interested in the entirety of the BL Cotton Otho A.xii's legitimacy.

The critical practice of titling the *textus receptus* of the *Vita Ælfredi* (the passages in BL Cotton Otho A.xii that concern Alfred) in the light of its supposed generic or formal attributes offers a testimony to how differently the text has been regarded throughout its editorial and critical history. In Stevenson's own words:

The Life of King Alfred, known to us as the work of Bishop Asser, is one of the most important and at the same time most difficult of the sources of early history. The work possesses unique literary interest as the earliest biography of an English layman, and as its subject was a very great man, it occupies in English sources much the same position as Einhard's Life of Charles the Great in the history of France and Germany.

Probably no work of similar extent has contributed so much to English history. (xi)

Contemporary scholars have now come to address the text in ways that acknowledge its indebtedness both to the saint's life and to the royal biography. However, this has been a slow process. Anton Scharer states succinctly, essentially in agreement with Sheppard, that "[t]he defenders of the *Life's* originality have far too long tried to avoid the subject [of hagiography]

and only recently taken it more seriously by showing that illness and suffering were just another means of proving Alfred to be the elect" (313). In the mid-to-late twentieth century, fifty years after Stevenson, the *textus receptus* gained titles more immediately compatible with its occasionally evident hagiographical elements. In 1957, Schutt refers to the text, invoking a saint's life, as the *Vita Ælfredi*. In his entry, "Asser," for *The Wiley Blackwell Encyclopedia of Anglo-Saxon England*, Simon Keynes offers the more formal *Vita Ælfredi regis Angul* [sic] *Saxonum*.¹⁰² Hewitt's entry in the digital database, *Fontes Anglo-Saxonici*,¹⁰³ simply utilizes *Vita Ælfredi regis*. These titles are evidence of a critical shift in the acknowledgment of the saint's life and royal biographical forms that had been avoided by editors before the early-twentieth century. The more recent titles hybridize the biographical and historical aspects of the *Vita* in a single, natural designation.

In terms of genre—rather, so that we may offer a contemporary label to a medieval form—Sheppard (2004) uses the term "hagiographical biography" to describe the parts of the *Vita*'s textual tradition where the narrative breaks from ostensible Alfredian historiography and shifts to more sensationalist aspects of the king's virtue. Hagiographical biography is a useful term that clearly reflects the interconnected forms from which Asser appears to be drawing. In some ways Sheppard's term also offers parallels to the critical struggle for the *Vita Ælfredi*. To sum up, the significance of these invented titles as textual barometers for the Alfredian dossier is twofold. Firstly, they offer reflections of the *Vita Ælfredi*'s received forms: the biography (shading into the saintly biography, or hagiography), the aristocratic history (shading into the mirrors of princes), and the chronicle (undergirded by sets of bare annals). All of these distinct

¹⁰² Lapidge, "Asser," p. 52.

¹⁰³ R. Hewitt, "Vita Ælfredi regis" 2003. *Fontes Anglo-Saxonici: World Wide Web Register*, <http://fontes.english.ox.ac.uk/>, accessed July 2014.

parameters were perceived unevenly by the *Vita*'s various editors and transmitters. The *Vita* may have served a political purpose, having been intended to instill confidence in Wessex's overlordship in Wales.¹⁰⁴ As we have no firm evidence regarding the text's status in Wessex, any claims regarding its form as a political document must be set aside,¹⁰⁵ at least for now. Secondly, these titles and the forms they refer to may serve to foreground the editorial sequence according to which the *Vita Ælfredi* was shaped by editors and scholars from the time of its first publication by Matthew Parker. Since there is no evidence of the text ever having a title before Parker's edition, the supplied titles are indicative of a critical and social discourse surrounding the work. The only facsimile made of the BL Cotton Otho A.xii—the manuscript that contained the *Vita Ælfredi*—only depicted one page. This facsimile was made by James Hill to be employed by Francis Wise for his 1722 edition (and reprinted by Stevenson in his edition and by Keynes and Lapidge in their translation¹⁰⁶). It begins with ch. 1¹⁰⁷ and offers no title. None of the witnesses transmitted by way of Worcester or Durham present a title. It is possible that no one involved in its composition or early dissemination ever gave it one. The post-medieval acts of titling documented above may serve to clarify, but they may unintentionally obscure contemporary perspectives regarding biases towards the work.

Biographical and annalistic contexts of the *Vita Ælfredi*

The *Vita* as we have it seems to present first-hand accounts of Asser's own experience with Alfred over a course of years, as well as a number of anecdotal narratives interspersed with

¹⁰⁴ Kirby advances that the work was primarily used to instill aid in Alfred acquiring the submission of Anarawd, king of Gwynedd, and that Asser was instrumental in accomplishing this through systematic revisions to the main text over the course of almost 9 years. See Kirby, "Asser and His Life of King Alfred," pp. 13-25.

¹⁰⁵ On this, see Schutt, "The Literary Form," pp. 209-220; Whitelock, *The Genuine Asser*, p. XII.5 and fn. 2; Keynes and Lapidge, *Alfred the Great*, p. 42.

¹⁰⁶ Keynes and Lapidge, *Alfred the Great*, p. 66.

¹⁰⁷ For simplicity this dissertation will utilize William H. Stevenson's numbering.

Latin translations from the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. The biographical and anecdotal sections occasionally do give the work the appearance of a saintly *vita*, though as a whole it differs from most lives of saints and kings in terms of the span of the life of its subject which it recounts. Specifically, the narrator states in ch. 91 that the date of the composition of that part of the text was 893 (section 1.6 below), which we now know to have been near the start of the last decade of Alfred's life. The writing evidently ends in this same year. Unlike saints' lives, which essentially by definition offer *post mortem* accounts of their subjects, the *Vita Ælfredi* concludes before the death of the king and its writer does not return to his writing to offer any account of Alfred's later battles.¹⁰⁸ The *textus receptus* ends abruptly with a flurry of information pertaining to Alfred's interest in scripture, his approach to judicial hearings, and even his building of a horn lantern in 887. It has been traditionally held that work on the *Vita* was cut short suddenly for some reason, though the historical Asser lived a decade longer than the subject of the *Vita Ælfredi*.¹⁰⁹

The content of the *Vita Ælfredi* (as we have it) is uneven, jostling between events in Wessex's recent past, the narrator's observations regarding the present time, as well as recollections of past meetings with Alfred also narrated from the perspective of the present time. While much of the *Vita* is concerned with Anglo-Saxon forces fighting against the Danes, it also includes a lengthy complaint against bad queens, an exemplary passage in which Charlemagne is shown to rebuke the Mercian king Beorhtric's daughter, Eadburh. There are also occasional details of Frankish affairs (particularly those involving Charles the Fat). We also encounter an

¹⁰⁸ Keynes and Lapidge have hypothesized that this may reflect the nature of Alfred's later years, and conjecture that the *Vita's* author(s) would perhaps rather end on a positive note (*Alfred the Great* 56), and they hypothesize elsewhere that the abruptness of the end may have something to do with the 893 siege of Exeter, where Asser was given a monastery by Alfred (p. 287, fn. 9).

¹⁰⁹ The *Annales Cambriae* (also known as the Welsh Annals) records Asser's death in 908, while the *Anglo Saxon Chronicle*, depending on the version, gives his death in 909 or 910.

anecdotal story of the young Alfred learning and reciting a book of English poetry by heart. The *Vita* begins by offering as its main subject the lineage of Alfred, as well as some details of his childhood. Soon after, however, the narrator states the main intention of the undertaking:

Sed, ut more navigantium loquar, ne diutius navim undis et velamentis concedentes, et a terre longius enavigantes longum circumferamur inter tantas bellorum clades et annorum enumerationes, ad id, quod nos maxime ad hoc opus incitavit, nobis redeundum esse censeo, scilicet aliquantulum, quantum meae cognitioni innotuit, de infantilibus et puerilibus domini mei venerabilis Ælfredi, Angulsaxonum regis, moribus hoc in loco breviter inserendum esse existimo¹¹⁰ (Stevenson's ch. 21)

The *textus receptus* concludes by conveying a sentiment that the reader will be satisfied with its writer's (or writers') exposition of Alfred's interest in learning as the lynchpin of his character (ch. 106, Sed hanc senum iuvenumque in discendis literis solertiam ad praefati regis notitiam explicavimus¹¹¹).

Whether or not the reader is satisfied with the text's unceremonious conclusion, the majority of its composition is, despite shifting tenses and generic forms, strikingly coherent. While exposition of the *Vita* has been criticized as jumbled, its narrative gives the sense that its author(s) and, perhaps, redactors, put a certain amount of thought into the various inclusions. For instance, Alfred's queen, Ealswith (who is never named outright in the *textus receptus*), was of Mercian birth as was Beorhtric's daughter, Eadburh. Despite the account of Alfred's marriage

¹¹⁰ "But (to speak in nautical terms) so that I should no longer veer of course – having entrusted the ship to waves and sails, and having sailed quite far away from the land – among such terrible wars and in year-by-year reckoning, I think I should return to that which particularly inspired [us] to this work: in other words, I consider that some small amount (as much as has come to my knowledge) of the infancy and boyhood of my esteemed lord Alfred, king of the Anglo-Saxons, should briefly be inserted at this point" (Keynes and Lapidge, *Alfred the Great* 74).

¹¹¹ "But [we] have explained this concern for learning how to read among the young and old in order to give some idea of the character of King Alfred" (Keynes and Lapidge, *Alfred the Great* 110)

occurring much later in the composition than the anecdote addressing Eadburh, the contrast between the two queens is not wholly obscured by this separation. Indeed, the queen honorably bears Alfred five children. It is regrettable that the *textus receptus* fails to include any of her physical descriptions or any details of her behavior. The figure of the queen serves a didactic role in the narrative far outstripping its historical value. This lack of specificity does not instill confidence in the scholar who wishes to treat the text as a contemporary account by a man (or men) who knew Alfred personally. On the other hand, passages in the *textus receptus* frequently impress us with their narratological craft. Just as Eadburh's figure of the bad wife (ch. 15) anticipates Ealswith's good (ch. 75), so too does Alfred's early interest in learning, writing, and reading (chs. 22-25) anticipate his interest in learning and later educational reforms (chs. 76-79). Both thematic gestures are joined together at chapter 75, when we learn that his children were dedicated to the liberal arts and were taught English and Latin. Alfred's scholarly interests are indicated early on but vindicated in the *Vita* when Alfred has become king and has the ability to attend to the state of learning in his kingdom. Furthermore, Charlemagne outside of the testing of Eadburh¹¹² appears as a minor character, but his inclusion serves important didactic role in the *Vita Ælfredi regis*. The emperor's inclusion is woven very carefully into the fabric of the narrative as if to pass on the greatness of the great Frankish ruler to his Anglo-Saxon counterpart.

¹¹² "Accordingly, when King Beorhtric was dead, since Eadburh was unable to stay any longer among the Saxons, she sailed overseas with countless treasures and went to Charlemagne, the very famous king of the Franks. As she stood before the throne, bearing many gifts for the king, Charlemagne said to her: 'Choose, Eadburh, whom you wish between me and my son, who is standing with me on this throne.' She, foolishly replying without thinking, said: 'If the choice is left to me, I choose your son, as he is younger than you.' Charlemagne smiled and replied to her: 'Had you chosen me, you would have had my son; but because you have chosen my son, you will have neither him nor me.' He did however give her a large convent of nuns in which, having put aside the clothing of the secular world and taken up that of nuns, she discharged the office of abbess – but only for a few years. For just as she is said to have lived recklessly in her own country, so was she seen to live still more recklessly among a foreign people. When at long last she was publicly caught in debauchery with a man of her own race, she was ejected from the nunnery on Charlemagne's orders and shamefully spent her life in poverty and misery until her death; so much so that in the end, accompanied by a single slave boy (as [we] have heard from many who saw her) and begging every day, she died a miserable death in Pavia" (trans. Keynes and Lapidge, *Alfred the Great* 72).

This is unlikely to be a coincidence, as Einhard's *Vita Karoli* may have provided one of the models for the *Vita Ælfredi*'s Alfred. This is evident, as Michael Lapidge writes, "from context if not from verbal debt" ("Asser's Reading" 28).¹¹³ With the inclusion of the anecdote centering on Charlemagne, the reader is inclined to look favorably on Ealswith as if she were the sort of queen of whom Charlemagne would have genuinely approved.¹¹⁴ It is not uncommon in *vitae* treating kings (or saints) to find parallel narratives adding rhetorical weight to the main subject's own characterization.

While the *Vita Ælfredi* may emerge stylistically from the genre of the saint's life, it is still in many respects structured as a historical chronicle (or set of annals). Roughly half of the *Vita Ælfredi* involves passages that are also present in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. Nevertheless, the *textus receptus* differs from all of the extant witnesses to the *Chronicle* at several crucial points. In ch. 48, the *textus receptus* records the arrival of six Danish ships, whereas all extant versions of the *Chronicle* mention seven; the *Vita Ælfredi* counts 1200 men with whom Ivan the Halfdan perished, whereas other texts of the *Chronicle* have 840 (A, D, E, F) or 860 (B, C); the *Vita* agrees with the A-text of the *Chronicle* in the information regarding the Danes sailing up the river Scheldt given in ch. 65 (year 883 in the *Chronicle*), but it does not include the matter of the residency of the Danish army in Amiens (year 884), which is present in the A-text; the *Vita* gives the name of "a certain foolish king's thane," Ceolwulf, whereas the A-text of the *Chronicle* does not (the other extant versions, however, do name him); the *Vita* enumerates eight battles that took place in 871, whereas all known Old English texts of the *Chronicle*, and Æthelweard, give nine.

¹¹³ Keynes and Lapidge suggests that there are "reflections" of the *Vita Karoli* in chs. 16 and 81, but there may be a more explicit stylistic borrowing in ch. 91 (see Chapter 4).

¹¹⁴ It is therefore difficult to substantiate Alfred Smyth's claim that "the folk-tale of Eadburh, the daughter of King Offa, adds nothing to our knowledge of Alfred and was inserted to conceal the compiler's ignorance of events in Alfred's own youth" (*King Alfred the Great* 197).

It is known that Æthelweard had a version of the *Chronicle* that (like version E) only extended up to 892 and that excluded the continuation for 893-6 found in the A, B, C and D versions. E omits 891 and the continuation, but contains 892. Keynes and Lapidge suggest that the return of the pagan army to England in 892 may have presented Alfred's biographer with an unfortunate ending, a development that led to its omission, had his version extended to 892, as does Athelweard's account. That is, after Alfred is shown to have fought valiantly and to have ejected the pillaging Danish army, they suggest that Alfred's efforts would not achieve the intended magnanimity.¹¹⁵ They consider, "it may be that by this stage [ch. 106] Asser had said what he most wanted to say about the king, and could not bring himself to return once again to the more mundane task of translating the remaining entries in his copy of the *Chronicle*, particularly when the material available would be anti-climactic" (278). Though it differs in some ways from all surviving texts of the *Chronicle*, the *textus receptus* contains enough points of correspondence to suggest that a version of the *Chronicle*, similar to E, but that shared characteristics with BC, was utilized in preparation of this Alfredian dossier.

A careful evaluation of the narrative content of the *Vita Alfredi regis* will also draw attention to some cohesive elements of style. This is evident in the repetition of antiquated forms and personal clichés: for instance, the unconventional spelling of "die noctuque" (chs. 22, 24, 25) and the phrase "in illa paga" for (ch. 1, and variants in chs. 35, 42) that does not show up elsewhere in this particular use until the mid-thirteenth century.¹¹⁶

Many of the allegedly biographical parts of the *Vita* have again, recently, as in the past, come under fire, as I have outlined above, in view of their ostensibly hagiographical character. It must be stressed that these claims of hagiographical influence have not been entirely exaggerated

¹¹⁵ Keynes and Lapidge, *Alfred the Great*, p. 279.

¹¹⁶ Latham, *Revised Medieval Latin Word-List*, p. 328.

by their adherents.¹¹⁷ For example, in ch. 74, Alfred finds himself divinely cured of one illness, only to be struck down by another. The narrator shows no interest in rationalizing the occurrence, as though these events speak for themselves. That the text's emphasis on Alfred's illnesses (as well as his competition with his brothers) "conforms to hagiographical models" (Smyth 204) may be acceptable without disallowing that a contemporary wrote them, particularly if the writer had had experience composing hagiography. Smyth has claimed that the character of these passages, as in ch. 74, provide evidence for a forger's inventiveness, betraying a lack of personal experience with the king. Part of the difficulty with the arguments put forth by adherents of the forgery hypothesis, has been their unwillingness to take these descriptions at face value, to accept that they are signs not of interpolation but of integration. The *Vita Ælfredi* may be, in some sense, a composite text that draws on multiple medieval forms, sometimes imperfectly, but it is not necessary to conclude that it is a forgery, or, further, a product of multiple authorship, due to these exaggerations. The rhetorical effect of these inclusions may, at times, add to the narrative's hagiological character, as has been admitted even by Stevenson,¹¹⁸ but it also speaks to the complexity of the milieu in which the *Vita* appears to have emerged and the many unique aspects of the dossier in question.

While the *Vita* offers a unique biographical and annalistic treatment of Alfred's reign, it is not alone in presenting a heterogeneous text addressing political developments during the ninth century. Describing of a ninth-century manuscript which combines parts of the *Annales regni Francorum* with chapters from Einhard's *Vita Karoli*, James Campbell, writes "[the fact that] Asser was not alone in the ninth-century in feeling the need to combine annals and biography

¹¹⁷ The quality of Alfred's asceticism is not of a "fanatical intensity" as reported by Alfred P. Smyth (*King Alfred the Great* p. 205), but neither is it nonexistent. The *Vita Ælfredi regis* is at times indebted to hagiography.

¹¹⁸ See Tait's Review of Stevenson, ed. *Asser's Life*, pp. 137-140, specifically p. 139.

gives more interest to the way in which he does it" (119). One might also say that it also generates interest in the ways that the text does *not* do it; no mode of expression or method of exposition is adhered to with absolute consistency, or for too long. The *Vita* maintains the chronicle form for only a while, but the annalistic passages are interrupted by flurries of biographical information—both historiographical and quasi-hagiographical in tenor. Subsequently, the chronicle material is taken up and then abandoned it again. This may speak to the idea that the literary forms reflected in the *textus receptus* were not wholly sufficient for the task that seems to have been undertaken—the presentation of an adequate Alfredian biography. By chapter 91 the *Vita* has abandoned the chronicle form altogether, and in several of the closing chapters the narration takes on a deeply personal character, with the idea of its subject highlighted through his societal deeds and concerns, along the lines of the *specula principum*. The *Vita Ælfredi*, whatever its author (or authors, or redactors) intended it to be, comes to us as a chimaera. It offers a multi-voiced, multiply generic Welsh/Anglo-Saxon biography with echoes of a Frankish lineage. It may well be the work of the historical Bishop Asser, but the *textus receptus* it is ultimately the product of many hands. As may be evident from my reluctance in preliminary examination to stand firmly either with the traditionalists, who view the *Vita* narrowly as an integral work of the Welsh bishop Asser, or with the anti-traditionalists, who argue that the work—again viewed most often as an integral whole—is a later forgery, this study seeks to rethink the Alfredian dossier as a work of multiform fragmentation. It is a complex source, one in which multiple literary forms and modes of narration contend for visibility. The traditionalist view can be seen in the strict, formal schematizations of Gransden, who views the text, holistically, as a work reflecting a "bipartite arrangement" (47-51), the first part containing

the history of its subject's family and the second an account of the subject.¹¹⁹ This division, I would argue, is not as strict as Gransden wishes it to be. These forms certainly overlap in the *Vita Ælfredi*, making a firm structural demarcation difficult if not impossible to achieve.

To return to a subject addressed at the start of this study, the title, *Vita Ælfredi regis*, used throughout this project, has been chosen in large part for its tacit recognition of two of the main literary forms (biography and annal) which it comprises. The title may recall thematic parallels with the ninth-century *Vita Karoli*, as well as various treatments of other secular aristocrats, and, also perhaps, the dossier-like nature of many saints' lives. The title may also reflect a departure from the emphasis on Asser as the presumed architect and promulgator of the whole of the *Vita Ælfredi*, even if the historical bishop may well have been the main progenitor and transmitter of this particular Alfredian dossier. There are, however, challenges that accompany the use of this title. First, the title may imply a shift away from the historical emphasis of other early titles (*Res gestae...*, *Annales...*, and so on), deemphasizing the chronicle-derived material into which the biographical material has been interspersed. In response, this study views the historical material as indebted to the biographical form instead of the biographical material to the historical or annalistic material. The first-person narrative that occurs throughout cannot easily be reconciled if the *textus receptus* is defined primarily in terms of the chronicle form (approximating to, as Leland sometimes called it, "Asser's Annals"¹²⁰). Second, my preferred title acknowledges that episodes with thematic parallels in saint's lives are allowed to intrude into the narrative, ostensibly to bolster the characterization of its subject, without invalidating the possible historicity of other passages. It is essential to stress that while the title allows for the recognition

¹¹⁹ Gransden, *Historical Writing*, p. 52. Gransden suggests further that the *Encomium Emmae Reginae* had perhaps been influenced by the structure of the *Vita Ælfredi*.

¹²⁰ "ut Asserius Menevensis in suis annalibus refert" Leland, *De viris illustribus*, p. 252.

of a certain hagiological character in the narrative, it does not seek to define the *Vita Ælfredi* as hagiography.

Identifiable periods in the transmission of the *Vita Ælfredi regis*

The manuscript now identified as BL Cotton Otho A.xii, the primary source used by Parker for his *editio princeps* of the *Vita Ælfredi*, was itself a copy made in the early-eleventh century from an earlier exemplar since lost to posterity. This Cottonian manuscript was badly damaged in the Ashburnham House fire of 1731. The remains of Cotton Otho A.xii, essentially a collection of charred fragments, are kept in the British Library under that shelf-mark, though no trace of any of the leaves containing the text of the *Vita* has survived.

The *Vita Ælfredi regis* attests to its composition in ch. 91 (Stevenson's edition) when its writer states:

Erat itaque rex ille multis tribulationum clavis confossus, quamvis in regia potestate constitutus; nam a veginimo aetatis anno usque ad quadragesimum quintum annum, quem nunc agit.¹²¹ (Stevenson 76)

This passage may serve as a basis for the dating of at least part of the *textus receptus* (parts which may go back to a ninth-century exemplar). Alfred's "forty-fifth" year, counting from 849, would make the year 893-4. Keynes and Lapidge accept some flexibility of the dating to as early as 891 if we place authority in the earliest extant version of the West Saxon Regnal Table,¹²² which makes Alfred twenty-three years old on his accession, after Easter 871.¹²³ Calculations

¹²¹ "King Alfred has been transfixed by the nails of many tribulations, even though he is invested with royal authority: from his twentieth year until his forty-fifth (which is now in course)" (trans. Keynes and Lapidge, *Alfred the Great* 101).

¹²² Whitelock, *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, p. 4.

¹²³ For an examination of the Latin translation of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* surrounding Easter, see Chapter 5.

based on the West Saxon Regnal Table put his birth either on 847 or 848 depending on whether he was born before or after Easter. The precise significance of these dating criteria, however, is tenuous. Lapidge is skeptical that the narrator could have been using Alfred's age as a *terminus ad quem* for the whole of the text, though it is possible he was doing so. The *Historia regum* (SD1) associated with Symeon of Durham but going back to a redaction prepared by Byrhtferth of Ramsey, which uses a variant copy of the *Vita* (possibly a pre-Cottonian version), gives Alfred's birthdate as 848. If we accept this dating, evidently going back to a tenth-century (or earlier) source, that would give the passage cited from the *Vita* a composition date in 892-3, though it may remain unclear whether this provides an early or late terminus for the work as a whole. The cessation of the *Chronicle*-linked material c. 892-3 may also provide some corroboration here.

Accepting these dates initially, we may, therefore, identify four distinct periods in the *Vita's* circulation. The first is the dark period between the *Vita's* internally-attested composition date circa AD 893 (ch. 91; as early as 891 and 892-3 by the West Saxon Regnal List, or at some point before Alfred's death if we were to admit a later date) and the production of Cotton Otho A.xii at or around the year 1000 (to which it has been most plausibly dated¹²⁴). Details relating to the circulation of copies of the *Vita Ælfredi* during this period are few and far between. Dorothy Whitelock points out that insofar as the Cotton text of the *Vita Ælfredi* shares error with the Byrhtferthian passages (SD1) and with the readings of the *Annales S. Neoti* of a type "which is due to miscopying, and not the sort of error an author can himself make" the passages concerning Alfred in Cotton Otho A.xii must have been at least a copy of a copy.¹²⁵ However, it is difficult even to guess how many copies had been in circulation by that point. The standard dating for

¹²⁴ Stevenson, *Asser's Life*, p. xlv. Keynes and Lapidge, *Alfred the Great*, pp. 51, 223-225.

¹²⁵ Whitelock, *The Genuine Asser*, pp. 19-20.

Byrhtferth's activities are c. 985 x c. 1016-17?¹²⁶ Therefore, we may hypothesize that at least two and possibly three copies of the *Vita Ælfredi* were produced between 893 and c.1000, one of whose texts was preserved in Cotton Otho A.xii. The exact state of the second exemplar (or a third) is unknown.

Copies of the *Vita* (though not specifically the copy in Cotton Otho A.xii) can be perhaps situated more specifically in the light of evidence provided by various transmitters. Peter Hunter Blair suggests that Byrhtferth's redaction incorporated an early version of an Asserian source that contained a copy of the *Vita Ælfredi*, and, specifically, that this copy (or perhaps a working draft) of the *Vita* had to be dated to c. 900 "the date by which a copy of Asser's *Life of King Alfred* could have reached the north" to be used by Byrhtferth.¹²⁷ Hunter Blair speculates that the *Vita* ends in a way that suggests it was "unfinished" when it began to circulate; at any rate, the copy that came to Byrhtferth also arguably appears to have been unfinished.¹²⁸ Keynes and Lapidge note that the Co transcript of the Cottonian manuscript "terminates abruptly in chapter 106 without any concluding remarks or epilogue of any sort; and although Asser outlived his subject by a decade or so, he never returned to record Alfred's significant achievements against the Vikings in the 890s or his death in 899. We cannot tell why this was so."¹²⁹ It is also possible that the Cotton manuscript included a copy made from an incomplete source, that is, that some material following Stevenson's ch. 106 was lost in transmission. That copy of the text could have arrived in Northumbria by as early as c. 900 and, eventually—though a precise dating is

¹²⁶ In his reconstruction of Byrhtferth's career, Lapidge suggests that Byrhtferth's active writing period possibly began under Abbo of Fleury's tutelage during his tenure at Ramsey between 985–7 (*The Lives of St Oswald and St Ecgwine* xxvii) and dates Byrhtferth's composition of *St. Ecgwine* to post-1016, since Ashingdown took place in October 1016 (xxxix).

¹²⁷ Hunter Blair, "Some Observations," pp. 116-7.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 116, fn. 1.

¹²⁹ Keynes and Lapidge, *Alfred the Great*, p. 56; It should be stressed that the concluding passages of the *Vita* are almost entirely absent from any Byrhtferthian and Worcesterian sources related to our study, but that both have added eulogies to Alfred that are not in the *Vita*.

impossible—reached the circle of Byrhtferth of Ramsey, who seems to have used it in his chronicling activities.

The second identifiable period in the transmission of the *Vita Ælfredi* involves the work of copyists in the post-Conquest centuries. Specifically, this phrase involves the use of the work in the composition of chronicles and related texts, including the *Annales S. Neoti*, over a period of time that spans nearly six hundred years. This period begins with the early sections of the *Historia regum* (SD1) and involves the potential production of Cotton Otho A.xii (c. 1000), and ends when the text, almost certainly in the Cottonian manuscript, comes into the hands of John Leland. The period, in other words, predates the physical interpolation of material into that manuscript made in the course of Matthew Parker's publication program. During this time, the *Vita* was used mainly by scribes who were attempting to augment their histories, especially where documentation of that part of English history was found wanting. After Byrhtferth, this period can be broken down further into specific periods involving the incorporation of the *Vita* into chronicles and miscellany: passages in the *Encomium Emmae reginae* composed in the middle of the eleventh century (1041-2); and, nearly contemporaneously with the work of William of Malmesbury and the Worcester compilers, the passages used by the Bury St. Edmunds scribe that compiled the *Annales S. Neoti* (dated to c. 1120 x c. 1140¹³⁰); the nearly contemporaneous passages of the *Historia regum* (SD2) derived (c. 1129¹³¹) mainly from SD1 and the *Chronica chronicarum* and ascribed chiefly to the monk Symeon of Durham; and the passages of the *Vita* for the years 849-897 used (c. 1131¹³²) by the compilers of the *Chronica*

¹³⁰ See Dumville and Lapidge, *The Annals of St Neots*, p. xvi.

¹³¹ Dating the Symeon contributions is exceptionally difficult. We know little about Symeon's life, though he is ascribed the history of kings in a rubric composed many years after his death. The Symeon contributed annals extend to 1129, when the annals would have likely been started. His death is guessed at c. 1130. See Hunter Blair, "Symeon's History of the Kings," pp. 87-91.

¹³² Dumville and Lapidge, *The Annals of St Neots*, p. xli. Dumville notes that the *Chronica* was "probably published first in 1131," but that it is possible it was "in circulation in draft form among like-minded scholars for some

chronicarum (also known as the *Chronicle of John of Worcester*).

The third period in the transmission of the *Vita Ælfredi* to be considered in greater detail below begins with the apparent discovery of Cotton Otho A.xii by John Leland, and his attribution of the material to the historical Bishop Asser. It is soon followed by the interpolation of related material into Cotton Otho A.xii itself by Matthew Parker—who was deeply familiar with the activities of Leland¹³³—and his associates. This period in the transmission of the *Vita* continues until the destruction of the Alfredian materials in 1731. During this period, as we will see below, the text transmitted by the Cotton manuscript was an open site for various types of interpolation, many of which ultimately influenced sixteenth-century and later critical reception of the Cottonian text.

The fourth period in the transmission of the *Vita Ælfredi regis* begins when the great bulk of the manuscript is no longer extant. During this period, the critical understanding of the *Vita Ælfredi* emerges primarily from eleventh- and twelfth-century materials which seem to utilize the *Vita* for the construction of regional identity and the retention of ecclesiastical power. Editors of the *Vita Ælfredi regis*, following the destruction of the Cotton Otho A.xii manuscript, we shall see, are the primary determiners of the Alfredian dossier's ontological status.

On the historical value of the *Vita Ælfredi regis*

The *Vita Ælfredi regis* preserves the only text which claims to offer a contemporary, ninth-century account of an Anglo-Saxon king¹³⁴; further, it is one of two substantial sources (the other being the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*) that details the period leading up to West Saxon

years before"; see also Brett, "John of Worcester," pp. 101-26.

¹³³ Strype, *Life and Acts of Matthew Parker*, Vol 2, p. 521.

¹³⁴ *Vita Kenelmi* also claims to offer a ninth-century royal biography, but it is regarded as hagiography.

hegemony in England. It also describes Alfred's efforts to reform an educational system and details Alfred's involvement in the promulgation of law-codes and in other legal matters. Beyond these texts, we have charters composed during Alfred's reign, the literary texts which were translated either by Alfred himself or by scholars he had summoned to his court, along with references to other manuscripts. The *Vita* not surprisingly has been and is still placed high among our most important pre-Conquest historical documents.

Beyond the sketchy treatments of ninth-century English ecclesiastical culture in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, the *Vita Ælfredi regis* and Alfred's Preface to the *Pastoral Care* provide our most detailed evidence (as far as they go) for the state of learning in England before and during Alfred's reign. As Alfred writes in the Preface to his translation of the *Pastoral Care* of Gregory the Great:

Learning had declined so thoroughly in England that there were very few men on this side of the Humber who could understand their divine services in English, or even translate a single letter from Latin to English: and I suppose that there were not many beyond the Humber either. There were so few of them that I cannot recollect even a single one south of the Thames when I succeeded to the kingdom. (*Alfred the Great* 125)

This state of learning may be implicitly corroborated in a passage of the *Vita Ælfredi*, when its author describes a youthful Alfred who yearns to read (or have read to him) English poetry:

Cui ab incunabulis ante omnia et cum omnibus praesentis vitae studiis, sapientiae desiderium cum nobilitate generis, nobilis mentis ingenium supplevit; sed, proh dolor! Indigna suorum parentum et nutritorum incuria usque ad duodecimum aetatis annum, aut eo amplius, illiteratus permansit. Sed Saxonica poemata die noctuque

solers auditor, relatu aliorum saepissime audiens, docibilis memoriter retinebat.¹³⁵

Further, we learn from the *Vita* that, toward the later period of his reign, Alfred encouraged the spread of literacy and learning in his kingdom by threatening to withhold the offices of his ealdorman and reeves.

Tunc ille, discrete et moderanter illorum imperitiam et insipientiam redarguens, aiebat, ita inquires: "Nimum admiror vestram hanc insolentiam, eo quod, Dei dono et meo, sapientium ministerium et gradus usurpastis, sapientiae autem studium et operam neglexistis. Quapropter aut terranarum potestatum ministeria, quae habetis, illico dimittatis, aut sapientiae studiis multo devotius [docere] ut studeatis, impero."¹³⁶

The historical value of the *Vita Ælfredi*, then, is in that it often confirms, and never contradicts, other first-hand accounts from the reign of Alfred.

Scholarship post-destruction

Some physical aspects of the manuscript before it was damaged are known. The Parchment is vellum. William H. Stevenson suggests that the manuscript, before it was severely damaged, was "a small folio or large quarto volume, containing 107 pages."¹³⁷ But the surviving remains appear to be even smaller than those described by Stevenson. The folio volume, if it is a

¹³⁵ "From the cradle onwards, in spite of all the demands of the present life, it has been the desire for wisdom, more than anything else, together with the nobility of his birth, which have characterized the nature of his noble mind; but alas, by the shameful negligence of his parents and tutors he remained ignorant of letters until his twelfth year, or even longer. However, he was a careful listener, by day and night, to English poems, most frequently hearing them recited by others, and he readily retained them in his memory" (trans. Keynes and Lapidge *Alfred the Great* 75).

¹³⁶ "[T]hen the king, admonishing their inexperience and foolishness with discretion and restraint, would reply as follows: 'I am astonished at this ignorance of yours, since through God's authority and my own you have enjoyed the office and status of wise men, yet you have neglected the study and application of wisdom. For that reason, I command you either to relinquish immediately the offices of worldly power that you possess, or else to apply yourselves much more attentively to the pursuit of wisdom'" (trans. Keynes and Lapidge *Alfred the Great* 110).

¹³⁷ Stevenson. *Asser's Life*, p. xlv.

folio volume, would have been surprisingly small, approaching handbook size, about 90 millimeters wide by 135mm tall (if we are to trust the size of the surviving leaves of Æthelweard's chronicle that were also bound in Cotton Otho A.xii as a base-line for this measurement.) These figures, moreover, do not include the lost bound gutter and outer margin, which were of unknown size. The margin, however, must have been large enough to allow Parker and his associates to interpolate materials into it.¹³⁸ The present BL Cotton Otho A.xii only contains fragments of leaves numbered 1-47 (both sides) in a modern hand; the numbering do not correspond to the manuscript's previous foliation. As noted, fragments of Æthelweard's *Chronicon* are present,¹³⁹ but most of the manuscript is now in a state of extreme disrepair, comprising a collection of hard, blackish fragments. We know from Twyne, cited by Stevenson, that when Cotton Otho A.xii came to Lord Lumley,¹⁴⁰ the manuscript contained fifty-six leaves and the *Vita* occupied fols. 1-55r.¹⁴¹ Also contained in the manuscript were two charms, in Latin and Old English, on folio 55v, as well as material on Edward I.¹⁴² This was how the manuscript looked when it came into the hands of Robert Cotton in 1621, but soon after this, Cotton bound the manuscript with other texts, including the fragment of the celebrated Old English poem, *The Battle of Maldon*. From this point on, the manuscript contained a total of 155 folios.¹⁴³ The manuscript remained in the Cotton collection until, during the catastrophic fire at the Ashburnham House of 1731, where the Cottonian manuscripts were being temporarily held, it was almost entirely destroyed.

The only copy of the *Vita Ælfredi* to survive into modern times was contained in this

¹³⁸ See Chapter 4.

¹³⁹ See Gneuss, "Die Handschrift Cotton Otho A. xii," pp. 289-318.

¹⁴⁰ Twyne, *Antiquitatis*, vol II, p. 144.

¹⁴¹ Keynes and Lapidge, *Alfred the Great*, p. 223.

¹⁴² Ibid.

¹⁴³ Scragg, *Battle of Maldon*, pp. 1-4.

early-eleventh-century manuscript. The Ashburnham fire damaged or destroyed many other texts from the Anglo-Saxon period, including those in BL Cotton Vitellius A.xv, containing the unique copy of *Beowulf*, and the unique fragments of *The Battle of Maldon*.¹⁴⁴ The remains of Cotton Otho A.xii are still kept in the British Library under this shelf-mark. Before this loss, Archbishop Parker had altered the physical state of the manuscript by "repairing" the text in preparation for his first edition. Parker made a number of physical insertions and interpolations in Cotton Otho A.xii after comparing it with other, similar sources, such as the *Annales S. Neoti*, a twelfth-century historical miscellany made at Bury St. Edmunds. This last major set of textual changes before 1731 involves other editorial confluences of sources inaccurately associated with the manuscript's text, as well as long-standing debates about the antiquity of the universities at Cambridge and Oxford. Unfortunately, scholars have not fully managed to identify other post-Parkerian editorial changes that were made when the manuscript was extant. Problems with the pre-1731 editions of the *Vita* reach a peak when William Camden, in his edition publicized in 1602, included an evidently forged "lost" chapter containing a legendary account of Alfred's founding of the University of Oxford. Debate about this and other problematic passages continued right up to the manuscript's destruction. It is clearly regrettable that scholars did not recognize more fully appreciate the unique value of the pre-Conquest *textus receptus* of the *Vita Ælfredi* before this point.

Sources and witnesses: tracing the legacy of Cotton Otho A.xii

The main pre-Conquest source for the *Vita Ælfredi regis* acquired the shelf-mark Cotton Otho A.xii from Sir Robert Cotton (d. 1631) in the early-seventeenth century. The manuscript

¹⁴⁴ Fulk and Cain, *A History*, p. 317.

was plausibly dated by Humfrey Wanley (d. 1726) to around the year 1000. We do not have any other *terminus ad quem* for the *Vita Ælfredi*, so this dating of the production of Cotton Otho A.xii provides us with a sure if imprecise later approximate terminus for the composition of its text. Arguments attempting to localize Cotton Otho A.xii in Ramsey or Worcester are difficult to follow and ultimately inconclusive.¹⁴⁵ However, the general question of provenance may be discussed profitably in relation to the centers involved in the transmission of the *textus receptus*, as long as such speculation is here tempered by caution and reason.

Byrhtferth's relationship to the *Vita Ælfredi*

It is likely that either the copy of the *Vita* contained in the Cotton manuscript itself, or a text very close to it, was owned by Byrhtferth of Ramsey¹⁴⁶ and used for his *Historia regum*.¹⁴⁷ Byrhtferth is indeed the earliest known witness to a self-standing copy of the *Vita*, but his personal ownership of the Cotton manuscript specifically, and the extent of his involvement in the promulgation of its text, is currently contested.¹⁴⁸ Nevertheless, the available evidence suggests that Byrhtferth, at the very least, had access to a text markedly close to the one transmitted by Cotton Otho A.xii. Byrhtferth preserves the position of sections (corresponding to the present chs. 74-77, under the *Vita's* annalistic year 885) that a twelfth-century compiler

¹⁴⁵ See Whitelock, "*William of Malmesbury on the Works of King Alfred*."

¹⁴⁶ Lapidge, "Byrhtferth of Ramsey and the Early Sections of the *Historia Regum*," p. 97-122. Lapidge argues that the early portions of the *Historia regum* (SD1) exhibit stylistic idiosyncrasies with the Ramsey scholar, Byrhtferth. This finding is significant in that it gives Asser scholars a reasonable center for the creation of a tenth-century exemplar of the *Vita Ælfredi*.

¹⁴⁷ This is at times called Byrhtferth's chronicle or the *Historical Miscellany*. His chronicle was compiled into a larger volume by Symeon of Durham and contained entirely in a single manuscript, Cambridge, Corpus Christi MS 139.

¹⁴⁸ The hypothesis that Smyth has advanced, that the *Vita Ælfredi* was forged outright by Byrhtferth or by someone in his circle, is an argument staked on the likelihood that Byrhtferth used the Cotton manuscript. There is, as of yet, no firm evidence that Cotton Otho A.xii was made by or for Byrhtferth, and there is no textual evidence concerning its exemplar.

associated with the production of the *Chronica chronicarum* (who also had direct access to a version of the *Vita*) moves to a more appropriate moment for his narrative, one which follows Alfred's accession. However, as noted, specific evidence has been advanced to suggest that the version of *Vita* used for Byrhtferth's *Historia regum* may not have been the text formerly preserved in Cotton Otho A.xii. Hunter Blair argues that the orthography of place-names, where Byrhtferth's chronicle uses the *Vita*, reveals more antiquated forms, specifically in their inclusion of the preposition *et* (more correctly *æt*) ("Some Observations" 101). The forms of these place-names, *etcippanhama* (in the entry for 853), for Cippenhamme, and *etsandwic*, for Sandwic (852), are taken by Whitelock to be relics of an earlier exemplar, and this would provide evidence that the copy of the *Vita* used for Byrhtferth's chronicle would not have been the one in Cotton Otho A.xii. Whitelock agrees with Hunter Blair when she states that "we cannot see a copyist introducing into his work an outmoded formula not present in his source" (*The Genuine Asser* 18-19). This argument, however, must be considered in the light of textual and stylistic evidence relating to other works attributed to Byrhtferth. The use of outmoded place-names, such as *ethomme* (sometimes in a more correct form *æthomme*), for Homme, appear frequently in the *Vita S. Ecgwini* (210-11, 244-5, 254-5, 258-9, and 282-3), and this may demonstrate a Byrhtferthian affinity for onomastic archaisms.¹⁴⁹ Additions involving the preposition *æt* in the sections reliant on the *Vita Ælfredi* might thus, in the event, be Byrhtferthian in origin. It is worth noting that where the *æt*-prepositions occur in Byrhtferth's chronicle, the source-material has been recast in a paraphrase. With these observations in mind, it is less troublesome to confront the fact that the manuscript available to the compiler of the *Annales S. Neoti*, who is thought to have had better access to some readings than those present in the Cotton manuscript, evidently

¹⁴⁹ For more on the development of this preposition, ultimately into *Eoueshamm*, see Michael Lapidge, "Byrhtferth and the *Vita S. Ecgwini*," *Anglo-Latin Literature*, II: 900-1066. pp. 308-310.

did not include these archaisms either. It is then unnecessary to ascribe these features, as Whitelock has done,¹⁵⁰ to the modernization of forms closer to Byrhtferth's treatment of place-names.

Several apparent errors in Byrhtferth's rendering that are also present in the Worcester *Chronica chronicarum* offer evidence that these two writers, over a span of more than one hundred years, were copying from a similar, or conceivably even identical, exemplar. However, despite their common recourse to a distinctive text of the *Vita Ælfredi*, the two writers manifest stark differences of style. Where Alfred's biographer emerges in a sense as an active participant in the narrative,¹⁵¹ speaking openly and casually about his own experiences with the king, Byrhtferth is selective in his paraphrase, omitting passages containing first-person narration that do not adhere to his chronicle form. This tendency is not observed in the Worcester *Chronicon*. At times, the Byrhtferthian chronicle adheres strictly to its source-material, while at other times it seems to advance an idiosyncratic, anti-Danish agenda. Hunter Blair notes that while the Worcester chronicler includes the phrase *qui fuit Esla* and *qui fuit... Freothegar* in a treatment of Alfred's lineage (ch.1) both the Cottonian text and Byrhtferth's chronicle omit these phrases.¹⁵²

The implication here is that the Worcester compiler was utilizing a different source for Alfred's lineage, one considerably more developed, which was available neither to Byrhtferth nor the other early promulgator(s) of the *Vita Ælfredi*. These evident omissions, however, show that Byrhtferth's chronicle rests on a version of the *Vita* corresponding closely to the one formerly preserved in the Cotton manuscript, even if additions present in productions by other chroniclers have muddied the waters for more detailed comparison. In the end, it must remain

¹⁵⁰ Whitelock, *The Genuine Asser*, p. 19

¹⁵¹ See below, Chapter 3.

¹⁵² Stevenson, *Asser's Life*, p. xlvii.

uncertain whether Byrhtferth's source was Cotton Otho A.xii manuscript itself, or a pre-Cottonian witness to the *Vita* that may have been in his possession.¹⁵³ At times, both Byrhtferthian chronicler and the Worcester chronicler adhere strictly to their source-material, to the point of preserving the same errors. Stevenson notes that in both Byrhtferth's chronicle and in the *Chronica chronicarum*, the writers retain several similar errors between them, such as the erroneous form *Caetuua/Cetwa* as against *Taetwa* (ch.1; see [1,36] in our collation), *sumere debere sciret*, (ch. 38), and others,¹⁵⁴ following a text resembling the one in Cotton Otho A.xii.¹⁵⁵ The fact that these errors are retained in both sources leads Whitelock to suggest that neither the Byrhtferth chronicle nor the *Annales S. Neoti* had access to an author's original.¹⁵⁶ This in turn, along with other evidence, may suggest that a similar (or the same) exemplar was in use.

If the text used by Byrhtferth was not consulted directly in Cotton, and if the text of the *Vita* used for the Worcester chronicle was, then we can say with a fair amount of confidence that by the early-eleventh century, at least three extant copies of the *Vita* had been produced: a ninth-century archetype, a copy that was consulted for Byrhtferth's chronicle, and the copy in Cotton Otho A.xii. Whitelock suspects that the text used for Byrhtferth's chronicle was a better (earlier) copy than the Cotton manuscript. However, Whitelock's conclusion has been challenged by Lapidge, who demonstrates that some of the "better" (or even idiosyncratic) readings in Byrhtferth's chronicle share stylistic similarities with Byrhtferth's other writings. Lapidge suggests that the copy used for the early portions of the *Historia regum* may in fact have been the

¹⁵³ Whitelock, *The Genuine Asser*, pp. 19-20.

¹⁵⁴ Stevenson, *Asser's Life*, p. xlvii. The passage containing *Caetuua/Cetwa* (corresponding to Stevenson's Chapter 1) is not given by the *Annales S. Neoti*. The *Annales* evidently begins copying with the *Vita*'s ch. 3.

¹⁵⁵ Cf. Stevenson, *Asser's Life*, pp. xlvii, xlix; this evidence is questionable, as "C" and "T" were easily confused by copyists, and while they may have been derived from a similarly corrupted source, the errors may have been independently generated. In fact, Byrhtferth's chronicle reproduces "Cetwa" against "Caetuua" in the *Chronica chronicarum*.

¹⁵⁶ Whitelock, *The Genuine Asser*, pp. 19-20, fn. 5.

every copy in Cotton Otho A.xii itself.¹⁵⁷

Traces of *Vita Ælfredi* in the *Encomium Emmae reginae*

An eleventh-century writer, possibly from Saint-Omer in Flanders, evidently had access to a version of the *Vita Ælfredi* when composing his so-called *Encomium Emmae reginae*.

Alistair Campbell adopts this hypothesis in his reading of two glosses, treating the place-names Sheppey and Æscendun.¹⁵⁸ It is not clear how the Saint-Omer writer might have become acquainted with the passages in the *Vita Alfredi* (if he even was), or even whether he knew the full text at first hand, though Keynes and Lapidge suggest, following Campbell, that he may have encountered it in England in the eleventh century.¹⁵⁹

The influence of Cotton Otho A.xii was once thought to be visible in a passage in the *Encomium* which mentions the Raven Banner supposedly carried by the Danish army (II, 9).¹⁶⁰ The detail involving the Raven Banner occurs in Matthew Parker's *Ælfredi regis res gestae*, but it has been shown that this passage (in the present ch. 54b) was one of Parker's interpolations.¹⁶¹ In a subsequent edition, published in 1722, Francis Wise raised doubts that the reference to the Raven Banner was present in the Cotton Otho A.xii, maintaining that the detail goes back to an interpolation by Parker. Wise suggests that Parker took this passage from the *Annales S. Neoti*,¹⁶²

¹⁵⁷ Lapidge, "Byrhtferth of Ramsey," pp. 97-122.

¹⁵⁸ In the *Encomium*'s gloss of Sheppey (Bk II, ch. 8), it reads, "Sic rex ut dictum est Scepei, quod est dictum latine insula ovium, ut poterat hiemavit." For the same gloss, the *textus receptus* of the *Vita Ælfredi* has "Et ipso eodem anno primum hiemaverunt pagani in insula, quae vocatur Sceapiege, quod interpretatur 'insula ovium'" (ch. 3). For its glossing of Ashingdon, the *Encomium*'s passage, "quod nos Latini 'montem fraxinorum' possumus interpretari" (Bk II, ch. 9), is also present in the *Vita*, where it reads "quod Latine 'mons fraxini' interpretatur" (ch. 37). See Campbell, *Encomium Emmae Reginae*, pp. xxxv-xxxvi; also see Townsend, "Assandun and Assatun," pp. 21-29.

¹⁵⁹ Campbell, *Encomium Emmae Reginae*, p. xl; see Keynes and Lapidge, *Alfred the Great*, p. 57.

¹⁶⁰ Campbell, *Encomium Emmae Reginae*, pp. xl, fn. 3; xxxvii.

¹⁶¹ Dumville and Lapidge. *Annals of St Neots*, p. 78.

¹⁶² Campbell, *Encomium Emmae Reginae*, pp. xxxv-xxxvi; Stevenson, *Asser's Life*, p. 44. He marks this chapter, following Wise, as an interpolation. It begins "*Ibique acceperunt spolia non minima. In quo etiam acceperunt illud vexillum, quod Reafan nominant.*" ["There they took not the least of the spoils. They have taken the

believing that they preserved lost sections of the *Vita*. This view is also held by Albert Cook in his translation (1906), and is accepted by Keynes and Lapidge in their study.¹⁶³ The details that we have are that detail of the Raven Banner does not occur in Matthew Parker's first transcript, Corpus Christi College, Cambridge MS 100 (Co), one that Stevenson regards as largely derived from a pre-interpolated stage of the Cottonian manuscript in that it lacks most of Parker's interpolations present in his edition (though, as we shall see, the situation is not so simple). The Raven Banner passage occurs in the present BL Cotton Otho A.xii* (B) which is a fair copy, or at any rate, a later transcript, including many of Parker's alterations. Campbell suggests, however, that the author of the *Encomium* had been acquainted with a version of the *Vita* that contained the passage treating the Raven Banner, even though the tradition of the *Vita* does not reproduce this detail. Each of the three ostensibly Alfredian inclusions in the *Encomium* (glosses on Sheppey, Æscendun, and the mention of the Raven Banner) occur within close proximity to each other, evidence that the inclusions might have come from a single source. This has been the view since 1949.¹⁶⁴ More recently, Alfred P. Smyth has challenged Campbell's view, stating that it is equally likely the *Encomium* draws on a version of the *Annales S. Neoti* that did not survive to us, a version that contained all three references (Æscendun, Sheppey, and Raven Banner). This position is difficult to substantiate. The main witness¹⁶⁵ to the *Annales S. Neoti* we have is in the twelfth-to-fifteenth-century composite manuscript in Trinity College, Cambridge, MS R.7.28, and while the *Annales S. Neoti* material contains the reference to Æscendun and the Raven Banner, it omits the gloss treating Sheppey. Smyth argues that the hypothesis of a better

standard of this, too, which gives the name of Raven." Cf. Dumville and Lapidge, *Annals of St Neots*, p. 78.

¹⁶³ Cook, *Asser's Life of King Alfred*, p. viii; Keynes and Lapidge, *Alfred the Great*, p. 57.

¹⁶⁴ When Campbell published the first edition of the *Encomium Emmae reginae*. The argument for a single source is also for convenience, and does not necessarily have to be the case.

¹⁶⁵ For a newly-discovered witness to Cambridge, Trinity R.7.28, see Chapter 3, "Giraldus Cambrensis."

exemplar for the *Annales S. Neoti* that contains all three references more concretely fits the dating of the *Encomium Emmae reginae* (c. 1040-1) since the dating of a hypothetical lost source for the *Annales S. Neoti*, according to one argument,¹⁶⁶ may go as early as 1000. Smyth hypothesizes a pre-Conquest composition date of c. 1020-35.¹⁶⁷ Even if the dating Smyth gives appears convenient for his overall argument,¹⁶⁸ so that he may place both texts within the lifetime of Byrhtferth of Ramsey, it is important to stress that the dating of the *Annales S. Neoti* is currently disputed.¹⁶⁹ It is certainly worth considering Smyth's hypothesis that the author of the *Encomium* never consulted any form of the *Vita* (and therefore the *Annals of Saint Neots* pre-dates the *Encomium Emmae Reginae*), but it is equally likely that the glosses each had a separate transmission.¹⁷⁰

The *Vita Ælfredi* as a source for the *Chronica chronicarum*

It is generally accepted that the *Chronica chronicarum* (c. 1131) now associated with the name of John of Worcester either bears witness to direct use of Cotton or to a close copy of the text witnessed by Cotton. Dumville and Lapidge write that "while some few sections of Asser's text have been minimally employed, most are incorporated boldly, often to the extent of including Asser's first-person observations on his surroundings."¹⁷¹ The most valuable text to be

¹⁶⁶ Smyth's (doubtful) dating of a source for the *Annales S. Neoti* to as early as 1000 is, on the whole, drawn from Cyril Hart's argument for an early-eleventh-century date. See Hart, "East Anglian Chronicle," pp. 274-277. Smyth, *King Alfred the Great*, pp. 160-165.

¹⁶⁷ This dating is convenient for Smyth's argument, so that he is able to place it in the possession of Byrhtferth's pupils. See Smyth, *King Alfred the Great*, p. 164.

¹⁶⁸ For a summation of Smyth's argument, see Lapidge, "Asser's Reading," pp. 44-7.

¹⁶⁹ This study accepts the dating of the *Annales S. Neoti* to the mid-twelfth century (c. 1120- c. 1140), which is a position advanced by Dumville and Lapidge, *Annals of St. Neots*. pp.lxiv-lxv. Ultimately, one must consider the intentions of Smyth in his dating of the *Annales*; sufficient evidence besides possibility has not been given to dissuade me from Dumville and Lapidge's dating.

¹⁷⁰ Smyth, *King Alfred the Great*, p. 163. Why one should prefer Campbell's hypothetical version of the *Vita* (witnessed by *Annales S. Neoti*) over a hypothetical version of the *Annales Si Neoti* (witnessing the late passages of the *Historia regum*) is not explained by Smyth.

¹⁷¹ Dumville and Lapidge, *The Annals of St Neots*, p. xxxix.

found among the many manuscripts of the *Chronica* is C, MS Bodley 157, which is the earliest of the Worcester witnesses to the *Vita Ælfredi*, and therefore, the most valuable copy of the *Chronica* for the undertaking of the present work.¹⁷² In this lengthy compilation of chronicle extracts and various annalistic materials, the story of Wessex and Alfred's early life unfolds in parallel with military exploits and battles involving the Franks. The Worcester compiler reproduces several of the errors present in the text formerly preserved in the Cotton manuscript.¹⁷³ As noted, Stevenson was of the opinion that the compiler of the *Chronica* utilized the Cotton manuscript directly, evidence of which, he writes,

is afforded by the error in [ch.] 55, 4, where the scribe's eye had wandered from *pagae* to *paganos*. [The compiler] repeats the error in number in [ch.] 54, 5, and the blunder concerning Pip[p]in, [ch.] 70, 10. He has with the Life eight battles instead of nine in [ch.] 42, 31, but he supplies the account of the battle of Meretun, which should have appeared in [ch.] 41, the omission of which in the Life has been supposed to be the cause of the difference between the number of fights given in the Chronicle and in the Life, [ch.] 42, 31.¹⁷⁴

Dumville and Lapidge doubt whether it is possible with the existing evidence to determine concretely whether the *Chronica* drew on the Cotton Otho A.xii manuscript directly.¹⁷⁵

Darlington and McGurk do not appear to have an opinion on the matter.¹⁷⁶ Given the information now available below in the diplomatic edition, I would side with Dumville and Lapidge's

¹⁷² For a description of the manuscripts in question, see Darlington and McGurk, *The Chronicle of John of Worcester*, pp. xxi-lxv. For a discussion of Stevenson's use of one of the derivative manuscripts of the *Chronica Chronicarum* for use in his edition, and the consequences of doing so, see Chapter 3. For their relationship, see Brett, "John of Worcester."

¹⁷³ For a list, see Stevenson, *Asser's Life*, p. xlvi; Cf. our collation.

¹⁷⁴ Stevenson, *Asser's Life*, p. xlvi.

¹⁷⁵ Dumville and Lapidge, *The Annals of St Neots*, pp. xxxix-xlii.

¹⁷⁶ Darlington and McGurk's edition is not orientated in such a way to make claims regarding the Cotton, though they agree that John of Worcester drew on a text of the *Vita Ælfredi*. See their p. xx.

statement that it is currently impossible to determine for certain whether the compiler of the *Chronica* specifically used the Cottonian manuscript. Nevertheless, beyond the compiler's errors involving eye-skip and other confusion, the *Chronica* does reproduce a large part of the *Vita Ælfredi*, a text which can be collated against Parker's transcription (Co), as Stevenson does in his edition, to form the basis of a "core text" that we can still identify as Cottonian. (Byrhtferth's chronicle can offer little corroborative help to the scholar for the battle-related passages mentioned in the quotation from Stevenson, as his narrative for these passages is largely composed of materials paraphrased from the *Vita*. In the *Historia regum*'s paraphrases, for example, the number of battles fought has been omitted entirely.¹⁷⁷)

These errors in the *Chronica* that parallel readings in the Cottonian text of the *Vita*, in a passage where the compiler seems to have slavishly copied his source, juxtapose sharply with changes deliberately made to the *Vita*'s anecdotal sections, where the compiler of the *Chronica* generally simplifies, and occasionally repositions the material, for narrative clarity, for instance, in the *Vita*'s lengthy section chs. 73-81, where the narrator turns to Alfred's personal affairs, including his marriage, his children, and his hunting prowess, the matter is condensed in the *Chronica* and repositioned to follow his accession to the throne. The compiler's intention, Stevenson suspects, was to make "this confused chapter [ch. 77] much clearer."¹⁷⁸ By shortening and recasting these sections, however, the Worcester compiler significantly reduces the value of the *Chronica* for reconstructing Stevenson's aforementioned core text.

¹⁷⁷ Stevenson, *Asser's Life*, p. 33; Keynes and Lapidge, *Alfred the Great*, pp. 81. Cf. Simeon, *Opera*, p. 53.

¹⁷⁸ Stevenson, *Asser's Life*, p. lvi.

The *Annales S. Neoti* and its excerpt from the *Vita Ælfredi*

A late-twelfth-century¹⁷⁹ manuscript, Trinity College Cambridge, R.7.28, contains an anonymous compilation known as the *Annales S. Neoti* (compiled c. 1120- c. 1140), which reproduces lengthy portions of the *Vita Ælfredi*.¹⁸⁰ Stevenson concludes that although the readings of *Annales* agree very closely with the text going back to the Cotton Otho A.xii, there are enough superior readings to suggest that the Bury chronicler drew on a better witness to the *Vita*. Several of these superior readings see the *Annales* standing in agreement with a consensus of witnesses to the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, as when the *Annales* sets the number of ships in ch. 48¹⁸¹ at seven, instead of the six mentioned in the text going back to Cotton Otho A.xii, and also seen in the *Chronica chronicarum*, and in both relevant parts of the *Historia regum* (SD1 and SD2, which derived the majority of its text from SD1). This value of these superior readings, however, has been contested by Dumville and Lapidge. They state that "although the Annals present many small divergences from possible readings of that manuscript, and although the Annals' Compiler generally seems to make few alterations to his source-texts, we find that deviations occur most commonly at places where the transmitted text (and therefore putatively Asser's wording) displays awkward syntax or inelegant style."¹⁸²

It appears possible that a redactor who was aware of readings in the Trinity B.11.16 copy of the *Vita S. Æthelberti* of Giraldus Cambrensis, discussed below, introduced the variant readings in question as corrections to the sections of the *Annales S. Neoti* derived from the *Vita Ælfredi*. A correction of this kind may be visible in the *Annales S. Neoti* under the year 855, in the section the treats the account of Eadburh (see our collation, [15,25]), where the place-name

¹⁷⁹ For a brief summary of the critical disagreement over the dating of the *Annales S. Neoti*, see above.

¹⁸⁰ Dumville and Lapidge, *The Annals of St Neots*, pp. xxxix-xliii.

¹⁸¹ Stevenson, *Asser's Life*, p. lvii.

¹⁸² *Ibid.*, p. xlii.

Pavia in the *Annales S. Neoti* has been altered.¹⁸³

William of Malmesbury and the *Vita*

The evidence in medieval primary sources for Asser as the author of the *Vita Ælfredi* is wholly restricted to the epistolary dedication that, as seen in James Hill's facsimile, immediately preceded the passages in the *Vita* treating Alfred's lineage. None of the witnesses to the *Vita Ælfredi*¹⁸⁴ discussed above mention Asser as the author of a text. The early-eleventh-century chronicle in the *Historia regum* now attributed to Byrhtferth of Ramsey does not mention any author. The twelfth-century compiler of the *Chronica chronicarum* does not describe Asser as author of the passages derived from the *Vita Ælfredi* in that chronicle, though some of the witnesses to the *Chronica* do mention Asser in passing.¹⁸⁵ Although these secondary witnesses do not reproduce or even mention the epistolary salutation, this does not negate its value as evidence for authorship. Nevertheless, its absence in the chronicles may raise the possibility that the dedication is a unique feature of the Cottonian text or one of its exemplars. Additionally, that passages of the *Vita* that go back to the Cottonian text may have circulated as excerpts.

Even more striking than the lack of specificity regarding authorship in Byrhtferth's chronicle and in the *Chronica* is the paucity of detail in William of Malmesbury's accounts of the historical Asser. William, in both his *Gesta Pontificum* and *Gesta regum Anglorum*, mentions bishop Asser as an associate of Alfred who expounded the significance of Boethius' *De consolatione Philosophiae*, but, even, here, William fails to name him as creator of any specific

¹⁸³ Dumville and Lapidge, *The Annals of St Neots*, p. 49, fn. 60; The new reading, "Papia" or "Papua" (with the "p" biting the "u"), resembles that in the Trinity College, Cambridge, MS B.11.16, *Pappia*.

¹⁸⁴ If the scribe of Cambridge, Trinity College B.11.16 knew the *Vita Ælfredi* directly, he would be one very notable exception.

¹⁸⁵ "Illi substituti sunt Heahmundus, Aethelhegus, Alsius, Asserus, qui librum Boetii de consolatione phylosophie planioribus uerbis elucidauit et iussu regis Aelfredi in Anglicum sermonem transtulit" (Darlington, p.282; present in the C, B, and P manuscripts and "written partly over erasure and running into mg." eds.).

work that would resemble the *Vita Ælfredi*.¹⁸⁶ William does mention that Asser was instrumental in aiding the king's compiling of passages for a text that William refers to as Alfred's handbook (*liber manualis*, elsewhere cited as the *Enchiridion* or *handboc*,¹⁸⁷ and which he claims to have known at first hand in a surviving copy.). This statement strikingly recalls the account of the collaboration described in chs. 88-89 of the *Vita Ælfredi*, and it is difficult to avoid the suspicion that these passages were William's ultimate source. It is mentioned, moreover, in Faricius (also known as Faritius or Fabricius) of Arezzo's *Vita S. Aldhelmi* that this same handbook clarified the rumored relationship of Aldhelm and King Ine.¹⁸⁸ Provided William was in possession of passages from a text of the *Vita Ælfredi*, it may be evident that he identified the work described there with the *Enchiridion* of King Alfred mentioned by Faricius and the Alfredian work which he had seen in a surviving copy.¹⁸⁹ It has been suggested by Whitelock, followed by Alfred Smyth, that the *handboc* that William saw was Alfred's translation of Augustine's *Soliloquies*.¹⁹⁰

There is reason to suspect that William of Malmesbury had access to a copy, or a paraphrase, of the *Vita Ælfredi*, due largely to the reproduction (albeit often cursory) of material related to the reign of Alfred. Moreover, the passages relating to the Alfredian handbook do not appear in either the *Annales S. Neoti* or the *Chronica chronicarum*. This position, however, has been highly contested. Stevenson argues that William may never have seen a self-standing copy

¹⁸⁶ Malmesbury writes that "From St. David's [Alfred] procured a person named Asser, a man of skill in literature, whom he made bishop of Sherborne. This man explained the meaning of the works of Boethius, on the Consolation of Philosophy, in clearer terms, and the king himself translated them into the English language" (Giles' trans. p. 120).

¹⁸⁷ Thomson, *Gesta regum Anglorum* II, 4, "liber proprius, quem patria lingua handboc, id est manuaem librum, appellavit" and *Gesta Pontificum*, chs. 188, 190.

¹⁸⁸ Thomson, *Gesta regum Anglorum*, II, p. 9.

¹⁸⁹ See Stevenson's ch. 89: "Quem enchiridion suum, id est manuaem librum, nominari voluit".

¹⁹⁰ Whitelock, "William of Malmesbury," pp. 90-1. Smyth, *King Alfred the Great*, pp. 232-4. Whitelock's argument is built on the fact that Augustine's *Soliloquies* were not mentioned by William in his list of Alfred's projects. Rodney Thomson advances the opinion that the omission of the *Soliloquies* by William is irrelevant to the identification of the *handboc*. Thomson, *Gesta regum Anglorum* II. pp. 103-4.

of the *Vita Ælfredi regis*.¹⁹¹ Whitelock advanced the view that William consulted a copy of the *Vita Ælfredi* at Sherborne. The main basis for this claim is William's inclusion in the *Gesta Pontificum* (ch. 80) of a record that derives from the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (E-text, s.a. 883), in which Sigehelm, a layman, took alms to Rome and to India and returned with jewels.¹⁹² The *Gesta Pontificum* shares with the *Chronica chronicarum* the error of naming this Sigehelm as Asser's successor. To paraphrase quickly, Whitelock suggests that this hypothetical event, where William consulted a form of the *Vita Ælfredi* at Sherborne, led him to distrust the possibility, and therefore to decline to mention, that it was written by a bishop Asser of Sherborne around 893, knowing that he could not have been bishop there if the bishop in 892 was Sigehelm. Whitelock's argument maintains that William would have believed the monks at Sherborne regarding Sigehelm's status as bishop, especially given the authority of the jewels that the monks would have shown him.¹⁹³ Rodney Thomson accepts that there are good reasons to doubt that William knew the *Vita* in any full form, though he admits that it is likely that he knew passages from it.¹⁹⁴ Thomson, after considering the option that William consulted the *Vita* directly and in full, and that he might've have found it at Worcester, states that,

[t]his leaves the possibility that William knew [the *Vita Ælfredi*] in a truncated form only, independently of John's final text and yet closely related to what was used in it.

¹⁹¹ Stevenson writes: "Clear proof that Malmesbury used [the *Chronica chronicarum*] may be found in his reproduction of part of [its] eoncomium of Edward the Elder" (lxii).

¹⁹² 883 [882] Here the raiding-army went up to the Scheldt to Conde, and settled there for a year. And Pope Marinus sent the wood of the Lord to King Alfred; and the same year Sigehelm and Athelstan took to Rome - and also St Thomas in India and to St Bartholomew - the alms which King Alfred ha vowed to send there when they besieged the raiding-army at London; and there, by the grace of God, they were very successful in obtaining their prayers in accordance with their vows." (Swanton 79). Also, see Darlington and McGurk, *The Chronicle of John of Worcester*, p. 318, fn. 1.

¹⁹³ Whitelock, "William of Malmesbury," p. 90-91.

¹⁹⁴ Thomson, *William of Malmesbury*, pp. 147 (and fn. 62) and 150; Thomson, *Gesta regum Anglorum*, p. 93. "In only two places does William seem to know some [of the *Vita Ælfredi*] independently [...], but it is possible to imagine that he found even this information elsewhere and that its correspondence with the text of [the *Vita Ælfredi*] is either indirect or coincidental" Also see Stevenson, *Asser's Life*, p.9. It is worth acknowledging that Thomson is a known proponent of the forgery hypothesis.

In that case the problem of material in [the *Vita Ælfredi*] unused by William remains, and so does the question of why William did not explicitly say that it was a contemporary source. (*Gesta Regum* 93)

But Thomson, apparently not entirely convinced by his own argument, still places a "?" next to his entry to Asser in his Appendix II, in which he lists the sources that William evidently knew.¹⁹⁵

Giraldus Cambrensis: concerning the *Vita S. Æthelberti* preserved in Trinity College, Cambridge, MS B.11.16

An early ascription, going back at least to the twelfth century, of work that resembles the *Vita Ælfredi*, to Asser, and possibly referring to the Cottonian text or a similar source appears in the *Vita S. Æthelberti* (c. 1195)¹⁹⁶ produced by the late-twelfth-century writer Giraldus Cambrensis¹⁹⁷ (d. c. 1223). A copy of Giraldus's *Vita S. Æthelberti* was contained in the Cotton Vitellius E.vii, but the manuscript was almost entirely destroyed in the same fire that obliterated the Cotton Otho A.xii. Before the manuscript was effectively destroyed, however, the text in question had been transcribed by William Dugdale and sent to the Bollandists to be published. The Bollandists, in the event, printed it within the body of John Brompton's chronicle and without any ascription to Giraldus. (The *Vita S. Æthelberti* has subsequently been edited by Brewer.¹⁹⁸) This Dugdale transcript, according to M. R. James, presented the majority of the *Vita S. Æthelberti*, as we know it, by Giraldus' predecessor, Osbert of Clare (d. 1158), whose has

¹⁹⁵ Thomson, *William of Malmesbury*, p. 204.

¹⁹⁶ Lapidge and Sharpe, *Bibliography of Celtic-Latin*, p. 25.

¹⁹⁷ See Sharp, *A Handlist*, pp. 134-137; also see Tanner, *Bibliotheca*, p. 53, fn. b: "Asserius autem arch. Menev. Occurrit in Girald. Camb. Et *Itiner.* Camb. Lib. Ii. C. 1. Et in catalogo antiquo Ms. Cotton. Claudius B. vii. Ubi postea episcopus Shirburn. Suisse dicitur."

¹⁹⁸ Brewer, ed., *Giraldi Cambrensis Opera*, Vol III, pp. 407-430.

came down to us in incomplete forms.¹⁹⁹ But, according to James, the copy of the *Vita S. Æthelberti* that the Bollandists published is "wholly taken from Giraldus." This text contains a neglected mention of Asser, who is alleged to have reported that Offa, when he heard about the miracles at Æthelbert's tomb, sent two bishops to investigate.²⁰⁰ The passage in question reads: "Et Asser historicus veraxque relator gestorum regis Alfredi, dicit quod crescentibus circa martyris sepulcri loca virtutum et prodigiorum signis, rex Offa duos episcopos, quibus praecipuam fidem habebat, ad investigandum istorum eventuum certitudinem, *Fernlegam*, quae nunc Herefordia dicitur, destinavit."²⁰¹ Keynes and Lapidge state succinctly that no such event is recounted in the *Vita*,²⁰² and that there is no reason to think that any such passage authored by Asser ever existed. Critical discussion of the relationship between *Vita Ælfredi* and Giraldus has effectively ended there.²⁰³ We have a citation of Asser that does not correspond to any passage that exists in the transmitted tradition, and we have no way to determine how Giraldus had come by the name Asser or his identification as a historian. The relationship between Giraldus Cambrensis' *Vita S. Æthelberti* and the *textus receptus* of the *Vita Ælfredi*, however, deserves further attention by historians and codicologists. Even in the absence of a legitimate citation, the identification of Asser as a historian breaks the silence of, say, the *Annales S. Neoti* and the *Chronica*, and it goes beyond even the more fulsome profile in William's works. In short, the

¹⁹⁹ James, "Two Lives of St Ethelbert," pp. 215-216.

²⁰⁰ Societe des Bollandistes, *Acta Sanctorum*, p. 241

²⁰¹ Brewer, *Giraldi Cambrensis Opera*, Vol III, p. 422. and James, "Two Lives of St Ethelbert," pp. 217; Keynes and Lapidge cite Brewer's edition and translate this passage: "And Asser, the historian and reliable narrator of the deeds of King Alfred, says that as the miracles and signs increased at the tomb of the martyr [St Æthelbert], King Offa sent two bishops in whom he had the greatest confidence to Hereford, in order to investigate the truth of the reports" (*Alfred the Great* 57).

²⁰² Keynes and Lapidge, *Alfred the Great*, p. 57

²⁰³ An argument put forth by John William Adamson in *The Illiterate Anglo-Saxon* (1946) hypothesized that the *textus receptus* was a forgery by Giraldus Cambrensis, but this argument goes against the dating of the *textus receptus* to 1000. Whitelock implies that Giraldus may have been copying from the *Annales S. Neoti* (*The Genuine Asser* 3, fn. 2).

allusion in the *Vita* ultimately must be seen to attest to a lost tradition for the historical writings linked to Asser. The fact that this allusion arises out of Asser's homeland in Wales is also suggestive.

As the heavily damaged manuscript, Cotton Vitellius E.vii, is no longer able to be consulted for the aforementioned passages that mention of Asser, critics have depended on its transcription by Dugdale published by the Bollandists. We may now turn to the only other surviving copy of the *Vita S. Æthelberti* of Giraldus Cambrensis, which survives in a fourteenth- or fifteenth-century manuscript, Cambridge, Trinity College B.11.16. Those passages of the *Vita S. Æthelberti*, contained in ff.77v-98r, include several passages that were not present in the Bollandist-Brompton version, and that evidently differ in some ways from the text that was contained in Cotton Vitellius E.vii. M. R. James summarized the variant Trinity passages in the *Vita S. Æthelberti*:

As compared with the Brompton text, printed by the Bollandists, and the extracts from Giraldus given in their notes, the present publication contains the following portions of new matter: the prologue (i); the whole of ii except one or two lines; the end of iii from 'Ad hec eciam '; most of viii; two paragraphs of ix (' Sic itaque ' and 'Sed quoniam '); portions of x; all of xiii, besides many clauses and sentences throughout.²⁰⁴

James utilizes Trinity B.11.16 as the base text for his edition, and he emphasizes that the passages in section xiii are unique. They are inserted just after the text mentioning the reliability of Asser's narration, and they conclude just before a passage in which Offa is said to have sent two bishops to visit Æthelberth's tomb. This insertion is evidently an interpolation into the

²⁰⁴ James, "Two Lives of St Ethelbert," p. 217.

Osbert material, which James suggests, with Keynes and Lapidge expressing agreement, most plausibly derives from Giraldus. The passages in question (James' section xiii), Trinity B.11.16, ff. 94v-95r, concern the exemplary story of Eadburh as a bad queen (Stevenson's chs. 14-15, and see below in our edition²⁰⁵). These passages closely resemble the version of the story given in the *textus receptus* of the *Vita Ælfredi*.

The Trinity passages concerning Eadburh are strange for a number of reasons. Firstly, they have been inserted in the middle of the material of the alleged Asser citation. In the Bollandist version it is stated that Asser wrote his reliable history and reported that Offa sent two bishops to Hereford to examine the miracles at Æthelbert's tomb. In Trinity B.11.16, the alleged citation has been effectively deferred by the interjection of the Eadburh episode after the declaration of Asser's authority:

Unde et huic nostre pagine quod Asser historicus veraxque relator gestorum Regis
Alfridi de hac generatione perversa conscripsit eisdem interserere verbis non
indignum reputavi.²⁰⁶

The Eadburh material is then inserted, and, following the Eadburh material, the redactor returns to the alleged Asser citation from Vitellius E.vii, having essentially removed Asser's authority from it entirely. The Trinity manuscript reads:

Sicut fidelis antiquitas posteritati reliquit, crebrescentibus circa martirii sepulcricque
loca virtutum et prodigiorum signis, rex Offa duos episcopos quibus precipuum <?>
fidem habebat ad investigandam evencium istorum certitudinem Fernlegam, que nunc

²⁰⁵ These passages found on ff. 94v-95r of Cambridge, Trinity B.11.16 have been collated with the other witnesses in the following diplomatic edition. This marks the first time that passages in Trinity B.11.16 have been recognized as related to the transmission history of the Alfred dossier.

²⁰⁶ "And at this point, through the medium of this page, I have considered it no unworthy thing to sow the seeds of these very words in addressing Asser, that truth-telling historian and narrator of the deeds of King Alfred, who committed those things to writing in that corrupt and fallen age."

Herefordia dicitur, destinavit.²⁰⁷

Firstly, revision of the citation ascribed to Asser, as originally transmitted and transcribed by Dugdale from Vitellius E.vii through the Bollandists suggests to me that the redactor of the Æthelberth passages in Trinity B.11.16, even beyond the knowledge of Asser as "historian" exhibited by his predecessor, had been familiar with the *Vita Ælfredi* to such a degree that he was careful to make this change in handling of the citation, and did not wish to reproduce the error that evidently had been present in the text represented by Vitellius E.vii. It is difficult to believe that a redactor with this level of familiarity with Asser's legacy, and who inserts a passage in some way going back to the *Vita Ælfredi* (the Eadburh episode), would not be familiar with the *Vita* in some (possibly derivative) form.

Secondly, as the Eadburh passages have been inserted *in media sententiae*, this suggests strongly to me that the revision of the alleged citation of Asser and the inclusion of the Eadburh passages are in some way connected. That is to say, the Eadburh passages were known to be Asserian in content, and that had been potentially derived from a text that the writer also believed was Asserian, possibly a continuous text of the *Vita Ælfredi*. The reviser of the passages found in Trinity, consequently, inserted the Eadburh passages into the matter of the *Vita S. Æthelberti* in order to repair, or answer, the non-Asserian citation that the Bollandist version shows had been present in the (now damaged) manuscript Vitellius E.vii.

Thirdly, the Eadburh passages may go back to a the twelfth-century composite work, the previously discussed *Annales S. Neoti*. The Eadburh passages, as found in the text transmitted by Trinity B.11.16, share many idiosyncrasies with the treatment of Eadburh in the *Annales S.*

²⁰⁷ "And so, addressing further those early days of the faith, such as they have been transmitted to posterity, when the signs had grown frequent in the vicinity of the graves and tombs of the martyrs, those sites of holy power and portents, King Offa retained two bishops, whom he held in special trust, to investigate the events at a certain place called Fernley, which now is known as Hereford."

Neoti, which are evidently derived from a version of the *Vita Ælfredi regis*. These passages in Trinity B.11.16 may have been primarily derived from a text represented by the Bury manuscript, Cambridge Trinity College R.7.28. Strong evidence in support of this position includes these characteristics of the Eadburh passages present in the Trinity version of the *Vita S. Æthelberti*. A preliminary comparison of the texts presented in these two manuscripts, Trinity R.7.28 and Trinity B.11.16, reveals several similar readings:

- The inclusion of the word *Occidentales* (our edition [15,2])
- The version of the phrase *magnum illum [famosissimum]*, for the *Annales S. Neoti's illum atque [famosissimum]* ([15,4]: *illum et*, found in Co, is not present in the Cottonian tradition of the *Vita Ælfredi*, confirmed by Wise. It is an interpolation by Parker that derives from the tradition of the *Annales S. Neoti*.)
- The omission of *dicens* ([15,9])
- The orthography of the name Eadburh: *Ædburgha (Vita S. Æthelberti)/Eadburha (Annales S. Neoti)* ([14,6]; [15,7])
- Possibly the form of Pavia ("Papia" or "Papua", as transformed in *Neoti*), and the reading, *Pappia* in Trinity ([15,24]²⁰⁸).

There are other minor similarities:

- The orthography of *michi* against *mihi* (ch.15,9)
- The reading *et* against *atque* ([14,4])

These readings offer evidence that, regarding the matter involving Eadburh, the redactor of the text now found in Trinity B.11.16 had been copying from a text that was very close to (or in fact

²⁰⁸ Dumville and Lapidge explain that the word-form Pavia has been written over either Papia or P, *The Annals of St Neots*, p. 49, fn. 60.

had been) the treatment of Eadburh in the *Annales S. Neoti*. We may conclude tentatively, therefore, that the redactor of the version of the *Vita S. Æthelberti* matter preserved in Trinity B.11.16 may have believed that the anonymous *Annales S. Neoti* were the work of Asser; or, at the very least, that the *Annales S. Neoti* contained some material that ultimately derived from the *Vita Ælfredi*. According to either hypothesis, the conclusion remains that at least some matter from the *Vita Ælfredi* had been known by the redactor firsthand, and that it was associated with the name of Asser.

We should not state too hastily that the version of the *Annales S. Neoti* known to the redactor was the copy in Trinity R.7.28. The addition to the *Vita S. Æthelberti* frequently elaborates material going back to the *Annales S. Neoti*. The revised text of the *Vita S. Æthelberti*, preserved in Trinity B.11.16, has some readings that should give us pause.

- The position of *impetrare*, which mirrors the *Chronica chronicarum* [*cf.* our edition 14, 14]
- The reading *eiecta*, with the *Chronica chronicarum* against *deiecta* in *Annales S. Neoti* and Co [*cf.* 15,22]
- The reading *cunctos* against SD1's *cunctis* [*cf.* 14,11], which appears solely in SD1 and GC

Though our sample-size is admittedly limited, due to the restricted length of the passages, the above examples may nevertheless offer us a glimpse of the relationship of the two manuscripts, and may broaden our understanding of their textual traditions. The two examples, involving the forms *impetrare* and *eiecta*, given above, where the *Vita S. Æthelberti* corresponds to readings in the *Chronica*, should not be taken to prove, for example, that the *Vita S. Æthelberti* was revised on the basis of a version of *Annales S. Neoti*, that had been emended in the light of a copy of the

Chronica. Either or both sources may witness features of lost texts in the tradition of the *Vita Ælfredi regis* and its excerpted versions of the textual traditions. Future research might profitably address the relationship of the textual traditions of the *Vita Ælfredi*, the *Annales S. Neoti*, and the *Vita S. Æthelberti* of Giraldus.

A truly engaging prospect, moreover, is the likelihood that the redacted version of the *Vita S. Æthelberti* witnesses a continuous text of the *Vita Ælfredi regis*—including an explicit attribution to Asser — that was in circulation prior to the time of the compilation of the *Annales S. Neoti* (that is, before c. 1120 - c. 1140). This markedly variant version of the text evidently circulated outside of the Cottonian textual tradition, even at this early stage, and this in turn perhaps suggests that many more such authorially "signed" exemplars were in existence in the early Middle Ages.

John Leland, John Bale, and other sixteenth-century use of the historical Asser

The location of the Cottonian manuscript from the middle of the twelfth century (or, perhaps, the beginning of the eleventh) to the middle of the sixteenth is unknown. We know that it eventually came to the attention of the antiquary John Leland (d. 1552),²⁰⁹ who in the process of writing his great biographical catalogue, *De viris illustribus*, came across the excerpts of the *Vita Ælfredi* in the *Annales S. Neoti* and eventually, it would seem, the Cotton manuscript itself. As noted by Carley, Leland's efforts in producing his *De viris illustribus* were based foundationally on the work of German bibliographer, Johann Tritheim, whose work *Liber de scriptoribus ecclesiasticis*, published in 1494, attempted to offer bare-bones sketches of some 963 writers—a large number of whom were English—and summaries of their writings.²¹⁰

²⁰⁹ Stevenson, *Asser's Life*, pp. xxxiv-xxxvi.

²¹⁰ Leland, *De viris illustribus*, Ed. Carley. pp. cv-cvii

Leland, evidently dissatisfied with Trithem's statements regarding many English authorities, traveled to numerous monasteries and libraries, seeking both to correct and to outdo the work of Trithem. Leland declares that his work on the *De viris illustribus*, which at the time of his death remained unpublished, seeks to preserve the names and works of the great writers of England. Carley writes that Leland, displeased with the extreme measures taken by Henry VIII during the Dissolution, and upon returning to his work in the *De viris illustribus*, had realized that "the end had come and there was no hope of revival within the foreseeable future. Leland's task had now become more urgent: it was his memory that would guarantee that the names of Britain's great writers would not fall permanently into oblivion."²¹¹

Leland expresses a keen interest in Asser's writings and in the content of the Cotton Otho A.xii manuscript, which had come into his possession at some point subsequent to his examination of the anonymous *Annales S. Neoti*.²¹² In his entry on Asser, he concludes:

Meanwhile, I must point out that Asser was eager to bring about the enduring and splendid memory, fame, and glory of his patron through every means, and depicted his life and all his illustrious deeds in a book of annals that will endure, written in a style befitting his royal subject. Like a rare Apelles he finally set out his pictures for the general gaze. [John of Worcester], quite captivated by their beauty, avidly picked flowers like little stars from them to include as highlights in his own history.

By these few facts on Asser which I have brought out of the dense shadows of antiquity into the light, I greatly desire (if my talent permits) to make him immortal.²¹³

²¹¹ Leland, *De viris illustribus*, Ed. Carley. pp. civ.

²¹² Stevenson, *Asser's Life*, pp. xxiv-xxxvi.

²¹³ Translation by Carley, in Leland, *De viris illustribus*, p. 257. "Neque hoc interim omittendum, quod Asserius patroni sui memoriam, finam, gloriam modis omnibus cum longissimam, tum clarissimam efficere studens, eius

Leland is clearly exaggerating, or may be said to be exalting, the style and reach of the *Vita*, as I have above argued, in the same manner the *Vita* at times would seem to aggrandize Alfred's personal achievements. As a humanist dedicated to the revival of Ciceronian rhetoric, Leland had hoped perhaps that future scholars would be drawn to his rhetorical descriptions, much as John of Worcester had attempted to do with some of his *Vita*-derived material, attracted to the beauty and energy of his images. In expressing his intention with regard to the ascription to Asser ("By these few facts on Asser which I have brought out of the dense shadows of antiquity into the light, I greatly desire (if my talent permits) to make him immortal."²¹⁴), Leland characterizes the past status of Asser in terms similar to the ones he uses to characterize the ancient writers which he found hidden in secluded, monastic libraries.²¹⁵ The ascription of the *Vita* to Asser, whom Leland mentions by name in *De viris illustribus* entries relating to Alfred the Great,²¹⁶ Edward (*Asserii iudicium secutus*²¹⁷), Werferth (*ut Asserius Meneuensis in suis annalibus refert*²¹⁸), and in other passages, appears as part of a series of additions made later in the first stage in Leland's drafting.²¹⁹ At this stage in his work on the *De viris illustribus*, as I have detailed above, Leland's

uitam atque adeo facta illustria omnia libro annalium uicturo eleganter, pro rei maiestate, tanquam rarus Apelles, depinxerit ac demum tabulas uel medio foro spectandas produxerit, quarum et Marianus Scottus uenustate totus captus, flores ex eisdem audis, ueluti stellulas, quibus suam interpolaret historiam selegit.

Haec ego pauca de Asserione e crassissimis antiquitatis tenebris in lucem erui, quibus percipio illum, annuente genio, uel immortalem facere."

²¹⁴ Leland, *De viris illustribus*. Ed. Carley p. 257: "Haec ego pauca de Asserione e crassissimis antiquitatis tenebris in lucem erui."

²¹⁵ Leland, *De viris illustribus*. Ed. Carley. p. liv, and also there, fn. 160.

²¹⁶ Leland, *De viris illustribus*, Ed. Carley, p. 242.

²¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p.248. "[William of Malmesbury] follows Asser's verdict" (249: trans Carley).

²¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p.252; this marks the first time that this particular ascription "Asserius Meneuensis" is used. "as Asser of St David's tells in his *Annals*" (253: trans Carley).

²¹⁹ Leland had, at one point, misidentified *The Annals of St Neots* as the work of Asser. It appears that he originally conceived a chapter that decried the lack of an author. That chapter had read: "The scribe of Alfred, whom I have mentioned twice in the above, must not be left with such a slight notice to commemorate him. Come, then, let me say more fully and clearly how he laid out his history. He began it with the emperor Julius Caesar, and recounted very briefly the deeds of the Romans in Britain up to the death of Severus. Then he turned his attention to the kings of the West Saxons, but he gave no extended account of these either, until he reached Aethelwulf and his four sons, each of whom ruled his father's kingdom in turn. Alfred, the youngest, was the most successful, and our author is prolix about his noble deeds. As a conclusion he added to his account of Alfred fourteen years of the reign of Edward I, in which he plied his pen sparingly, as if hastening to the end of his work; which I, too, shall

primary goal was to preserve the names of famous English writers to the best of his ability; Asser, though Welsh, was certainly held in high regard by Leland as a British writer in the larger sense and as one of the promulgators of a work detailing the deeds of a great English king. It may therefore be said that Leland's interest in revealing the unknown parts of Asser's history (*tenebris in lucem erui*²²⁰) goes beyond the essential, towards the personal (*quibus percipio illum, annuente genio, uel immortalem facere*²²¹). Even on the basis of his initial reading of the excerpts in the *Annales S. Neoti*, Leland had been moved to invent a name for the strong authorial persona he detected—*scriba Ælfredi*. After initially discovering the role of Asser in producing the work, Leland's interest shifts, in which he views his own work as an authorizing moment in the promulgation of the *Vita* that he evidently hopes may lead to empathy for his own efforts.

Leland does not state how or precisely when he came by the Cotton manuscript. Henry Bradshaw, having misinterpreted a comment by Leland, asserted that Cotton Otho A.xii had been housed at St. Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury. Stevenson, however, shows that there is no evidence either for this provenance at Canterbury or for the existence of the fragments to which Bradshaw refers.²²² The most likely circumstance for Leland's acquisition of the Cotton manuscript, offer Keynes and Lapidge, is that he acquired it from the library of an unknown

now do, once I have shown that the author of this history was a member of Alfred's household. This is perfectly clear from the words which I shall quote: 'which I have also heard from my lord Alfred, the truthful king of the Anglo-Saxons, who has often said it to me'. It seemed best to give the author the not unsuitable name of 'scribe', since his own name appears nowhere in the single manuscript which I had" (Leland, *De viris illustribus* [trans Carley] 253). The given above describes *The Annals of Saint Neots*. Further evidence is in Leland's spelling of *veridico*, (*veredico* in the Co transcript). (Wise, who reproduces the *Saint Neots* variant in his edition, had likely been copying from it for this passage, as well.) Leland, evidently learning of his error, had gone back and deleted this extraneous chapter and added in the ascription to Asser throughout his *De viris Illustribus*.

²²⁰ "out of the darkness, into light."

²²¹ Leland, *De viris illustribus*, p. 257. "I greatly desire (if my talent permits) to make him immortal" (trans, Carley).

²²² *Ibid.*, pp. xxxv; cxii, fn. 3. See Bradshaw, *Collected Papers*, pp. 467, 485. The "fragment" that Bradshaw mentions on p. 485 has never been identified.

religious house during the Dissolution of the Monasteries.²²³ During his many travels to monasteries and libraries, Leland had been authorized by the king to borrow manuscripts and printed books, and it is evident for obvious reasons that many of these were never returned.²²⁴ Some of these are the works that John Bale would go on to cite in his *Index* as having been found *ex bibliotheca Ioannes Lelandi*, as he does with his material treating the *Vita*.

What is evident, however, is that the bibliographer Henry of Kirkestede, writing c. 1350 did not see the manuscript in his inventorying of medieval English libraries, for the compilation of his *Catalogus de libris authenticis et apocryphis*.²²⁵ This is significant because Kirkestede's *Catalogus* drew for the majority of its contents on the Franciscan *Registrum Angliae*, and also on Dominican lists of their authors, various patristic authors, and on Vincent of Beauvais's *Speculum historiale*. Kirkestede's most notable personal additions were from his own house at Bury St Edmunds. The cited *Registrum*, compiled (c. 1320) by the Franciscan monks based most plausibly at Greyfriars Oxford, was a compilation of works from all over England. Though all of the libraries that were visited in the preparation of the *Registrum* were non-Franciscan libraries (it is interesting to note), the work as a whole was strictly Franciscan in its devotional orientation; the compilers were primarily interested in gathering patristic texts, texts on the Christian life, and those that were exegetical, mystical, or broadly theological.²²⁶ They largely ignored scholastic texts, as well as a range of texts by recent authors (even Franciscan and Dominican), histories and chronicles, hagiographic texts, literature in the vernacular and works by classical authors, with only a few exceptions.²²⁷ In other words, even if the Franciscans had

²²³ Evidence that Leland found it at one of these houses may be in the connection of the above-mentioned intentions that he had with the Asser. Keynes and Lapidge, *Alfred the Great*, p. 223.

²²⁴ Leland, *De viris illustribus*, pp. lvii-lxiii.

²²⁵ Rouse, *Henry of Kirkestede*, pp. 385-391.

²²⁶ Rouse, *Registrum Anglie*, pp. lxxiii.

²²⁷ *Ibid.*, lxxiii-lxxiv.

found a text of the *Vita Ælfredi* in their travels, it almost certainly would not have been included in their *Registrum*. The Franciscans, in the course of their work, compiled many lists of works of primary interest (including texts most likely to be added to the register) as well as secondary lists, nearly all of which have been destroyed (including texts of interest that might or might not ultimately meet their requirements). Had a work of the *Vita Ælfredi* been found in the course of the Franciscans' research, it conceivably could have been mentioned in one of the secondary lists, now destroyed, of works that did not make it into the *Registrum Angliae*.

Neither the *Registrum* nor Kirkestede's *Catalogus*, it is clear, can be used convincingly as negative evidence to suggest that the *Vita Ælfredi* was absent from the search area of the Franciscans. Kirkestede utilized the *Registrum* as the model for his *Catalogus*, supplementing the Franciscan religious list with new listings of texts, and with some that he had sent to him, many of which do not survive.²²⁸ Kirkestede added entries from libraries situated all over England, but his personal search range was mainly limited to Bury St. Edmunds and its general vicinity.²²⁹ Kirkestede was interested in a wide range of texts, from scholastic texts, not specifically histories or *vitae*, he was seeking to produce as extensive a list as possible and a neglected text like Cottonian *Vita Ælfredi* (or a version of it) would certainly have piqued his interest. As Kirkestede was interested in all names, all authors, and even anonymous works, a non-surviving list of authors and works would almost certainly have noted the *Vita* had he come across it during his inventorying efforts. We might venture to conclude that the Cotton manuscript was unlikely to have been housed in the vicinity of Bury, and corroborating evidence for this view will emerge from the records of Leland's itineraries.

As noted, Leland apparently found a copy of the *Vita* while he was working on his *De*

²²⁸ Ibid., pp. xlv-xlvii.

²²⁹ Rouse, *Henry of Kirkestede*, pp. lv-lix.

viris illustribus. Carley has shown that Leland's efforts fall into two main stages of compilation.²³⁰ At the time Leland had drafted the first version of his chapter on Alfred (ch. 115), he had already discovered the *Annales S. Neoti* at St. Neots, as he quotes the obituary of Alfred, for the year 900, directly from the folios of the present Cambridge, Trinity College R.7.28.²³¹ This was done during stage I (1533x1541),²³² though much of this section (which contains some of ch. 87, and the bulk of chs. 88-117) was compiled at stage II²³³ (approximately 1543 - 1545²³⁴). At the time of chapter 115's initial composition (1535²³⁵), Leland had not yet discovered the Cottonian manuscript, although this chapter (as with others) would later be revised to accommodate his momentous discovery. Leland would alter his words in ch. 155 regarding his source (at that point, the *Annales S. Neoti*) from "Quod quanquam ex multis abunde liqueat autoribus, illustrissime tamen ex cuiusdam scribae historia, qui Alfredo familiarissimus fuit, et eius acta scripsit"²³⁶ to "Quod quanquam ex multis abunde liqueat autoribus, illustrissime tamen ex eo libello, qui Asserii annals in epitome rediget."²³⁷ The dating for the finding of the *Annales S. Neoti* then, based on Leland's travels, is 1534,²³⁸ though the date of the composition of this chapter must be placed slightly later.²³⁹ Leland states that the exemplar (again, the *Annales S. Neoti*) was found "nuper" (recently), making it likely that this chapter, with the mention of the text from St. Neots, was originally composed during this early draft stage (that is,

²³⁰ Leland, *De viris illustribus*, pp. c-cv.

²³¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 248-249.

²³² *Ibid.*, pp. xcvi-iii and fn. 413, cf. sec. 165: shows that work on stage I continued until 1541.

²³³ *Ibid.*, p. 841.

²³⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. c-ci.

²³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. cxix.

²³⁶ "Although that [date] may be evident from very many authors, yet it is most clearly according to a certain scribe's history, who was most intimate with Alfred, and wrote of his deeds."

²³⁷ "Although that [date] may be evident from very many authors, yet it is most clearly in the abridgement of Asser's *Annals*."

²³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. lxii.

²³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. cxix. Carley states that the first draft of the *De viris illustribus* was compiled from 1535-6, (but work on it continued until 1541).

in 1535 and not in 1536).

The chapters that follow this quire, with treatments for Werferth and Asser (chs. 118-19) are contained on a single quire (leaves 117-18) and inscribed on a single bifolium. Like the few other leaves in the manuscript,²⁴⁰ the single, folded leaf containing the entries on Werferth and Asser do not have a distinguishing watermark, and were evidently added later to this section of the manuscript, but according to Carley's masterly analysis, still were written during stage I. The two chapters are joined by more than just the bifolium they are inscribed on; the only source for the ascription of Werferth to the translation of Gregory's *Dialogues* occurs in the *Vita Ælfredi*, giving us a general idea of the closeness of these entries' composition.

The dating Leland's discovery the finding of the Cottonian manuscript is exceptionally difficult. But there are several plausible datings for the discovery of the *textus receptus* that we may purpose cautiously with the general caveat that the precise dating may remain a matter of speculation. The finding of the *textus receptus* must be assigned conservatively to the period 1535-1541, as it is part of Leland's stage I compilation. One of the possibilities is that he had found it in his later travels. One of the four candidates for Leland's later travels was Bury. Leland returned to Bury carrying a letter of introduction written in Barnwell around 1539, and Carley suggests that he would have had to make the trip before 1540, when the monastery would be utterly destroyed.²⁴¹ However, as I have explained, Leland's finding it still there is highly unlikely. Kirkestede had not mentioned a copy of the *Vita* at Bury St. Edmunds and its vicinity many years before. If the manuscript was still there, it is likely Kirkestede would have found it, or, at any rate, that Leland would have found it during an earlier visit to Bury,²⁴² but as it had not

²⁴⁰ Ibid., *De viris illustribus*, pp. 840-844.

²⁴¹ Ibid., p. xcix

²⁴² Ibid., pp. lxxii-lxxiii.

been found by either biographer, it is unlikely that this was its location.

It is more possible that Leland had found the *textus receptus* in his later travels to the West to destinations which included Wales and Wessex and later the West Midlands. Toulmin Smith placed these Welsh journeys conservatively between the dates 1536-9.²⁴³ Carley has since narrowed Leland's dates for his Welsh trip to the spring through autumn of 1538,²⁴⁴ for his trip to the West Country and into Wessex to 1542,²⁴⁵ and for his trip to the West Midlands to 1543.²⁴⁶ A suggestive aspect of these dates resides in the circumstance that Leland would have been able to visit not only St. Davids but Sherborne during these years. However, as the last two itineraries fall outside of Carley's dating of Leland's stage I compilation (1535-1541), the preponderance of evidence might point to Leland's discovery of the Cottonian manuscript in the period ranging from spring to autumn of 1538.

There is also a possibility that Leland had come across the manuscript through some other channel or that he happened upon some undocumented cache of manuscripts, perhaps in London in the wake of the Dissolution. Leland does not state from where he acquired it, but his silence on the matter may likewise indicate that he found it during when he was no longer making lists of manuscripts, due to the destruction of monasteries and texts. As many of his destinations were soon-to-be destroyed, there would be no places of which to make his lists.²⁴⁷ The fact that he does not remark on this, as he had with the *Annales S. Neoti*, may simply indicate that he was not writing in his notebooks when he came across the *Vita Ælfredi*. The

²⁴³ Leland, *De viris illustribus*, p. xcvi, fn. 416. Also see Smith, *Leland's Itinerary*, 3. pp. viii-ix.

²⁴⁴ "It seems likely, therefore, that the journey was begun in spring of 1538 and ended some time late that summer or early autumn." Leland, *De viris illustribus*, p. xcvi

²⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. xcvi.

²⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, p. xcvi. According to Carley's dating of the stages of Leland's composition of the *De viris illustribus*, I am most favorable to a 1538 (or thereabouts) dating for the discovery of this copy of the *Vita*, though each of these trips are possible.

²⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. xcix-c.

hypothesis of the acquisition of the manuscript wholly through undocumented channels suggest that we cannot entirely rule out a later acquisition of the manuscript containing the *textus receptus* in 1539/40 or as late as 1541.

The manuscript that contained the *Vita Ælfredi* evidently did not circulate while it was in the possession of Leland. In fact, it would appear that Leland—with the exception of his contemporary John Bale—was alone for some time in his capacity to elucidate the characteristics of the manuscript, as well as in ascribing the *Vita Ælfredi*'s authorship to Asser. This is evident in John Bale's bibliographical records. In Bale's *Index Britanniae Scriptorum*, first published in 1548, Bale's contemporaries, Reginaldus Mohun, Nicolai Brigan (or Brigham) and Ioanne Everesden, are all evidently held to cite William of Malmesbury's accounts of the historical Asser for his role in the translation of Boethius' *Consolation of Philosophy*, but not in the composition of a work concerning the life of Alfred. These contemporaries (excluding Bale) had not, it would appear from even a cursory glance, seen the manuscript of the *Vita Ælfredi*. Leland is the first scholar, apparent by Bale's *Index*, to publicize—but not ascribe (see the discussion on Giraldus Cambrensis, above)—the authorship of the historical writing to Asser. Bale is, chronologically, the second, after Leland, to publicize the authorship of the *Vita* specifically. There is a strong case that Bale had seen at least portions of the *Vita* manuscript first hand, evident from how he paraphrases the dedication to the *Vita Ælfredi* in his entry for Asser: "Asserius Shireburnensis episcopus, scripsit ad Alphredum Anglosaxonum regem, Historiam Britannicam, Vitam eiusdem Alphredi."²⁴⁸ Bale accompanies his gloss by quoting the first lines from the first chapter of the *Vita* (the start of Alfred's royal lineage), and then citing it *ex bibliotheca Ioannes Lelandi*.²⁴⁹ This

²⁴⁸ "Asser, bishop of Sherborne, dedicated to Alfred, king of the Anglo-Saxons, a British history, the life of the same Alfred." Poole, *Index Britanniae Scriptorum*, pp. 34-35.

²⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p.35.

indicates with some certainty that Leland had the manuscript that contained the *Vita* in his personal library, where Blae consulted it personally, and that had not circulated up to that point.²⁵⁰

The epistolary salutation addressing Alfred at the very start of the text in Cotton Otho A.xii is evidently the sole source for Leland's ascription of the *Vita* to Asser,²⁵¹ though, as we have seen, there is at least one earlier source that may indicate this attribution of authorship.²⁵² The epistolary language does mention Asser (and not an *Asserius*, as later sources would have it), but it does not explicitly name him as the author of the passages that follow, and it does not explicitly cite Alfred as the recipient or dedicatee of a work by this Asser.

Domino meo venerabili piisimoque omnium britannie insulae christianorum rectori
aelfred anglorum saxonum regi asser omnium servorum dei ultimus millemodam
advota desideriorum utriusque vitae prosperitatem.²⁵³ (Stevenson 1)

This language has been cited as proof that the prose which follows, in its entirety, is the work of the Welsh bishop Asser of St. David's. This epistolary phrasing, along with the external evidence of Asser's episcopacy under Alfred and his documented aiding of Alfred in his translation of Boethius' *De consolatione Philosophiae*, offers strong evidence for an attribution of authorship to the historical Asser. The circumstance that the cited epistolary passage is immediately juxtaposed with the commencement of the Alfredian material contained in Cotton Otho A.xii, beginning

²⁵⁰ Bale's *Summarium* mentions a "syllabus" by Leland. This may have been notes or summaries of the *Vita* material, and may have been what Bale saw. Also see Tanner, *Bibliotheca*, pp. 53-54, derived from Leland, but with interesting notes.

²⁵¹ We may be reasonably certain that Leland was not aware of the ascription of Asser to the *Vita Ælfredi* present in the versions of the *Vita S. Æthelberti* by Giraldus Cambrensis as this ascription is not mentioned in *De viris illustribus*—though he had seen a version of the *S. Æthelberti*.

²⁵² See above, discussion of the revised text of Giraldus Cambrensis's *Vita S. Æthelberti*.

²⁵³ "To my esteemed and most holy lord, Alfred, ruler of all the Christians of the island of Britain, king of the Angles and Saxons, Asser, Lowest of all the servants of God, wishes thousandfold prosperity in this life and in the next, according to the desires of his prayers" (*Alfred the Great* 67; trans Keynes and Lapidge).

suddenly and somewhat jarringly with the laconic rendering of ancient, pre-West Saxon genealogical passages, supports the view of the formula as a dedication, but raises its own set of stylistic and structural problems.

There are good reasons to believe that the attribution of Asser's authorship to the twelfth-century text known as the *Annales S. Neoti* may originate with the writings of Leland and Bale, and not, as has previously been stated frequently, with Parker.²⁵⁴ As I have detailed above, Leland had called the writer of the *Annales S. Neoti*, in one of his deleted chapters of his *De viris illustribus*, the "Scriba Alfredi," an invented figure who appears to have been, at some point, identified with the writer(s) of the *Vita Ælfredi*.²⁵⁵ In another entry (from the later phase of Carley's stage I), quoting from the *Annales S. Neoti*, Leland addresses the occasion of Alfred's death:

Quod quanquam ex multis abunde liqueat autoribus, illustrissime tamen ex eo libello, qui Asserii annales in epitomen redegit. Nos igitur, quoniam apud Fanum Neoti [[coenobium [] Isodunensis prouinciae in ripa Iscae fluminis situm]] in uetus exemplar nuper incidimus, ipsa tam bonae fidei autoris uerba subiiciemus²⁵⁶

Leland's relationship to the ascription of Asser to the *Annales S. Neoti* is complex. Leland evidently knew the *Annales S. Neoti* as distinct from the *Vita Ælfredi*,²⁵⁷ but it appears that he did not always clearly indicate that these works, throughout the course of his career, had been promulgated by multiple individuals. As an example of how ambiguous Leland's statements may be, we may observe that, in his entry for Æthelweard, Leland comments that "it greatly surprises

²⁵⁴ Dumville and Lapidge, *The Annals of St Neots*, pp. xxxix-xl.

²⁵⁵ Leland, *De viris*, pp. 252-253.

²⁵⁶ "Although the date is perfectly well known from many authorities, it is described most clearly of all in the abridgement of Asser's *Annals*. Having recently happened upon this ancient manuscript at St Neots, [[a monastery in the county of Huntingdon situated on the banks of the river Ouse,]] I shall subjoin the very words of that trustworthy author" (trans Carley; Leland, *De viris*, pp. 248-249).

²⁵⁷ Leland, *Antiquarii*, p. 214; Leland refers to the *Annales S. Neoti* as "incerto autore" ("of uncertain author").

me that the author of the *Annals of St Neots*, who wrote Alfred's history in most diligent fashion, made not even the slightest mention of Æthelweard.²⁵⁸ The author is unnamed, and the phrase "autorem chronicorum sani neoti" has been substituted for "scribam illum" (which appears to have been emended as it would have wrongly implied that the writer of "Alfred's history" was William of Malmesbury). This passage does not state, however, that Asser is the author of the *Annales S. Neoti*; it states only that whoever wrote the history of Alfred—contained in the *Annales* manuscript—had it transcribed clearly. Nevertheless, Leland apparently believed, at some stage in his early researches, that the *Annales S. Neoti* had been written by Asser.²⁵⁹ The Trinity manuscript of the *Annales S. Neoti*, R.7.28, contains an ascription of authorship, plainly in Leland's hand, which reads: "Annales Jo. Asser Epi. Welsh." This ascription would have been added prior to Leland's late stages of his *De viris illustribus*, when he had disavowed that Asser had written the *Annales S. Neoti*, but this ascription had never been corrected by him.

Dumville and Lapidge offer that it was perhaps Bale who suggested to Leland that Asser was the writer of the *Annales S. Neoti*.²⁶⁰ In his *Summarium*, Bale ascribes to Asserius Menevensis two works: "*Historiam Britannicam*" and the "*Alphredi res gestas*". In his *Catalogus*, he has added a variety of works to Asser's authority, including the *Enchiridion*, or handbook of king Alfred, the *Annales Brytanniae* (evidently the same text as the "*Historiam Britannicam*", but with a title instead indicating its annalistic content instead of its status as a history), the *Commentarios in Boetium*, and *Homelias & epistolas*.²⁶¹ Bale claims wrongly that Asser was responsible for many of these texts. (One, the translation of Boethius' *Consolation of*

²⁵⁸ Leland, *De Viris Illustribus*, pp. 250-251.

²⁵⁹ It was in Wise's view that Bale had willingly misled Leland: "omnes profecto Balei opinione in errorem rapti, & a veritate pariter abducti" (Wise xx).

²⁶⁰ Dumville and Lapidge, *The Annals of St Neots*, p. xxiii.

²⁶¹ Bale, *Summarium*, p. 125.

Philosophy, which, evident by its preface, had been translated by Alfred, and, two, the *Enchiridion*, which is alleged to contain inscriptions of psalms and prayers copied there by Alfred (see Stevenson's chs.88-89)). Bale adds several Homelies and epistles, too, as though he had been dissatisfied with these works being listed as anonymously authored.²⁶²

It is the "*Annales Brytanniae*" (formerly "*Historiam Britannicam*" in his *Summarium*) that immediately concerns this chapter. Bale appears to have identified the so-called "*Annales Brytanniae*" with the *Annales S. Neoti*, which begins with the sentence "Igitur Brittaniam Romanis usque ad Gaium Iulium Cesarem inaccessa atque incognita fuit", and is organized as annals.²⁶³ Bale, who usually quotes the first few words of sources he had seen, does not give the first line of this manuscript, which may indicate that he had not seen the *Annales S. Neoti* directly, but had seen become aware of it through Leland's journals.²⁶⁴

Evidence that the "*Annales Brytanniae*" refers to *Annales S. Neoti* matter, specifically, appears in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, MS 100—the same manuscript into which Parker had transcribed version Co of the *Vita Ælfredi regis*. A copy of the *Annales S. Neoti* had been transcribed (as ff. 261-319) into this same manuscript, evidently for Parker's use. It is inscribed on its first page: "Annales Britanniae, authore I. Asser, cum paralipomenis alterius scriptoris."²⁶⁵ At the end of the transcript, in a small hand, it is noted that the source codex, from which this transcription had been made, was of an ancient character and had been annotated by Leland; this ancient work is evidently the manuscript at Trinity College Cambridge, MS R.7.28. To this gloss,

²⁶² Additionally, Bale had apparently believed that Asser was a Saxon, evident in his Preface to Leland's New Year's Gift to Henry VIII where he states:

As ye fynde a notable Antyquyte, suche as are the hystories of Gildas and Nennius among the Brytaines, Sephenides and Asserius among the English Saxons, lete them anon be imprented, and so brynge them into a nombre of copyes, both to their and your owne perpetuall fame. (Leland, *The Laboryouse Journey* 22)

²⁶³ Dumville and Lapidge, *The Annals of St Neots*, p. 1.

²⁶⁴ Moreover, that Bale does not give this text in his *Index* may indicate that he had not consulted it directly.

²⁶⁵ "The Annals of Britain, author J. Asser, with another writer of the Paralipomenon."

it has been added, in a smaller hand: "Asserius Menevensis scriba scripsit Ælfredi res gestas et annales Britanniae: huius Asserii annalibus vetustus quidam auctor paralipomenon addidit. Haec Balaeus."²⁶⁶ This claim that Asser is ascribed as author of these annals, which we know to be the *Annales S. Neoti*, derives, Parker was aware, from Bale. And it appears that Parker took this claim in good faith, as he used the *Annales* for the publication of the *Ælfredi regis res gestae*. In Bale's *Summarium*, he adds to the entry on Asserius Menevensis a statement that, "Author quidam vetustus et doctus Paralepomena, opus tersum et spectabile, huius historium libro postea annexuit, ut saepe Lelandus notat in antiquarum doctionum <sic> syllabo."²⁶⁷ This is revised in his *Catalogus* to read "Etiam plures erit libros in Anglicum sermonem. Claruit anno a laeta Redemptoris nativitate 890, sub rege Alphredo. Huius Asserii annalibus, quidam uetustus author Paralipomenon addidit."²⁶⁸ Nevertheless, these entries are certainly the ones referenced by the paraphrase in the transcript of the *Annales S. Neoti*. Bale's interests in the ascription of the historical Asser to the work known as the *Annales S. Neoti* are, evidently, to broaden Asser's textual authority.

Ostensibly following the authority of Bale, and specifically Bale's treatment of its authorship in his *Summarium*, Parker appears to have been led to believe that the *Annales S. Neoti* was also written by Asser. Significantly, Wise notes in his edition that, after the matter corresponding to Stevenson's ch. 50d—an interpolation from the *Annales S. Neoti*—"Ex Annalibus Asserii" had been inscribed into the Cottonian manuscript, evidently by Parker or one

²⁶⁶ "The scribe Asser of St. David's wrote the deeds of Alfred and the annals of Britain: certain old author attached the Paralipomenon to the annals of Asser. This <is> Bale."

²⁶⁷ Bale, *Illustrium Maioris Britanniae Scriptorum Summarium*, fo. 65. "A certain venerable and learned authority subsequently joined a third source worthy of note to that work, the two books of Paralipomenon and their narratives, as Leland mentions more than once in his catalogue of early writings."

²⁶⁸ Bale, *Illustrium Maioris Britanniae Scriptorum Catalogus*, p. 125. "These many books will be in the English word. In a joyous year of the birth of the Redeemer, 890, it flourished under King Alfred. A certain old author attached the Paralipomenon to the annals of Asser." [FIX]

of his secretaries.²⁶⁹ This evidence may confirm, Stevenson claims,²⁷⁰ that Parker believed the whole of the *Annales S. Neoti* to be written by the author of the *Vita Ælfredi*. Parker's treatment of the *Annales S. Neoti* (and other texts²⁷¹) in his *Ælfredi regis res gestae* and subsequent silence on the matter has not been completely examined, and has mostly been disregarded as an unfortunate lapse in Parker's judgment. His completed edition contained a version of the *Vita Ælfredi* that, while problematical in its handling of additions to the source text, was nevertheless presented by its editor as an honest reproduction of the source material.

Whether Parker trusted Bale's opinion, on the one hand, that the two texts were produced by the same author, or whether he felt, on the other hand, that the *Annales S. Neoti* merely preserved a better, but not authorial, version of parts of the *Vita Ælfredi*, may not be known with complete certainty (for instance, some of these scribal alterations and claims may have been perpetrated by his secretaries). Nevertheless, some preliminary conclusions may be drawn. This distinction between Parker's expressed belief, most notably his claims to be acting in good faith, is important because it may indicate Parker's intentions with respect to the matter taken from the *Annales S. Neoti*. Subsequently, the distinction may also offer clues to how Parker wished to represent his authorities in approaching his "final" text of the *Vita Ælfredi*. It would be helpful, at this point, to engage in a brief discussion of Parker's known perceptions of the source material he had drawn on for his *editio princeps*. Specifically, his account may clarify the actions with respect to the extant witnesses and may elucidate the response he hoped to elicit from his readership.

²⁶⁹ Wise, *Annales Rerum*, p. 29, fn. 3.

²⁷⁰ Stevenson, *Asser's Life*, pp. xix-xxi.

²⁷¹ Stevenson, *Asser's Life*, pp. xix-xxi.

The available evidence strongly suggests that Parker had been influenced by Bale's assertion of Asser's authorship of the whole of the *Annales S. Neoti*, and that he may have believed them to be written by the same person. Parker's self-reflection of his efforts in his preface to *Ælfredi regis res gestae* is helpful here. His intentions, he explains (though with no specific mention of those sources he drew from), were to reproduce the source texts with great fidelity and to offer an edition that might prove useful to those who wish to study its languages. Parker assures his readers that he had printed all these words as they appeared in the exemplars. He writes:

Quod autem ad historiæ fidem attinet (lector humanissime) hoc te scire volo, eam me semper rationem secutum, in omnibus ijs libris quos diuulgavi, nihil ut de meo adiecerim, aut diminuerim, sed cuncta prout in primis exemplaribus reperiuntur ad verbum expresserim.²⁷²

It is not known specifically which sources Parker sought to indicate by the phrase *primis exemplaribus*. However, it is clear that Parker appears to be indicating multiple sources, and not solely the now-mostly-destroyed Cottonian manuscript that contained a text of the *Vita Ælfredi regis*. We should consider whether Parker is here referencing *all* the sources that formed the bases for his *editio princeps*, those that he does not mention, including the manuscript, Trinity College Cambridge, R.7.28, that contained a version of *Annales S. Neoti*, or whether he is referencing the "first copies" of those other works that he included in his edition: Alfred's will and Alfred's prose preface to Gregory's *Pastoral Care*. He may have felt that the transmission tradition of the *Annales S. Neoti* was of good-enough fidelity to believe that it was a more

²⁷² "But I want you (most gentle reader) to know this, which pertains to the credibility of the history, that in all the books which I have published I always followed this procedure, so that I have not added or removed anything on my own account, but I have printed to a word all things as they are found in the first exemplars." [Trans. Butler, *Textual Community*, p.197]

complete form of the text contained in the Cottonian manuscript. But, alternatively, Parker's assertion of the credibility (*ad historię fidem attinet*) of his sources may indicate that he did, in fact, believe both works had been produced by the same writer and that therefore he had not been betraying his historical fidelity by interpolating materials from the *Annales S. Neoti*. Strangely, Parker also states that he was aware of the potentiality of making the edition a kind of chimera. He indicates his awareness of the potential for his edition to participate in textual correction by referencing Cornelius Nepos' fear that changing the work of antiquity effectively modernized it:

Alioquin si quid forsā de meo attulissem, aut vetustatis veluti rugas ac nævos delere omnes voluissem, metuendum mihi sanè foret (ne quod Salustio suo scribit Cornelius nepos) non tam illorum qui illas conscripserunt historię, quàm meę videri possent).²⁷³

Whether we accept Parker's claim of fidelity to the manuscripts or not, his effort to publish an authoritative edition of the *Vita* can still reasonably be said to have been built upon an idea similar to the supposition that his edition preserved a kind of Bowersian purity that had not been available to him in his (perhaps insufficient) source manuscript. Furthermore, Parker must have felt that those related sources, which contained passages referencing Alfred's reign, in some cases borrowing extensively from the *Vita Ælfredi*, must have themselves preserved more valuable material, in some cases, than in his *primis exemplaribus*.²⁷⁴

What the above examination demonstrates of the pre-Parkerian ascriptions of the historical Asser to the composite work known as the *Annales S. Neoti* is that the misidentification

²⁷³ "Otherwise, if perchance I had reported anything of myself or if I had wanted to remove all the wrinkles and warts of old age, certainly I would have feared (indeed, as Cornelius Nepos wrote to his Sallust) lest the histories would have seemed not so much theirs (who wrote them) as mine." [Trans. Butler, *Textual Community*, p.197]

²⁷⁴ A more difficult to reconcile interpolation is the passage of Parker's edition, corresponding to Stevenson's ch. 50c, which derives from Matthew of Paris' *Chronica Maiora*.

of authorship, which is frequently said to have been initiated with Parker and his assistants, had earlier historical roots. The first appearance of the name "Asser" in connection with a construction of authorship arises out of the juxtaposition of the epistolary salutation attributed to the lost Cottonian manuscript and the genealogical rendering that follows immediately after this. A brief attribution of authorship, which mentions Asser as a writer of history occurs in the transmitted texts of the *Vita S. Æthelberti* attributed to Giraldus Cambrensis. The author-construct proper begins with Leland naming of the *scriba alfredi*, his eventual substitution of the name "Asser," and Bale's subsequent efforts to build a canon. As the known popularity and readership of Leland and Bale's bibliographical collections may further attest, Parker was, it appears, continuing in a tradition that contributed to misattribution that, though having begun during his lifetime, had been established before the later stages of his publication program, when he was working on his edition of the *Vita Ælfredi*.

Transcripts of the Cotton Otho A.xii

The Cotton manuscript's location after its tenure with Leland is slightly better known. Stevenson alleges that John Caius had access to the manuscript as he refers directly to ch. 91's²⁷⁵, but during this time the manuscript was in the possession of Matthew Parker, who used it to issue the *editio princeps* of the *Vita* through the publisher John Day in 1574. Given that John Bale very likely was witness to, and perhaps even had possession of, the Cottonian manuscript that had been in the possession of Leland (Bale characteristically quotes from the first chapter in his *Summarium* and *Catalogus*), circumstantial evidence may suggest that, though there is no strict certainty, Cotton Otho A.xii came to Parker by way of John Bale, whose rare manuscript

²⁷⁵ Stevenson, *Asser's Life*, pp. xxxvi-xxxvii; Also see Caius, *De Antiquitate*, p. 209.

collection, upon his death in 1563, was purchased by Parker.²⁷⁶

During the time of Parker's editorial efforts, the Corpus transcript (Co) was made directly from the Cotton Otho A.xii for Parker; it contains "clerical errors, wrong divisions of words" and other irregularities, yet remains the most valuable of all the sixteenth-century transcripts, as it does not contain the bulk of the alterations present in Parker's edition, even if it is the source for a few.²⁷⁷ The Cotton Otho A.xii manuscript contained some glosses and additions physically inscribed by Parker and his secretaries.²⁷⁸ Before his death in 1575, Parker had bequeathed his library to Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, but although Cotton Otho A.xii was presumably supposed to have been included in this donation, the manuscript, in the event, was not included among the texts given.²⁷⁹ It was found nearly twenty-five years later, in 1600, in London, in the library of Lord Lumley (d. 1609), by the Bodleian Library's first librarian, Thomas James. James was interested in whether the manuscript had the controversial ch. 83 b, from Camden's edition of 1602. It did not, of course; and James eventually identified the manuscript as the one Parker used for his edition: it contained, among other things, Parker's characteristic red ochre pencil markings, and Parker's notes for emendations to be made for his edition. While it was in the possession of Lumley, the manuscript was seen by Brian Twyne.²⁸⁰ Twyne was interested in whether the manuscript was the source of the text that Parker had used for his edition, and maintained its status as controversial.²⁸¹ During this period, two further copies of the manuscript, one known as the B transcript (BL Cotton Otho A.xii*), and another known as the Arundel transcript, or Ar (Cambridge University Library, MS Add. 3825), were made, likely before 23

²⁷⁶ Strype, *Life and Acts of Matthew Parker*, p. 520.

²⁷⁷ Stevenson, *Asser's Life*, p. xxxvii.

²⁷⁸ Smyth, *King Alfred the Great*, p. 168.; Stevenson, *Asser's Life*, p. xlii.

²⁷⁹ Stevenson, *Asser's Life*, p. xxxvii.

²⁸⁰ Pits states that it was still in the Lumley Library by 1602. *Iohannis Pitsei Relationum Historiarum de rebus Anglicis tomus I*, Paris, 1619, p.172. Also see, Tanner, *Bibliotheca*, p.53.

²⁸¹ Stevenson, *Asser's Life*, pp. xxxix-xxxl.

November, 1574.²⁸² Stevenson states that the origin of the B transcript "is obscure", had apparently not been used by Parker, and contains some of Parker's interpolations (liii). Stevenson connects this manuscript to one that Lord Lumley bequeathed to the Royal Library at his death in 1609 (this manuscript was given the shelfmark, No.577). Stevenson concludes that, due to "the absence of the errors of the press" of Parker's edition, it must have been made from another source, likely the Cottonian manuscript.²⁸³ Stevenson's assertion that B was copied from the Cottonian manuscript—with his reading that the omissions of the errors "Eowwa" and "Faroli" in Parker's printed edition against *Eoppa* and *Karoli* in B—is not satisfactory, as, by Stevenson's own admission, both corrections (*Eoppa* and *Karoli*) are present in the Co transcript. Furthermore, the reading "Faroli", however wrong it may be, was witnessed by Wise in his edition, and therefore it is problematic to suggest that B could not be copied from multiple sources. The Ar transcript, which has the name "Arundel" written on the first page. Stevenson explains that most of the readings given in it are reproductions of Parker's edition, and yet it contains some readings—including an omission by eye-skip—which are also present in the B transcript.²⁸⁴ Stevenson advances that "possibly it was made from an early proof, and has thus some variations from the published text."²⁸⁵

At the time of Lumley's death, the Cotton manuscript briefly became part of the Royal Library, but by 1621 it was in the possession of Robert Cotton, as in this year a catalogue of his holdings (Harley MS 6018) was made and among it is recorded Cotton Otho A.xii.²⁸⁶ During this

²⁸² Bruce, *Correspondence of Matthew Parker*, p. 468. In a letter to Lord Burghley, Parker states that "This last addition of Alfred's life I have added to such stories as before I sent to my lord Arundel, which yet being so homely, I would not have done if his lordship had not seemed to desire it." Parker is likely referring to the Ar transcript, which he had made for Sir Thomas Arundel.

²⁸³ Stevenson, *Asser's Life*, p. liii.

²⁸⁴ Stevenson, *Asser's Life*, p.liv.

²⁸⁵ Ibid.

²⁸⁶ Ker. *A Catalogue*, pp. 221-2.

period the manuscript was seen by several scholars. The first was James Ussher, Archbishop of Armagh, who collated the *Vita* against several witnesses for the edition in his immense *Britannicarum ecclesiarum antiquitates*; however, Ussher's collations have not been found.²⁸⁷ Around this time, John Spelman also inspected the manuscript and noticed the presence of at least two scribal hands.²⁸⁸ Humfrey Wanley consulted the manuscript and refers to it in his *Catalogus*, published in 1705, but it was Francis Wise who reported, in his edition, published in 1722, that Wanley had assigned the first, and evident, the earliest hand to about the year 1000.²⁸⁹ In his subsequent edition, Francis Wise describes the hand beginning ch. 88 to the end of ch. 98 as a "manus recentior" while the notes made by Parker as a "manus nova."²⁹⁰ As mentioned above, Wise's friend James Hill made a facsimile of the first page of the *textus receptus*. The facsimile at first hand served to counter critics who had erroneously stated that the *Vita* was written in Old English (it was written in Latin with forms of some proper names notable for their inclusion of Anglo-Saxon characters). Since 1731, Hill's facsimile has provided scholars with the only reliable image of what the *textus receptus* looked like before the total destruction of the leaves containing the *Vita Ælfredi*.

Finally, we may turn to modern catalogs, which are woefully incomplete, such as William George Searle's *Onomasticon Anglo-Saxonicum*.²⁹¹ Searle offers that Asser, bishop of Sherborne, is named in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, the *Chronica chronicarum*, and the Dictionary of National Biography, but goes no further. Searle writes that Asser was bishop of St. Davids, "author of the Life of k. Ælfred, afterwards bp Sherb." (75). Searle states that Asser is referenced

²⁸⁷ Stevenson, *Asser's Life*, p.xli.

²⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, p. xlii.

²⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, p. xlv. "illud Asserii Menevensis exemplar, quo usus est Dn. Mattheus Parker, Archiep. Cant," See Wise, *Annales Rerum*, p.137 "Prior et antiquior huius codicis scriptura (iudicium sequentor viri pereruditi, et rei antiquariae accuratissimi indagatoris, Cl. Humfredi Wanleii) circiter annum Domini 1000 vel 1001 exarata fuit."

²⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. xliii-iv; on the topic of Wise's confusion of hands in the *Vita*, see below.

²⁹¹ Searle, *Onomasticon*, p.75.

by name earlier sources such as in Wright's *Biographia Britannica literaria*, Hardy's *Descriptive Catalogue of MSS. Relating to the history of Great Britain and Ireland*, (again) the *Dictionary of National Biography*, and William of Malmesbury's *Gesta Regum*. More contemporary sources aiming to catalogue the history of authorship of the *Vita Ælfredi* could be served by a closer examination of the extant primary and secondary sources.

Chapter 4. Publication and Woe: the Pre-destruction Editions of the *Vita Ælfredi regis*

The *Vita Ælfredi regis* was first published in 1574 by the printer John Day in London, as edited by Matthew Parker (d. 1575) and, as noted above, was there first given the title *Ælfredi regis res gestae*. The publication was part of a concerted effort by Parker and his helpers, from 1566 to 1574, to preserve rare texts from medieval manuscripts. A good number of these, including the *Vita Ælfredi*, only survive today because of his efforts.²⁹² While he was not the only antiquary working to publish medieval manuscripts, his work ranks highly among medieval manuscript preservationists of the sixteenth century. Yet, as with other devotees in the time of emerging Protestantism, primarily Camden, Ussher, and Twysden, Parker's publications were not meant primarily for commercial benefit or even for antiquarian preservation. As we may observe from Strype:

[w]e have seen how our Archbishop sought much after Saxon antiquities, and many of them he made subservient to the vindication of our reformation in opposition to Popery.²⁹³

As will be clearly demonstrated, his publications were concerned primarily with the place of such texts in the context of the contemporaneous religious reforms. For Parker, the *Vita Ælfredi* may well have appeared to be as a text in need of correction. It seemed to present a faulty, problematic narrative, which from the outset he sought to fix by drawing on the *Annales S. Neoti* to fill in the gaps of history. Preston explains that to fill in the gaps of history—even to fix manuscripts—was evidently one of Parker's primary roles as publisher; he had done this in some earlier editions as well: Matthew Paris' *Chronica maiora*; the *Textus Roffensis*; and the

²⁹² For a more comprehensive exploration of the English book trade during the late-sixteenth century, see Barker, "Editing the Past," pp. 206-227.

²⁹³ Strype, *Life and Acts of Matthew Parker*, Vol 2, p. 512.

Black Book of the Archdeacon of Canterbury.²⁹⁴ It is my contention that observable textual modifications to the text preserved in Cotton Otho A.xii, beginning with Parker's contributions, bear witness to the emergence of editorial adoption of what has been come to be known as Bowers' author's final intentions. Parker and his associates sought to recover what was implicitly intended to have been created near the end of the ninth century, with limited regard as to whether or not this had ever come to pass.

In the *testimonia* to Parker's *De antiquitate Britannicae ecclesiae* (1572), we can see the narrative interest in the establishment of a Rome-independent British religion. After the invocation of Gildas, our writer produces the propagandistic

Tum Origenes, qui proximis fuit post Apostolos saeculis, testatur Britanniam in
Christianam consentire religionem.²⁹⁵

During his tenure as Archbishop to Elizabeth I, Parker revised the *Thirty-Nine Articles*, which defined the doctrine of the Anglican Church in the midst of the Reformation and set to mediate between Puritanical Calvinist thought that reached its height during the reign of Edward VI and Roman Catholic practice that had regained footing under Queen Mary I.²⁹⁶ Following soon after Elizabeth I's excommunication by Pope Pius V (1570), Parker published an edition of Matthew Paris' *Chronica maiora* (1571) comprising two volumes of a three-volume set. The passages containing the *Chronica maiora* were based on two of the extant manuscripts of Matthew Paris available to Parker, Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, MSS 16 and 26, each of which contained only a part of that work. The matter that would have appeared in several previously missing folios of those manuscripts had been restored into those folios in a forged, medieval

²⁹⁴ Stevenson, *Asser's Life*, p. xxi, fn.2; see also Strype, *Life and acts of Matthew Parker*, pp. 456, 518.

²⁹⁵ "At that time Origen, who lived right after the period of the Apostles, bears witness that Britain had accepted the Christian religion." *De antiquitate Britannicae ecclesiae*, p.1.

²⁹⁶ Preston, *King Alfred's Book of Laws*, pp. 87-90; and Strype, *Life and acts of Matthew Parker*, pp. 1-92.

hand by one of Parker's secretaries.²⁹⁷ A chief aim of this edition of Matthew Paris, whose thirteenth-century writer is depicted righteously in his resistance to the papacy, was to validate British, or essentially, English power over the national church and to show that England's independence from Rome had medieval roots.²⁹⁸ The publication of the Paris edition had been preceded by an edition of Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies* (1567), and would be followed soon after by an edition of the Gospels in Anglo-Saxon (1571), his edition of the *Vita Ælfredi* (1574), and an edition of Thomas Walsingham (1574) (which would be issued with the *Vita Ælfredi*). Parker's selection of medieval works that he utilized in his publication efforts are mostly what would be considered at the time sensible texts, such as the Gospels and Walsingham's chronicle, with the latter "recall[ing] an earlier age—of William of Malmesbury, or, even earlier, of Bede—when Latin literature formed the foundation of the monastic curriculum."²⁹⁹ Parker did not always promulgate dissent towards his present-day papacy in his editions; instead he often focused on works that harked back to a time when Rome and the English nation were united in a closer bond. It is, therefore, worth examining how his promulgation of anti-Rome rhetoric in some his publications contrast with that of the *Ælfredi regis res gestae*, which does not appear evidently radical when viewed at a distance. Further, we must remind ourselves that at the same time as the *Ælfredi regis res gestae*'s publication, Matthew Parker was fifteen years the Archbishop of Canterbury (1559-75) and former master of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge (1544-53). In addition to being one of the most powerful ecclesiastics, he was also one of the most influential bibliophiles in England. Parker's public life, in which he was viewed as an ideological supporter of a reformed Anglican Church, intruded on his published texts in ways that informed his

²⁹⁷ McKisack, *Medieval History*, p. 53.

²⁹⁸ Vivienne Sanders, "The Household of Archbishop Parker and the Influencing of Public Opinion," *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*. 34 (1983): 538; A similar purpose may be detected in his *De antiquitate* (~1572).

²⁹⁹ Preest, *The Chronica Maiora*, p. 9.

selections of texts and his editorial choices.³⁰⁰ Even with evident ideology in mind, it is more accurate, perhaps, to view Parker primarily as a publisher (or promulgator) and, secondarily, as an editor. His publication program, nevertheless, included many faulty editions containing errors of transcription, obvious fabrications involving wholesale interpolation and distortion of historical manuscript evidence, as well as the conflation of certain documents with tangentially related sources.³⁰¹ Ultimately, in later centuries, these faults were to become defining characteristics of his editions.

Beyond these faults, I do not wish to undervalue Parker's contribution to the popularization of certain medieval texts in sixteenth-century England and on to the present day. Many *editiones principes* emerged from his publishing efforts, including the *Vita Ælfredi regis*, the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (the so-called A version, still known as the Parker Chronicle, resides at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge as the library's MS 173), Gildas' *De excidio Britanniae*, and Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies*. In his time, Parker was a distinguished editor and scholar, one whose publication of materials relating to English history gained admiration from respected historians.³⁰² Furthermore, besides some indiscernible independent house-stylings in the work of independent printers, publishing in England had not given rise to set rules for the production of scholarly editions. Printing was still only in its second century, and the processes of collating readings from multiple manuscripts and for the preparation of fair copy had not been theorized, let alone codified. Whether or not Parker had the intention to deceive his readership is not known, but publishing endeavors had been taken up not only by bibliophiles, but also by propagandists who had placed the codex, beyond the service of the Queen and her sovereignty, in

³⁰⁰ Strype, *The life and acts of Matthew Parker*, pp. 67-71.

³⁰¹ McKisack, *Medieval History*, p. 35. Also see Preston, *Alfred's Book of Laws*, pp. 83-99.

³⁰² Bruce, *Correspondence of Matthew Parker*, p. xiii.

the support of Protestantism and the continuing unification of the English nation under one fundamentally anti-Roman church.³⁰³

For the moment, we will set aside Parker's edition and consider the effects of his publication program on the source-text. The question we seek to answer firmly is this: what is the textual evidence to suggest that the text preserved in Cotton Otho A.xii, as we have it, was one of the casualties of Parker's propagandistic efforts, especially in connection with the establishment of his *Ælfredi regis res gestae*? One of the more recent analyses based on the evaluation of Parker's publication program comes from Alfred P. Smyth, who ultimately concludes in *King Alfred the Great* that the Life of King Alfred was a tenth-century forgery by Byrhtferth or someone in his circle. Setting this controversial conclusion aside, Smyth's argument does not require an explanation of Parker's emendations, yet it offers evidence that the text witness of Cotton Otho A.xii was received interpolation while the manuscript was in Parker's care, in an attempt, it seems to me, to undermine the value of the manuscript's reading in the sixteenth century. In consequence, I would maintain, any empirical conclusions drawn from the transcripts would have to rest upon the unknown threat of long-standing textual contamination. W. H. Stevenson reached the conclusion that it was one of Parker's scholars (possibly Lyly or Joscelyn) who tampered with (one assumes on Parker's orders) the actual physical leaves of Cotton Otho A.xii while it was in the process of being finalized for publication. Stevenson seems to suggest as much when he writes that

the great carelessness thus shown in preparing the copy for press is also evidenced by the overlooking of errors of transcription, even in the interpolations. These alterations and errors have been retained, almost without exception, in all the later editions. Most

³⁰³ Preston, *King Alfred's Book of Laws*, pp. 84-85; on Parker's influence, see McKisack, *Medieval History*, pp. 26-49.

of the alterations and interpretations were written in the Cott. MS. by Parker's secretaries, in accordance with his custom. (Stevenson xxi)

As Stevenson states, the indefensible readings, present in the printed copy are evidence of deficiencies in transcription and the wholesale introduction of interpolated material. One problem with stating firmly that these changes to the MS were present *before* the publication is that it generalizes the disputed readings into a homogeneous effort, suggesting that they were all done as part of the same editorial undertaking. But this is simply not the case. It can be shown that many of these readings had been effected after Co was copied, but before the *Ælfredi regis res gestae* was published by Parker.

The transcript, Co (Corpus Christi, Cambridge, MS 100), in fact offers us substantial help here. First, we may observe several inserted slips in Co, written in Parker's hand, noting where future chapters were to be added to the edition. Two of these slips, now ff. 324 and 324a-b, occur outside of the range of material employed for the edition proper, but one, now f. 339a, is tipped into the manuscript, evidently to be used for the treatment of the year 877. In Wise's edition, this is marked as the product of a recent hand and identified as an interpolation. In his early-twentieth-century edition, Stevenson designates the section as ch. "50c," indicating that it is an interpolation, and Stevenson states that it was taken from Matthew Paris' *Chronica Maiora*.³⁰⁴ Later editions and transcripts verify that ch. 50c was added after the transcript Co was produced, but before the publication of *Ælfredi regis res gestae*. The matter of ch. 50c is, predictably, present in all later transcriptions that used Co, and also present in Camden's edition, which derives almost entirely from Parker's published edition. The surrounding passages, which Stevenson designates chs. 50b and d, Keynes and Lapidge note, are drawn from the *Annales S.*

³⁰⁴ Stevenson, *Asser's Life*, p. 38.

Neoti, and they do not occur in the Co transcript; in Co, the matter of the chapters passes directly from 50 to 52, and there follows the image of a hand pointing to the words "deest anno 877" ["it is wanting in the year 877"]. These chapters, the so-called 50b, c, and d (and, possibly, 51), all occur in Wise's edition (1722), which means that after the Co transcript had been produced, these passages had been inscribed directly into Cotton Otho A.xii. Stevenson notes the inclusion of a later interpolation, his ch. 54b, whose readings are found in the Ar transcript, as well as the editions of Parker, Camden, and Wise. Wise's edition is the most recent of these listed witnesses, but it gives no indication that this passage is an interpolation. In point of fact, Wise states that he bears witness to this passage's presence in the Cotton manuscript.³⁰⁵ Stevenson concludes, on Wise's authority, that this chapter was physically inscribed in Cotton Otho A.xii at some time after the creation of the B transcript, which does not have this chapter. The surrounding passage's content details the Saxon victory over the Danes at Countisbury, and ch. 54b augments this by including the well-known passage about the Raven Banner ("quod Reafau nominant"³⁰⁶). It is far from certain which source was used to supply it. Dumville and Lapidge note that this passage with the Raven Banner present in the *Annales S. Neoti* is "padding, and has no known source. It was perhaps felt to be a necessary introduction to the following sentence which is drawn from the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, being found in MSS BCDE."³⁰⁷ The following two sentences, containing Lothbrok-lore, also have "no source."³⁰⁸

During the preparations for Parker's edition (P), several additional interpolations can be accounted for if we accept Stevenson's hypothesis that the transcript in the present BL Cotton

³⁰⁵ Wise, *Annales Rerum*, p. 33; also see Stevenson, *Asser's Life*, p. 44.

³⁰⁶ Stevenson, *Asser's Life*, p. 44.

³⁰⁷ Dumville and Lapidge, *The Annals of St Neots*, p. 78, fn. 25.

³⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, fn. 26.

Otho A.xii* (B) was made from the Cotton manuscript.³⁰⁹ In B, many of Parker's interpolations (in P) are indeed reproduced, including those corresponding to Stevenson's chs. 17b, 50b, c and d, (which are present in transcript Co in the forms of tipped in leaves), 106b, c, and probably d.³¹⁰ Yet, the transcript in B omits matter corresponding to Stevenson's chs. 10, 36, part of 53, 53b, c, and 54b, as well as Camden's noted interpolation, now Stevenson's ch. 83b. Stevenson states that B's "origin is obscure" but hypothesizes that it was copied from the Cotton Otho A.xii manuscript at some point before Lord Lumley's death in 1609, when the Cotton manuscript went to the Royal Library. Thomas James identifies a second manuscript in Lord Lumley's library in 1600 that may have been B.³¹¹ If we could be certain James was indeed referring to B, we could be sure that the changes physically entered in Cotton Otho A.xii occurred after B's copying but before the end of the sixteenth century.

However, even here, we have less-than-adequate information to go on. Evidence suggests that because Parker's edition contains the matter of Stevenson's ch. 54b, that chapter had been physically introduced to Cotton Otho A.xii by the time of the publication of P or that it was added retroactively, to produce a text that more closely resembled that of the published version. As there is nothing to indicate that this had been noted before Parker's death in 1575, I am inclined to accept the former view. The matter of Stevenson's ch. 54b is not present in B, and so it can be posited that the matter of this chapter was physically added to Cotton Otho A.xii at some point before the publication of P but after the transcripts in Co and B had been produced; before transcript Ar was completed; and, most plausibly, before Camden's edition appeared in 1602-3. The evidence thus suggests only a broad date for the B transcript, of a dating of 1574 -

³⁰⁹ Stevenson, *Asser's Life*, p. liii.

³¹⁰ Stevenson, *Asser's Life*, p. liii.

³¹¹ Ibid.

1603 (>Co, <P) x 1609. This in turn suggests that the interpolations physically inscribed in Cotton Otho A.xii were introduced in three identifiable stages: those made after Co but before B (chs.17b; 50b, c, and d; 106b, c, and d), those made after B but before P (chs. 10; part of 36; part of 53; 53b and c; and ch. 54b), and those made before the end of the sixteenth century, or up to the appearance of Camden's edition. Since Twyne and others did not find Camden's ch. 83b in the Cotton manuscript even years after his edition was published, we can be certain that Camden's chapter on the founding of Oxford (83b) was never physically added to the Cotton manuscript in any form. Moreover, it is likely that Camden never consulted Cotton Otho A.xii directly. One can be all but certain that the interpolations in this last stage were made before the Cotton manuscript was moved to the Royal Library, and very likely before the printer's copy for Parker's *Ælfredi regis res gestae* was sent to John Day.

While Parker was wont to conflate his sources, merging them with what he viewed as like-sources, there is no firm evidence that he introduced complete fabrications of the kind found in Camden's edition (see further below). In several (semi-) independent testimonials, we find the presence of various interpolations that had been physically entered into Cotton Otho A.xii. Stevenson's observations, it would seem, are based for the most part on observations made by Twyne, Ussher, James, Wise, and Wanley. Each of these accounts deserves re-evaluation. Having identified the main stages of the physical interpolation of passages into the Cotton Otho A.xii, we can now offer two general observations regarding the status of these interpolations in the manuscript before it was destroyed.

When Cotton Otho A.xii was in the possession of the Lumley Library (after 1609), it was seen and described by Brian Twyne. Twyne consulted the manuscript during the controversy over William Camden's falsified chapter 83b. Twyne, a friend of Camden's, initially maintained that

there were imperfections in the Cotton manuscript and doubted whether it was the manuscript on which Parker founded his edition. His statements seem to have been intended, in large measure, to give Camden's edition the benefit of the doubt, and to allow more time for the other manuscript Camden claimed to have drawn from to be found. In his *Antiquitatis Academiae Oxoniensis Apologia* (1608), Twyne writes that

nescio nisi eum imperfecto exemplari (quod fortasse in Domini Lumlaei bibliotheca rubra ocre manu propria notatum vidi, mancum tamen et plurimis in locis imperfectum et chartulis appenditiis recenter scriptis suffultum) usum fuisse dicas, quod saepe in huius Asserii exemplaribus usu venisse intelligosi illis credendum sit qui non pauca etia de Ecclesiae D. Petri Oxoniae in Oriente sita et a Grymbaldo excitata, per Dorcestrensem Episcopum consecratione, ex vetustissimis eiusdem Asserii exemplaribus se accepiste prodiderunt.³¹²

Twyne describes this incomplete copy as having been marked with a red ochre pencil and augmented with appended notes. While Twyne states the appended leaves and markings were introduced by Parker, it should be observed that he does not mention any wholesale physical interpolations or intended "repairs" that have been made to the manuscript proper. These observations and practices echo the contents of a letter from Bishop Sandys of Worcester, dated 6 February 1565, to Parker, where the archbishop is asked to print pamphlet-editions of two books of the Bible, with the bishop's modifications. Here we may observe an identifiable practice,

³¹² "I do not understand precisely what you are describing, unless it has been transmitted in an incomplete copy (an example of which I possibly saw, marked up in red ink by the same hand, in the library of Lord Lumley), that is, a copy mutilated and incomplete at many points and, further, more recently augmented through the addition of annotated sheets, a configuration which is known to have been transmitted more than once with copies of writings of Asser, and minor examples of which, I believe, might be housed in the church of St. Peter, in the eastern part of Oxford (as raised up by Grimbold for the consecration of the bishop of Dorchester on Thames), that is, in copies which have been produced, as you have apprehended, on the authority on the most ancient exemplars of the writings of this very writer Asser." Twyne, *Antiquitatis*, II, p. 144.

wherein the Bishop's notes were inserted into the returned book (the initial book sent by Parker) with instructions. There are then at least two additional steps involved in repairing the text, which are described as follows:

According unto your grace's letters of instructions I have perused the book you sent me, and with good diligence (having also conference with some others) considered of the same in such sort I trust as your grace will not mislike of. I have sent up with it my clerk, whose hand I used in writing forth the corrections and marginal notes. If it shall please your grace to set over the book to be viewed by some one of your chaplains, my said clerk shall attend a day or two to make it plain unto him how my notes are to be placed. In mine opinion your grace shall do well to make the whole Bible to be diligently surveyed by some well learned before it be put to print, and also to have skilful and diligent correctors at the printing of it, that it may be done in such perfection that the adversaries can have no occasion to quarrel with it.³¹³

The first step described in this letter is for the corrected copy of the book to be "surveyed" by some of Parker's secretaries "before it be put to print." It is clear from the context that Bishop Sandys of Worcester is referring to a printed text of the Bible that Parker had sent to him to inspect; the bishop has sent it back with corrections and notes. The second phase in Parker's editing procedure is reflected in Bishop Sandys's request that Parker have diligent correctors present at the time of its printing. We may infer there were to be additional changes made to the printer's fair copy when the book is sent to print. We also observe a similar pattern of editing in the handling of the Corpus transcript, which, as demonstrated above, includes inserted notes for various passages to be added to the text and Parker's ochre pencil markings. Similarly, elsewhere

³¹³ Bruce, *Correspondence of Matthew Parker*, pp. 256-257.

among Parker's correspondence we find a letter to an unknown addressee—dated 1571, at the height of his publishing house—where Parker states that he is returning a borrowed manuscript along with a print copy of that manuscript "somewhat more enlarged with such old copies as I had of other of my friends."³¹⁴ Here, the printed form offers an "enlarged" form of the manuscript, similar to the relationship illustrated between the text of Parker's *Ælfredi regis res gestae* and that of Cotton Otho A.xii. What these reports offer us is a sense of what Parker's publication house was capable of doing and what it was accustomed to do on a regular basis. Parker's practice was to "fix" or add text to texts found in manuscripts or even printed books that he viewed as either incomplete or damaged. But it seems that Parker did so in good faith, even if this involved multiple stages of production that were, it appears, fairly widely known to at least some of his customers.

Another account in this case, by James Ussher, Archbishop of Armagh, in his *Britannicarum ecclesiarum antiquitates* (1639), complements the witnesses to Parker's printing efforts adduced above. Ussher frequently borrowed manuscripts from the Cotton Library and, among them, Cotton Otho A.xii (Stevenson xl, fn. 2). Ussher states that the pieces of paper he found inserted into the manuscript were from the *Annales S. Neoti* and not from Asser.³¹⁵ However, Ussher's observation only highlights the inserted pieces of paper and not the recent hand—some of the many interpolations physically entered into the manuscript. Furthermore, Ussher describes the script used for the text as dating to a period much earlier than Wanley had given in the eleventh century, closer to the late-ninth century. He states incorrectly that it was

³¹⁴ Ibid., pp. 388-389.

³¹⁵ Ussher, *Britannicarum*, p.184; Stevenson has taken this to mean the Cotton Otho A.xii had been repaired by one of Parker's secretaries skilled in forging medieval manuscripts outright, and is echoed by Smyth, who suggests it was possibly Joscelyn or Lyly. Smyth, *King Alfred the Great*, pp.166-8.

written in an insular script typically used for vernacular texts: it was not.³¹⁶ Stevenson's apology that he "probably meant that it was written in a hand older than the Norman Conquest" (xli) does not instill confidence, especially when Stevenson places strong emphasis elsewhere on the testimonial of Ussher, a man he describes as having "special knowledge" of pre-Conquest manuscripts.

John Spelman was the first scholar to call the additions "supply'd" by someone recent. He notes in *Life of Ælfred the Great* (1709) the presence of an "ancienter and most undoubted hand" as well as occurrences of a "later hand," though he does not provide information that would allow us to identify this later hand as a sixteenth-century hand (i.e. Parker's secretary's), a twelfth-century or late Anglo-Saxon hand, or anything between. Spelman's statement reads as follows:

I...have seen an ancient manuscript *Asser[ius] Men[evensis]* conceived by some to be the very original, by which the archbishop first published that author: and probably enough both for the affinity the character has with the Saxon letters, and also for the lines and marks of red oaker, with which the archbishop was wont to note the manuscripts that he perused. In this manuscript there were the clauses, which in Mr. Camden's edition do immediately precede and follow the clause of the discord [ch. 83b], and they are both in that part of the book, which is of the ancienter and most undoubted hand, whereas other parts are of a later hand and seem supply'd.³¹⁷

Stevenson interprets "seem supply'd" to mean that these passages were added by Parker or his secretaries in this later hand. It is a great shame that Spelman does not identify those chapters that he felt had been entered in a later hand. If he had done so, our efforts to account for

³¹⁶ From Hill's transcript, it is clear that the text was written in Latin and was executed in Anglo-Caroline minuscule. For certain proper names and place-names, Anglo-Saxon characters had been employed. See also, Stevenson, *Asser's Life*, p. xliii.

³¹⁷ Spelman, *Life of Ælfred the Great*, p.182.

discrepancies in the reports of various commentators would not have to be so thorough.

Another conflicting observation, for example, occurs in an earlier account by Thomas James. When consulting the Cotton Otho A.xii to see if Camden's evident interpolation was present, Thomas James notices Parker's ochre pencil markings as well as his notes, and adds that the manuscript

was written by two diverse scribes at the least, whereof the later part of the book, where the poynte in controversie lyeth [Camden's interpolation, ch. 83b], is by much in my opinion the latest, yet hath it many Saxon letters, especially the letters r and f, but hereof judge you. (Stevenson xxxviii, fn. 1; my italics)

James' contention that the area of the Cotton Otho A.xii around Camden's interpolation was in a post-twelfth-century hand contradicts Spelman's observation that this same area of the manuscript was an earlier hand. One is tempted to side with James on the matter—as Stevenson does—since the only next available discussion of the age of this hand around ch. 83, in the entry for the year 886, does not transpire until almost one hundred years after James' statement, in the edition published by Francis Wise in 1722.

One important characteristic of Wise's edition, as has been mentioned above, is that he describes the hand beginning with the entry of text corresponding to Stevenson's ch. 88 and continuing to the end of ch. 98 as a "manus recentior" while differentiating the notes made by Parker as a "manus nova" (Stevenson xliiii-iv). Wise's edition represented the first serious attempt at a scholarly edition of the *Vita*, but it contained its own share of infelicities. For example, Wise mistakenly describes several of Parker's interpolations in his edition, chs. 50b, c, and d, as having been entered by a "manus recentior," thus confusing them with the post-twelfth-century hand of

chs. 88-98.³¹⁸ Wise does, however, identify ch. 106d in his edition as by Parker. Part of the error, Keynes and Lapidge point out, is a result of Hill's collation:

Hill collated the manuscript against a copy of Camden's printed text of 1602 and reported its readings to Wise, and it is evidently on Hill's authority that Wise states that a portion of the text from near the beginning of chapter 88 to the end of chapter 98 was written by a "more recent hand", though it remains uncertain whether the scribe (or scribes) who completed the text was (or included) the first, whose work was described and dated by Wanley. (*Alfred the Great* 224)

Wise's distinctions reveal that if the passages in the *Vita* were indeed added, they were done so to conform with the Anglo-Saxon characters of the rest of the text if not in age, then in style.

Similarly, Wise fails to identify the interpolations that were present in transcript B, which he never consulted.³¹⁹ Furthermore, Wise's collation appears to have been corrected against the Arundel transcript (Ar): clear evidence of this occurs in [4,4] *Londoniam civitatem*, [5,4] *Cantii*, [15,2] *occidentales*, [15,4] *magnum et*, [15,25] *quotidie*, [20,9] *Cantii*, [26,4] *aquilonari*, [29,2] *erat tunc*, [29, 6] Cf. marginalia in Ar that is repeated by Wise and also *expetivit*, and others.

When Humfrey Wanley observed and dated the Cotton Otho A.xii to about the year 1000, he also differentiated a pre-twelfth-century hand from a post-twelfth-century hand, but failed to mention the chapters where he believed the post-twelfth-century hand was present.³²⁰

We may conclude from this culling of the relevant evidence that at different points in the life of the Cotton Otho A.xii manuscript, there were various interpolations that were physically made into it (both as additions to existing leaves and on inserted slips), but that it is not certain

³¹⁸ Stevenson, *Asser's Life*, p.xliii.

³¹⁹ Stevenson, *Asser's Life*, p. liii.

³²⁰ *Ibid.*, p.xliv, fn.4.

that these interpolations were all present at the time of the publication of Parker's edition in 1574. There is evidence to suggest that matter corresponding to some of the chapters, particularly Stevenson's ch. 54b, but possibly others, were physically added to the manuscript later to bring its content into conformity with the print editions. By the time that the Cotton manuscript came to Parker, when Co had been made, but before Parker's edition had been published, there were no interpolations that had been physically introduced by Parker or his secretaries (though that does not mean there were no textual additions or interpolations whatsoever). Cotton Otho A.xii evidently contained many difficult passages: in Stevenson's ch. 75, the phrase "cuius numerus est" appears to have lost a number.³²¹ This deficiency is not repaired in transcript Co or in Parker's edition; it appears in both as "de quorum numero est" with the number still evidently wanting.³²² What this proves is that certain readings occurring in Cotton Otho A.xii, which Parker was unable to compare with other extant texts, were left unchanged. In point of fact, some (or many) of these likely were present in the manuscript as textual deficiencies long before it came to Parker. On the other hand, Parker seemed to remove wholesale corruptions from his edition. Wheeler explores two other similar sections of the copies of the *Vita* where numerals had fallen out but whose absences are reproduced, not repaired, in Co.³²³ In one, at the beginning of Stevenson's ch. 40 in Co, we find the nonsensical phrase "*Quibus cum talia praesentis vitae dispendia alienigenis perperam quaerentibus non sufficerent*,"³²⁴ which is omitted in Parker's edition.³²⁵ Keynes and Lapidge write that this difficulty is comprehensible "as if Asser originally intended to begin the chapter with a remark to the effect that the Vikings nevertheless came back

³²¹ Keynes and Lapidge, *Alfred the Great*, p. 256, fn. 144; See also Wheeler, "Textual Emendations," p. 87.

³²² Stevenson, *Asser's Life*, p. 75.

³²³ Wheeler, "Textual Emendations," p. 87.

³²⁴ Stevenson, *Asser's Life*, p. 31.

³²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 31, fn. 40.

for more punishment, but then decided on consulting the *Chronicle* that such a remark would be inappropriate at this point" (*Alfred the Great* 242-3, fn. 72), but, given the ease by which chapters seem to be added to the Cotton Otho A.xii, we should not be overly hasty to trace this error back to the tenth century or earlier. We should suspect that this passage might not pre-date Wanley's dating of the Cotton manuscript to about 1000, but before the manuscript came to Parker.

We would be remiss if we said that the readings of Co against those found in Parker's printed edition didn't, in general, give better readings than the other transcripts, B and Ar. Co augments critical understanding of the state of the Cotton manuscript before it was largely destroyed, but this understanding must be viewed as, on the whole, incomplete. Though reading transcript Co against Parker's printed editions justifies further confidence that Co represents an essentially pre-interpolated point in that manuscript's life before it came to Parker, it does not aid in our identification of passages that were physically inscribed during, or after, the Cotton manuscript's production.

I wish to turn briefly to the printed text in Parker's *Ælfredi regis res gestae*. Surviving copies of the printed book can shed some light on whatever rhetorical effect Parker may have intended his edition to have. Three copies of Parker's 1574 edition are held in Cambridge University Library are³²⁶: Broxbourne b.51, Syn 4.57.9, and Syn 4.57.2.³²⁷ Syn 4.57.2 was the copy owned by Roger Twysden and it bears his signature on the title page, it is likely the copy he used to compare against the Alfred sections in his *Historiae Anglicanæ Scriptores Decem* in 1652. The University Library copies mostly all agree in organization of quires: Parker's preface, a table comparing Anglo-Saxon letters to Latin letters, Parker's *Ælfredi regis res gestae*, Alfred's

³²⁶ UL Cambridge direct URL to book record: <<http://search.lib.cam.ac.uk/?itemid=|cambrdgedb|1406090>>; See *A Short-Title Catalogue*, ed. W. A. Jackson. 3 vols. 2nd ed. 1976-1991, no. 863

³²⁷ This book bore the shelfmark Syn 4.57.? at the time of my viewing, but it appears to have been changed in their catalog to Syn 4.57.2 at the time of the present writing.

Will, an English interlinear translation of Alfred's Old English translation of Gregory's *Regula Pastoralis*, Parker's Latin translation of Alfred's Old English of the *Regula Pastoralis*, and an edition of Thomas Walsingham's *Historia Anglicana* – here published as the *Historia Angliae brevis* – including a table of contents and timeline of the Norman kings to Henry V.

One perhaps insignificant difference in the printings occurs in the printing contained in Syn 4.57.9,³²⁸ where the preface and table of contents of Thomas of Walsingham's *Historia* are misbound and occupy the first quire preceding the *Ælfredi regis res gestae*; the book otherwise continues normally. Walsingham's *Historia* was extremely critical of Wat Tyler, John Wycliffe, and the Lollards. The juxtaposition of the West Saxon King, Alfred, with the reign of the Norman Kings raises questions about the perceived influence of the famous king on post-conquest writers, particularly among those whose filial duty to a ruler included reinforcing and re-instituting their right to rule. Additionally, the issuing³²⁹ of Walsingham's *Historia Angliae brevis* with Parker's edited work of the *Ælfredi regis res gestae* and the paratextual materials, may indeed indicate Parker's intentions with his edition.

Validity in publication: Alfred's preface to the *Pastoral Care*, law-code, and *Ælfredi Regis res gestae*

This foregoing analysis of Matthew Parker's approach to his publications has pivoted on the crucial observation that the texts published were intended to do double duty as late-sixteenth-century polemical treatises. These Reformation publications ultimately sought to depict an England that was supposedly in-step with its pre-Conquest origins, at least for the purpose of establishing an English church that was separate from Roman authority. Todd Preston's recent

³²⁸ Syn 4.57.9 has been signed: John Jeremy of Bayfield.

³²⁹ *A Short-Title Catalogue*, no. 863.

publication, *King Alfred's Book of Laws: A Study of the domboc and Its Influence on English Identity*, connects the Anglo-Saxon reverence for Rome and the sixteenth-century need to publish those particular reverential texts during the Protestant Reformation. In detailing the Reformation and its relationship to King Alfred's law-code, Todd Preston reads Parker's efforts as a lightning-rod for Protestant religious and legal identities. Specifically, Preston argues that the *Testimonie of Antiquitie* under the direction of Parker (and composed by his secretary, John Joscelyn), utilizing parts of the Alfredian law-code, was held as a considerable authority for Protestant scriptural interpretations, mainly in its reading of Ælfric's *Catholic Homilies* as a polemic directed against doctrines of transubstantiation and as providing a rationale for the acceptance of vernacular scripture.³³⁰ Further, Preston demonstrates that William Lambarde uses Alfred's legal writings in his *Archaionomia* (1591) "to forward an ideological agenda that validates the primacy of English common law and establishes the early native roots of Protestantism" and that Lambarde's ideological focus for his publication echoed that of Parker's circle (84). Preston concludes firmly that

[the law-code's] combination of sacred and political authority was consonant with Elizabeth's role in Reformation England. Its sense of continuity with the past aligned it with the historical projects of the reformers. Its comparison of the Anglo-Saxon experience with that of the biblical Israelites mirrored the English Protestant view of being the Elect Nation. (99)

In Preston's view, this imagined continuity with the past allowed the reformers to visualize and orchestrate the as-yet-unknown future of the "Elect Nation," and with Catholics shouting "Where was your church before Luther?"³³¹ the perceived validity of the reforms was as important to

³³⁰ Preston, *King Alfred's Book of Laws*, pp. 87-90.

³³¹ Collinson, "Religious Publishing," p. 38.

Protestant publishers like Parker as it was for reformers in general. That is to say, for some, the concern was more with the right to undertake reform in the first place, and less with the definition of the specifics of the reforms themselves.

Preston's contention is that Parker's historical publications of sources from the Anglo-Saxon period (particularly as they relate to the Alfredian law-codes), as well as those of Lambarde, had direct and unequivocal influence on the shaping of national identity during the Reformation. It is slightly more difficult to apply these insights to the *Vita Ælfredi*, since it was printed in Latin (but in Saxon characters) and would be inaccessible to a member of the general populace except through an interlocutor.³³² Whereas Alfred's legal writings were able to be employed by reformers as precedents in the English vernacular, the *Vita Ælfredi* demanded a more complex political application. Parker's own religious attitudes were frequently co-mingled with his own educational interests,³³³ and this can be clearly observed in his glossing of Alfred's preface to his (Old English) *Pastoral Care*, and its juxtaposition to Parker's Latin translation of the *Pastoral Care* in the same printed edition. As Suzanne C. Hagedorn has shown,³³⁴ Parker's engagements with ecclesiastical controversies are of a comparative nature, such that Alfred's revival of the English educational system and his patronage of book production were in concert with Parker's own interests and goals. That is, both Alfred and Parker had a special interest in the overseeing of church reform and in the promotion of English-language learning.

Parker's interest in educational reform can also be viewed alongside Preston's reading of sixteenth-century uses of Alfred's law-codes. Further points of comparison between Parker's

³³² Ibid., p. 31.

³³³ On Parker's possible goals with respect to educational reform, specifically in using Alfred's Preface to the *Pastoral Care*, which was attached to his 1574 edition of *Ælfredi regis res gestae*, see Hagedorn, "Received Wisdom," pp. 88-90; also see Page, *Matthew Parker and His Books*, pp. 43-63, 87-107; and Page, "Sixteenth Century Reception," pp. 36-64.

³³⁴ Hagedorn, "Received Wisdom," pp. 88-90.

publication of Alfred's legal writings and the *Ælfredi regis res gestae* can be observed through a reading of Parker's preface to his edition. In the preface, there are discernible parallels between the *Ælfredi regis res gestae* and the Protestant turn to an Anglo-Saxon past, but these emerge most clearly when viewed in the context of Parker's general editorial aims. In this preface to his edition, Parker hopes that his efforts in publishing *Ælfredi regis res gestae* for a Latin-educated audience would lead those seeking edification to learn the Anglo-Saxon alphabet. Parker writes:

Latina autem cum sint, Saxonice literis excudi curavimus, maxime ob venerandam ipsius archetypi antiquitatem, ipso adhuc (ut opinio fere mea) Ælfredo superstite, iisdem literarum formulis descriptam.³³⁵

By printing Latin words in Saxon characters, Parker is both honoring the past (by preserving the Latin) and honoring Alfred's language (by adding Saxon letters). Parker's gesture toward adducing the similarity of the sixteenth-century English vernacular and the authority of his Anglo-Saxon-derived typeface represents more than a mere homage to King Alfred's native tongue. He continues:

Præterea opera pretium erit patrium hunc nostrum (quo hodie utimur) sermonem, cum illo obsoleto iam pene et extincto conferre, et conferendo quam sint inter se similes, et pene eadem, animadvertere.³³⁶

Of particular interest here is the contention that language is clearly seen by Parker as providing a validating link between the reforms of the late-ninth and early-tenth century and those of the sixteenth century. Parker's comparison of languages may also necessitate a comparison of

³³⁵ "But though being in Latin, we have taken care to forge them in Saxon letters, chiefly for the venerable antiquity of the archetype, it was still (in my general opinion) written in the same letter forms as when Alfred was still alive."

³³⁶ "Furthermore, the reward for these efforts will be the recovery of the very language of our ancestors, which is still the language which we use today, especially when we take note of aspects of the language which are obsolete or almost wholly out of use, and when, by way of comparison, we pay attention to those aspects which are similar or almost the same."

cultures. Parker insists that scholars, and others interested in the English past, should compare Anglo-Saxon culture to the exigencies of a pre-Iconoclastic England. Preston describes this congruity of the Anglo-Saxon past and the Protestant Reformation as emerging at a specific point of crisis in England. At this juncture, Parker and Lambarde chose to "reproduce the text to supply their countrymen with a link to an authorizing native past" (12). However, the circumstance that there are no explicit declarations of a Protestant agenda in Parker's preface or in the interpolations in his edition, in contrast to his edition of *Chronica maiora*, might suggest that Parker's intentions with respect to the *Ælfredi regis res gestae* were more immediately scholarly than polemical. Nevertheless, the polemical aspects of his edition do parallel the aims of his other works in his publication sequence in some respects. That the Old English and Early Modern English languages, to Parker, resemble each other to the point of being "et pene eadem" suggests that the appearance of the *Ælfredi regis res gestae* may have exerted a more subversive cultural role than has been previously recognized.

Parker's use of observations regarding language to establish links to the past, and to provide validation of the sixteenth-century present, also offers parallels to aspects of Alfred's *Boethius* in the context of the Roman past. Susan Irvine highlights Alfred's recasting of a rhetorical question by Lady Philosophy regarding the abuse of royal power.³³⁷ In Alfred's elaboration Theodoric is named explicitly and the Roman emperor Nero is given as another example of this abuse. Irvine reads the description of these figures by Alfred in his phrasing "forslean 7 forheregian"³³⁸ as "recall[ing] the behavior of the invading Danes whose leaders must

³³⁷ The Boethian phrase is from Bk II, pr. 6: "Quid autem de dignitatibus potentiaque disseram, qua uos uerae dignitatis ac potestatis inscii caelo exaequatis? Quae si in improbissimum quemque ceciderunt, quae flammis Aetnae eructantibus, quod diluuium tantas strages dederint?" ["Now, why should I discourse of dignities and power, by which you are ignorant of true dignity and of the power of the skies? If both these evil men are fallen down, which is flowing in the flames of Aetna, which is so great destruction shall deliver to the deluge?"]. For Alfred's version, see Irvine, "The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle," p. 70.

³³⁸ "Destroying and ravaging."

have epitomized for Alfred the abuse of power. The wide geographical and historical range of the allusions here only serves to emphasize the implied significance of the past in interpreting the present" (70). For Irvine, these links to the past illuminate Alfred's "ambivalent attitude" to his past; while tyrants seemingly reminded Alfred of the Danes, wise and intellectual Roman leaders are given flattering (and sometimes inaccurately so) titles.³³⁹ Parker was certainly familiar with Alfred's translation of *Boethius*, and he likely found something resembling his view of the Roman past in Alfred's depiction. Yet, if Parker viewed Anglo-Saxon England's connections to Rome as offering parallels to those of his present day, he may well have done so with some sense of reservation. It is more likely that Parker considered the Rome of Alfred's day to have been a benevolent unity that enhanced the development of England, at least to some extent, and not the formidable opponent of his own period.

Moreover, Parker's political interests did not in the event prompt him to cut sections of the *Vita* referring to Rome from his *Ælfredi regis res gestae*, and in fact England's connections to Rome, which appear to be thematized at many points in the *Ælfredi regis res gestae*, may have constituted to Parker's interest in this work. The *Vita* begins with Ine's trip to Rome in passages corresponding to Stevenson's ch.1. In passages corresponding to Stevenson's ch. 8, Alfred is sent to Rome to be anointed; Alfred travels there for a second time (corresponding to Stevenson's ch. 11), with Æthelwulf, and he remains there a whole year. In ch. 12 there is a denouncement of the seditious acts by Æthelbald (allowing a reprise of Alfred's pilgrimage), Ealhstan, and Eanwulf while Æthelwulf is away; in ch. 16 Æthelwulf returns and sends a large monetary gift to Rome; in ch. 46, Rome is depicted as a haven and ally for Burghred, who is forced to flee to there by the Danes; in ch. 71 Pope Marinus I's death offers an occasion to mention his admiration of Alfred,

³³⁹ Irvine, "The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle," p. 71.

which contributed to his lifting tribute and taxation from the Anglo-Saxon quarter in Rome, and the bestowing of a piece of the Cross on Alfred. And in ch. 86 Alfred sends further alms to Rome. Each example reflects the trend in England of linking their line to Roman authority, a theme clearly visible in the writings of Gildas and in the *Historia Brittonum* of pseudo-Nennius. This validation of the present by means of references to the past links the Anglo-Saxon legacy to events in Parker's England. And while Alfred's relationship with Rome during his reign did not overtly resemble issues during the Reformation, perhaps it did not have to. Alfred's England was likely viewed ambivalently by Parker the educator, whose involvement in the reformers' ecclesiastical schism sent him further away from a Rome that during Alfred's time offered models for reforms in the areas of education, religion, and theology generally.

Beyond his tendencies to politicize his published material, Parker's *Ælfredi regis res gestae* occupies a middle ground between Anglo-Saxon scholarship and the political noise from the likes of John Jewel, Bishop of Salisbury, and Thomas Harding, who engaged with the former in the form of published rejoinders over the legitimacy of the Church of England. Emily Elisabeth Butler reads the aim of Parker's sequence of publications more generally, noting that Parker's efforts were "directly tied to an attempt to repair dramatic political and religious rupture in England."³⁴⁰ Butler's view that Parker's two aims were to quell revolution and promote reform received strong support from his publication of a text of the *Ælfredi regis res gestae*. Parker's reformist influence through this editorial process was aimed at blunting the force of Catholic (and certain Protestant) uprisings, which is no better seen than when he is named as participating in an open print-based debate.³⁴¹ This suggests that his authority extended beyond the realm of scholars and editors and all the way to Elizabeth I, to whom Parker sent the first printed copy of

³⁴⁰ Butler, *Textual Community*, p. 7.

³⁴¹ Collinson, "Religious Publishing," p. 39.

the *Ælfredi regis res gestae*.³⁴² Yet his efforts, as viewed in the light of the publication of his 1574 edition, in context, may appear more moderate than radical. As Preston has argued was the case with Lambarde and Joscelyn's editions within the context of their own publishing programs, Parker's *Ælfredi regis res gestae* can only be read in context with his publishing program's generalized aim. We may suspect that one that would likely never have appeared if the reformers' cries for validation had not reached a heightened point. If the publication of the *Ælfredi regis res gestae* was only at best reasonably successful in affecting a limited discursive community, its fortunes were none the worse for that, as the *Vita* had found an audience among the most influential discursive community in England.

Controversy after Parker: editions of the *Vita Ælfredi regis*, 1602-1731

The other editions that appeared before the destruction of the *Vita* passages in Cotton Otho A.xii have aims that drastically differ from those of Parker and other contemporary public figures with Parker who were involved in the Reformation. The goals of these subsequent editions were, for the most part, self-interested. The editions of both William Camden and Francis Wise adhere very closely to Parker's first edition, but they do introduce substantial changes whose ramifications in the main involve non-Reform concern.

While Parker's edition reflects a broad political and religious agenda, William Camden's 1602-3 edition (in a collection entitled *Anglica, Hibernica, Normannica, Cambrica*) reveals a narrower, ostensibly personal interest in manipulating certain aspects of the *textus receptus*. For Camden, the *Vita* provided a vehicle for the squabble over the antiquity of the universities at

³⁴² See Bruce, *Correspondence of Matthew Parker*, p. 467-468; Parker writes to Lord Burghley "Concerning the rude pamphlet which I promised your honor, because I send but this morning one book to her Highness, I would her Highness should have the first, and put it to her pleasure."

Oxford and Cambridge. Even now, no other edition of the *Vita Ælfredi regis* has evinced as narrow an aim as Camden's, which apart from its one major, notorious addition (marked in Stevenson's edition as ch. 83b) is nearly identical to Parker's edition. The egregious ch. 83b falls under the year 866 of the annalistic material and invents a pre-Alfredian creation of the University of Oxford which is held to have occurred just two years after Grimbald came to England.³⁴³ The implication, if true, would be that Oxford was founded before its closest peer-institution, the University of Cambridge. For some, however, Camden's interpolation was not unexpected, as the promulgation of this claim had already appeared in his *Britannia*, published in 1600; but the debate raged on all the same. Camden's Asserian interpolation sparked the interest of scholars from both schools, all of whom wished to assert the antiquity of their respective colleges.

The consequences of the debate are worth recounting here briefly, as the controversy ultimately would have an animating effect on Asser scholarship by directing attention to certain textual issues surrounding the readings of Cotton Otho A.xii. The Cambridge side maintained throughout the debate that the passage was interpolated by Camden. Supporters of Camden, mainly at Oxford, claimed that Parker, who was from Cambridge, suppressed the passage in his edition. The accusation of interpolation hung over Camden's head for over twenty years, until Brian Twyne interviewed him and asked him to clear up the controversy.³⁴⁴ Camden stated that he had already done so, then attempted to convince Twyne by telling him that extensive research into the antiquities of the university would enable him to appreciate the genuineness of the passage.³⁴⁵ In 1623, under duress and in poor health, Camden admitted that his source was

³⁴³ For a more detailed explanation of Camden's ch. 83b, see Stevenson, *Asser's Life*, p. 70.

³⁴⁴ Stevenson, *Asser's Life*, p. xxvi.

³⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, p. xxvi.

written about the time of Richard II, (1367-1400). Camden's source was never recovered, if it ever existed.

Francis Wise's edition, entitled *Annales Rerum Gestarum Ælfredi Magni, Auctore Asserio Menevensi*, was published in 1722 by the University of Cambridge Press in limited quantities. There were two versions: a normal sized copy was available for five shillings as well as large copies for ten.³⁴⁶ Keynes and Lapidge remark that Wise "did his best to distinguish between the genuine text and the later additions admitted by Parker and Camden, and he also made use of the extracts from Asser incorporated in the chronicle attributed to Florence of Worcester."³⁴⁷ In the view of Keynes and Lapidge, the aim of Wise's edition was to restore a kind of pure form of Asser's text, and to put to bed outstanding questions regarding Camden's interpolation.

Wise's edition was the first to attempt to reconcile many of the textual issues surrounding the witness of Cotton Otho A.xii. In the proposals for his edition, Wise claimed that he would collate all the extant manuscripts against Camden's and Parker's editions.³⁴⁸ Despite the intentions for the edition he had stated earlier, the textual undertaking to which Wise promised was never fully completed. Wise asked his friend, James Hill, to collate the readings of the single Cotton manuscript and report any irregularities back to him. It is clear that Hill had done so only at second hand, using, in fact, a copy of Camden's edition for his collation. Furthermore, it is W. H. Stevenson's view that while Hill had evidently consulted Cotton Otho A.xii for portions of Wise's edition, specifically for the making of his facsimile of the first page, Wise had never consulted the Cotton Otho A.xii manuscript directly; in fact Wise reproduces almost all of the

³⁴⁶ Gibson, "Francis Wise," pp. 173-195

³⁴⁷ Keynes and Lapidge, *Alfred the Great*, p. 226.

³⁴⁸ Gibson, "Francis Wise." p.174; Gibson states that Wise's proposals "were contained in a four-page leaflet stating that the work would be published from Camden's edition collated with that of Archbishop Parker and all the extant manuscripts, particularly with MS. Cotton Otho A.xii, an appendix being added in vindication of a passage relating to the antiquity of the University of Oxford."

errors of Parker's text.³⁴⁹ Stevenson finds that in chs. 56, 74, 97, 106, and in other instances Wise silently prints chapters containing Parker's alterations (see above).³⁵⁰ Hill's ability to distinguish different scribal hands was either poor, or Parker's secretary had been particularly gifted at forging script, as is claimed of Lyly in Parker's correspondence.

The evidence of phases of inscribing on, editing around, and physical interpolation into Cotton Otho A.xii reflects the general practice of Parker's publication program. Likewise, scholars and antiquaries who saw Cotton Otho A.xii before it was destroyed offer conflicting opinions as to which chapters had been copied out in an earlier hand. Wise's account only complicates our task of assigning passages to specific scribal hands due to overhanging doubts regarding the care he took in preparing his edition. He submits, furthermore, that the text of the *Vita Ælfredi* contained in the Cotton manuscript was, it appeared to him, the work of several scribes ["plures ... amanuenses" (Wise 137)], not just two, as other testimonials had claimed. And while there are several moments in his edition where he attempts to identify differing hands as recent (eleventh-century) or modern (sixteenth-century), given that he might not have seen the manuscript at all, these observations, we must conclude, do not carry much weight.

³⁴⁹ Stevenson, *Asser's Life*, p. xxix.

³⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

Chapter 5. Un-Editing Alfred: An Argument for a Parallel-Text Edition on Diplomatic Principles

What does an artifact gain when it receives the designation "genuine," and what does it lose? Is the artifact "genuine" in the sense that its historical value has been factually authenticated by means of set criteria (and what are those criteria?); or is "genuine" determined through the identification of what an author has intended to say and to mean? The term was certainly used by Whitelock as a stand-in for ownership: not ownership by the author, but by an idea of an author. It was used by Stevenson to indicate the potential of recovering the homogeneous work of Asser. We are left to ponder whether an assertion of the "genuine" references the figure of the Author or whether it is meant to refer to the *ipsissima verba* that the author is held to have written, or to both.

As we have now seen, editorial intentions with respect to representations of the *Vita Ælfredi* have been wide-ranging. Should an editor approach the text from the perspective of seeking to recover the voice of the Author, when that voice must be derived from a transmitted text that contains evident corruptions and interpolations? Should an editor cede control to the tyranny of the material documents, and reproduce those corruptions and interpolations precisely? Certainly, any sort of editorial intervention will always involve a certain reconstitution of significant textual authorities. This is what Jerome McGann means when discussing Edward Bulwer-Lytton's novel *Pelham*. Bulwer-Lytton revised the novel between early editions, and McGann views the critical response (the interpretive-event) of each revision as part of the responsibility of the editor. He states that,

Bulwer-Lytton introduced [these revisions] in response to pressures brought by some of his early readers and reviewers, so that, if later readers and critics see the matter

differently, one must judge that the question of authority has not been settled. The editor and textual critic is himself implicated in the determination of that authority.³⁵¹ Even though, for *Pelham*, there are processes of revision that critics may observe, that does not necessarily mean that in the absence of clear editorial divisions the disseminator, editor, and textual critic are not implicated in the determination of a text's authority. Quite the opposite: texts transmitted in medieval manuscripts, which generally come to be edited centuries after their initial inscription, come to us through the hands of scribes as "revised" works. These manuscript copies are not altogether wholly distinct from authorial and editorial revisions. Though the conditions and contexts of manuscript transmission clearly differ from the authorial revisions carried out to *Pelham*, the contributions of any actors who have participated in the transmission of a text have, inevitably, changed it. Even the smallest change to the material documents may influence the reader's perception of the whole. Below, I offer an example drawn from William H. Stevenson's 1904 edition of the *Vita*, in which Stevenson's chapter divisions may be rightly called an interpretive act.

Stevenson was the first editor of the *Vita Ælfredi* to provide chapter-numbers for the passages of Parker's transcript and the sections in Camden's edition, labeling the chronicle-derived and biographical material with numbers ranging from 1 to 106d. The salutation addressing Alfred is not numbered, and this may indicate that Stevenson considered this epistolary passage to exist outside the text of the work proper. To eleven of these chapters Stevenson assigns the designation *interpolatum* in his apparatus. Those chapters are regarded by Stevenson as additions having been introduced by either Parker or Camden into the sequence of passages derived from Cotton Otho A.xii. The chapters in question are 17b, 50b, c, and d, 53b

³⁵¹ McGann, *A Critique*, p. 85.

and c, 54b, 83b, 106b, c, and d. In Stevenson's scheme, each year of the annalistic material derived from the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* is usually given its own chapter division. When the annalistic entries become lengthier, Stevenson generally sub-the events of a single year into smaller chapters containing singular incidents. These mid-year divisions are usually marked by the appearance of rhetorical formulae, such as the frequently encountered phrases, *Eodem quoque anno* and *Eodem tempore*. Stevenson's chapter-numbers are, admittedly, mainly supplied as a matter of convenience. Thus, it is necessary to bear in mind that his choices are not necessarily intended to indicate stylistic divisions within the work going back to the Author: The chapter divisions, moreover, not are evidently intended to show how the *vita* may have been understood by its premodern readership, or its early modern editors, or even indicative of how Stevenson himself saw the text as being constituted. It is important to recognize that details of the content are therefore not closely connected to the chapter divisions introduced by Stevenson. In some cases, moreover, the heterogeneity of the content in certain chapters is highlighted by the chapter divisions, and the divisions thus draw our attention to the *textus receptus*'s idiosyncrasies.

Some of Stevenson's divisions, moreover, unintentionally obfuscate the varying genres of the prose that runs across the individual chapters and ultimately serves to lend the *Vita* its shape. The section of BL Cotton Otho A.xii that once contained a version of a *Vita Ælfredi regis*, as we have seen, offered a convergence of *res gestae* (mostly translated from the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*) and *vita* alleged to be from a contemporary of Alfred.³⁵² Setting aside the question of whether the biographical material was produced separately from the rendering of the *res gestae*, it is usually the *vita* matter, where the narrator becomes a subject commenting on his own

³⁵² A discussion of some of the formal attributes and the former critical perspective regarding Asser's method can be found in Schutt, "The Literary Form," pp. 209-220.

history, that garners the greatest amount of critical attention. Marie Schutt, for example, has stated that "[t]he directness and nearness to [Alfred] appears, in fact, to be the characteristic quality of Asser's way of telling his story" (218). It may be possible, however, to analyze parts of the *res gestae*, generally taken from the *ASC*, for evidence that the *vita* even here reveals a distinctive narratorial voice. Such evidence would typically lack the appearance of expressions in the first-person singular, such as we find in ch. 73 (*Igitur, ut ad id, unde digressus sum*, "Therefore, to return to the point whence I digressed"). The first-person pronouns going back to the *Chronicle* generally remain in the plural, a sort of collectively voiced annalistic mode. We must remain attentive to specific changes in the content of the *Chronicle*-derived material when we seek to establish whether there is an overarching narrative mode in the *Vita Ælfredi regis*. Does the idiosyncratic voice detected in the *vita* passages carry over to renderings of the *res gestae*? How have the details of the *Chronicle*-derived material changed once they have been translated into *res gestae*?

Given that the annalistic passages can to some extent be viewed as having originated in the ninth century, the detection of a characteristic style might throw light on the *textus receptus*'s relationship to the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. Furthermore, a comparison of the annalistic material as it appears in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* with the rendering of that matter in the *res gestae* may complement our consideration of the *Vita Ælfredi*'s role as a political text that possibly did circulate in the ninth century. While it is beyond the scope of this study to inquire too deeply into the political impact that circulating copies of the *Vita Ælfredi regis* might have had on local governments and political alliances—as we have little evidence for the circulation of these texts or their possible influence in Wales or Wessex during the ninth century—future research may

benefit from an analysis of the voices in the *Vita's* Latin renderings from the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*.

Subduing Guthrum: three campings and the centrality of Easter

Central to the concerns of the *res gestae* passages in the *textus receptus* are the conditions and legitimacy of Alfred's accession. In 871, in an account corresponding to Stevenson's ch. 41, Alfred is said to have taken over the kingdom of the West Saxons, whereupon his kingdom was immediately beset with problems. This was not, we are told, a result of any failings in Alfred's character or leadership. The narrator remarks that the state of his armies already had been left in disarray after the death of his brother Æthelred, and any blame for mismanagement should thus be placed on him. As the Old English text of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* tells us, Alfred struggles but manages a few victories against the Viking hosts. After several battles, Alfred subdues Guthrum, and in an historic moment, the Viking army offers hostages to the Anglo-Saxons. Alice Sheppard has suggested that the language and content of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* entry for 878, the entry that details Guthrum's submission, support a view that the surrounding annals used by the *ASC* annalist reinforce "the idea that 878 is the moment at which Alfred wins his kingdom" and where power in the region shifts decisively to Wessex.³⁵³ Sheppard argues that the *Vita Ælfredi regis* highlights these entries in passages of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* in order to emphasize the centrality of the relevance of loyalty to one's king and serve as an exemplary passage to the subjects of Alfred's kingdom.³⁵⁴ Building on this point, we might note that the characterization of this shift of power and importance of the submission are more subtly

³⁵³ Sheppard, *Families of the King*, p. 47.

³⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 68. Sheppard writes: "Personal instruction from the king reinforced the bond of lordship by emphasising the personal element of the political and social tie between king and man and in doing so confirms the ideological centrality of lordship in Alfred's kingdom."

orchestrated in the *textus receptus* than it is in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. This is especially evident in the material preceding the account of the submission, which is augmented rhetorically through an expansion of the details of the baptism of Guthrum. The section describing Guthrum's baptism in the *Vita Ælfredi regis* is indeed nearly double the length of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* entry. Additionally, the *Vita Ælfredi* emphasizes, conspicuously, the conditions that lay behind the increase in Alfred's regal power, and these developments are also anticipated as a shift in the central locus of that power. This shift of regional power to Wessex is occasioned in both *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* and *Vita Ælfredi* by Alfred's show of military prowess and regal mercy: Alfred no longer gives hostages to the Viking army (on the contrary, he receives some of Guthrum's men as hostages) and offers to take Guthrum as his adopted son to enforce the bond between them.

The account of Guthrum's baptism and the surrounding matter going back to the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* are rendered expansively in the *Vita Ælfredi regis*. In some cases, the *textus receptus* offers more concrete facts that relate directly to the circumstances of the baptism. For example, the *Vita Ælfredi* states Guthrum and his men remained with Alfred for eight days before he was baptized, a statement that is not precedent in the *Chronicle*. While the terms of Alfred's pardon of Guthrum result in the king becoming the adoptive father of the Danish leader, they additionally link the two men with respect to their lordship and in spiritual kinship (47). If the wording of this passage seeks to elaborate the diction of the *Chronicle* with the intention of displaying a particular type of *elocutio*, a crucial year has been chosen in which to do so. Just as Alfred's defeat of the Viking army signals a shift in domestic military success, so too does it signal a shift in Alfred's command of his kingdom. As I will demonstrate below, moreover, the *Vita Ælfredi* seems to reflect more interest in the rhetorical unification of the surrounding

passages than does the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, and the *elocutio* becomes even more clearly visible against the background of the longer Latin tradition.

The *Vita*'s treatment of the events preceding Guthrum's baptism is characterized by repetition of certain phrases as well as enhancements of the larger structure. These serve to connect the significance of lordship and spiritual kinship to the Resurrection, a day that appears to mark the inevitability of Alfred's accession. This thematic unification invites us to read against the editorial chapter divisions and to question whether the structuring that Stevenson has given it is serving to break up the *elocutio*. The editorial chapter-numbers are modern conveniences, of course, but they should not distract (or obscure) us from the likelihood that chs. 55 and 56 are meant to be read together as a unit. The continuity of this section contributes to our understanding of these events as the culmination of Alfred's rise to power in the early years of his reign.

In ch. 55, when Alfred joins his army with the inhabitants of Hampshire at Egbert's Stone, the *Vita Ælfredi* has the reading,

visoque rege, sicut dignum erat, quasi redivivum post tantas tribulationes recipientes,
immenso repleti sunt gaudio, et ibi castra metati sunt una nocte.³⁵⁵

Alfred's described rejuvenation from his illnesses is punctuated by the action of his army's pitching camp (*et ibi castra metati sunt una nocte*), which is the first in a series of three passages describing encampment, and comes at the end of Stevenson's chapter. Following this, the phrase repeats, punctuating the end of Alfred's arrival with his army at Aclea:

³⁵⁵ "When they saw the king, as he was, restored to life after receiving many afflictions, they were filled with an immense joy, and there they made camp for one night."

Diluculo sequenti illucescente, rex inde castra commovens, venit ad locum, qui dicitur Æclea, et ibi una nocte castra metatus est.³⁵⁶

The repeated phrase is essentially formulaic, but in the second case it is elaborated conspicuously. The army's movements are described repeatedly, like fingers rapping on a door, suggesting the anticipatory quality of the moment. The conflict has essentially been alluded to before the battle has occurred. Stevenson inserts a chapter break here, but the sense of the passage continues as the details of the previous campaign is repeated in the following chapter.

The account of the arrival of Alfred at Aclea in ch. 55 is effectively doubled, and greatly expanded in length, in ch. 56, and the account of the third encampment comes anticipatorily, like a breath being held and then exhaled, after Alfred's arrival at Edington, where he pursues the host to the gates of their stronghold and camps boldly in front of it:

Inde sequenti mane illucescente vexilla commovens ad locum, qui dicitur Ethandun, venit, et contra universum paganorum exercitum cum densa testudine atrociter belligerans, animoseque diu persistens, divino nutu, tandem victoria potitus, paganos maxima caede prostravit, et fugientes usque ad arcem percutiens persecutus est, et omnia, quae extra arcem invenit, homines scilicet et equos et pecora, confestim caedens homines, surripuit, et ante portas paganicae arcis cum omni exercitu suo viriliter castra metatus est.³⁵⁷

³⁵⁶ "Early in the morning on the next daybreak, the king thence stirring the camp, he went to the place, that is called Aclea, and there they made camp for one night."

³⁵⁷ "When the next morning dawned he moved his forces and came to a place called Edington, and fighting fiercely with a compact shield-wall against the entire Viking army, he persevered resolutely for a long time; at length he gained the victory through God's will. He destroyed the Vikings with great slaughter, and pursued those who fled as far as the stronghold, hacking them down; he seized everything which he found outside the stronghold—men (whom he killed immediately), horses and cattle—and boldly made camp in front of the gates of the Viking stronghold with all his army" (trans Keyens and Lapidge, *Alfred the Great* 84-85).

The passage in the *Vita Ælfredi* renders single account of the campaign and elaborates what appears in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. It starts with the first encampment, detailing a bodily restoration for Alfred ("*quasi redivivum post tantas tribulationes recipientes*"³⁵⁸ derived from the Old English "*7 his gefaegene waerun*"³⁵⁹). His army is stirred by Alfred in the second campaign (*commovens*) to Aclea, and stirred finally into battle near Edington. The *Vita's* enhancements to the *Chronicle*-derived matter offers more than a mere reinforcement of the social and political bond between Guthrum and Alfred, as Sheppard has argued.

The pattern evident in the entries for year 878 may be viewed additionally, I would argue, in light of the *Vita's* elaborations and the *elocutio* of its narrative voice. In point of fact, the similarities are too many between the second and third camping to suggest that there is no *elocutio* in the verbal parallels, or no relevance to the verbal construction of these chapters. The verbal phrasing of the latter two campings ("*sequenti... illucescente... commovens... ad locum... qui dicitur... castra metatus est*") is the shell in which the narratological voice can be applied. Thus, the account of the battle of Edington can be seen as a purposeful repetition of the encampment formula, a sustained retelling, with elaboration of the verbiage from the second camping. Even though the description of the third camping contains similar verbiage albeit with new details added, it is not a rote retelling, but offers an active, coordinated rhetorical enhancement. The passages corresponding to Stevenson's ch. 56, therefore, augment the verbiage of ch. 55. Due to their close proximity, the repetitions intensify the *res gestae*, an otherwise straightforward but clearly not word-for-word translation of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, until

³⁵⁸ "restored to life after receiving many afflictions" is elaborated from the *Chronicle's* "and his devil glad."

³⁵⁹ "And they were rejoicing."

they swell like waves into the crashing of not water, but of the Anglo-Saxon warriors' shield-wall of metal and wood ("*densa testudine*"³⁶⁰).

The account of Alfred's attack and subsequent victory at Edington against the Vikings at their stronghold concludes with Guthrum baptized and adopted by Alfred's as his son. This detail serves to punctuate a section that—not insignificantly—begins *post Pascha*. The multiple allusions to Easter in the *Vita* are typically perfunctory. In all instances, references to Easter appear with little elaboration or embellishment. Easter is referenced, nevertheless, throughout the Alfred sections of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* and in the *Vita*. More specifically, dates of Easter frame the action of Alfred's accession. Beginning in the year 853, after Easter, Æthelwulf marries his daughter to Burgred, King of Mercia. In the year 855, Æthelwulf dictates that that each year one hundred mancuses be set aside to fill oil of the lamps in Rome on Easter eve (which appears to originate from the *Vita Ælfredi*). Alfred's brother Æthelred dies just after Easter,³⁶¹ in the year 871, and soon after that Alfred ascends the throne. The highlighting of the significance of these events at or around Easter culminates with Alfred's baptism of Guthrum, in the year 878 (Stevenson's chs. 52-56), concluding the action begun by Alfred's father in 855.

These references to Easter, then, serve to remind the reader that while Alfred is a combative king who leads his men into battle against their enemies, he is also a Christian king who is capable of forgiving his opponents once they have undertaken a conversion ("*quibus acceptis, pagani insuper iuraverunt se citissime de suo regno exituros, necnon et Godrum, rex eorum, Christianitatem sibire <sic> et baptismum sub manu Alfreði regis accipere promisit*"³⁶²).

³⁶⁰ A "thick tortoise (shell)."

³⁶¹ Stevenson says: "Florence of Worcester adds the date of the death of Æthelred"

³⁶² "When they had been handed over, the Vikings swore in addition that they would leave his kingdom immediately, and Guthrum, their king, promised to accept Christianity and to receive baptism at King Alfred's hand" (trans. Keynes and Lapidge, *Alfred the Great*. 85).

Comparable to the depiction of the king in the biographical passages, the temporal marker of Easter serves to orientate the reader toward Alfred's piety. Even in the *res gestae* passages, the significance of his struggles against the pagan armies is highlighted as a way to introduce his unbending concern with religious matters. It is not merely Alfred's military prowess that gives him his power, the *textus receptus* reveals, but his ability to transcend the military life once it is no longer forced upon him. For example, in ch. 99, Alfred is said to have turned to matters of the soul only after he has taken care of administrative matters in his kingdom. It is in this verbal plan, however, this framing of secular within spiritual, that we see the characteristic *elocutio* of the *Vita Ælfredi regis* affecting a wide range of sections in the *textus receptus*.

What is more unusual, but possibly more gratifying for critics who wish to read the *Vita Ælfredi* as a repository of rhetorical gestures, is that the chapters I have analyzed above (that is to say, Stevenson's chs. 52-56), collectively, serve to retain the voice of the chronicler—they retain first-person plural pronouns that indicate this mode of writing. In effect, the narrative voice maintains an objective distance from its subject. That is to more clearly state, while Schutt suggests that "[the narrator's] way of telling his story" is in the nearness to its subject, when in the *vita*-linked, or biographical, mode, we are still clearly experiencing a "telling" by the voice, firmly ensconced in the *res gestae* material, even whilst at a distance from the subject (Alfred). These rhetorical features viewed critically as a way to organize these multiple voices, may not match the characteristic voice of the "Asser" posited by Schutt and others, but neither one is any less relevant than the other to the discussion of the authorization and accepted generic forms in the *textus receptus*.

Accommodating heterogeneity: translations and editions after Stevenson

What this qualitative study of the genres, conditions of transmission, and editions has been concerned with, above all, has been to demonstrate the heterogeneity of the *textus receptus* of the *Vita Ælfredi regis*. Efforts to accommodate heterogeneity into editions range from substandard, as in the case of Wise's ostensibly critical but ultimately indiscriminating edition, to laudable, as in the case of Stevenson's far-reaching study. Still, the existing editions have, on the whole, left the textual tradition out of these presentations of the text. The closest attempt at depicting a visual key to the relationship between the texts of the *Vita Ælfredi* is the now outdated parallel text translation of the chroniclers who drew from the *Vita Ælfredi*, first printed in 1863, by J. A. Giles.³⁶³ Giles utilizes separate columns for his translations from the *Vita Ælfredi* (titled simply as "Asser"), the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, Æthelweard's chronicle, the *Chronica chronicarum*, Henry of Huntington's chronicle, and the *Historia regum*. Giles makes no attempt to document the editions (or manuscripts) he is drawing on for his translation. Whether his "Asser" is ultimately from Henry Petrie's *Monumenta Historica Britannica* (which Giles mentions in the context of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*) or one of the transcripts is not clear. Concerning the effort as a whole, there is not much to praise; Giles transfers conflated *Vita* passages present in the *Chronica chronicarum* and *Historia regum* so that they agree with the text of *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, which misrepresents those passages (and he doesn't explain where in the sources those passages are found). The translation homogenizes the relationships in order to demonstrate its harmony. "In the 'Harmony'," writes Giles, "their narratives will be arranged in parallel columns; for which mode of treatment, they are admirably adapted by the tabular form of annals into which they were originally thrown by their authors" (5). The multiple

³⁶³ Giles, "Harmony of the Chroniclers," pp. 1-128.

columns conflate into one when "harmony" is achieved. Due to the organization of the columns, it is impossible to show how two texts on opposite sides of the page might "harmonize." The translation may be useful for showing a general relationship between the chroniclers' versions, but the translation ultimately has limited value as a scholarly resource (except if one were studying the idiosyncrasies present in mid-nineteenth-century translation practice). By Giles' own admission the "Harmony" is "intended for historical and not philological purposes" (7), so perhaps we should not expect too much from it.³⁶⁴ Ultimately, the translations are of dubious historical value. Still, Giles's translation is striking because it shows that there was a critical need, during the mid-nineteenth century, for a parallel-text edition of the *Vita*. What it required was a more discerning eye than that of Dr. Giles.³⁶⁵

Certainly, there are fundamentally different purposes and uses for translations and editions, and I do not intend to conflate the two. Simon Keynes and Michael Lapidge's translation, for example, has been exceptionally helpful in bringing the difficulties of the manuscript tradition to the forefront of Alfredian scholarship, whilst offering a very readable and teachable text of the *Vita Ælfredi*. It does not pretend to be a substitute for the Latin—and no translation can provide an adequate substitute for the original language—but it has drawn attention to the complexities of the Latin.

Accommodating the heterogeneity and inconsistencies of the transmission history of the *Vita* is by no means an easy task. The challenge presented to an editor operating in a "variorum" tradition would be in reproducing readings of all texts of the Alfred dossier so that they might be

³⁶⁴ It was overshadowed by Stevenson's massive edition some forty years later.

³⁶⁵ It is regrettable that Giles' translation, due to it being out-of-copyright, is the most readily available translation that may be found online. The *OMACL* (*The Online Medieval & Classical Library*) archives a text of Giles' translation, taken from the parallel-text version. It is viewable here: <<http://omacl.org/KingAlfred/>>. Subsequently, a student may download a LibriVox recording of Giles' translation (<<https://librivox.org/alfred-the-great-by-asser/>>) read by R. S. Steinberg.

compared and studied. Cross-textual relationships would thus be less likely to be obfuscated by a tyrannical copy-text. That is to more clearly say: this edition would reproduce manuscript readings entirely, and would not intervene to correct Latin forms, remove problematical readings, and excise chapters that might be labeled "not genuine." Such an edition would do this so that it may be studied, and so the reader less frequently would have need to turn to the medieval source (though the availability of that source will always remain valuable).

The editor would have to choose a format that openly participates in a discourse of ontology, one that embraces and addresses the inescapability of an edition's ideological fittings, such as those which I have discussed in more detail in Chapter 1. The need is great, and perhaps the time is right, for a Latin parallel-text edition of the *Vita Ælfredi* (and with *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* passages in parallel). Much of this need has been due, I have argued, to the lack of certainty regarding the finality of the *Vita Ælfredi*, and the condition of the text that was contained in BL Cotton Otho A.xii. Furthermore, reconstruction of textual forms should not be the goal of this edition (nor is it the goal of the edition below). While reconstruction of the lost readings of the Cottonian manuscript in their entirety is a noble goal, as there will always remain dissatisfaction with certain readings in *texti recepti*, absolute fidelity of reconstruction is not a realistic goal with the available textual evidence. The edition may comment on potential readings and the evidence for these, but the edition would not offer them as part of its archive. The edition would be most accurately called "documentary" in its editorial bias.

The future of the Alfred dossier: a case for a digital edition

There is an argument to be made that the kind of edition of which I have been discussing would be more suitable to the digital medium. This, I feel, is a legitimate point that needs to be

addressed. A digital edition would allow for a more user-centered interface with the dossier of texts under scrutiny. With regards to the resizing of text, side-by-side display of passages from several sources, hypertext linking, and the integration of an apparatus of references, a digital edition may help shortcut the difficulties inherent to studying and working with print editions of the Alfred dossier.

The *Piers Plowman Electronic Archive*³⁶⁶ offers a striking example of the success of collecting many curated digital editions in the digital format. The many edited manuscripts of the B-Text of *Piers Plowman* may be viewed in several "stylesheets" (text formatting): "Diplomatic," in which the text is displayed just as it appears in the manuscript; "scribal," in which the text is displayed as in the manuscript, but with certain editorial interventions such as text color-coding and information on certain readings; "Critical," in which the editors link to other readings, provide notes, and attempt to reconstruct the scribe's original intentions; and "All Views," which is a combination of all previously discussed views. There is great value in the ability to format the digital text, including, but not limited to, the comparison of manuscript readings and critical renderings, the immediate access to commentary, and the ability to be linked to a source or discussion. It allows the critical edition to coexist beside the documentary edition, essential for the destabilization of editorial authority. Hoyt Duggan, a founding director of the *PPEA*, writes on the validity of digital editions in 2007 that "[a]n electronic edition does not suppress editorial disagreement or impose spurious notions of authority, as printed editions often tend to do. Instead, it embraces the provisional nature of scholarly editing."³⁶⁷ Indeed, these "notions of authority" in the print editions of the *Vita Ælfredi*, which I have now gone on about at some length, may still nonetheless be present in a digital edition. Yet, the format of digital allows

³⁶⁶ <<http://piers.iath.virginia.edu/index.html>>.

³⁶⁷ Hoyt's description of the *PPEA* is archived on the TEI website: <http://www.tei-c.org/Activities/Projects/pi01.xml>

for data to be more easily compared, moved, and exchanged, and because of this, digital editions tend to be viewed as more democratic than their print cousins. Because a text in digital is not fixed like a print text (as the digital text can be changed, commented on, or repositioned in space by the user, and it can allow researchers access to useful metadata), readers are not usually beholden to a single text and its dictatorial editor.

That should not be taken to mean that all digital archives or editions are created equally. On the contrary, we may briefly tour the available digital editions of the *Vita Ælfredi* to get a sense for the challenges with reproducing it online, and we may get a sense for the desperate critical need for a new comprehensive digital edition. Presently, there are two digital Latin editions of the *Vita* available. One is available through *The Latin Library* and the other is available through *IntraText*.

The Latin Library website contains dozens of medieval Latin and classical Latin texts. Each text's source at this site is of dubious origin. On the "About These Texts..." page we learn from the curator that "[o]ccasionally texts are submitted by contributors or discovered on the Internet without indication of the edition from which they derive. If I am unable to identify the edition (which is often the case), I have attempted, if feasible, to conform the text to an out-of-copyright edition."³⁶⁸ The edition of the *Vita* given is one of those texts that has not been identified by the curator. It is Stevenson's edition with text in square brackets and interpolations from the sixteenth century removed. We are also told that many errors remain in these documents because they have been taken "as is"³⁶⁹ or as they had been submitted. The site offers no

³⁶⁸ <<http://www.thelatinlibrary.com/about.html>>.

³⁶⁹ On the "Credits" page we learn that the text titled *de rebus gestis Alfredi* had been submitted by one, Sally Winchester, who had evidently been the one to remove undesirable text from Stevenson's edition.

interactive or reader-curated content. It does not recognize variant readings or any of the copyists' texts. It could have been inscribed on a rock instead of being digitized on a website.

The *IntraText* edition³⁷⁰ also appears to derive from Stevenson's edition, even though the printed source for this edition is stated to be "not available." Regarding its source, the curator states that "[t]he electronic transcription of this text, available on several Web sites, has been amended and fully integrated by the IntraText editorial staff." The text, on the whole, appears to be identical to the *Latin Library* version, as readings that Stevenson included in square brackets and spurious chapters that Stevenson identified as sixteenth-century interpolations have been removed from it. Unfortunate to say, this edition appears to have been abandoned by the "*IntraText* editorial staff," and I do not have high hopes that it will ever be returned to.³⁷¹

The *IntraText* edition does have several features that better utilize the digital format than had the *Latin Library* edition. Most (but not all) of the Latin words in each chapter hyperlink to an individuated page which presents a collection of every instance of that word-form present in the concordance. In this hyperlinked page, *IntraText* places the selected Latin word within its context within the surrounding words from the chapter. In addition, it lists each chapter in which an instance of that word occurs. Furthermore, the *IntraText* offers an alphabetic reference for other Latin words like the one hyperlinked. Besides the ability to list all words in the text alphabetically, the edition also allows words to be sorted by length and frequency. The "Statistics" page offers a collection of the aforementioned data, including the frequency and length of words. As though in an extreme idealization of Stevenson's chapter separations, the *IntraText* only allows one chapter to be displayed on a browser tab at a given moment. What the *IntraText* Stevenson offers, then, is an idealized, quantitative Latin edition of the *Vita Ælfredi*.

³⁷⁰ This edition may be found here: <http://www.intratext.com/IXT/LAT0472/_INDEX.HTM#fonte>.

³⁷¹ The last update appears to be, as of this writing, July 19, 2007.

Scholars, then, are left with no high-quality digital edition that represents the textual reality of the Alfred dossier. Both of these online Latin editions offer no judgment on textual emendations, on Latin phrases, and on chapter inclusions and exclusions, and they fail to account for the circumstances and conditions of the materials from which they're drawing. Besides the immediate need for an updated Latin edition in print, there is pressing demand for a poly-textual, digital edition that would aid in the comparison of the many texts of the Alfred dossier. If we cannot see clearly texts under our feet, we will be walking the path we have chosen to tread indefinitely.

The Alfred dossier of diplomatic texts: *Vita Ælfredi regis*

Collated below are many significant documents in the Alfred dossier, excluding those derivative manuscripts or sources where appropriate, notably the edition of Matthew Parker, which is readily available. The *Historia Regum* (SD1) has been collated within the current print format; however, it often deviates from the Parker transcripts and John of Worcester's Chronicle or the *Chronica chronicarum* (JoW), offering interpretive readings, emendations, and excisions. These deviations are noted where possible. Passages in witnesses of matter strictly unrelated to the Alfred dossier have been omitted. The polytextual edition that follows reproduces the orthography of personal- and place-names present in the source texts in order to better facilitate their study and to disrupt the chain of academic requirements that inevitably leads the reader back to the original documents. Direct consultation of the manuscripts, of course, is still the best source for the information on the Alfred dossier, recommended to those specifically interested in palaeographical, textual, and orthographic signs.

Given that our modern sensibilities can accommodate some modification to letter-forms, the following edition standardizes a limited number of orthographic readings from the writers of the present sources: "u" has been normalized to "v" when it is more correct (as in "vivere" where it had been inscribed "uiuere"), and "v" has been normalized to "u" when "u" is more fitting to the sense of the word (as in "Ubi" where the reading is "Vbi"). Forms of "ę" frequently found in the *Annales S. Neoti* are rendered here as "e." Letter-forms that are often written interchangeably as "AE," "Æ," specifically in names like *Ælfredi* or *Ætheredi*, given that it is sometimes difficult to determine whether the letters are meant to be joined, are have been standardized as "Æ." Otherwise, all other proper-name inscriptions have been retained in the following edition. For example, the first letter of king Alfred's name is sometimes inscribed in the witnesses with the letter "E" as in "Elfred" and at other times "A," these orthographic readings have been retained, as have the Anglo-Saxon characters "ð" (eth) and "þ" (thorn)—any instances where "ð" or "þ" is expected but given as "th" I reproduced here exactly. Suspensions and abbreviation marks present in the source texts have been expanded for simplicity (such as "xpīanorū" as "Christianorum"), except in special instances where the sense is unusual or unclear (these are noted). Forms of "i" have not been changed to "j", as Francis Wise has done in his edition. Sometimes sources would produce "jj" or "ij" (stylistic flourishes), but these have been standardized to "ii." (Wise's edition's "j" forms have been retained for posterity.) This is the extent of the standardizations that I have allowed myself for use the present edition. Word endings, such as "a" vs "æ," where evidently written, have not been changed or standardized, due to the presence of regionalisms. Source inscriptions of "Uu," primarily in place-and-personal-names have been retained, not standardized to "w," as would be more common to modern readers; this is due to the fact that the readings present in the dossier deviate frequently (for

example, "w" being rendered in the source as single-"u"), and this may, in some cases, and as with the other retained letter-forms in the following diplomatic edition, indicate that reading's textual derivation or regionalisms (or simply a scribal tendency).

Italics present in Stevenson's edition are retained in our collation to denote where he marks readings in the Co transcript (Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, MS 100) are not present in the *Chronica chronicarum* (here represented by MS Bodley 157, the principal manuscript used by the Worcester scribes) attributed to John of Worcester. It must be noted, that the text of the *Chornica Chronicarum* utilized by Stevenson for his edition was clearly not MS Bodley 157, but was another derivative manuscript, likely MS Bodley 297 (from which he derives the interlined "qui fuit Iared" for purposes of comparison [ch.1,40]). The evidence that one might amass with our present collation to prove this is quite substantial. For just one example, we have the reading of "Seth" (ch. 1,39) given by Stevenson's edition for the *Chronica chronicarum*. The name "Seth" occurs twice in Parker's transcript (Co). First it is written following "Bedwig" and again preceding "Adam." This first "Seth" appears as "Sem" in the principal manuscript of the *Chronica chronicarum* (Oxford, MS Bodley 157), but "Seth", as indicated by Stevenson, in several derivative copies (Dublin, Trinity College MS 502; London, Lambeth Palace MS 42; Oxford, MS Bodley 297; and Cambridge, Corpus Christi MS 92). This is an indication that Stevenson had based his edition on a derivative manuscript of the *Chronica*, and not the principal manuscript, which had made this correction. The principal manuscript, MS Bodley 157, was made in the mid-twelfth century at Worcester Cathedral Priory. Throughout the manuscript there are numerous signs of erasure—these indicate a late stage revision by the "C³" scribe (known to us as John of Worcester)—as well as more modern highlights that resemble Matthew Parker's ochre pencil markings from the Co transcript. In MS Bodley 157, there is erasure under the first

"Sem" in Alfred's genealogy, and "Sem" appears to have been written in over the erasure. This revision was not given much care. Lexigraphically, the leftmost stem in the -m- does not extend to connect with the first shoulder, giving it the appearance of "Sein." Stevenson evidently used one of the derivative manuscripts of the *Chronica* for his collation, and not MS Bodley 157, or else it is possible he collated the witnesses quantitatively instead of genetically.

Whether or not the Cotton manuscript reading was "Sem" or "Seth" is difficult to evaluate given contradictory manuscript evidence. Wise's edition, which purports to have witnessed BL Cotton Otho A.xii, agrees with MS Bodley 157 and has the reading "Sem." The *Historia Regum*, the earliest known witness to the *vita*, also has the reading "Sem." It is possible, the C³ scribe revised the reading "Sem" to bring it in line with the Vulgate, Luke iii, 36-38.³⁷² The derivative transcripts, Ar and B, each supply "Seth." Stevenson suggests that B was copied from Cotton Otho A.xii after several interpolations had been added to it, but his evidence (see Chapter 1) is problematic, and B may have been copied, partially, from Co. I suspect that "Seth" was the reading in the Cottonian manuscript, but evidence, on close examination, is inconclusive and it may, in fact, have been "Sem." Keynes and Lapidge, following Stevenson, take the reading "Seth" for their translation, but they do not comment on this choice.

Where a reading in this diplomatic edition is indicated by a blank space, the reading in the current source is identical in orthography to the reading in Stevenson's edition. Omission of a reading where compared to Stevenson's edition is indicated by hyphen "-", and where a whole line from one source of the Alfred dossier is missing the source is entirely omitted from that line of the edition. Stevenson's and Wise's punctuation/spelling has been reproduced exactly (except

³⁷² See Keynes and Lapidge, *Alfred the Great*, pp. 228-229, fn. 4.

where above noted). Indication of substantial punctuation or capitalization can be found in the footnotes/appendices.

The goal of this *apparatus diplomaticus* is to present an accurate basis for future study of the Alfred dossier. This dossier of diplomatic texts is organized around Stevenson's edition, with his chapters and line numbers so that students can quickly reference the work in question. While I have some personal concerns about Stevenson's chapter breaks, I believe it is more relevant to standardize the chapters to aid study. Stevenson's edition allows us a point of scholarly reference for early-sixteenth and late-eighteenth/early-nineteenth-century study of the Alfred dossier, but it is far from complete. Locations of Stevenson's errors are marked with a dagger (†) and the correct reading is given in the cell in question.

One should not hope to completely reconstruct the lost Cotton Otho A.xii, but to illustrate the manuscript's irregularities, complications, and relationships as accurately as possible, given the materials as one's disposal. This collation aims to be supplementary, not exhaustive. It does provide, one hopes, a new standard for comparative analysis of the *Vita Ælfredi*.

Abbreviations

Transcripts consulted:

Co - Parker transcript, Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, MS 100.

Ar - Arundel transcript, University Library, Cambridge, Add. 3825.

B - British Library transcript, British Library Cotton Otho A.xii*.

Primary Medieval Witnesses consulted:

JoW - *Chronica chronicarum*, MS Bodley 157.

ASN - *Annales S. Neoti*, Trinity College, Cambridge, MS R.7.28.

SD1 - *Historia Regum*, Corpus Christi College, Cambridge MS 139. ff. 69r-76v.

Secondary Medieval Witnesses consulted:

SD2 - Symeon's Recapitulation, Corpus Christi College, Cambridge MS 139. ff. 77r-83r.

GC - *Vita S. Æthelberti* by Giraldus Cambrensis (Girard Sylvester of Wales), Trinity College, Cambridge B.11.16. ff. 77v-98r (material likely derived from *Annales S.*

Neoti {possibly Trinity College, Cambridge, MS R.7.28; see Chapter 2}: ff. 94v-95r)

Editions consulted:

St - *Asser's Life of King Alfred*. Ed. William H. Stevenson, 1904.

W - *Annales rerum gestarum Ælfredi Magni, auctore Asserio Menevensi*. Ed. Francis Wise, 1722.

Other references that do not appear in the collation:

P - *Ælfredi regis res gestae*, Ed. Matthew Parker, 1574.

C - "Asserus de Ælfredi Rebus Gestis" in *Anglica, Normannica, Hibernica...* Ed. Camden, 1602-3.

Taxonomy of Symbols:

- ... reading not present in this text.
- † ... denotes the location of an error in Stevenson's edition. The reading is either not given by Stevenson or is indicated incorrectly. I have given the correct reading.
- ‡‡ ... passage is corrupt in the manuscript and may be a variant reading
- ⌈ ... the reading, in the form of an entire chapter or extended passage, is present and has been transposed by its copyist to a later position in this manuscript tradition. I have restored that passage to its location for comparison.
- (-)↑5 ... indicates that the corroborative reading is given in another line. An arrow up (i.e. "given above") or arrow down (i.e. "given below") is present to aid the reader's location of the corroborative reading. If an arrow up or down is followed by a single number, this indicates that the reader is instructed to consult the line indicated in the present chapter (in this example, line five of the present chapter). An arrow up or down that is followed by two numbers separated by a comma indicates that the corroborative reading may be found in a preceding or subsequent chapter with its corresponding line number; [e.g. (-)↑2,5 indicates that the comparable reading may be found in ch. 2, ln. 5, which is above the reader's current position.]
- (-)→ or (-)← ...indicates that the corroborative reading is present in the current line; the arrow directs the reader in which direction she may find it.

[Asserius de rebus gestis Ælfredi]³⁷³

[0 (epistolary dedication to Alfred), 1]³⁷⁴

| | | | | | |
|---------------------|----------------|------------|-------------------|-------------------|---------------|
| St | <i>Domino</i> | <i>meo</i> | <i>venerabili</i> | <i>piisimoque</i> | <i>omnium</i> |
| Hill ³⁷⁵ | | | | | |
| Co | ³⁷⁶ | | | <i>pussimoque</i> | |
| B | | | | | |
| Ar | ³⁷⁷ | | | | |
| W | | | | | |

[0,2]

| | | | | | |
|------|-------------------|----------------|----------------------|-----------------|----------------|
| St | <i>Britanniae</i> | <i>insulae</i> | <i>Christianorum</i> | <i>rectori,</i> | <i>Ælfred,</i> |
| Hill | Britannie | | | | |
| Co | | | ³⁷⁸ | | |
| B | Britannia | | | | Alfred |
| Ar | Britanniae | | | | |
| W | Britannie | insule | | | |

[0,3]

| | | | | | | |
|------|-----------------|----------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------|
| St | <i>Anglorum</i> | <i>Saxonum</i> | <i>regi,</i> | <i>Asser,</i> | <i>omnium</i> | <i>servorum</i> |
| Hill | | | | | | |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | |

[0,4]

| | | | | | | |
|------|------------|-----------------|-------------------|-----------|-------------|---------------------|
| St | <i>Dei</i> | <i>ultimus,</i> | <i>millemodam</i> | <i>ad</i> | <i>vota</i> | <i>desideriorum</i> |
| Hill | | | | | | |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | |

[0,5]

| | | | |
|------|------------------|--------------|-----------------------|
| St | <i>utriusque</i> | <i>vitae</i> | <i>prosperitatem.</i> |
| Hill | | | |
| Co | | vite | |
| B | | | |
| Ar | | | |
| W | | | |

³⁷³ Co: Alfredi res gestae authore Asser

³⁷⁴ Chapter organization is based on Stevenson. The form is [Chapter, Line].

³⁷⁵ James Hill's facsimile of first page.

³⁷⁶ Before this reading is, "Ælfredi Res gestae authore J[erased] asser"

³⁷⁷ "Arundel" written at the top of the page. "Add. 3825" in the right margin. No title.

³⁷⁸ There is an unusual variant on the shorthand for 'Christianorum' here.

[1,1]

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------|------|----|-----------|---------------|------|--------------|---------|-----|-------|---|----------|
| St | Anno | - | Dominicae | Incarnationis | - | DCCCXLIX | - | - | - | - | - |
| Hill | | - | | | - | | - | - | - | - | - |
| Co | | - | | | - | | - | - | - | - | - |
| B | | - | | | - | 849 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ar | | | | | - | 849 | - | - | - | - | - |
| W | | - | | | - | | - | - | - | - | - |
| SD1 | - | - | - | - | - | | exortum | est | lumen | e | tenebris |
| SD2 | | ab | - | Incarnationem | deum | dccc.xl viii | exortum | est | lumen | e | tenebris |

| | | | | | |
|------|---------------|-----|----------|--------------|-------|
| St | - | - | - | - | natus |
| Hill | - | - | - | - | |
| Co | - | - | - | - | |
| B | - | - | - | - | |
| Ar | - | - | - | - | |
| W | - | - | - | - | |
| SD1 | (-)→ | - | Elfredus | Rex Anglorum | |
| SD2 | Angul saxonum | Rex | Elfredus | - | - |
| JoW | Angul saxonum | Rex | Ælfredus | - | - |

[1,2]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|------|-----|---------|------------------|-------|----|---------|-------|--------|------|
| St | est | Ælfred, | Angul-Saxonum | rex, | in | - | villa | regia, | quae |
| Hill | | | Angul saxonum | | | - | | | |
| Co | | | Angulsaxonum | | | - | | | |
| B | | Alfred | Anglorum Saxonum | | | - | | | |
| Ar | | | Angulsaxonum | | | - | | | |
| W | | | Angulsaxonum | | | - | | | |
| SD1 | | (-)↑1 | (-)↑1 | (-)↑1 | | regalia | | - | |

[1,3]

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------|---------------------|--------------------------|----|------|-------|------|-----------|----|--------|-----------|------------|
| St | dicitur | Uuanating, | in | illa | paga, | quae | nominatur | - | - | - | - |
| Hill | | uuanating ³⁷⁹ | | | | que | | - | - | - | - |
| Co | diu~ ³⁸⁰ | Wanating | | | | que | | - | - | - | - |
| B | | Wanating | | | | | | - | - | - | - |
| Ar | | | | | | | | - | - | - | - |
| W | | | | | | | | - | - | - | - |
| SD1 | (-)→ | (-)→ | - | - | - | - | - | ab | Anglis | Wanetinge | appellatur |
| SD2 | - | - | | | plaga | que | | - | - | - | - |
| JoW | - ³⁸¹ | - | | | | que | | - | - | - | - |

³⁷⁹ I have left this word lower-cased, as it is clearly inscribed that way in Hill's transcription.

³⁸⁰ The reading in Co is an unusual contraction of "dicitur."

³⁸¹ In John of Worcester, MS Bodley 297 p. 294; the lower margin of the right column contains the phrase "In uilla regia quae uocatur est Wanetinge," which is a version of Co except for the variant "uocatur." The variant may be due to a corruption in the Cotton Otho A.xii. The variant spelling of Wantage, however, is closest in spelling to SD1.

[1,4]

| | | | | | | | |
|------|--------------|------|------|---------|---------|---|--------|
| St | Berrocscire: | quae | paga | taliter | vocatur | a | Berroc |
| Hill | | que | | | | | |
| Co | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | |
| Ar | Berrocshire | | | | | | |
| W | Berrocsc | | | | | | |
| SD1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| SD2 | Barrocscire | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| JoW | | - | - | - | - | - | - |

[1,5]

| | | | | | | |
|------|--------|-----|-------|------------------|-----------|-------|
| St | silva, | ubi | buxus | abundantissime | nascitur. | Cuius |
| Hill | | | | babundaneissime | nasettur | |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | habuntantissime† | | |
| W | | | | | | |
| SD1 | - | - | - | - | - | |
| SD2 | - | - | - | - | | |
| JoW | - | - | - | - | | |

[1,6]

| | | | | | | | | |
|------|---------------------------|------------------|------|----------------------|-------------|-----------|------|--------|
| St | genealogia | - | tali | serie | contexitur: | Ælfred | rex, | filius |
| Hill | genealogia ³⁸² | talis | | serie ³⁸³ | - | - | - | - |
| Co | | talis | | | | | | |
| B | | talis | | serie | | | | |
| Ar | | talis | | serie | | | | |
| W | | talis | | serie | | | | |
| SD1 | | - | | serie | | Elfred | | |
| SD2 | | - | | serie | | Elfredus† | | - |
| JoW | | - | | serie | | Alfred | | |

[1,7]

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------|-------------|-------|---------------|---------|--------|-----|------|------------|-----|------|
| St | - | Æthelwulfi | regis | - | - | - | qui | fuit | Ecgberhti, | qui | fuit |
| Co | - | | | - | - | - | | | | | |
| B | - | Æthelwolffi | | - | - | - | | | Egberhti | | |
| Ar | - | | | - | - | - | | | | | |
| W | - | | | - | - | - | | | | | |
| SD1 | erat | Ethelwlfi | | - | - | - | | | | | 384 |
| SD2 | erat | - | | occidentalium | saxonum | filius | | | | | |
| JoW | - | Athelwulfi | | occidentalium | saxonum | - | | | | | |

³⁸² "gene^alogia"

³⁸³ Hill's facsimile ends here.

³⁸⁴ Above: fuit

[1,8]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------------|-----|-------|-------|-----|------|--------|-----|
| St | Ealhmundi; | qui | fuit | Eafa; | qui | fuit | Eoppa; | qui |
| Co | | | fruit | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | Eowwa | |
| W | | | | | | | | |
| SD1 | alhmundi | | | Affa | | | | |
| SD2 | | | | Eafae | | | | |
| JoW | | | | Eafae | | | | |

[1,9]

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------|---------|---------|----|------|------|---------|---------|----------|-----|---------------|
| St | fuit | Ingild; | Ingild | et | Ine, | ille | famosus | - | - | - | Occidentalium |
| Co | | | | | | | | - | - | - | |
| B | | | | | | | | - | - | - | |
| Ar | | | | | | | | - | - | - | |
| W | | | | | | | | - | - | - | |
| SD1 | | | Indgild | | | - | (-)↓10 | fratres | fuerunt. | Ine | |
| SD2 | | Ingels | Ingels | | | | | - | - | - | |
| JoW | | Ingels | Ingels | | | | | - | - | - | |

[1,10]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|-----------------------------|---|----------|---------|-----|----------|------|-----|
| St | rex | (-)↑9 | | Saxonum, | germani | duo | fuerunt, | qui | Ine |
| Co | | (-)↑9 | | | | | | | |
| B | | (-)↑9 | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | (-)↑9 | | | | | | | |
| W | | (-)↑9 | | | | | | (qui | |
| SD1 | | famosissimus ³⁸⁵ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| SD2 | | (-)↑9 | | | | | | | |
| JoW | | (-)↑9 | | | | | | | |

SD1 erat per totius fines gentis Anglorum qui Occidentalium regionum regna

SD1 regaliter regebat et, peractis in regno plurimis annis,

[1,11]

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------|-----------|------------|---------|----|-----|-------|--------|------------|---------|
| St | Romam | perrexit, | - | - | et | ibi | vitam | - | praesentem | finiens |
| Co | | | - | - | | | | - | presentem | |
| B | | | - | - | | | | - | presentem | |
| Ar | | | - | - | | | | - | presentem | |
| W | | | - | - | | | | - | presentem | |
| SD1 | | porrexit | relinquens | patriam | | - | - | regnum | praesens | - |
| SD2 | | | - | - | | | | - | presentem | |
| JoW | | Perexit | - | - | | | | - | presentem | |

³⁸⁵ Cf. [1,9].

[1,12]

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------------|-----------|----------|----|-----|---------|-------------|------------|----------|------|
| St | honorifice, | caelestem | patriam, | - | cum | Christo | regnaturus, | - | - | - |
| Co | | | | - | | | | - | - | - |
| B | | | | - | | | | - | - | - |
| Ar | | | | - | | | | - | - | - |
| W | | | | - | | | | - | - | - |
| SD1 | - | - | - | ut | | | - | possideret | aeternum | quod |
| SD2 | -† | | | - | | | | - | - | - |
| JoW | | | | - | | | | - | - | - |

[1,13]

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----|-----------|---------|------------|----------|-----|----------------------|-----|---------|------|----------|-----|------|
| St | - | - | - | - | - | - | adiit; | qui | fuerunt | fili | Coenred; | qui | fuit |
| Co | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | | | |
| B | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | | | |
| Ar | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | fuere | | | | |
| W | - | - | - | - | - | - | adiit:) | | | | | | |
| SD1 | ei | concessit | Divinae | majestatis | imperium | Hii | - | - | | | | | |
| SD2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | adiit ³⁸⁶ | | | | | | |
| JoW | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | | | |

[1,14]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|------------|-----|------|--------|-----|------|------------|
| St | Ceoluuald; | qui | fuit | Cudam; | qui | fuit | Cuthwine; |
| Co | Ceolwalde | | | | | | |
| B | Ceolwalde | | | | | | Cuthwyne |
| Ar | Ceolwalde | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | |
| SD1 | Ceolwold, | | | Cuda | | | Cutherwine |
| SD2 | | | | Cutha | | | Cuthuine |
| JoW | † | | | Cutha | | | Cuthuine |

[1,15]

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|------|----------|-----|------|---------|-----|------|---------|------------------|
| St | qui | fuit | Ceaulin; | qui | fuit | Cynric; | qui | fuit | Creoda; | - |
| Co | | | | | | Cinric | | | | - |
| B | | | | | | | | | | - |
| Ar | | | | | | Cinric | | | | - |
| W | | | | | | | | | | - |
| SD1 | | | Ceawlm | | | Cinric | | | | - |
| SD2 | | | Ceaulin | | | Cinric | | | | e ³⁸⁷ |
| JoW | | | Ceaulin | | | Cynric | | | | - |

³⁸⁶ After: sic beda in gentis anglorum narrat.

³⁸⁷ Symbol is above the *punctus*. Same indicator is in the margin to the left of line, indicating the scribe's awareness of omission. On next page but not in the text block proper we find what was needed: "qui fuit cerdic qui fuit elesa qui fuit elsa": see the ms. Fol. 77r.

[1,16]

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|------|---------|-----|------|--------|------|------|--------|-----|
| St | qui | fuit | Cerdic; | qui | fuit | Elesa; | <qui | fuit | Esla;> | qui |
| Co | | | | | | | - | - | - | |
| B | | | | | | | - | - | - | |
| Ar | | | | | | | - | - | - | |
| W | | | | | | | [qui | Fuit | Esla;] | |
| SD1 | | | | | | | - | - | - | |
| SD2 | | | | | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | | | | | |

[1,17]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------|---------|----|-----|-----------|-------|-------|--------|
| St | fuit | Geuuis, | a | quo | Britones | totam | illam | gentem |
| Co | | Gewis | | | Brittones | | | |
| B | | Gewys | | | | | | |
| Ar | | Gewis | | | | | | |
| W | | Gewis | (a | | Brittones | | | |
| SD1 | | Gewis | | | | | | |
| SD2 | | | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | Brytones | | | |

[1,18]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------|------------|------|------|------|-----|------|-----------|
| St | Geguuis | nominant; | <qui | fuit | Wig; | qui | fuit | Freawine; |
| Co | Geguis | | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| B | Gegwys | | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ar | Geguis | | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| W | Gegwis | nominant;) | [qui | | | | | |
| SD1 | Gewis | | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| SD2 | Gewis | | qui | | | | | Freauuine |
| JoW | Gewis | | qui | | | | | Freauuine |

[1,19]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|------|--------------|-----|------|--------|-----|------|
| St | qui | fuit | Freothegar;> | qui | fuit | Brond; | qui | fuit |
| Co | - | - | - | | | | | |
| B | - | - | - | | | | | |
| Ar | - | - | - | | | | | |
| W | | | Freothegar;] | | | | | |
| SD1 | - | - | - | | | Brand† | | |
| SD2 | | | Freoðegar | | | Brand† | | |
| JoW | | | Freoðegar | | | Brand† | | |

[1,20]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------------------------|-----|------|------------------------|-----|------|---------------|
| St | Beldeag; | qui | fuit | Uuoden; ³⁸⁸ | qui | fuit | Frithowald; |
| Co | Belde, | | | Woden,† | | | |
| B | Belde | | | Woden† | | | |
| Ar | Belde | | | Woden† | | | Ffrithowalde† |
| W | Belde | | | Woden† | | | |
| SD1 | Belde | | | Woden† | | | Frithuwald |
| SD2 | Bealdeag | | | Woden† | | | Friðewlad† |
| JoW | Bealdeag † ³⁸⁹ | | | Woden† | | | Frithouwald |

[1,21]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|------|------------|-----|------|---------------|-----|------|---------------|
| St | qui | fuit | Frealaf; | qui | fuit | Frithuwulf; | qui | fuit | Finn |
| Co | | | Ffrealaf † | | | Ffrithuwulfe, | | | Fingodwulf, |
| B | | | | | | Frithowulfe | | | Fyngodwulfe |
| Ar | | | Ffrealaf† | | | Ffrithuwulfe† | | | Ffingodwulfe† |
| W | | | | | | | | | Fingodwulf |
| SD1 | | | | | | Friðuwulf | - | - | - |
| SD2 | | | | | | Friðewulf | | | Fingolduulf |
| JoW | | | | | | Friðuwulf | | | Fingolduulf |

[1,22]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------|-------|----------|-----|------|--------|------|-------|
| St | <qui | fuit> | Godwulf; | qui | fuit | Geata, | quem | Getam |
| Co | - | - | - | | | | | |
| B | - | - | - | | | | | |
| Ar | - | - | - | | | | | |
| W | - | - | - | | | | | |
| SD1 | - | - | - | | | Geta | | - |
| SD2 | - | - | - | | | Geta | | |
| JoW | - | - | - | | | Geata | | |

[1,23]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|--------|-----|-----|---------------|--------------|
| St | iamdudum | pagani | pro | deo | venerabantur. | <i>Cuius</i> |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | |
| Ar | iamiudum† | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | (cujus |
| SD1 | | | | | | |
| SD2 | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | - |

³⁸⁸ Stevenson prints the "W" in Woden as the stylized "Uu" even though no witnesses utilize this orthography.

³⁸⁹ Stevenson prints "20 Beldeag *Flor* (*recte* Bealdaeg, *cf.* *Chron. Anglo-Sax. Ann.* 855)" (p. 2, fn.). The reading in the *Chornica* (JoW) witnesses reads "Bealdeag".

[1,24]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------------|--------------|------------|------------------|--------------|-----------|-----------------|----------------|
| St | <i>Sedulius</i> | <i>poeta</i> | - | <i>mentionem</i> | <i>facit</i> | <i>in</i> | <i>Paschali</i> | <i>metrico</i> |
| Co | | | - | | | | | |
| B | | | - | mencionem | | | | |
| Ar | | | - | | | | | |
| W | | | - | | | | | |
| SD1 | | | Insignis † | | faciens† | | | |
| SD2 | | | Insignis † | | faciens† | | | - |

[1,25]

| | | | |
|-----|----------------|------------|----------------|
| St | <i>carmine</i> | <i>ita</i> | <i>dicens:</i> |
| Co | | | |
| B | | | |
| Ar | | | |
| W | | | |
| SD1 | | | exorsus† |
| SD2 | | | exorsus† |

[1,26]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|------------|------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| St | <i>Cum</i> | <i>sua</i> | <i>gentiles</i> | <i>studeant</i> | <i>figmenta</i> | <i>poetae,</i> |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | |
| SD1 | | | | | | |
| SD2 | | | | | | |

[1,27]

| | | | | | |
|-----|--------------------|----------------|--------------|-------------------|--------------|
| St | <i>grandisonis</i> | <i>pompare</i> | <i>modis</i> | <i>tragicoque</i> | <i>boatu</i> |
| Co | | | | | |
| B | | | sonis† | | |
| Ar | | | | | |
| W | | | | | |
| SD1 | | | | | |
| SD2 | | | | | |

[1,28]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------------------|--------------|------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------------|---------|
| St | <i>ridicolove</i> | <i>Getae</i> | <i>seu</i> | <i>qualibet</i> | <i>arte</i> | <i>canendi,</i> | - |
| Co | | | | | | | - |
| B | | | | | | | - |
| Ar | | | | | | | - |
| W | | | | | | | - |
| SD1 | | | | | | | &cetera |
| SD2 | | | | | | | &cetera |

[1,29]

| | | | | | |
|----|--------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------|---------------|
| St | <i>saeva</i> | <i>nefandarum</i> | <i>renovant</i> | <i>contagia</i> | <i>rerum,</i> |
| Co | | | renovant | | |
| B | | | renovant | | |
| Ar | | | renovant | | |
| W | | | | | |

[1,30]

| | | | | | | |
|----|-----------|-----------------|------------------|---------------|----------------|-----------------|
| St | <i>et</i> | <i>scelerum</i> | <i>monumenta</i> | <i>canant</i> | <i>rituque</i> | <i>magistro</i> |
| Co | | | monimenta | canunt | | |
| B | | | monimenta | canunt | | |
| Ar | | | monimenta | cadunt† | | |
| W | | | | | | |

[1,31]

| | | | | | |
|----|----------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| St | <i>plurima</i> | <i>niliacis</i> | <i>tradunt</i> | <i>Mendacia</i> | <i>biblis.</i> |
| Co | | | | | |
| B | | | | | |
| Ar | | | † | mendatia† | |
| W | | | tradant | | |

[1,32]

| | | | | | | |
|----|------------|------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------|
| St | <i>cur</i> | <i>ego</i> | <i>Davidicis</i> | <i>assuetus</i> | <i>cantibus</i> | <i>odas,</i> |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | Davidicis | | | |
| Ar | | | Davidicis | | | |
| W | | | Davidicis | | | |

[1,33]

| | | | | | |
|----|------------------|-----------------|--------------|------------------|------------------|
| St | <i>chordarum</i> | <i>resonare</i> | <i>decem</i> | <i>sanctoque</i> | <i>verenter,</i> |
| Co | cordarum† | | | | |
| B | cordarum† | | | | |
| Ar | chordarum | | | | |
| W | cordarum† | | | | |

[1,34]

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--------------|---------------|-----------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| St | <i>stare</i> | <i>choro,</i> | <i>et</i> | <i>placidis</i> | <i>celestia</i> | <i>psallere</i> | <i>verbis,</i> |
| Co | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | caelestia | | |
| Ar | | | | | caelestia | | |
| W | | | | | | | |

[1,35]

| | | | | | |
|----|--------------|-------------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| St | <i>clara</i> | <i>salutiferi</i> | <i>taceam</i> | <i>miracula</i> | <i>Christi?</i> |
| Co | | | | | Christi |
| B | | | | | Christi |
| Ar | | | | | Christi |
| W | | | | | Christi?) |

[1,36]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|--------------|------|----------|-----|------|--------|-----|------|
| St | Qui | <i>Geata</i> | fuit | Taetuaa; | qui | fuit | Beauu; | qui | fuit |
| Co | | | | Caetwa† | | | Beaw† | | |
| B | | Geta | | Caetwa† | | | Beaw† | | |
| Ar | | | | Caetwa† | | | Beaw† | | |
| W | | | | Caetwa† | | | Beaw† | | |
| SD1 | | Geta | | Cetwa | | | Beaw† | | |
| SD2 | | Geta | | Ceatuaa† | | | ‡beaw‡ | | |
| JoW | | - | | Ceatuaa† | | | | | |

[1,37]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------------|-----|------|----------|-----|------|----------|-----|
| St | Sceldwea; | qui | fuit | Heremod; | qui | fuit | Itermod; | qui |
| Co | | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | | |
| SD1 | Seldwa† | | | | | | | |
| SD2 | Scelduaa† | | | | | | | |
| JoW | Scelduaea† | | | | | | | |

[1,38]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------|---------|-----|------|--------|-----|------|----------|-----|
| St | fuit | Hathra; | qui | fuit | Huala; | qui | fuit | Beduuig; | qui |
| Co | | | | | | | | Bedwig† | |
| B | | | | | Haula | | | Bedwig† | |
| Ar | | | | | | | | Beduuig† | |
| W | | | | | | | | Bedwig† | |
| SD1 | | Hatra† | | | Wala | | | Bedwig | |
| SD2 | | Hatra† | | | Wala | | | Bedwig | |
| JoW | | | | | Wala | | | | |

[1,39]

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------|---------------------|-----|------|------|-----|------|---------|-----|------|
| St | fuit | Seth; | qui | fuit | Noe; | qui | fuit | Lamech; | qui | fuit |
| Co | | | | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | | | | |
| W | | Sem | | | | | | | | |
| SD1 | | Sem | | | | | | | | |
| SD2 | | Sem | | | | | | | | |
| JoW | | Sem† ³⁹⁰ | | | | | | | | |

³⁹⁰ This reading is not supported by all witnesses of the *Chornica chronicarum*. It is reproduced, however, in the C text.

[1,40]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------------|-----|----------------|--------|------|------|---------|
| St | Mathusalem; | qui | fuit | Enoch; | <qui | fuit | Iared;> |
| Co | | | | | - | - | - |
| B | | | | | - | - | - |
| Ar | | | | | - | - | - |
| W | | | | | [qui | | Jared;] |
| SD1 | | | ³⁹¹ | | - | - | - |
| SD2 | | | | | - | - | - |
| JoW | | | | | - | - | _392 |

[1,41]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|------|-----------|-----|------|---------|-----|------|-------|
| St | qui | fuit | Malaleel; | qui | fuit | Cainan; | qui | fuit | Enos; |
| Co | | | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | Caynan† | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | | | |
| SD1 | | | | | | Canaan | | | |
| SD2 | | | | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | | | | |

[1,42]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|------|-------------------|-----|------|-------|--------|----------|
| St | qui | fuit | Seth; | qui | fuit | Adam. | - | - |
| Co | | | | | | | - | - |
| B | | | Se ³⁹³ | | | | - | - |
| Ar | | | | | | | - | - |
| W | | | | | | | - | - |
| SD1 | | | | | | | primi† | hominis† |
| SD2 | | | | | | | - | - |
| JoW | | | | | | | - | - |

[2,0³⁹⁴]

| | | | | |
|----|-----------|-------------------|---------------|-------------|
| St | <i>De</i> | <i>genealogia</i> | <i>matris</i> | <i>eius</i> |
| Co | | | | |
| B | | | | |
| Ar | | | | |
| W | | | | |

³⁹¹ Above: "qui"; not by original hand in MS Bodley 139, fol. 69r.

³⁹² "qui fuit Iared" is present interlined in MS Bodley 297, p. 295, col. 1.

³⁹³ This ink is badly faded and the page appears to be damaged here.

³⁹⁴ [2,0] may have been present in Cotton Otho A.xii, though it is equally likely to be an addition by Parker or his assistants. W gives it in his edition in italics but offers no note.

[2,1]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------|------|-------|---------|--------|---------|---------|---------|--------------|
| St | Mater | - | - | - | quoque | eiusdem | - | Osburh | nominabatur, |
| Co | | - | - | - | | | - | | |
| B | | - | - | - | | | - | Osbruh | |
| Ar | | - | - | - | | | - | Osburgh | |
| W | | - | - | - | | | - | | |
| SD1 | | vero | regis | Elfredi | | | - | Osburg | - |
| SD2 | | - | - | - | | | Elfredi | | |
| JoW | | - | - | - | | | - | | |

| | | | | |
|-----|-----------|-----|-----|------|
| SD1 | appellata | est | que | erat |
|-----|-----------|-----|-----|------|

[2,2]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|-------|---------|------------|----------|------|-------------|---------|----|
| St | religiosa | nimum | femina, | nobilis | ingenio, | - | - | nobilis | et |
| Co | | | | | | - | - | | |
| B | | | faemina | | | - | - | | |
| Ar | | | | | | - | - | | |
| W | | | faemina | | | - | - | | |
| SD1 | | | | nobilisque | | quam | nobilitatem | - | - |
| SD2 | | | | | | - | - | | |
| JoW | | | | | | - | - | | |

[2,3]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|-----------|--------|------|--------|-------|
| SD1 | exornavit | prudencia | mentis | erat | quoque | pater |
|-----|-----------|-----------|--------|------|--------|-------|

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------|------|------|-------|--------|-----|------|--------|-----------|
| St | genere; | quae | erat | filia | Oslac, | - | - | famosi | pincernae |
| Co | | | | | | - | - | | |
| B | | | | | | - | - | | |
| Ar | | | | | | - | - | | |
| W | | | | | | - | - | | |
| SD1 | - | - | - | - | | qui | fuit | - | pincerna |
| SD2 | | | | | | - | - | | Pincerna |
| JoW | | | | | | - | - | | pincerna |

[2,4]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------|-------------|--------|-----|-------|--------|------|----------|
| St | - | Æthelwulfi | regis. | Qui | Oslac | Gothus | erat | natione; |
| Co | - | | | | | | | |
| B | - | Æthelwolffi | | | | | | |
| Ar | - | | | | | | | |
| W | - | | | | | | | |
| SD1 | - | Ethelwlfi | | | | | | |
| SD2 | (-)→ | Atheluulfi | | | | | | |
| JoW | regis | Apelwulfi | (-)← | | | | | |

[2,5]

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------|------|------|----|--------|----|-----------------------|----|--------|----------|
| St | ortus | enim | erat | de | Gothis | et | Iutis, ³⁹⁵ | de | semine | scilicet |
| Co | | | | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | | | | |
| SD1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| SD2 | | | | | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | | | | femine | |

[2,6]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|----|-----------|--------|---------|----|--------|----------|
| St | Stuf | et | Wihtgar, | duorum | fratrum | et | etiam | comitum, |
| Co | | | Wihtgur | | | | | |
| B | | | Wightgur† | | | | eciam† | |
| Ar | | | Wihtgur | | | | | |
| W | | | Wihtzur | | | | | |
| SD1 | Stuph† | | | | | - | - | - |
| SD2 | Stuph† | | | | | | | |
| JoW | Stuph† | | Uuihtgar | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|-----|-------------|-----|-----|-------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|---------|
| SD1 | his | sic | praelibatis | jam | pro | posse | susceptum | exequamur | negotium | suscepti | operis. |
|-----|-----|-----|-------------|-----|-----|-------|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|---------|

[2,7]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|------|---------|------------|---------|---------|----|----------|
| St | qui, | accepta | potestate | Uuectae | insulae | ab | avunculo |
| Co | | | potestatae | | | | |
| B | | | | Vectae | | | |
| Ar | | | potestatae | Vuecte | | | |
| W | | | potestatae | Wectae | | | |
| SD2 | | | potestatae | Vectae† | | | |
| JoW | | | | Uectae† | | | |

[2,8]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|--------|------|----|---------|-------|------|------------|
| St | suo | Cerdic | rege | et | Cynric | filio | suo, | consobrino |
| Co | | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | Cinric | | | |
| W | | | | | | | | |
| SD2 | | | | | Cinric† | | | |
| JoW | | | | | Cinric | | | |

³⁹⁵ W: "Indis MS. Cott & Ed. Cam[den]." St: "Quid e Cott perperam enotat," or what the Cotton MS wrongly noted. Wise and Camden, such as is their authorities, are witness to *Indis* in Cotton Otho A.xii. Confirmed by Ussher.

[2,9]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|--------|-----------|---------|---------|----------|
| St | eorum, | paucos | Britones | eiusdem | insulae | accolas, |
| Co | | | Brittones | | | |
| B | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | |
| W | | | Brittones | | | |
| SD2 | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | Brytones | | | |

[2,10]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------|----|----|----------|------------|----|-------|-----|---------|
| St | quos | in | ea | invenire | potuerunt, | in | loco, | qui | dicitur |
| Co | | | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | | | |
| SD2 | | | | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | | | | |

[2,11]

| | | | | | |
|-----|------------------|-------------|---------|------|---------|
| St | Guuhtgaraburhg, | occiderunt. | Ceteri | enim | accolae |
| Co | Gwith Garaburhg† | | | | |
| B | Wight Garaburhg† | | caeteri | | |
| Ar | Gwightgaraburhg† | | | | |
| W | Gwhtgaraburhg | | | | |
| SD2 | Withgaraburh† | | | | |
| JoW | Whtgaraburh | | | | |

[2,12]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------|---------|------|-----|--------|-------|-----|--------|
| St | eiusdem | insulae | ante | aut | occisi | erant | aut | exules |
| Co | | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | | |
| SD2 | | | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | | | |

[2,13]

| | |
|-----|-------------|
| St | aufugerant. |
| Co | aufugerunt |
| B | aufugerunt |
| Ar | aufugerunt |
| W | |
| SD2 | |
| JoW | |

[3,1]

| | | | | | |
|-----|-------------|------------------|----------------------|----------------|--------------------|
| St | <i>Anno</i> | <i>Dominicae</i> | <i>Incarnationis</i> | DCCCLI | <i>nativitatis</i> |
| Co | | | | | |
| B | | | | 851 | |
| Ar | | | | | |
| W | | | | | |
| SD1 | | | | | |
| SD2 | | | | | |
| JoW | - | - | - | ³⁹⁶ | - |

[3,2]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|--------------|----------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|------------|
| St | <i>autem</i> | <i>Ælfredi</i> | <i>regis</i> | <i>tertio,</i> | Ceorl, | Domnaniae |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | | iii | | |
| Ar | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | |
| SD1 | - | Elfredi | - | iii | | - |
| SD2 | | Elfredi | | iii | | |
| JoW | - | - | - | - | | Dominaniae |
| ASN | - | - | - | - | ³⁹⁷ | Domnaniae |

[3,3]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|-----|-----------|--------|---------|------------|------|----------------------|
| St | comes, | cum | Domnaniis | contra | paganos | - | - | - |
| Co | | | Domnanus | | | - | - | - |
| B | | | Domnanis | | | Normannos | sive | Danos ³⁹⁸ |
| Ar | | | | | | Normannos | sive | Danos |
| W | | | | | | - | - | - |
| SD1 | | - | - | (-)→ | (-)→ | - | - | - |
| SD2 | | | | | | - | - | - |
| JoW | | | | | | - | - | - |
| ASN | | | | | | Nordmannos | sive | Danos |

| | | | | |
|-----|----------|----|--------|-------|
| St | pugnavit | in | - | - |
| Co | | | - | - |
| B | | | - | - |
| Ar | | | - | - |
| W | | | - | - |
| SD1 | | - | contra | Danos |
| SD2 | | | - | - |
| JoW | | | - | - |
| ASN | | | - | - |

³⁹⁶ Not within the annal proper, but aligned to the margin (right, in this case) as JoW does for years.

³⁹⁷ ASN begins copying from Asser here.

³⁹⁸ The readings in transcripts B and Ar here derive from ASN.

[3,4]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------|-----|---------|------------------------------|----|------------|-----------|
| St | loco, | qui | dicitur | Uuicganbeorg, | et | Christiani | victoriam |
| Co | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | Wicganbeorg | | | |
| Ar | | | | Wicganbeorg | | | |
| W | | | | | | | |
| SD1 | - | - | - | - | | | |
| SD2 | | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | Uuicganbeorga ³⁹⁹ | | | |

[3,5]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|------------|----|------|-------|------|--------|
| St | habuerunt. | Et | ipso | eodem | anno | primum |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | |
| SD2 | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|-----|----|----------|--------|-------|------|--------|
| SD1 | de | inimicis | adepti | sunt. | Dani | quoque |
|-----|----|----------|--------|-------|------|--------|

[3,6]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------------------------|--------|----|---------|------|---------|-----------|
| St | hiemaverunt | pagani | in | insula, | quae | vocatur | Sceapieg, |
| Co | | | | | | | Scepieg |
| B | hyemaverunt | | | | | | Scepieg |
| Ar | | | | | | | |
| W | hyemaverunt† ⁴⁰⁰ | | | | | | Scheapieg |
| SD1 | hyemaverunt† | (-)†5 | | | | | Scepiege |
| SD2 | | | | | | | Scepiege |
| JoW | | | | | | | Sceapege† |
| ASN | | | | | | | Sceapeige |

[3,7]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------|---------------|----|--------------------|---------|---------|------|-------|------|
| St | quod | interpretatur | - | - | 'insula | ovium'; | quae | (-)↓8 | sita |
| Co | | | - | - | | | | (-)↓8 | |
| B | | | - | - | | | | (-)↓8 | |
| Ar | | | - | - | | | | (-)↓8 | |
| W | | | - | - | | | | (-)↓8 | |
| SD1 | - | - | id | est ⁴⁰¹ | | | - | - | - |
| SD2 | - | - | id | est | | | - | - | - |
| JoW | | | - | - | | | | (-)↓8 | |
| ASN | - | - | - | - | - | - | | est | |

³⁹⁹ The *o* appears to have been altered.

⁴⁰⁰ W follows SD1 here, the only witness to this variant spelling.

⁴⁰¹ *id est* in shorthand.

[3,8]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------|----|---------|----------|-------|----|-------------|----|-------------|
| St | est | in | Tamesi | flumine | inter | - | East-Seaxum | et | Cantuarios, |
| Co | | | | | | - | Eastseaxum | | |
| B | | | Thamesi | | | ax | Eastsexum | | |
| Ar | | | | | | - | Eastseaxum | | |
| W | | | | | | - | Eastseaxum | | |
| JoW | | | | | | - | Easseaxum† | | |
| ASN | (-)†7 | | Tamensi | fluminae | | - | Eastseaxum | | |

[3,9]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|----|---------|-----------|-----|------|----|
| St | sed | ad | Cantium | propior | est | quam | ad |
| Co | | | | | | | |
| B | | | Cantium | proprior† | | | |
| Ar | | | Cantium | proprior† | | | |
| W | | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | - |

[3,10]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|--------------|----|-----|-------------|---------|-------------|
| St | East-Seaxum; | in | qua | monasterium | optimum | constructum |
| Co | Eastsaxum† | | | | | |
| B | Eastsexum | | | | | |
| Ar | Eastsaxum | | | | | |
| W | Eastseaxum | | | | | |
| JoW | Easseaxum† | | | | | |
| ASN | Eastseaxum | - | - | - | - | - |

[3,11]

| | |
|-----|------|
| St | est. |
| Co | |
| B | |
| Ar | |
| W | |
| JoW | |

[4,1]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------|--------|------|--------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------|
| St | Eodem | quoque | anno | magnus | (-)→ | paganorum | exercitus | - |
| Co | | | | | (-)→ | | | - |
| B | | | | | (-)→ | | | - |
| Ar | | | | | (-)→ | | | - |
| W | | | | | (-)→ | | | - |
| SD1 | | -† | | | Exercitus | | (-)← | uenit |
| SD2 | | | | | (-)→ | | | - |
| JoW | | | | | (-)→ | | | - |
| ASN | | | | | (-)→ | | | - |

[4,2]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|-----------|----|---------------|---------|----|
| St | cum | trecentis | et | quingquaginta | navibus | in |
| Co | | | - | Cccl | | |
| B | | 350 | - | - | | |
| Ar | | 350 | - | - | | |
| W | | | | | | |
| SD1 | | | - | | | |
| SD2 | | | - | | 402 | |
| JoW | | | - | | | |
| ASN | | - | - | .cccl. | | |

[4,3]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----------|-------------------------|----------|------|-------|----|----------------------------|----|
| St | ostium | Tamesis | fluminis | - | venit | et | Doruberniam, | id |
| Co | hostium† | | | - | | | Doroberniam | |
| B | hostium† | Thamesis | | - | | | Doroborniam | |
| Ar | | | | - | | - | - | - |
| W | | | | - | | [& | | |
| SD1 | hostium† | Tamensis ⁴⁰³ | | - | | | Doroberniam ⁴⁰⁴ | |
| SD2 | hostium† | Tamensis | | quod | - | - | | |
| JoW | | | | - | | | | |
| ASN | | Tamensis | | - | | | - | - |

[4,4]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|-----------------------------|----------------------------|-----|------------|--------------------------|-------|
| St | est | Cantuariorum ⁴⁰⁵ | civitatem, | <et | Lundoniam> | - | (quae |
| Co | | Cantuariorum | | - | - | - | quae |
| B | | Cantuariorum | | - | - | - | quae |
| Ar | - | - | - | et | Londoniam | civitatem ⁴⁰⁶ | quae |
| W | | | civitatem,] ⁴⁰⁷ | et | Londoniam | civitatem | quae |
| SD1 | | Cantuariorum | | | Londoniam | - | - |
| SD2 | | Cantuariorum | | - | - | - | - |
| JoW | | Cantuariorum | | | | - | quae |
| ASN | - | - | - | et | Londoniam | civitatem | quae |

[4,5]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|------|----|-------------|--------------------|------|----------|-----------|----|
| St | est | sita | in | aquilonari | - | ripa | Tamesis | fluminis, | in |
| Co | | | | aquilonali† | - | | | | |
| B | | | | aquilonari | - | | Thamesis | | |
| Ar | | | | aquilonari | - | | | | |
| W | | | | | - | | | | |
| JoW | | | | aquilonali | Per ⁴⁰⁸ | | | | |
| ASN | | | | aquilonali | - | | Tamensis | | |

⁴⁰² Interlined.

⁴⁰³ The ASN follows this reading.

⁴⁰⁴ The letters "do" appear to be added by a secondary hand to correct a misspelling.

⁴⁰⁵ Stevenson takes the spelling from W.

⁴⁰⁶ Also in Parker's edition, likely derives from *Annales S. Neoti*.

⁴⁰⁷ W: *Desunt MS. Cott.*

⁴⁰⁸ Erased.

[4,6]

| | | | | | |
|-----|----------|-------------|----|----------------|-----|
| St | confinio | East-Seaxum | et | Middel-Seaxum, | sed |
| Co | | EastSeaxum | | | |
| B | | Eastsexum | | MidleSexum | |
| Ar | | Eastseaxum | | Middleseaxum | |
| W | | EastSeaxum | | Middelseaxum | |
| JoW | | Eastſæxum | | Middelsæxum | |
| ASN | | Eastsexum | | Middelseaxum | |

[4,7]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------|----|-------------|------|---------|-----|----------|
| St | tamen | ad | East-seaxum | illa | civitas | cum | veritate |
| Co | | | | | | | |
| B | | | Eastsexum | | | | |
| Ar | | | Eastseaxum | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | Eastſæxum | | | | |
| ASN | | | Eastseaxum | | | | |

[4,8]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|------------|-------|----|--------------|-----------|
| St | pertinet) | depopulati | sunt, | et | Beorhtulfum, | Merciorum |
| Co | pertinet | | | | | |
| B | pertinet | | | | Beortulfum | |
| Ar | pertinet | | | | | |
| W | pertinet | | | | | |
| SD1 | - | | | | Berhtulfum | |
| SD2 | - | | | | Berthulfum | |
| JoW | pertinet | | | | Beorhtuulfum | |
| ASN | pertinet | | | | Beorhtulfum | |

[4,9]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|-----|---------|----------|------|-----|----|------------|
| St | regem, | cum | omni | exercitu | suo, | qui | ad | proliandum |
| Co | | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | -† | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | | preliandum |
| W | | | | | | | | |
| SD1 | | | | | | | | proliandum |
| SD2 | | | omnium† | | | | | proliandum |
| JoW | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | preliandum |

[4,10]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|-------|----------|----|-------|------------|
| St | contra | illos | venerat, | in | fugam | verterunt. |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | |
| SD1 | | | | | | |
| SD2 | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | |

[5,1]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|---------|------------|-----------|-----------|
| St | His | ibi | ita | gestis, | praedictus | paganorum | exercitus |
| Co | | | | | predictus | | |
| B | | | - | | predictus | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | predictus | | |

[5,2]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------|-----|------------|------|---------|-----------|-------|---------|----|
| SD1 | Post | hec | audationes | Dani | effecti | exercitus | omnis | ipsorum | ad |
| SD2 | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----------|----|---------------------------|------|------|------|-----|----|-------------|
| St | perrexit | in | Suthrie, | quae | paga | sita | est | - | - |
| Co | | | | | | | | - | - |
| B | | | Suthrye | | | | | - | - |
| Ar | | | | | | | | - | - |
| W | | | Suthriae | | | | | - | - |
| SD1 | - | - | Suhtrige† | - | - | - | - | et | congregatus |
| SD2 | - | - | Suthrige | - | - | - | - | et | congregatus |
| JoW | | | Suðregiam† ⁴⁰⁹ | | | | | - | - |
| ASN | | | Suthrigie | | 410 | | | - | - |

[5,3]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----|-----------|----------|----------|-------|----|-------------|-------|
| St | in | meridiana | Tamesis | fluminis | ripa | ab | occidentali | parte |
| Co | | | | | | | | |
| B | | | Thamesis | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | Tamensis | | ripam | | | |

⁴⁰⁹ Possibly a misprint in St; there is a shorthand mark over the *a*.

⁴¹⁰ Altered, Dumville and Lapidge write "Altered from *pago*" (*The Annals of St Neots* 43).

[5,4]

| | | | |
|-----|------|---------|-------------|
| SD1 | Quod | audiens | bellipotens |
| SD2 | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|-----|----------|----|--------------|-------|-----------------|-------------|
| St | Cantiae. | Et | Æthelwulfus, | (-)↓5 | [Occidentalium] | Saxonum |
| Co | | | Ethelwulfus | (-)↓5 | - | |
| B | | | Æthelwulfus | (-)↓5 | Occidentalius | |
| Ar | Cantii | | | (-)↓5 | Occidentalium | |
| W | Cantii | | | (-)↓5 | | |
| SD1 | - | - | Ethelwlfus | rex | - | |
| SD2 | - | - | Atheluulfus | rex | - | |
| JoW | | | Aþeluulfus | (-)↓5 | - | Uuessaxonum |
| ASN | | | Adheluulfus | (-)↓5 | Occidentalium | Saxonum |

[5,5]

| | | | | |
|-----|----|-------|-----------|----------|
| SD1 | Et | ipsum | exercitum | copiosum |
| SD2 | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------|----|--------|-------|-------------|-----|----|------------------|----------|
| St | rex, | et | filius | suus | Æthelbaldus | cum | - | omni | exercitu |
| Co | | | | | | | - | | |
| B | | | | | | | - | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | - | | |
| W | | | | | | | - | | |
| SD1 | (-)↑4 | | | | Ethelbaldus | | Eo | - ⁴¹¹ | - |
| SD2 | (-)↑4 | | | Eius† | | | Eo | - | - |
| JoW | | | | | Æþelbaldus | | - | | |
| ASN | | | | | Adhelbaldus | | - | | |

| | | | | |
|-----|-----|--------|----------|-----------|
| ASN | suo | contra | prefatum | exercitum |
|-----|-----|--------|----------|-----------|

[5,6]

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----|-------|-----|---------|--------|----|-----|-----|---------|-----------|
| St | in | loco, | qui | dicitur | Aclea, | id | est | 'in | campulo | quercus,' |
| Co | | | | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | | | | |
| SD1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| SD2 | | | | | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | - | - | - | - | - |

⁴¹¹ Cf. [5,2]

[5,7]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|------------|--------------|---------|-----|-----|-----------|
| St | diutissime | pugnauerunt; | ibique, | cum | diu | acerrime |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | accerrime |

[5,8]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|----|---------|----|---------|-------|----------|--------|
| St | et | animose | ex | utraque | parte | pugnatum | esset, |
| Co | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | |

[5,9]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|------|-----------|--------------|----------|--------|
| St | maxima | pars | paganae | multitudinis | funditus | deleta |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | paganicae | | | |
| Ar | | | pagane | | | |
| W | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | pagane | | | |
| ASN | | | pagane | | | |

[5,10]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----|--------|------|-----|----------|---------|----|--------|---------|
| St | et | occisa | est, | ita | qualiter | nunquam | in | aliqua | regione |
| Co | | | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | |

[5,11]

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----|-----|------|------|-----|-------|----|-----|---------|------|------------|
| St | in | una | die, | ante | nec | post, | ex | eis | occisam | esse | audivimus, |
| Co | | | | | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | | | occisum | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | occisum | | |

[5,12]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----|------------|---------------------|------|-----|-----------|-------------|-----------|
| St | et | Christiani | - | - | - | victoriam | honorifice | tenuerunt |
| Co | | | - | - | - | | | |
| B | | | - | - | - | | | |
| Ar | | | - | - | - | | | |
| W | | | - | - | - | | | |
| SD1 | - | | vero ⁴¹² | ipso | die | | | |
| SD2 | - | | - | - | - | | | |
| JoW | | | - | - | - | | | |
| ASN | | | - | - | - | | honorificae | |

[5,13]

| | | | | | |
|-----|----|---------------------|---------|----------|-------|
| St | et | loco | funeris | dominati | sunt. |
| Co | | loci | | | |
| B | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | |
| W | | | | | |
| SD1 | | | | | |
| SD2 | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | |
| ASN | | loci ⁴¹³ | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|----------------|-----------|--------|----|--------|----|----------------|
| SD1 | grates | reddentes | domino | in | hymnis | et | confessionibus |
| SD2 | ⁴¹⁴ | | | | | | |

[6,1]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|----------------|-----------|---------------|-----------------------------|-----------|------------|------|
| SD1 | Anno | Dominicae | incarnationis | DCCC secondo ⁴¹⁵ | - | - | - |
| SD2 | ⁴¹⁶ | - | - | DCCCLii | Merciorum | Berthulfus | uita |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----------|-----|----|--------|-----------|------|--------|------|
| SD2 | decessit | cui | In | regni‡ | burhredus | fuit | cessit | ipso |
|-----|----------|-----|----|--------|-----------|------|--------|------|

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------|--------|------|-------------|-------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| St | Eodem | quoque | anno | Æthelstan, | - | <i>[filius</i> | <i>Æthelwulfi</i> |
| Co | | | | | (-)↓5 | - | - |
| B | | | | Ethelstan | (-)↓5 | - | - |
| Ar | | | | | (-)↓5 | - | - |
| W | | | | | - | filius ⁴¹⁷ | Æthelwulfi |
| SD1 | - | - | - | Ethelstanus | (-)↓5 | - | - |
| SD2 | - | - | - | Æthelstanus | (-)↓5 | - | - |
| JoW | | | | Aþelstan | (-)↓5 | - | - |
| ASN | | vero | | Adhelstan | rex | filius | Adheluulfi |

⁴¹² Cf. [5,11].

⁴¹³ Co may have been corrected against ASN here.

⁴¹⁴ Interlined above *reddentes*.

⁴¹⁵ Erasure and correction to date in MS.

⁴¹⁶ SD2 scribe was following SD1 in this chapter and in some cases elaborating on readings there.

⁴¹⁷ W: "desunt" - *filius Æthelwulfi regis* appears to be a Parkerian addition.

[6,2]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|---------------|----|----------|-------|--------|--------------|
| St | <i>regis/</i> | Et | Ealhere | comes | magnum | paganorum |
| Co | rex† | | | | | |
| B | rex† | | | | | |
| Ar | rex† | | | | | |
| W | rex† | | | | | |
| SD1 | rex† | | Alchere | | | |
| SD2 | rex† | | Alchere | | | |
| JoW | rex† | | | | | |
| JoW | regis | | Ealchere | | | Nordmannorum |

[6,3]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|------------|----|---------|----|-------|-----|---------|-----------|
| St | exercitum | - | in | Cantia, | in | loco, | qui | dicitur | Sandwic, |
| Co | | - | | | | | | | |
| B | | - | | Cantio | | | | | |
| Ar | | - | | Cantio | | | | | |
| W | | - | | | | | | | |
| SD1 | | invenerunt | | | | | | | Etsandwic |
| SD2 | | invenerunt | | | | | | | |
| JoW | | - | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | - | | | | | | | Sanduuc |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|------|--------|-----|----------|------------|-------|----------------------|
| SD1 | quem | ibidem | Deo | auxilium | concedente | prope | totus ⁴¹⁸ |
| SD2 | | | | | | | |

[6,4]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------------|----|----|---------|-------|-------|-------|---------------------------|
| St | occiderunt, | et | ex | navibus | eorum | novem | naves | ceperunt; |
| Co | | | | | | | | acceperunt ⁴¹⁹ |
| B | | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | | |
| SD1 | | | | | | | - | rapuerunt† |
| SD2 | | | | | | | - | rapuerunt† |
| JoW | | | | | | ix | | |
| ASN | | | | | | .ix. | | |

[6,5]

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----------|-----|-------|---------|---------|----------|-----------|-------|---------------|-----------|---|
| St | ceteri | per | fugam | elapsi | - | - | - | sunt. | - | - | - |
| Co | | | | | - | - | - | | - | - | - |
| B | caeteri | | | | - | - | - | | - | - | - |
| Ar | | | | | - | - | - | | - | - | - |
| W | | | | | - | - | - | | - | - | - |
| SD1 | caeteri | | | - | terrore | perculsi | fugerunt. | - | - | - | - |
| SD2 | caeteri | | | | terrore | perculsi | fugerunt. | - | nativitatis † | Elfredi † | † |
| JoW | | | | | - | - | - | | - | - | - |
| ASN | caeteris | | | elapsis | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

⁴¹⁸ Interlined.

⁴¹⁹ W testifies to this reading in the Cotton Otho A.xii

[7,1]

| | | | |
|-----|--------|-----------|-----------|
| JoW | Regnum | Burhredus | successit |
|-----|--------|-----------|-----------|

| | | | | | | |
|-----|-------------|------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|--------------|
| St | <i>Anno</i> | <i>Dominicae</i> | <i>Incarnationis</i> | DCCCLIII, | <i>nativitatis</i> | <i>autem</i> |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | | 853 | | |
| Ar | | | | 853 | | |
| W | | | | | | |
| SD1 | | dominice | | | | |
| SD2 | | - | - | | (-)↑6,5 | |
| JoW | - | - | - | | - | - |
| ASN | | - | - | .dccccliii. ⁴²⁰ | - | - |

[7,2]

| | | | | | |
|-----|----------------|--------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|-----------|
| St | <i>Ælfredi</i> | <i>regis</i> | <i>quinto,</i> ⁴²¹ | Burgred, | Merciorum |
| Co | | | Ii | | |
| B | | | - | | |
| Ar | | | ii | | |
| W | | | | | |
| SD1 | Elfredi | - | | Burhred ⁴²² | |
| SD2 | (-)↑6,5 | | | Burhred | |
| JoW | - | - | - | Burhredus | (-)↓3 |

[7,3]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|------|-----------|-----|---------|------------|-----|--------------|
| St | rex, | (-)↑4 | per | nuncios | deprecatus | est | Æthelwulfum, |
| Co | | (-)↑4 | | | | | |
| B | | (-)↑4 | | | | | Æthelwolfum |
| Ar | | (-)↑4 | | | | | |
| W | | (-)↑4 | | | | | |
| SD1 | | (-)↑4 | | | | | Ethelwlfum |
| SD2 | | (-)↑4 | | | | | Ethelwlfum |
| JoW | | Merciorum | | nuntios | | | Apeluulfum |

[7,4]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|---------------|---------|--------|----|----|----------|
| St | Occidentalium | Saxonum | regem, | ut | ei | auxilium |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | |
| SD1 | | | | | | |
| SD2 | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | |

⁴²⁰ The rest of Ch. 7 has been omitted by the ASN compiler.

⁴²¹ W: "undecimo MS. Cott. Edd. P. & C."

⁴²² The "u" is interlined and the previous letter has been erased. A descender from the erased letter is still visible.

[7,5]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|------------|-----|---------------|-----------|-----|-------|
| St | conferret, | quo | mediterraneos | Britones, | qui | inter |
| Co | | | | Brittones | | |
| B | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | |
| W | | | | Brittones | | |
| SD1 | | | | Brittones | | |
| SD2 | | | | Brittones | | |
| JoW | | | | Brytones | | |

[7,6]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------|----|------|----------------|-------------|---------|-----|
| St | Merciam | et | mare | occidentale | habitant, | dominio | suo |
| Co | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | |
| SD1 | | | | occidentaleum† | habitabant† | | |
| SD2 | | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | | |

[7,7]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------------------------|------------|-----|--------|-----|------------|----------|----------------|
| St | subdere | potuisset, | qui | contra | eum | - | immodice | reluctabantur. |
| Co | | | | | | - | | |
| B | | | | | | - | | |
| Ar | | | | | | - | | |
| W | | | | | | - | | |
| SD1 | ⁴²³ subdere | posset† | | | | frequenter | - | |
| SD2 | | | | | | - | | |
| JoW | | | | | | - | | |

[7,8]

| | | | | | |
|-----|-----|---------|-------------|------|-----------|
| St | Nec | segnius | Æthelwulfus | rex, | legatione |
| Co | | | | | |
| B | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | |
| W | | | | | |
| SD1 | | | Ethelwlf | -† | |
| SD2 | | | Atheluulfus | | |
| JoW | | | Aþeluulfus | | |

⁴²³ "subdere...reluctabantur" is inscribed over erasure.

[7,9]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------|----------|-----------|---------|------------|----------------------------|------------|-------------|-----|
| St | eius | accepta, | exercitum | movens, | Britanniam | - | - | - | cum |
| Co | - | | | | | - | - | - | |
| B | | | | | | - | - | - | |
| Ar | | | | | Britanniam | - | - | - | |
| W | | | | | | - | - | - | |
| SD1 | | | | mouit† | - | Uel spolia† ⁴²⁴ | Stipendia† | distribuit† | |
| SD2 | | | | | | - | - | - | |
| JoW | | | | | brytanniam | - | - | - | |

[7,10]

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|------|------------|----|--------|-------|--------|-----------|----|-------------|
| St | Burghredo | rege | - | - | - | - | adiit, | statimque | ut | ingreditur, |
| Co | | | - | - | - | - | | | | |
| B | Burgredo | | - | - | - | - | | | | |
| Ar | | | - | - | - | - | | | | |
| W | | | - | - | - | - | | | | |
| SD1 | Burhredo | | intrepidus | ad | bellum | exiit | - | - | - | - |
| SD2 | | | - | - | - | - | | | | |
| JoW | | | - | - | - | - | | | | |

[7,11]

| | | | | | |
|-----|-----|----|-----------|-----|----|
| SD1 | mox | ut | ingressus | est | ad |
|-----|-----|----|-----------|-----|----|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|-------|-------------|-------|---------|-------------|------|---------|-----------|---------|
| St | gentem | illam | devastans, | - | - | - | - | dominio | Burgredi | subdit. |
| Co | | | | - | - | - | - | | | |
| B | | | | - | - | - | - | | | |
| Ar | | | | - | - | - | - | | Burghredi | |
| W | | | | - | - | - | - | | | |
| SD1 | | | devastandam | cepit | occidit | subdiditque | regi | - | Burhredo | - |
| SD2 | | | | - | - | - | - | | Burhredi | |
| JoW | | | | - | - | - | - | | Burhredi | |

[7,12]

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|---------|-------|---------|-----|-----|-----|--------|-------|-------------|
| St | - | - | - | - | - | - | Quo | facto, | domum | revertitur. |
| Co | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | |
| B | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | |
| Ar | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | |
| W | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | |
| SD1 | qui | gratias | agens | dimisit | eum | cum | - | - | - | - |
| SD2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | redit |
| JoW | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | |

| | | | | |
|-----|--------|----|---------|---------|
| SD1 | gaudio | ad | propria | remeare |
|-----|--------|----|---------|---------|

⁴²⁴ Interlined: gloss of "stipendia."

[8,1]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------|------|------|-------------|------|-----------|--------|--|--|
| St | Eodem | anno | (-)→ | Æthelwulfus | rex | praefatum | filium | | |
| Co | | | (-)→ | | | | | | |
| B | | | (-)→ | Æthelwulfus | | prefatum | | | |
| Ar | | | (-)→ | Æthelwulfus | | | | | |
| W | | | (-)→ | | | | | | |
| SD1 | | | (-)→ | Ethelwlfus | | - | | | |
| SD2 | | | (-)→ | Ethelwlfus | | | | | |
| JoW | | | (-)→ | Ethelwlfus | | | | | |
| ASN | - | - | rex | Adheluulfus | (-)← | - | | | |

[8,2]

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------|-----------|-----|-------|----------|----|-------|------------|---------|--------|
| St | suum | Ælfredum, | - | magno | nobilium | et | etiam | ignobilium | - | - |
| Co | | | - | | | | | | - | - |
| B | | Ælfredum | - | | | | | | - | - |
| Ar | | | - | | | | | | - | - |
| W | | | - | | | | | | - | - |
| SD1 | | Elfredum | cum | | | - | - | - | militum | agmine |
| SD2 | | Elfredum | - | | | | | | - | - |
| JoW | | Ælfredum | - | | | | | | - | - |
| ASN | | Alfredum | - | | | | | | - | - |

[8,3]

| | | | | | |
|-----|--------|--------------|------------|-------|-------------|
| St | numero | constipatum, | honorifice | Romam | transmisit. |
| Co | | | | | |
| B | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | |
| W | | | | | |
| SD1 | - | | - | | |
| SD2 | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | |

[8,4]

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------------|----------------|------------------------|-----|---------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|-----|--------|--------|
| St | <i>Quo</i> | <i>tempore</i> | <i>dominus</i> | Leo | Papa ⁴²⁵ | <i>[quartus]</i> ⁴²⁶ | <i>apostolicae</i> | - | - | - |
| Co | | | | | | - | | - | - | - |
| B | | | | | | 4 ^{us} | | - | - | - |
| Ar | | | | | | 4 | apostolice | - | - | - |
| W | | | | | | | | - | - | - |
| SD1 | | | beatus | | | - | | - | - | - |
| SD2 | quem | - | sanctus ⁴²⁷ | | | - | - | - | - | - |
| JoW | quem | - | - | | | - | - | fui | patris | rogatu |
| ASN | | | dompnus | | | quartus | apostolice | - | - | - |

⁴²⁵ W: "Deest MS. Cott." (7).

⁴²⁶ W claims this was present in Cotton Otho A.xii. As it is not present in other transcripts, this may have been a later addition to the MS.

⁴²⁷ Simeon, *Opera*, reports *sui* (44).

[8,5]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|-------------|------------------|------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| St | <i>sedi</i> | <i>praeerat,</i> | <i>qui</i> | <i>praefatum</i> | <i>infantem</i> | <i>Ælfredum</i> |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | <i>Ælfredum</i> |
| Ar | | | | <i>praefatum</i> | | |
| W | | | | | | |
| SD1 | | | | | | - |
| SD2 | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | <i>praefatum</i> | | <i>Alfredum</i> |

[8,6]

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------------|-----------------|--------------|-----------|---------------|--------------------|-----------|-----------|---------------|-------------------|
| St | <i>oppido</i> | <i>ordinans</i> | <i>unxit</i> | <i>in</i> | <i>regem,</i> | <i>(-)↓7</i> | <i>et</i> | <i>in</i> | <i>filium</i> | <i>adoptionis</i> |
| Co | | | | | | <i>(-)↓7</i> | | | | |
| B | | | | | | <i>(-)↓7</i> | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | <i>(-)↓7</i> | | | | |
| W | | | | | | <i>(-)↓7</i> | | | | |
| SD1 | | | | | | <i>(-)↓7</i> | | | | |
| SD2 | <i>-†</i> | | | | | <i>(-)↓7</i> | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | <i>(-)↓7</i> | | | | |
| ASN | <i>-</i> | <i>-</i> | <i>-</i> | <i>-</i> | <i>-</i> | <i>convirmavit</i> | | | | |

[8,7]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----------------|------------------|---------------------|-----------|-----------|---------------|--------------|-----------|---------------|
| St | <i>sibimet</i> | <i>accipiens</i> | <i>confirmavit.</i> | <i>-</i> | <i>-</i> | <i>-</i> | <i>-</i> | <i>-</i> | <i>-</i> |
| Co | | | | <i>-</i> | <i>-</i> | <i>-</i> | <i>-</i> | <i>-</i> | <i>-</i> |
| B | | | | <i>-</i> | <i>-</i> | <i>-</i> | <i>-</i> | <i>-</i> | <i>-</i> |
| Ar | | | | <i>-</i> | <i>-</i> | <i>-</i> | <i>-</i> | <i>-</i> | <i>-</i> |
| W | | | | <i>-</i> | <i>-</i> | <i>-</i> | <i>-</i> | <i>-</i> | <i>-</i> |
| SD1 | ⁴²⁸ | | | <i>et</i> | <i>ad</i> | <i>patram</i> | <i>atque</i> | <i>ad</i> | <i>patrem</i> |
| SD2 | | | | <i>et</i> | <i>ad</i> | <i>patrem</i> | <i>-</i> | <i>-</i> | <i>-</i> |
| JoW | | | | <i>-</i> | <i>-</i> | <i>-</i> | <i>-</i> | <i>-</i> | <i>-</i> |
| ASN | | <i>accepit</i> | <i>(-)↑6</i> | <i>-</i> | <i>-</i> | <i>-</i> | <i>-</i> | <i>-</i> | <i>-</i> |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|------------|---------------------|---------------|--------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|
| SD1 | <i>cum</i> | <i>benedictione</i> | <i>Sancti</i> | <i>Petri</i> | <i>Apostoli</i> | <i>direxit</i> | <i>-</i> |
| SD2 | <i>eum</i> | <i>benedictione</i> | <i>-</i> | <i>-</i> | <i>-</i> | <i>-</i> | <i>remisit</i> |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|--------------|---------------|-------------|--------------------|-----------|--------------|
| ASN | <i>et</i> | <i>etiam</i> | <i>unctus</i> | <i>oleo</i> | <i>consecravit</i> | <i>in</i> | <i>regem</i> |
|-----|-----------|--------------|---------------|-------------|--------------------|-----------|--------------|

⁴²⁸ "met" interlined

[9,1]

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----|------------|-------|--------|------|----------|--------|----|---------------------|-----|-------------|
| St | - | - | Eodem | quoque | anno | Ealhere | comes, | - | - | cum | Cantuariis, |
| Co | - | - | | | | Aelhere | | - | - | | |
| B | - | - | | | | | | - | - | | |
| Ar | - | - | | | | | | - | - | | |
| W | - | - | | | | Ealhere | | - | - | | |
| SD1 | Ea | tempestate | - | - | - | Alchere | | et | wada ⁴²⁹ | | |
| SD2 | - | - | - | quo | | Ealchere | | - | - | | |
| JoW | - | - | | | | Alchere | | - | - | | |

[9,2]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|----|-------|-----|-----|------------|--------|-----------|
| St | et | Huda, | - | cum | Suthriis, | contra | paganorum |
| Co | | | - | | | | |
| B | | | - | | Suthreis | | |
| Ar | | | - | | | | |
| W | | | - | - | | | |
| SD1 | | - | - | | Suthrigiis | | |
| SD2 | | uuada | dux | | - | - | |
| JoW | | | - | | Suðregis | | |
| ASN | | | - | | | | |

[9,3]

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|---------|----------|----|---------|------|----------|---------|----|----------|--------|
| St | exercitum | - | - | in | insula, | quae | (-)→ | dicitur | in | Saxonica | lingua |
| Co | | - | - | | | | (-)→ | | | | |
| B | | - | - | | | | (-)→ | | - | | |
| Ar | | - | - | | | que | (-)→ | | | | |
| W | | - | - | | | | (-)→ | | | | |
| SD1 | | duriter | pugnauit | | | que | (-)→ | - | - | | |
| SD2 | - | - | - | | | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| JoW | | - | - | | | que | Saxonica | | - | (-)← | - |
| ASN | | - | - | | | - | - | - | - | - | - |

[9,4]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|---------|------------|-------|---------|-------|---------|----|------------|
| St | Tenet, | - | Britannico | autem | sermone | Ruim, | animose | et | - |
| Co | | - | | | | | | | - |
| B | | - | | | | Ruym | | | - |
| Ar | Cenet | - | | | | | | | - |
| W | | - | | | | | | | - |
| SD1 | Tened | dicitur | | - | | | - | - | appellatur |
| SD2 | Thenet | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| JoW | Thenet | - | Britannice | - | - | | | | - |
| ASN | | - | - | - | - | - | | | - |

⁴²⁹ Cf. [9,2]

[9,5]

| | | | | | |
|-----|---------|------------------|-------|--------|---------|
| St | acriter | belligeraverunt, | - | - | - |
| Co | | | - | - | - |
| B | | | - | - | - |
| Ar | | | - | - | - |
| W | | | - | - | - |
| SD1 | - | - | - | - | - |
| SD2 | | bellum | meunt | contra | paganos |
| JoW | | - | - | - | - |
| ASN | | | - | - | - |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|----|----------|--------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|
| St | et | primitus | - | - | Christiani | victoriam | - |
| Co | | | - | - | | | - |
| B | | | - | - | | | - |
| Ar | | | - | - | | | - |
| W | | | - | - | | | - |
| SD1 | - | | - | - | | | - |
| SD2 | | primo | quidem | congressu | | victores | exciterunt |
| JoW | | | - | - | | | - |
| ASN | | | - | - | | | - |

[9,6]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|------------|-----|---------------|-----|------------------------|--------|
| St | habuerunt, | - | prolongatoque | diu | proelio | ibidem |
| Co | | - | | | | |
| B | | - | | | praelio | |
| Ar | | - | | | prelio | |
| W | | - | | | Praelio | |
| SD1 | | sed | prolongato | | | - |
| SD2 | - | sed | prolongato | | | - |
| JoW | | - | prolongatoque | | prelio | |
| ASN | | - | prolongatoque | - | praelio ⁴³⁰ | |

⁴³⁰ Dumville and Lapidge state that the "word *diu* follows" (*The Annals of St Neots* 44) but it actually precedes *proelio* in all witnesses it occurs.

[9,7]

| | | | | | |
|-----|----------|----|---------|-------|---------|
| St | - | ex | utraque | parte | plurimi |
| Co | - | | | | |
| B | - | | | | |
| Ar | - | | | | |
| W | - | | | | |
| SD1 | - | | | | |
| SD2 | plurimis | | | | (-)← |
| JoW | - | | | | |
| ASN | - | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|--------|-----|--------|----|----|------|
| SD2 | peremptis | gladis | non | nullis | et | in | mari |
|-----|-----------|--------|-----|--------|----|----|------|

| | | | | | |
|-----|------------|----------|-------|-------|---------|
| St | ceciderunt | - | et | in | aqua |
| Co | occiderunt | - | | | |
| B | | - | | | |
| Ar | | - | | | |
| W | | - | | | |
| SD1 | corruerunt | multique | - | | flumine |
| SD2 | - | - | (-)↑7 | (-)↑7 | (-)↑7 |
| JoW | occiderunt | | | | aquam† |
| ASN | | - | | | |

[9,8]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------|------------|-------|----|--------|---------|--------|-----------|-------|
| St | mersi | suffocati | sunt, | et | - | comites | - | - | - |
| Co | | | | | - | | - | - | - |
| B | | | | | - | | - | - | - |
| Ar | | | | | - | | - | - | - |
| W | | | | | - | | - | - | - |
| SD1 | - | | | | occisi | - | - | - | - |
| SD2 | - | suffocatis | - | - | - | - | tandem | utriusque | duces |
| JoW | | | | | - | | - | - | - |
| ASN | | | | | - | | - | - | - |

| | | | | | |
|-----|--------------|-----------|--------|------|-----------|
| SD1 | inedicilibis | multitudo | dulces | uero | praedicti |
|-----|--------------|-----------|--------|------|-----------|

| | | | |
|-----|------|------|--------|
| St | illi | ambo | ibidem |
| Co | | | |
| B | | | |
| Ar | | | |
| W | | | |
| SD1 | - | | |
| JoW | | | |
| ASN | | | |

[9,9]

| | | | | | | |
|------------------|--------------|-----|--------|------|-------------|-----|
| St | occubuerunt. | - | - | - | - | - |
| Co | | - | - | - | - | - |
| B | | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ar | | - | - | - | - | - |
| W ⁴³¹ | | - | - | - | - | - |
| SD1 | | pro | gentis | suac | liberatione | - |
| SD2 | | - | - | - | - | hoc |
| JoW | | - | - | - | - | - |
| ASN | | - | - | - | - | - |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------|----|-------|-------|--|--------------|--------|
| St | Necnon | et | eodem | anno | | Æthelwulfus, | (-)↓10 |
| Co | | | | | | | (-)↓10 |
| B | | | | | | | (-)↓10 |
| Ar | | | | | | | (-)↓10 |
| W | | | | | | | (-)↓10 |
| SD1 | - | - | - | - | | Athelwlfus | Rex |
| SD2 | - | - | - | | | Atheluulfus | (-)↓10 |
| JoW | Nec non | | | | | (-)↓10 | - |
| ASN | | | | eodem | | Atheluulfus | - |

[9,10]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|------|--------|---------------|---------|------------|-------|
| St | (-)→ | (-)→ | Occidentalium | Saxonum | (-)↑9 | rex, |
| Co | post | Pascha | | | (-)↑9 | |
| B | post | Pascha | | | (-)↑9 | |
| Ar | post | Pascha | | | (-)↑9 | |
| W | post | Pascha | (-)→ | (-)→ | (-)↑9 | (-)→ |
| SD2 | - | - | | | (-)↑9 | |
| JoW | (-)→ | (-)→ | | | Abeluulfus | (-)↑9 |
| ASN | post | Pascha | | | (-)↑9 | |

| | | | | |
|-----|-----------|------------|------|---------------------|
| SD1 | gloriosae | potestatis | ipso | anno ⁴³² |
|-----|-----------|------------|------|---------------------|

| | | | | | | |
|-----|------|--------|---------------|---------|-------|--------|
| St | post | Pascha | (-)← | (-)← | (-)← | filiam |
| Co | (-)← | (-)← | (-)← | (-)← | (-)← | |
| B | (-)← | (-)← | (-)← | (-)← | (-)← | |
| Ar | (-)← | (-)← | (-)← | (-)← | (-)← | |
| W | (-)← | (-)← | occidentalium | saxonum | rex | |
| SD1 | † | - | - | - | (-)↑9 | (-)→ |
| JoW | | | (-)← | (-)← | (-)↑9 | |
| JoW | - | - | (-)← | (-)← | (-)↑9 | |

| | | | | | |
|-----|--------------|---------|----------------|---------|--------|
| SD1 | festivitatem | sanctae | resurrectionis | Christi | filiam |
|-----|--------------|---------|----------------|---------|--------|

⁴³¹ W changes the ordering of the words in this and the line that follows [9,9-10].

⁴³² Cf. [9,9]

[9,11]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------|-----------|------|-----------|------|----------|-----|-------|--------|
| St | suam | Burgredo | - | Merciorum | regi | - | - | - | - |
| Co | | | - | | | - | - | - | - |
| B | | | - | | | - | - | - | - |
| Ar | | | - | | | - | - | - | - |
| W | | | - | | | - | - | - | - |
| SD1 | | Burhredo | regi | | - | tradidit | cum | magna | gloria |
| SD2 | (-)→ | (-)→ | (-)→ | (-)→ | (-)→ | tradidit | - | - | - |
| JoW | | Burhredo | - | | | - | - | - | - |
| ASN | | Burchredo | - | | | - | - | - | - |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----|-------|-----|-----|--------|--------|------|-----------|------|----------|
| SD1 | ut | regia | mos | est | (-)↓12 | - | - | - | - | - |
| SD2 | - | - | - | - | nuptus | filiam | suam | merciorum | regi | Burhredo |

| | | | | |
|-----|----|-------|--------|------|
| St | in | villa | regia, | quae |
| Co | | | | |
| B | | | | |
| Ar | | | | |
| W | | | | |
| SD1 | | | | |
| SD2 | | | | que |
| JoW | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |

[9,12]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------|--------------|-----|---------|-----------|---------|----|
| St | dicitur | Cippanhamme, | - | nuptiis | regaliter | factis, | ad |
| Co | | | - | | | | |
| B | | Cypanhamme | - | | | | |
| Ar | | | - | | | | |
| W | | | - | | | | |
| SD1 | | Etcippanhama | quo | | - | - | - |
| SD2 | vocatur | Cippanhame | - | (-)↑11 | - | - | - |
| JoW | | Cippanham | - | | | | |
| ASN | | Cippanhame | - | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----------|---------|----------|---------|-------------|-----|------------|-------|---------|
| SD1 | peractis | reginae | precepit | nominis | dignitatem. | - | - | - | - |
| SD2 | - | - | - | - | - | cum | affluentia | rerum | omnium. |

[9,13]

| | | |
|-----|---------|--------|
| St | reginam | dedit. |
| Co | | |
| B | | |
| Ar | | |
| W | | |
| JoW | | |
| ASN | | |

[10,1]

| | | | | | |
|-----|-------------|------------------|----------------------|-----------|--------------------|
| St | <i>Anno</i> | <i>Dominicae</i> | <i>Incarnationis</i> | DCCCLV, | <i>nativitatis</i> |
| Co | | | | | |
| B | | | | 855 | |
| Ar | | | | | |
| W | | | | | |
| SD1 | | - | - | | |
| SD2 | | - | - | | - |
| ASN | | - | - | .dcccclv. | - |

[10,2]

| | | | | | |
|-----|--------------|-----------------|--------------|-----------------|-----------|
| St | <i>autem</i> | <i>praefati</i> | <i>regis</i> | <i>septimo,</i> | <i>-,</i> |
| Co | | | | | - |
| B | | Ælfredi† | | | - |
| Ar | | | | | - |
| W | | | | | - |
| SD1 | - | | | vii | |
| ASN | - | - | - | - | rex |

[10,3]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|----------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|------------------------|---------------|----------------|--------------|
| St | <i>[Eadmundus⁴³³,</i> | <i>Orientalium</i> | <i>Anglorum</i> | <i>gloriosissimus,</i> | <i>coepit</i> | <i>regnare</i> | <i>VIII.</i> |
| Ar | Eadmundus | | | | cepit | | 8 |
| W | Eadmundus | | | | | | |
| ASM | Eadmundus | | | | cepit | | .viii. |

[10,4]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----------------|------------------|-----------|------------|------------|----------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|
| St | <i>Kalend.</i> | <i>Ianuarii,</i> | <i>id</i> | <i>est</i> | <i>die</i> | <i>natalis</i> | <i>Domini,</i> | <i>anno</i> | <i>aetatis</i> |
| Ar | | | | | | | | | etatis |
| W | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | Kalend. | | | | | | | | |

[10,5]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------------|---------------|----------------|------------|--------------|-------------|-------------------|------------------|
| St | <i>suae</i> | <i>decimo</i> | <i>quarto.</i> | <i>Hoc</i> | <i>etiam</i> | <i>anno</i> | <i>Lotharius,</i> | <i>Imperator</i> |
| Ar | | 14 | (-)← | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | | |
| ASM | | .xiiii. | (-)← | | | | | |

[10,6]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|-------------|
| St | <i>Romanus,</i> | <i>obiit,</i> | <i>filius</i> | <i>Ludovici</i> | <i>Augusti</i> | <i>piïssimi.</i> | <i>Anno</i> |
| Ar | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | |
| ASN | Romanorum | | | Hloduuici | | | |

⁴³³ St marks this as an interpolation from ASN, though W had not—he notes that it is missing from Cotton Otho A.xii.

[10,7]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------------|------------|---------------|-------|---------------|---------------|---------------------|-------------|-----------------|
| St | <i>eodem,</i> | <i>sub</i> | <i>initio</i> | - | <i>Karoli</i> | <i>tertii</i> | <i>Imperatoris,</i> | <i>fili</i> | <i>Ludovici</i> |
| Ar | | | | - | | | | | |
| W | | | | - | | | | | |
| ASN | | in | initium | regni | | tercii | | filius | Loduuici |

[10,8]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------------|-------|------|--------|-----------|-----------|------|----------|
| St | <i>Secundi]</i> | - | - | magnus | paganorum | exercitus | tota | hieme |
| Co | - | - | - | | | | | hyeme |
| B | - | - | - | | | | | hyeme |
| Ar | secundi | - | - | | | | | |
| W | secundi | - | - | | | | | hyeme |
| SD1 | - | - | - | -† | | | | hyeme |
| SD2 | - | - | - | | | | | hyeme |
| JoW | - | - | - | | | | | |
| ASN | secundi | eodem | anno | | | | - | hiemavit |

[10,9]

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----|---------|----------|--------|-----------|----|-----|--------|--------|--------------|
| St | in | prefata | sceapege | insula | (-)← | - | - | - | - | hiemaverunt. |
| Co | | | scepage | | (-)← | - | - | - | - | hyemaverunt |
| B | | | scepage | | (-)← | - | - | - | - | hyemaverunt |
| Ar | | | scepage | | (-)← | - | - | - | - | |
| W | | | | | (-)← | - | - | - | - | hyemaverunt |
| SD1 | - | | (-)→ | | Scepage | - | - | - | - | hyemaverunt |
| SD2 | - | | (-)→ | | Sceapege | id | est | insula | omnium | hyemaverunt |
| JoW | | | | | - | - | - | - | - | |
| ASN | - | - | - | | Sceapeige | - | - | - | - | - |

[11,1]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------|--------|------|-----|---------|-------------|-----------|-------------|
| St | Eodem | - | anno | - | - | Æthelwulfus | praefatus | venerabilis |
| Co | | - | | - | - | | | |
| B | | - | | - | - | Æthelwolfus | prefatus | |
| Ar | | - | | - | - | | | |
| W | | - | | - | - | | | |
| SD1 | - | - | - | quo | tempore | Ethelwlfus | - | - |
| SD2 | | - | | - | - | Atheluulfus | - | - |
| JoW | | - | | - | - | | | |
| ASN | | quoque | | - | - | Adheluulfus | - | |

[11,2]

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|---------------|---------|-----------|---------|-------|-----|----------|--------|----|---------|
| St | rex | - | - | decimam | totius | regni | sui | - | partem | ab | omni |
| Co | | - | - | | | | | - | | | |
| B | | - | - | | | | | - | | | |
| Ar | | - | - | | | | | - | | | |
| W | | - | - | | | | | - | | | |
| SD1 | | - | - | decimavit | totium† | | | imperium | - | - | - |
| SD2 | | - | - | | | | | - | | | |
| JoW | | - | - | | | | | - | | | omnius† |
| ASN | | Occidentalium | Saxonum | | | | | - | | | |

[11,3]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|----------|----|---------|------------|-----|----|---------------|
| St | regali | servitio | et | tributo | liberavit, | - | in | sempiternoque |
| Co | | | | | | - | | sempiterno |
| B | | | | | | - | | sempiterno |
| Ar | | | | | | - | | |
| W | | | | | | - | | sempiterno |
| SD2 | | | | | | et† | | sempiterno† |
| JoW | | | | | | - | | sempiterno† |
| ASN | | | | | | - | | sempiterno† |

[11,4]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------|----|-------|----------|-------|-------------|--------|
| St | graphio | in | cruce | Christi, | pro | redemptione | animae |
| Co | † | | | | | | |
| B | grafio | | | | | | |
| Ar | † | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | |
| SD1 | - | - | - | -† | | | |
| SD2 | | | | (-)↓5 | (-)↓5 | (-)↓5 | |
| JoW | | | | | | | |
| ASN | grafio | | | | | | |

[11,5]

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------|---------|-------|-------------|----|--------------|---------|-----|----|-------|-----|
| St | suac | (-)↑4 | (-)↑4 | (-)↑4 | et | antecessorum | suorum, | uni | et | trino | Deo |
| Co | | (-)↑4 | (-)↑4 | (-)↑4 | | | | | | | |
| B | | (-)↑4 | (-)↑4 | (-)↑4 | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | (-)↑4 | (-)↑4 | (-)↑4 | | | | | | | |
| W | | (-)↑4 | (-)↑4 | (-)↑4 | | | | | | | |
| SD1 | | - | (-)↑4 | (-)↑4 | | | | - | - | - | - |
| SD2 | | Christi | pro | redemptione | | | | | | | |
| JoW | | (-)↑4 | (-)↑4 | (-)↑4 | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | (-)↑4 | (-)↑4 | (-)↑4 | | | | | | | |

[11,6]

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------------|----------|--------|------|------|------|-------|-------|-----|--------|
| St | immolavit. | Eodemque | - | anno | - | - | cum | magno | - | honore |
| Co | | | - | | - | - | | | - | |
| B | | eodem | quoque | | - | - | | | - | |
| Ar | | | - | | - | - | | | - | |
| W | | | - | | - | - | | | - | |
| SD1 | - | - | - | - | ipso | uero | | | - | |
| SD2 | | | - | | - | - | | | cum | |
| JoW | | - | - | - | | | sique | | - | |
| ASN | | † | - | | | | cum | | - | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----|--------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-----|--------|----------------------|
| SD1 | ad | limina | principis | apostolorum | profectus | est | habens | secum ⁴³⁴ |
|-----|----|--------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-----|--------|----------------------|

[11,7]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|-------|-----------|--------------|-----------|------|----------|
| St | Romam | perrexit, | praefatumque | filium | suum | Ælfredum |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | prefatumque | | | Ælfredum |
| Ar | | | prefatumque | | | |
| W | | | | | | |
| SD1 | - | - | - | - | - | Elfredum |
| SD2 | | | - | filiumque | | Elfredum |
| JoW | | | - | filiumque | | Ælfredum |
| ASN | | | prefatum | | | Ælfredum |

[11,8⁴³⁵]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|----|--------|------|-------|---------|
| St | iterum | in | eandem | viam | secum | ducens, |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | candem | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | eadem | via | | |

[11,9]

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----|------|-------|---------------------|------|----------|-------|--------|-------|------------|--------|
| St | eo | quod | illum | - | plus | certis | - | filiis | - | diligebat, | ibique |
| Co | | | | - | | | - | | - | | |
| B | | | | - | | | - | suis† | | | |
| Ar | | | | - | | | - | suis† | | | |
| W | | | | - | | caeteris | - | | - | | |
| SD1 | | | | (-)→ | - | (-)→ | magis | - | - | diligeret | - |
| SD2 | - | - | - | quem | | ceteris | - | - | - | dilexit | - |
| JoW | - | - | - | quem ⁴³⁶ | | | - | - | - | | - |
| ASN | | | | - | | | - | | suis† | | |

⁴³⁴ Cf. Co [11,8].

⁴³⁵ Compare with SD2 & JoW [11,9].

⁴³⁶ For *eo quod illum*.

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------|----------|---------|------|-------|-------|---------|-------|------|-------|------|----------|
| SD1 | quam | caeteros | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| SD2 | (-)← | (-)← | quemque | nisi | antea | Romam | miserat | etiam | nunc | secum | illo | deducens |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|----|--------|------|-------|---------|-----|
| JoW | Iterum | in | eandem | viam | secum | ducens, | ibi |
|-----|--------|----|--------|------|-------|---------|-----|

[11,10]

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|-----|-----|----------|----|------------|------|----------|-----|---------|
| SD1 | susceptus | est | rex | anglorum | ab | apostolico | viro | decenter | quo | moratus |
|-----|-----------|-----|-----|----------|----|------------|------|----------|-----|---------|

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|------|--------|---------|-----------|------|-----|----------|----|
| St | - | anno | - | integro | remoratus | est. | quo | peracto, | ad |
| Co | - | | - | | | | | | |
| B | - | | - | | demoratus | | | | |
| Ar | - | | - | | demoratus | | | | |
| W | - | | - | | | | | | |
| SD1 | est | | - | | - | - | - | - | - |
| SD2 | - | | ibidem | | | | | | |
| JoW | - | | - | | | | | | |
| ASN | - | | - | | demoratus | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------------|----|------------|-----------|------------|----|--------|----|
| SD1 | orationibus | et | elemosinis | insistens | diligenter | eo | quoque | ad |
|-----|-------------|----|------------|-----------|------------|----|--------|----|

[11,11]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------|------|---------------------------|-----------|----------|-------|------------|
| St | patriam | suam | - | remeavit, | adferens | secum | Iuthittam, |
| Co | | | - | | | | |
| B | | | - | | ducens† | | |
| Ar | | | - | | | | |
| W | | | - | | | | |
| SD1 | | - | revertente ⁴³⁷ | - | - | - | - |
| SD2 | | | - | | afferens | | Iuditham |
| JoW | | | - | | afferens | | Iuðittam |
| ASN | | | - | | afferens | | Iudithtam |

| | | |
|-----|-------|-----|
| SD1 | filio | suo |
|-----|-------|-----|

[11,12]

| | | | | |
|-----|---------|------------|--------|---------|
| St | Karoli, | Francorum | regis, | filiam. |
| Co | | | | |
| B | | | | |
| Ar | | Ffrancorum | | |
| W | | | | |
| SD2 | | | | |
| JoW | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |

⁴³⁷ Cf. "adferens" / "afferens."

[12,1]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------|------------|--------|------------|------|-------|------|
| St | Interea | (-)→ | tamen, | Æthelwulfo | rege | ultra | mare |
| Co | | Æthelwulfo | | (-)← | | | |
| B | | (-)→ | | Æthelwulfo | | | |
| Ar | | (-)→ | | | | | |
| W | | Æthelwulfo | | (-)← | | | |
| JoW | | (-)→ | | aðeluulfo | | | |
| ASN | | (-)→ | | Adheluulfo | | | |

[12,2]

| | | | | | |
|-----|----------|---------|------------|---------|---------|
| St | tantillo | tempore | immorante, | quaedam | infamia |
| Co | | | | | |
| B | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | |
| W | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | quedam | |

[12,3]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|-------|--------|---------------|----|-------------|
| St | contra | morem | omnium | Christianorum | in | occidentali |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | |

[12,4]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|-------|----------|------|------|-----|-------------|
| St | parte | Selwuda | orta | est. | Nam | Æthelbaldus |
| Co | | | | | | Æthelbald |
| B | | | | | | Æthelbald |
| Ar | | | | | | Æthelbald |
| W | | | | | | |
| SD1 | - | - | - | - | - | Ethelbaldo |
| JoW | | Selwudae | | | | Aðelbald |
| ASN | | Salouuda | | | | Adhelbaldus |

[12,5]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------|---------------------|--------------|---------------|----|--------------|-------------|----------------|
| St | rex, | [<i>Æthelwulfi</i> | <i>regis</i> | <i>filii,</i> | et | (-)→ | Ealhstan, | Scireburnensis |
| Co | | - | - | - | | (-)→ | | |
| B | | <i>Æthelwolfi</i> | | <i>filii</i> | | (-)→ | | |
| Ar | | <i>Æthelwulfi</i> | | <i>filii</i> | | (-)→ | | |
| W | | | | | | (-)→ | | |
| SD1 | - | - | - | - | | Scirburnensi | Eathastano† | (-)← |
| JoW | | - | - | - | | (-)→ | | |
| ASN | | <i>Adheluulfi</i> | | <i>filii</i> | | (-)→ | Ealchstanus | |

[12,6]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------------------|-------------------|-----------|-----------------|-----------|---------------|--------------|----------------|-------------|
| St | <i>ecclesiae</i> | <i>episcopus,</i> | - | - | Eanwulf | <i>quoque</i> | - | - | - |
| Co | | | - | - | Eanwulfe | | - | - | - |
| B | | | - | - | Eamwulfe | | - | - | - |
| Ar | | | - | - | | | - | - | - |
| W | | | - | - | | | - | - | - |
| SD1 | - | <i>episcopo</i> | <i>et</i> | <i>plurimis</i> | - | - | <i>aliis</i> | <i>perosus</i> | <i>erat</i> |
| JoW | | | - | - | | | - | - | - |
| ASN | | | - | - | Eanuulfus | | - | - | - |

[12,7]

| | | | | | |
|-----|-----------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| St | <i>Summurtunensis</i> | <i>pagae</i> | <i>comes</i> | <i>coniurasse</i> | <i>referuntur,</i> |
| Co | | | | | |
| B | <i>Sumertunensis</i> | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | |
| W | | | | | |
| JoW | <i>Sumurtunensis</i> | | | | |
| ASN | <i>Sumurtunensis</i> | <i>page</i> | | | |

[12,8]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|---------------|--------------------|-------------|----------|-------------|-------------------|---------------|
| St | <i>ne</i> | <i>unquam</i> | <i>Æthelwulf</i> | <i>rex,</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>Roma</i> | <i>revertens,</i> | <i>iterum</i> |
| Co | | | | | | | | |
| B | | | <i>Æthelwolfe</i> | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | <i>Aðeluulf</i> | | | | | |
| ASN | | <i>umquam</i> | <i>Adheluulfus</i> | | | | | |

[12,9]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|--------------|---------------------|-------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------|
| St | <i>in</i> | <i>regno</i> | <i>reciperetur.</i> | <i>Quod</i> | - | <i>inauditum</i> | <i>omnibus</i> |
| Co | | | | | - | | |
| B | | | | | inad | | |
| Ar | | | | | - | | |
| W | | | | | - | | |
| JoW | | | | | - | | |
| ASN | | | | | - | | |

[12,10]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------|------|--------------|----------|----|--------|-----------|
| St | seculis | ante | infortunium, | episcopo | et | comiti | solummodo |
| Co | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | |

[12,11]

| | | | | | |
|-----|------------|-----------|----|--------|----------|
| St | perplurimi | reputant, | ex | quorum | consilio |
| Co | | | | | |
| B | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | |
| W | | | | | |
| SD1 | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | |

[12,12]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|--------|------|-------------|-------|--------|--------|
| St | hoc | factum | esse | perhibetur. | Multi | quoque | regali |
| Co | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | - |
| W | | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | |

[12,13]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|-------------|-----------|------|----|------|--------------------------|-----|----|
| St | solummodo | insolentiae | deputant, | quia | et | ille | - | rex | in |
| Co | | | | | | | Æthelbald ⁴³⁸ | | |
| B | | | | | | | Æthelbald | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | - | | |
| W | | | | | | | - | | |
| JoW | | | | | | | - | | |
| ASN | | insolentie | | | | | - | | |

[12,14]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|----|----|----|--------|-------|-----------------|----------|
| St | hac | re | et | in | multis | aliis | perversitatibus | pertinax |
| Co | | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | |

⁴³⁸ A note in the lefthand margin beside this line reads "Æthelbald per linaria."

[12,15]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|-------|-------|-----------|---------|--------|------------|
| St | fuit, | sicut | quorundam | hominum | relatu | audivimus: |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | |
| ASN | | sic | quorunda | | | |

[12,16]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|------|----|------|-----------|------------|-----------|-----|
| St | quod | et | rei | sequentis | approbavit | effectus. | Nam |
| Co | | | regi | | | | |
| B | | | | | probavit | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | |

[12,17]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----------|----|---|-------|------------|--------|-------|------------|
| St | redeunte | eo | a | Roma, | praedictus | filius | regis | Æthelwulfi |
| Co | | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | predictus | | | Æthelwolfe |
| Ar | | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | Adheluulfi |

[12,18]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|---------|------|---------------|------|--------------|
| St | cum | omnibus | suis | consiliariis, | immo | insidiariis, |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | insiliaris |
| ASN | | | | | | insiliaris |

[12,19]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|---------|------------|-----------|-------|----|-------|---|
| St | tantum | facinus | perpetrare | tentati | sunt, | ut | regem | a |
| Co | | | | temptati | | | | |
| B | | | | temptati | | | | |
| Ar | | | | temptati | | | | |
| W | | | | temptati | | | | |
| JoW | | | | temptati† | | | | |
| ASN | | | | temptati | | | | |

[12,20]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------|---------|--------------|------|-----|------|-----|-------|
| St | regno | proprio | repellerent: | quod | nec | Deus | ita | fieri |
| Co | | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | |

[12,21]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|-----|---------|--------|----------|---------------|
| St | permisit, | nec | nobiles | totius | Saxoniae | consenserunt. |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | Anglie | |

[12,22]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|------|----|----------------|--------|----------|------------|--------------|
| St | Nam, | ne | irremedicabile | - | Saxoniae | periculum, | belligerante |
| Co | | | | - | | | |
| B | | | | totius | | | |
| Ar | | | | - | | | |
| W | | | | - | | | |
| JoW | | | | - | Saxonie | | |
| ASN | | | inremediabile | - | Anglie | | |

[12,23]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------|----|--------|------|------|------|-----|-------|
| St | patre | et | filio, | quin | immo | tota | cum | gente |
| Co | | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | |

[12,24]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------|------------------|----------|----|-----------|-----|------|
| St | ambobus | rebellante, | atrocius | et | crudelius | per | dies |
| Co | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | |
| JoW | | † ⁴³⁹ | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | |

⁴³⁹ St: *fn. rebellantibus*

[12,25]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|----------|-------|--------|-----------|------------|------------|
| St | singulos | quasi | clades | intestina | augeretur, | ineffabili |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | |

[12,26]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|-----------|----|--------|---------------|-----------|
| St | patris | clementia | et | omnium | astipulatione | nobilium, |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | |

[12,27]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----------|-------|--------|-------|--------|----|--------|------------|
| St | adunatum | antea | regnum | inter | patrem | et | filium | dividitur, |
| Co | | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | |

[12,28]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|----|------------|--------|--------|--------------|-------|------|
| St | et | orientales | plagae | patri, | occidentales | filio | e |
| Co | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | | _440 |
| ASN | | | page | | | | |

[12,29]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------------|-------------|-----|------|-------|-------|---------|
| St | contrario | deputantur. | Ubi | enim | pater | iusto | iudicio |
| Co | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | |
| JoW | econtrario† | | | | | | |
| ASN | contra | | | | | | |

⁴⁴⁰ Cf. [12,29].

[12,30]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------|-----------|-------|---------|----|----------|--------|-----------|
| St | regnare | debuerat, | illic | iniquus | et | pertinax | filius | regnabat; |
| Co | | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | |

[12,31]

| | | | | | |
|-----|-----|--------------|------|----------|--------|
| St | nam | occidentalis | pars | Saxoniae | semper |
| Co | | | | | |
| B | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | |
| W | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | Anglie | |

[12,32]

| | | | |
|-----|-----------|--------------|------|
| St | orientali | principalior | est. |
| Co | | | |
| B | | | |
| Ar | | | |
| W | | | |
| JoW | | | |
| ASN | | | |

[13,1]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|------------|--------|------------|------|---|-------|
| St | Adveniente | igitur | Æthelwulfo | rege | a | Roma, |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | Æthelwolfo | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | Adheluulfo | | | |

[13,2]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------|------|-------|----|--------|-------|----|---------|----------|
| St | tota | illa | gens, | ut | dignum | erat, | in | adventu | senioris |
| Co | | | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | |

[13,3]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|---------|------|-----|----|------|--------------|------------|
| St | ita | gravisa | est, | ut, | si | ille | permitteret, | pertinacem |
| Co | | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | |

[13,4]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|------|-------------|-----|---------|------|--------------|
| St | filium | suum | Æthelbaldum | cum | omnibus | suis | consiliariis |
| Co | | | | | | | |
| B | | | Æthelbaldum | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | Aðelbaldum | | | | |
| ASN | | | Adhelbaldum | | | | |

[13,5]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|--------|-------|-------|-----------|----------|-----|
| St | a | totius | regni | sorte | expellere | vellent. | Sed |
| Co | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | |

[13,6]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------|----|----------|-------|-----------|----|----------|----------|
| St | ille, | ut | diximus, | nimia | clementia | et | prudenti | consilio |
| Co | | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | clemencia | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | |

[13,7]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------|----|----|-------|-----------|-------------|-----|-------|
| St | usus, | ne | ad | regni | periculum | perveniret, | ita | fieri |
| Co | | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | proveniret | | |

[13,8]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------|-----|----|------------|-----------------------|-------|---------|------|---|
| St | noluit; | - | et | Iuthitham, | Karoli ⁴⁴¹ | regis | filiam, | quam | a |
| Co | | - | | | | | | | |
| B | | - | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | - | | Iuthittam† | | | | | |
| W | | - | | | | | | | |
| JoW | | - | | Iuðittam | | | | | |
| ASN | | Sed | | Iuditham | | | | | |

[13,9]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------|-----|------------|-------|----|----|--------|----------------------|--------|
| St | patre | suo | acceperat, | iuxta | se | in | regali | solio ⁴⁴² | [suo,] |
| Co | | | | | | | | | - |
| B | | | | | | | | | - |
| Ar | | | | | | | | | suo |
| W | | | | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | | | | - |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | - |

[13,10]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|------|--------|--------|----------|--------------|----|-------|
| St | sine | aliqua | suorum | nobilium | controversia | et | odio, |
| Co | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | |

[13,11]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------|----|--------|-------|-------|--------|-----------|--------|
| St | usque | ab | obitum | vitae | suae, | contra | perversam | illius |
| Co | | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | |

[13,12]

| | | | | | |
|-----|--------|----------------|--------|------------|------|
| St | gentis | consuetudinem, | sedere | imperavit. | Gens |
| Co | | | | | |
| B | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | |
| W | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | |

⁴⁴¹ W: "Faroli MS. Cott. Edd P[arker]. & C[amden]."

⁴⁴² W: "Deest MS. Cott."

[13,13]

| | | | | | |
|-----|--------|---------------|---------|---------|-------|
| St | namque | Occidentalium | Saxonum | reginam | iuxta |
| Co | | | | | |
| B | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | |
| W | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | |

[13,14]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------|--------|-----|----------|-----|--------|---------|------------|
| St | regem | sedere | non | patitur, | nec | etiam | reginam | appellari, |
| Co | | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | eciam† | | appellare |
| Ar | | | | | | | | appellare |
| W | | | | | | | | appellare |
| JoW | | | | | | | | appellare |
| ASN | | | | | | | | appellare |

[13,15]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|-------|-----------|------------|------|----------------|
| St | sed | regis | coniugem, | permittit. | Quam | controversiam, |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | quae | controversia |
| ASN | | | | | | |

[13,16]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|------|-----------|----|--------|-----------|----|
| St | immo | infamiam, | de | quadam | pertinaci | et |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | insaniam | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | |

[13,17]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|----------|---------|--------|---------|-------|---------|
| St | malevola | eiusdem | gentis | regina | ortam | fuisse, |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | | reginae | | |
| Ar | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | |
| JoW | malivola | | | | orta | est |
| ASN | malivola | | | | | |

[13,18]

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------------|----------------|---------------|-------------------|-------------|--------------|------------------|---------|-----|------------------------------|
| St | maiores | <i>illius</i> | <i>terrae</i> | <i>perhibent;</i> | <i>quae</i> | <i>omnia</i> | <i>contraria</i> | - | - | - |
| Co | | | | | | | | - | - | - |
| B | | | | | | | | - | - | - |
| Ar | | | terre | | | | | - | - | - |
| W | | | | | | | | - | - | - |
| JoW | maioribusque | - | - | - | - | - | - | nostris | sic | attestantibus ⁴⁴³ |
| ASN | | ⁴⁴⁴ | | | | | | - | - | - |

[13,19]

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----------------|------------|-----------|-------------|---------------|------------|-----------------|-----------|------------|--------------|
| St | <i>seniori</i> | <i>suo</i> | <i>et</i> | <i>omni</i> | <i>populo</i> | <i>ita</i> | <i>peregit,</i> | <i>ut</i> | <i>non</i> | <i>solum</i> |
| Co | | | | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | |

[13,20]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------------|-----------------|--------------|-------------------|-----------|----------|------------------------|--------------|
| St | <i>suum</i> | <i>proprium</i> | <i>odium</i> | <i>mereretur;</i> | <i>ut</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>reginali</i> | <i>solio</i> |
| Co | | | | meretur | et | | regali | |
| B | | | | | | | regali ^{†445} | |
| Ar | | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | |

[13,21]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|---------------------------|------------|--------------|----------------|-------------|--|
| St | <i>proiceretur;</i> | <i>sed</i> | <i>etiam</i> | <i>omnibus</i> | <i>suis</i> | <i>subsequatricibus</i> ⁴⁴⁶ |
| Co | | | | | | subsequatricibus |
| B | proiiceretur [†] | | eciam | | | subsequatricibus |
| Ar | proiiceretur [†] | | | | | subsequatricibus |
| W | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | subsequatricibus |

⁴⁴³ Continues to [14,1].

⁴⁴⁴ "illius...seniori" The top of p.36 has been cut off, and the sentence that occurred here appears to have been supplied at the bottom of p.35 in a sixteenth-century hand. Dumville and Lapidge state that "the text given here depends on that note, on the transcripts (which may not, however, be independent of the note on p.35), and on the text of Asser (from which the note could have been supplied!). The last two words can in fact be deduced from their truncated remains on the page" (*The Annals of St Neots* 47, fn.31).

⁴⁴⁵ B and Ar appear to be corrected against ASN at this point.

⁴⁴⁶ W: 'subsequatricibus MS Cott. Edd. P[arker]. & C[amden].'

[13,22]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------------|-------------------|--------------|-------------|-----------|---------------------|-----|-----------|
| St | <i>eandem</i> | <i>pestiferam</i> | <i>tabem</i> | <i>post</i> | <i>se</i> | <i>submitteret.</i> | Pro | - |
| Co | | | | | | | | - |
| B | | | | | | | | - |
| Ar | | | | | | | | - |
| W | | | | | | | | - |
| JoW | - | - | - | - | - | - | pro | Huiusmodo |
| ASN | | | | | | submitteret | | - |

[13,23]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|------------------|--------------|----------------|
| St | <i>nimia</i> | <i>namque</i> | <i>illius</i> | <i>reginae</i> | <i>malitia</i> | <i>omnes</i> | <i>accolae</i> |
| Co | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | <i>malicia</i> † | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | <i>accolae</i> |
| W | | | | | | | |
| JoW | - | - | - | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | |

[13,24]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------------|---------------|-----------------------|-----------|---------------|---------------|--------------|
| St | <i>illius</i> | <i>terrae</i> | <i>coniuraverunt,</i> | <i>ut</i> | <i>nullum</i> | <i>unquam</i> | <i>regem</i> |
| Co | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | |

[13,25]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|------------|----------------|----------------------|------------|----------------|
| St | <i>super</i> | <i>se</i> | <i>in</i> | <i>vita</i> | <i>sua</i> | <i>regnare</i> | <i>permitterent,</i> | <i>qui</i> | <i>reginam</i> |
| Co | | | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | - | - | - | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | |

[13,26]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|-------------------|--------------|--------------|-----------|---------------|-----------------|
| St | <i>in</i> | <i>regali</i> | <i>solio</i> | <i>iuxta</i> | <i>se</i> | <i>sedere</i> | <i>imperare</i> |
| Co | | | | | | | |
| B | | <i>reginali</i> | | | | | |
| Ar | | <i>reginali</i> † | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | <i>reginali</i> | | | | | |

[13,27]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------|-----------|--------------|-----------|----------------|---------------|----------------|-------------------|
| St | vellet. | <i>Et</i> | <i>quia,</i> | <i>ut</i> | <i>opinor,</i> | <i>multis</i> | <i>habetur</i> | <i>incognitum</i> |
| Co | | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | | |
| JoW | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| ASN | | | | | | | | |

[13,28]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------------|-------------|------------------|-----------|---------------------|-------------------|-----------|
| St | <i>unde</i> | <i>haec</i> | <i>perversa</i> | <i>et</i> | <i>detestabilis</i> | <i>consuetudo</i> | <i>in</i> |
| Co | | | | | | | |
| B | | | <i>perversae</i> | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | |

[13,29]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|------|------|----------|
| St | <i>Saxonia,</i> | <i>ultra</i> | <i>morem</i> | <i>omnium</i> | - | - | - |
| Co | | | | | - | - | - |
| B | | | | | (-)→ | (-)→ | (-)→ |
| Ar | | | | | - | - | - |
| W | | | | | id† | est† | gentium† |
| ASN | <i>Anglia</i> | | | | - | - | (-)→ |

| | | | | | | |
|-----|-------------------------------------|-----------------|------|------|---------|-------------------------|
| St | ⁴⁴⁷ <i>Theotiscorum,</i> | <i>primitus</i> | - | - | - | (-)← |
| Co | Theothiscirum | | - | - | - | (-)← |
| B | Theothiscirum | (-)→ | id | est | gentium | primitus |
| Ar | Tcheothiscirum† | | - | - | - | (-)← |
| W | | | (-)← | (-)← | (-)← | (-)← |
| ASN | - | (-)→ | - | - | gentium | primitus ⁴⁴⁸ |

[13,30]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------------|-------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|----------------|--------------------|
| St | <i>orta</i> | <i>sit,</i> | <i>paulo</i> | <i>latius</i> | <i>mihi</i> | <i>videtur</i> | <i>intimandum.</i> |
| Co | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | mihi | | |

⁴⁴⁷ W: "Theotiscirum MS. Cott. Edd. P[arker]. & C[amden]."

⁴⁴⁸ B appears to derive this reading from ASN.

[13,31]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|-------------|----------|---------------|------------|-----------------|----------------------|
| St | <i>Quod</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>domino</i> | <i>meo</i> | <i>Ælfredo,</i> | <i>Angul-saxonum</i> |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | Alfredo | Angulsaxonum |
| Ar | | | | | | Angulsaxonum |
| W | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | Ælfredo | Angulo saxonum |

[13,32]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|-------------|-------------------------|--------------|--------------|----------------------|-------------------|
| St | <i>rege</i> | <i>veredico,</i> | <i>etiam</i> | <i>saepe</i> | <i>mihi</i> | <i>referente,</i> |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | sepe | | |
| W | | veridico ⁴⁴⁹ | | | | |
| ASN | | veridico | | sepe | michi ⁴⁵⁰ | |

[13,33]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|--------------|----------|------------------|---------------|----------------------|
| St | <i>audivi;</i> | <i>quod</i> | <i>et</i> | <i>ille</i> | <i>etiam</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>veredicis</i> | <i>multis</i> | <i>referentibus,</i> |
| Co | | | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | eciam† | | veridicis† | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | veridicis† | | |
| W | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | referaentibus |

[13,34]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------------|-----------|--------------|------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|
| St | <i>immo</i> | <i>ex</i> | <i>parte</i> | <i>non</i> | <i>modica</i> | <i>illud</i> | <i>factum</i> |
| Co | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | |

[13,35]

| | | |
|-----|-------------------------|------------------|
| St | <i>commemorantibus,</i> | <i>audierat.</i> |
| Co | | |
| B | | |
| Ar | | |
| W | | |
| ASN | | |

⁴⁴⁹ Also the reading from *Annales S. Neoti*. W has either copied the wrong manuscript, expecting it to be the identical in both, or has erred in his transcription.

⁴⁵⁰ Written with suspension marks; however, the scribe favors the orthography "michi" instead of "mihi" in all cases where it is expanded.

[14,1]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|-------|--------|----|--------|---------|---------|--------|----------|
| St | Fuit | - | in | Mercia | moderno | tempore | quidam | strenuus |
| Co | | - | | | | | | |
| B | | - | | | | | | |
| Ar | Ffuit | - | | | | | | |
| W | | - | | | | | | |
| JoW | | - | | | | | | |
| ASN | | - | | | | | | |
| GC ⁴⁵¹ | | inquit | | | | | | |

SD1 Anno DCC.ii ab incarnatione Dominica Brychtric Occidentalium Saxonum rex

SD1 qui eidem genti x et vii annis nobilissime praefuit

SD1 defunctus est cujus imperium et regnum post eum Ecgberht

SD1 ex regali illius gentis prosapia suscepit ac tenuit rex

SD1 autem Brichtric Occidentalium Saxonum accepit sibi in conjugium⁴⁵²

SD1 Earburgam quae erat filia Merciorum

[14,2]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------------|------------------|--------------|-----------|----------------|-----------|-------------------|
| St | <i>atque</i> | <i>universis</i> | <i>circa</i> | <i>se</i> | <i>regibus</i> | <i>et</i> | <i>regionibus</i> |
| Co | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | |
| GC | | | | | | | |

⁴⁵¹ Giraldus Cambrensis, *Vita S. Æthelberti* Cambridge, Trinity B.11.16, ff. 94v-95r, where it may be witness to a text of the *Annales S. Neoti* with passages deriving from the *Vita Ælfredi*.

⁴⁵² Interlined 'Vel in matrimonium.'

[14,3]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|--------------|------------|---------------|
| St | <i>finitimis</i> | - | <i>formidolosus</i> | <i>rex,</i> | (-)→ | <i>nomine</i> | <i>Offa,</i> | <i>qui</i> | <i>vallum</i> |
| Co | | - | | | (-)→ | | | | |
| B | | - | | | (-)→ | | | | |
| Ar | | - | | | (-)→ | | | | |
| W | | - | | | (-)→ | | | | |
| SD1 ⁴⁵³ | - | - | - | - | (-)→ | | | | |
| JoW | - | - | - | - | (-)→ | | | - | - |
| ASN | | - | | | (-)→ | | | | |
| GC | | <i>metuendus</i> | - | | <i>Offa</i> | | | (-)← | |

[14,4]

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------------|--------------|----------------|-----------|--------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------|------------|-----------|-------------|
| St | <i>magnum</i> | <i>inter</i> | (-)→ | - | <i>Britanniam</i> | <i>atque</i> | <i>Merciam</i> | - | - | <i>de</i> | <i>mari</i> |
| Co | | | (-)→ | - | | | | - | - | | |
| B | | | (-)→ | - | | | | - | - | | |
| Ar | | | (-)→ | - | | | | - | - | | |
| W | | | (-)→ | - | | | | - | - | | |
| SD1 | | | (-)→ | - | | | | <i>id</i> | <i>est</i> | | |
| ASN | | | - | (-)→ | <i>Bryttanniam</i> | <i>et</i> | | - | - | | |
| GC | | | <i>Merciam</i> | <i>et</i> | | | (-)← | (-)← | - | - | <i>a</i> |

[14,5]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------------|-----------|-------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|
| St | <i>usque</i> | <i>ad</i> | <i>mare</i> | <i>fieri</i> ⁴⁵⁴ | <i>imperavit.</i> | <i>Cuius</i> | <i>filiam</i> | - | - |
| Co | | | | <i>facere</i> | | | | - | - |
| B | | | | <i>facere</i> | <i>imperabat</i> | | <i>filia</i> | - | - |
| Ar | | | | <i>facere</i> | | | | - | - |
| W | | | | <i>facere</i> | | | | - | - |
| SD1 | | | | <i>facere</i> | | <i>cumque</i> | <i>filia</i> | <i>regis</i> | <i>esset</i> |
| JoW | - | - | - | - | - | | | - | - |
| ASN | | | | <i>facere</i> | | | | - | - |
| GC | | | | <i>fieri</i> | | | | - | - |

⁴⁵³ This chapter occurs under the year 802 in SD1, but the majority of the textual tradition it is retained.

⁴⁵⁴ Dumville and Lapidge state that "Better sense would be given by *fieri*, but all witnesses to the text of Asser read *facere* here" (*The Annals of St Neots* p.48); the only other witness to the *Vita* that has *fieri* is the fourteenth-or-fifteenth Cambridge, Trinity B.11.16, which contains a text of the *Vita S. Æthelberti* by Giraldus Cambrensis. Two chapters of the *Vita Ælfredi*, 14 and 15, have been copied almost entirely into this version of *S. Æthelberti*.

[14,6]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|-----------|--------|-----------------------------|---------------|---------|
| St | nomine | Eadburh, | (-)← | Beorhtric | Occidentalium | Saxonum |
| Co | | | (-)← | | | |
| B | | | (-)← | | | |
| Ar | | Eadburgh | (-)← | | | |
| W | | | (-)← | | | |
| SD1 | - | (-)↑1 | - | (-)↑1 | (-)↑1 | (-)↑1 |
| JOW | | | (-)← | | | |
| ASN | | Eadburgam | (-)← | Beorchtricus | | |
| GC | (-)→ | Ædburgam | nomine | Berthtricius ⁴⁵⁵ | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|----------|-----------|-------|----|------------|--------------|------|
| SD1 | Multis | suffulta | honoribus | miris | se | extollebat | ambitionibus | quae |
|-----|--------|----------|-----------|-------|----|------------|--------------|------|

[14,7]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------|----|---------------------------|-------|-------|-----------|----------|------|-----------|
| St | rex, | - | - | sibi | in | coniugium | accepit. | Quae | confestim |
| Co | | - | - | | | | | | |
| B | | - | - | | | | | | |
| Ar | | - | - | | | | | | |
| W | | - | - | | | | | | |
| SD1 | - | - | - | (-)↑1 | (-)↑1 | (-)↑1 | (-)↑1 | - | - |
| JoW | | ut | prediximus ⁴⁵⁶ | | | | | | mox |
| ASN | | - | - | | | | | | |
| GC | | - | - | | | | | | |

[14,8]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|----------------|--------------|-----------------|-----------|---------------|-------------|--------------|
| St | <i>accepta</i> | <i>regis</i> | <i>amicitia</i> | <i>et</i> | <i>totius</i> | <i>pene</i> | <i>regni</i> |
| Co | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | |
| GC | | | amicicia | | | - | |

[14,9]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------------------|-----------|-------------|----------------|------------------|---------------|------------------------------|-----------|-----------|
| St | <i>potestate,</i> | - | <i>more</i> | <i>paterno</i> | <i>tyrannice</i> | <i>vivere</i> | <i>incepit,</i> | <i>et</i> | (-)← |
| Co | | - | | | | | | | (-)← |
| B | | - | | | | | | | (-)← |
| Ar | | - | | | <i>tirannice</i> | | | | (-)← |
| W | | - | | | | | | | (-)← |
| SD1 | - | - | | | | | <i>coepit</i> ⁴⁵⁷ | | (-)← |
| JoW | - | - | - | - | | | - | - | (-)← |
| ASN | | - | | | | | | | - |
| GC | | Permaxima | | | - | | | | tirannide |

| | | | |
|----|--------|-------------|----------|
| GC | Tocius | iniquitatis | assumpta |
|----|--------|-------------|----------|

⁴⁵⁵ Compare this orthography to ASN.

⁴⁵⁶ *Ut prediximus* is interlined.

⁴⁵⁷ Compare with JoW [14,14].

[14,10]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|----------------|--------------|----------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| St | (-)→ | <i>omnem</i> | <i>hominem</i> | <i>execrari,</i> | <i>quem</i> | <i>Beorhtric</i> |
| Co | (-)→ | | | <i>execrarae</i> | | |
| B | <i>hominem</i> | | (-)← | <i>execrare</i> | | <i>Beorhtric†</i> |
| Ar | (-)→ | | | <i>execrarae</i> | | |
| W | (-)→ | | | | | |
| SD1 | (-)→ | | | | - | - |
| ASN | (-)→ | | | <i>execrare</i> | | <i>Brihtricus</i> |
| GC | - | - | - | - | <i>quecumque</i> | <i>enim</i> |

| | | | | | |
|-----|-------------------|---------------|-----------------|--------------|---------------------|
| St | <i>diligeret,</i> | - | - | - | - |
| Co | | - | - | - | - |
| B | | - | - | - | - |
| Ar | | - | - | - | - |
| W | | - | - | - | - |
| SD1 | - | <i>sicque</i> | - | - | - |
| ASN | | - | - | - | - |
| GC | | - | <i>gravibus</i> | <i>odiis</i> | <i>insequabatur</i> |

[14,11]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|-------------|----------------|--------------|---------------|------------|-----------------|
| St | <i>et</i> | <i>omnia</i> | - | - | - | <i>odibilia</i> |
| Co | | | - | - | - | |
| B | | | - | - | - | |
| Ar | | | - | - | - | |
| W | | | - | - | - | |
| SD1 | <i>ut</i> | <i>omnibus</i> | <i>esset</i> | <i>perosa</i> | - | - |
| JoW | - | | - | - | - | |
| ASN | | | - | - | - | |
| GC | <i>immo</i> | | - | - | <i>deo</i> | |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------------|-----------|---------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------------|----------------|-----------|---------------|------------------|
| St | <i>Deo</i> | <i>et</i> | <i>hominibus</i> | - | - | - | <i>facere,</i> | <i>et</i> | <i>omnes,</i> | - |
| Co | | | | - | - | - | | | | - |
| B | | | | - | - | - | | | | - |
| Ar | | | | - | - | - | | | | - |
| W | | | | - | - | - | | | | - |
| JoW | | | | - | - | - | | | | - |
| ASN | | | | - | - | - | | | | - |
| GC | (-)↑11 | - | <i>hominibusque</i> | <i>contraria</i> | <i>spiritu</i> | <i>malignitatis</i> | | - | - | <i>cogebatur</i> |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------------|--------------|----------------|-----------|----------------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|-------------------|--------------|
| SD1 | <i>non</i> | <i>solum</i> | <i>ducibus</i> | <i>et</i> | <i>magistratibus</i> | <i>veram</i> | <i>etiam</i> | <i>cunctis</i> | <i>populis</i> | <i>omnes</i> | <i>religiosos</i> | <i>viros</i> |
| GC | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | <i>cunctos</i> | - | - | - | - |

[14,12]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|------|---------|----|-------|--------|-----------|
| St | quos | posset, | ad | regem | - | accusare, |
| Co | | | | | - | |
| B | | | | | - | |
| Ar | | | | | - | |
| W | | | | | - | |
| SD1 | - | - | | | Semper | |
| JoW | | | | | - | |
| ASN | | | | | - | |
| GC | | poterat | | | - | accusabat |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|----------|----|-----|-----------|-------|------|-------------|------------|----|-------|----------|
| SD1 | non | cessavit | et | ita | maledicta | virum | suum | constrinxit | blanditiis | ut | Illos | accusare |
|-----|-----|----------|----|-----|-----------|-------|------|-------------|------------|----|-------|----------|

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|----|-----|----|-----|------|-----|
| St | - | et | ita | - | aut | vita | aut |
| Co | - | | | - | | | |
| B | - | | | - | | | |
| Ar | - | | | - | | | |
| W | - | | | - | | | |
| SD1 | coepit | - | - | - | | | |
| JoW | - | | sic | - | - | | |
| ASN | - | | | ut | | | |
| GC | - | | | - | eos | - | |

[14,13]

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|-----|-----|----------|-------|----------|----|----|---------------------|---|------|---------------------|
| St | potestate | - | per | insidias | - | privare. | Et | si | (-)→ ⁴⁵⁸ | a | rege | illud |
| Co | | - | | | - | | | | (-)→ | | | |
| B | | - | | | - | | | | (-)→ | | | |
| Ar | | - | | | - | | | | (-)→ | | | |
| W | | - | | | - | | | | (-)→ | | | |
| SD1 | - | - | - | - | regno | privaret | | | - | | | - |
| JoW | | - | | | - | | | | (-)→ | | | |
| ASN | | - | | | - | | | | (-)→ | | | |
| GC | | aut | | | - | privabat | | | aliud | | | (-)← ⁴⁵⁹ |

[14,14]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|-----|---------|-----------|--------|------|--------|----------|
| St | impetrare | non | posset, | (-)← | veneno | eos | - | necabat; |
| Co | | | | (-)← | | | - | |
| B | | | | (-)← | | | - | |
| Ar | | | | (-)← | | enim | - | |
| W | | | | (-)← | | | - | |
| SD1 | | | | (-)← | | | - | - |
| JoW | (-)→ | | | impetrare | | | coepit | necare |
| ASN | | | | (-)← | | | - | |
| GC | (-)→ | | | impetrare | | | - | |

⁴⁵⁸ Cf. illud.

⁴⁵⁹ Cf. aliud.

| | | | | | | |
|-----|--------------|------------|-----|--------|--------------|----|
| St | - | - | - | - | <i>sicut</i> | de |
| Co | - | - | - | - | | |
| B | - | - | - | - | | |
| Ar | - | - | - | - | | |
| W | - | - | - | - | | |
| SD1 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| JoW | - | - | hoc | factum | - | |
| ASN | - | - | - | - | | |
| GC | machinabatur | extinguere | - | - | - | - |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------|----------------------------|-----|----------|------|-------|---------|--------|-----------|
| SD1 | clam | disperedere ⁴⁶⁰ | non | distulit | Erat | eodem | tempore | quidam | praedives |
|-----|------|----------------------------|-----|----------|------|-------|---------|--------|-----------|

[14,15]

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------|--------------|--------|----------------------------|-------|--------------|-------|----------------|-----|--------|
| St | - | adolescente | quodam | - | regi | dilectissimo | - | - | hoc | factum |
| Co | - | | | - | | | - | - | | |
| B | - | | | - | | | - | - | | |
| Ar | - | | | - | rege† | | - | - | | |
| W | - | | | - | | | - | - | | |
| SD1 | - | adolescens | - | praeambilis ⁴⁶¹ | | - | - | - | - | - |
| JoW | - | | | - | | | - | - | - | - |
| ASN | - | adholescente | | - | | | - | - | | |
| GC | quod | adolescente | | - | | dilecto | eique | familiarissimo | | |

| | | | |
|-----|-----------|----|-------|
| SD1 | praedicto | et | carus |
|-----|-----------|----|-------|

[14,16]

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|----------|-----------|------|------|-------|-----|----|-------|----------|
| St | compertum | habetur, | (-)← | quem | - | - | cum | ad | regem | accusare |
| Co | | | (-)← | | - | - | | | | |
| B | | | (-)← | | - | - | | | | |
| Ar | | | (-)← | | - | - | | | | |
| W | | | (-)← | | - | - | | | | |
| SD1 | - | - | - | | - | - | | - | - | |
| JoW | (-)→ | | compertum | | - | - | | | | |
| ASN | compertum | | (-)← | | - | - | | | | |
| GC | - | - | - | | quia | coram | | | rege | causare |

| | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|----|----------------------|----|--------|-------------|
| SD1 | vellet | ad | regem ⁴⁶² | et | minime | praevaleret |
|-----|--------|----|----------------------|----|--------|-------------|

⁴⁶⁰ Interlined: "Vel necare," cf. JoW [14,14].

⁴⁶¹ Interlined: "Vel valde amabilis."

⁴⁶² Cf. [14,16].

[14,17]

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|---------|----------|-----------|-------|------|----------|--------------------|----------|----|-----|--------|
| St | non | posset, | veneno | - | - | - | - | eum ⁴⁶³ | necavit. | De | quo | veneno |
| Co | | | | - | - | - | - | | | | | |
| B | | | | - | - | - | - | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | - | - | - | - | | | | | |
| W | | | | - | - | - | - | | | | | |
| SD1 | - | - | | - | ipsum | ipsa | malevola | - | | | | |
| JoW | | | | - | - | - | - | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | - | - | - | - | - | | | | |
| GC | non | potuit | venefica | potatione | - | - | - | - | | | | |

[14,18]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------|-----------|-------|-----|------|------|--------------|-----|----------|
| St | etiam | praefatus | (-)← | - | - | ille | Beorhtric | rex | - |
| Co | | | (-)← | - | - | | | | - |
| B | eciam | prefatus | (-)← | - | - | | Beorhtric | | - |
| Ar | | | (-)← | - | - | | | | - |
| W | | | (-)← | - | - | | | | - |
| SD1 | - | - | - | cum | ipse | - | - | | - |
| JoW | | | (-)← | - | - | - | (-)→ | | - |
| ASN | | | (-)← | - | - | | Beorchtricus | | - |
| GC | (-)→ | | eciam | - | - | - | - | - | princeps |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------|----------|----------|---------|-----------|-----------|--------|
| St | (-)↓19 | (-)↓19 | (-)← | (-)↓19 | inscinter | gustasse | - |
| Co | (-)↓19 | (-)↓19 | (-)← | (-)↓19 | | | - |
| B | (-)↓19 | (-)↓19 | (-)← | aliquid | | | - |
| Ar | (-)↓19 | (-)↓19 | (-)← | (-)↓19 | | | - |
| W | (-)↓19 | (-)↓19 | (-)← | (-)↓19 | | | - |
| SD1 | - | - | - | - | | gustasset | periit |
| JoW | (-)↓19 | (-)↓19 | Brihtric | (-)↓19 | | | - |
| ASN | (-)↓19 | (-)↓19 | (-)← | (-)↓19 | | | - |
| GC | aliquid | refertur | - | (-)← | | | - |

[14,19]

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------|-----------|-------|-------|--------|-----|--------|---------|--------|--------|
| St | aliquid | refertur: | neque | enim | (-)↓20 | - | illa | venenum | (-)↓20 | dare |
| Co | | | | | (-)↓20 | - | | | (-)↓20 | |
| B | (-)↑18 | | | | (-)→ | - | | | regi | |
| Ar | | | | | (-)↓20 | - | | | (-)↓20 | |
| W | | | | | (-)↓20 | - | | | (-)↓20 | |
| SD1 | - | - | | etiam | (-)↓20 | - | | | (-)↓20 | (-)↓20 |
| JoW | | | | | - | - | | | - | |
| ASN | | | | | (-)↓20 | - | | | (-)↓20 | |
| GC | (-)↑18 | (-)↑18 | | | regi | sed | iuueni | | (-)← | - |

⁴⁶³ Dumville and Lapidge (*The Annals of St Neots*, p.48) accidentally give *eos* (likely a result of eye skip to *eos necabant* two lines above in Co) as the transmitted text from the *Vita*, but the Co transcript, W, and JoW have *eum*.

[14,20]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|--------------|------------|---------------------|-----|--------|
| St | regi | proposuerat, | - | (-)↑19 | sed | puero; |
| Co | | | - | (-)↑19 | | |
| B | (-)↑19 | | - | (-)↑19 | | |
| Ar | | | - | (-)↑19 | | |
| W | | | - | (-)↑19 | | |
| SD1 | | | - | dare ⁴⁶⁴ | | |
| JoW | - | | - | (-)↑19 | | |
| ASN | | | - | (-)↑19 | | |
| GC | (-)↑19 | | ministrare | - | - | - |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------|-----|-----|------|----------|-------|----------------|
| St | - | sed | rex | - | - | - | praeoccupavit, |
| Co | - | | | - | - | - | |
| B | - | | | - | - | - | preoccupavit |
| Ar | - | | | - | - | - | |
| W | - | | | - | - | - | |
| SD1 | - | - | - | quem | princeps | ducum | praeoccupans |
| JoW | - | | | - | - | - | |
| ASN | - | | | - | - | - | |
| GC | attamen | - | | - | - | - | |

| | | | | |
|-----|------|-------|---------|----------|
| SD1 | ambo | necis | poculum | biberunt |
|-----|------|-------|---------|----------|

[14,21]

| | | | | | |
|-----|---------|------|-------|------------|-----------|
| St | inde | ambo | - | - | periere. |
| Co | | | - | - | |
| B | | | - | - | |
| Ar | | | - | - | |
| W | | | - | - | |
| SD1 | - | | gustu | amarissimo | perierunt |
| JoW | | | - | - | |
| ASN | | | - | - | |
| GC | indeque | | - | - | |

⁴⁶⁴ Cf. [14,19]

[15,1]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|----|-----|---------|----------|----------|------|------------|
| SD1 | quo | ex | hoc | saeculo | perempto | venefica | illa | nequissima |
|-----|-----|----|-----|---------|----------|----------|------|------------|

| | | | |
|-----|--------|------------|----------|
| SD1 | timore | perterrita | fugiendo |
|-----|--------|------------|----------|

| | | | | | | |
|-----|----------|--------|------|-------------|-------|-----|
| St | Defuncto | igitur | (-)→ | Beorhtrico | rege, | cum |
| Co | | | (-)→ | | | |
| B | | | (-)→ | Beorthrico | | |
| Ar | | | (-)→ | | | |
| W | | | (-)→ | | | |
| JoW | | | (-)→ | Brihtrico | | |
| ASN | | | (-)→ | Beorchtrico | | |
| GC | | | rege | Berthricio | (-)← | - |

| | | | | | |
|----|---------|-----|---------|----|------------|
| GC | quoniam | pro | malicia | et | iniquitate |
|----|---------|-----|---------|----|------------|

| | | | |
|-----|--------|------|-------|
| St | - | illa | inter |
| Co | - | | |
| B | - | | |
| Ar | - | | |
| W | - | | |
| JoW | regina | - | |
| ASN | - | | |
| GC | - | sua | |

[15,2]

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------------------------|---------|-----|--------|---------|----------|----|-------|-----|-----------|-------|
| St | [Occidentales] | Saxones | - | - | diutius | - | - | fieri | non | posset, | ultra |
| Co | - | | - | - | | - | - | | | | |
| B | Occidentales | | - | - | | - | - | | | | |
| Ar | Occidentales | | - | - | | - | - | | | | |
| W | Occidentales ⁴⁶⁵ | | - | - | | - | - | | | | |
| SD1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| JoW | - | | - | - | | - | - | | | | |
| ASN | Occidentales | | vel | Anglos | | - | - | | | | |
| GC | Occidentales | | - | - | diucius | remanere | et | - | non | potuisset | |

⁴⁶⁵ Wise, *Annales Rerum*, p.11: "Deest MS. Cott."

[15,3]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|------|-----|---------|-----------|-----|-----------------|------------|
| St | mare | - | - | navigans, | cum | innumerabilibus | thesauris, |
| Co | | - | - | | | | |
| B | | - | - | | | | |
| Ar | | - | - | | | | |
| W | | - | - | | | | |
| SD1 | | est | egressa | - | | | |
| JoW | | - | - | | | | |
| ASN | | - | - | | | | |
| GC | | - | - | | | | |

| | | |
|-----|-------|--------|
| SD1 | regem | adiens |
|-----|-------|--------|

[15,4]

| | | | | | |
|-----|---------|-------|------------------------|-------|-------|
| St | Karolum | illum | ⁴⁶⁶ [magnum | et] | (-)← |
| Co | | | - | - | (-)← |
| B | | | - | - | (-)← |
| Ar | | | magnum | et | (-)← |
| W | | | magnum | et | (-)← |
| SD1 | (-)→ | - | - | - | - |
| JoW | | | - | - | (-)← |
| ASN | | | magnum | atque | (-)← |
| GC | Carolum | (-)→ | magnum | - | illum |

| | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|-----------------------------|-------|------------|---------|
| St | (-)→ | famosissimum ⁴⁶⁷ | (-)↓5 | Francorum | (-)← |
| Co | (-)→ | | (-)↓5 | | (-)← |
| B | (-)→ | | (-)↓5 | | (-)← |
| Ar | (-)→ | | (-)↓5 | Ffrancorum | (-)← |
| W | (-)→ | | (-)↓5 | | (-)← |
| SD1 | francorum | | (-)↑3 | (-)← | Karolum |
| JoW | (-)→ | | (-)↓5 | | (-)← |
| ASN | (-)→ | | (-)↓5 | | (-)← |
| GC | (-)→ | | Regem | | (-)← |

⁴⁶⁶ Wise, *Annales Rerum*, p.11, fn.2: "Desunt MS. Cott."

⁴⁶⁷ St's observation of W, "Om. Cott. (teste W)," is an error. *Famosissimum* is reported in the textual tradition of the *Vita Ælfredi*. *Magnum* is unreported in Co, but is recorded in *Annales S. Neoti* and Giraldu Cambrensis and may be said to have originated from the *Neoti* tradition.

[15,5]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------|--------|----|--------------------|-----|------|----------|
| St | regem | adiit. | Ad | quam, | cum | ante | solarium |
| Co | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | quem | | | |
| W | | | | quem | | | |
| SD1 | (-)↑3 | (-)↑3 | | quem | | | |
| JoW | | | | quem | - | | |
| ASN | | | | quem | | | |
| GC | (-)↑4 | adivit | - | cui ⁴⁶⁸ | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------|----|------|----------|--------|----------|-----|-----|-----|---------|
| SD1 | astaret | et | regi | deferret | munera | pretiosa | sic | est | eam | affatus |
|-----|---------|----|------|----------|--------|----------|-----|-----|-----|---------|

[15,6]

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------|-------|----------|------|-----------|------|--------------------------|---------|-----------|------|---------|
| St | multa | - | - | regi | afferens | dona | (-)← | staret, | Karolus | ait: | 'Elige, |
| Co | | - | - | | | | (-)← | | | | |
| B | | - | - | | | | (-)← | | | | |
| Ar | | - | - | | adferens† | | (-)← | | | | |
| W | | - | - | | | | (-)← | | | | |
| SD1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| JoW | | - | - | | offerens | | (-)← | | | | |
| ASN | | - | - | | | | (-)← | | Karolus | | |
| GC | | eidem | principi | - | (-)→ | | obtulerit ⁴⁶⁹ | - | imperator | | |

[15,7]

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----------|------|-------|----|--------|------|--------------|----|--------------------|--------|-------|-----|
| St | Eadburh, | quem | velis | - | - | - | <i>inter</i> | me | et | filium | meum, | qui |
| Co | | | | - | - | - | | | | | | |
| B | | | | - | - | - | | | | | | |
| Ar | Eadburgh | | | - | - | - | | | | | | |
| W | | | | - | - | - | | | | | | |
| SD1 | Eadburg | | | - | - | - | - | | aut ⁴⁷⁰ | | | |
| JoW | | | | - | - | - | - | | aut | | | |
| ASN | Eadburga | | | - | - | - | | | | | | |
| GC | Ædburga | | | de | duobus | unum | aut | | aut | filium | | |

⁴⁶⁸ Cambridge, Trinity B.11.16 may indicate here that the transmitted text it was copying from was corrupt in places.

⁴⁶⁹ Cf. "offerens/afferens" in this line.

⁴⁷⁰ The similarity of SD1 and JoW may suggest that this was the reading between their copied text or that the passage was corrupt. Co and the Cotton tradition has *et*. W is silent on the issue.

[15,8]

| | | | | | |
|-----|----|------|---------|------|-------|
| JoW | in | isto | solario | stat | mecum |
|-----|----|------|---------|------|-------|

| | | | | | | | | | |
|----|--------|------|-------|--------|-------|------|-----------|-------------|------------|
| GC | Stabat | uero | iuxta | patrem | filus | eius | Ludovicus | spectabilis | adolescens |
|----|--------|------|-------|--------|-------|------|-----------|-------------|------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------|------|---------|-------|----------|---------|------|--------|----|-------|------|---------------|
| St | mecum | in | solario | - | - | - | isto | stat.' | At | illa, | sine | deliberatione |
| Co | | | | - | - | - | | | ad | | | |
| B | | | | - | - | - | | | ad | | | deliberacione |
| Ar | | | | - | - | - | | | | | | |
| W | | | | - | - | - | | | | | | |
| SD1 | | | | - | - | - | - | astat | | | | |
| JoW | (-)← | (-)← | (-)← | - | - | - | (-)← | (-)← | | | | |
| ASN | | | | - | - | - | | | | | | |
| GC | - | - | | domus | potenter | innixus | - | - | | | | |

[15,9]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|-------------|-------------------|------|-----|----------------------|
| St | stulte | respondens, | [<i>dicens</i>] | ait: | 'Si | mihi |
| Co | | | dicens | | | |
| B | | | dicens | | | |
| Ar | | | dicens | | | |
| W | | | dicens | | | |
| SD1 | | respondit | dicens | - | | |
| JoW | | | - | | | |
| ASN | | | - | | | michi |
| GC | | | - | | | michi ⁴⁷¹ |

| | | | | |
|----|--------|------------|-------|-----------|
| GC | inquit | eleccionis | huius | tribuitur |
|----|--------|------------|-------|-----------|

| | | | | | | |
|-----|---------|---------|--------|--------|-------|----------|
| St | electio | - | - | - | - | - |
| Co | | - | - | - | - | - |
| B | | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ar | | - | - | - | - | - |
| W | | - | - | - | - | - |
| SD1 | optio | daretur | filium | tuum | magis | eligerem |
| JoW | | - | - | - | - | - |
| ASN | | - | - | - | - | - |
| GC | opcio | - | (-)↓10 | (-)↓10 | - | - |

⁴⁷¹ Cf. *Annales S. Neoti*, this line.

[15,10]

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------------|--------|-------|----|---------|------|---|--------|---------|---|------------|
| St | conceditur, | filium | tuum, | in | quantum | te | - | iunior | est | - | - |
| Co | | | | | | | - | | | - | - |
| B | | | | | | | - | | | - | - |
| Ar | | | | | | | - | | | - | - |
| W | | | | | | | - | | | - | - |
| SD1 | - | - | - | - | quam | quia | | esse | videtur | - | |
| JoW | | | | | | | - | | | - | - |
| ASN | | | | | | | - | | | - | - |
| GC | - | | | | | | - | esse | - | | dinoscitur |

[15,11]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|------------|-----|-----------|------|-------------|----|-----------|--------|
| St | eligo' | <i>Cui</i> | - | Karolus | - | respondens | et | arridens, | ait: |
| Co | | | - | | - | | | | |
| B | | | - | | - | | | | |
| Ar | | | - | Corolus | - | | | | |
| W | | | - | | - | | | | |
| SD1 | - | | rex | Carolus | ita | respondisse | - | - | fertur |
| JoW | | - | - | Carolus† | illi | | | subridens | |
| ASN | | | - | | - | | | arridens | |
| GC | | | - | imperator | - | respondit | | | |

[15,12]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|----|-----------|---------|--------|-------|---------|-----|------|
| St | 'Si | me | eligeres, | haberes | filium | meum; | (-)← | sed | quia |
| Co | | | | | | | (-)← | | |
| B | | | | | | | (-)← | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | (-)← | | |
| W | | | | | | | (-)← | | |
| SD1 | | | | | | | (-)← | | |
| JoW | | | | | | | (-)← | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | (-)← | | |
| GC | | | eligisses | (-)→ | | | haberes | | |

[15,13]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----------|--------|------|-----------|-----|----|-----|-------|-----------|
| St | (-)→ | filium | meum | elegisti, | nec | me | nec | illum | habebis.' |
| Co | (-)→ | | | | | | | | |
| B | (-)→ | | | | | | | | |
| Ar | (-)→ | | | | | | | 472 | |
| W | (-)→ | | | | | | | | |
| SD1 | (-)→ | illum | - | | | | | | |
| JoW | (-)→ | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | (-)→ | | | | | | | | |
| GC | elegisti | | | (-)← | | | | | |

⁴⁷² The letter "f" appears to have been erased.

[15,14]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----------|----|-------|------|---------|--------|---------|-------------|-----------------|
| St | Dedit | - | tamen | illi | unum | magnum | - | (-)↓15 | sanctimonialium |
| Co | | - | | | | | - | (-)↓15 | |
| B | | - | | | | | - | (-)↓15 | |
| Ar | | - | | | | | - | (-)↓15 | |
| W | | - | | | | | - | (-)↓15 | |
| SD1 | contulit | - | | - | - | | - | (-)↓15 | - |
| JoW | | ei | | - | | | - | (-)↓15 | |
| ASN | | - | | | | | - | (-)↓15 | monalium |
| GC | | - | | | Karolus | magnum | quoddam | monasterium | |

SD1 propter improbitatem eius optimum

[15,15]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------------|-----------|----|------|----------|-----------|--------|----|
| St | monasterium; | - | in | quo, | deposito | seculari | habitu | et |
| Co | | - | | | | | | |
| B | | - | | | | | | |
| Ar | | - | | | | | | |
| W | | - | | | | | | |
| SD1 | | - | | | | saeculari | | - |
| JoW | | - | | | | | | |
| ASN | | - | | | | | | |
| GC | (-)↑14 | feminarum | | | | | | |

SD1 sub specie hypocriissima

[15,16]

GC solo sine iijsticia vite aut mundicia

| | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------------|-----------|-----------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| St | sanctimonialium | indumento | (-)← | assumpto, | (-)← | perpaucis |
| Co | | | (-)← | | (-)← | |
| B | | | (-)← | | (-)← | |
| Ar | | | (-)← | | (-)← | |
| W | | | (-)← | | (-)← | |
| SD1 | (-)→ | | sanctimonialium | | (-)← | |
| JoW | | (-)→ | (-)← | sumpto† | indumento | |
| ASN | monalium | | | | (-)← | |
| GC | - | | sanctitatis | | - | |

[15,17]

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------|---------|-----|------------|------------|-------|-----|----------|--------------|-------------|
| St | annis | - | - | abbatissae | fungebatur | - | - | officio. | <i>Sicut</i> | <i>enim</i> |
| Co | | - | - | | | - | - | | | |
| B | | - | - | | | - | - | | | |
| Ar | | - | - | abbatisse | | - | - | | | |
| W | | - | - | | | - | - | | | |
| SD1 | - | - | - | - | | annis | - | - | | |
| JoW | | - | - | | | - | - | | - | - |
| ASN | | - | - | | | - | - | | | |
| GC | annorum | spaciis | Ibi | | functa | - | est | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|-----|-------------|----|----------|------|----------|----|
| SD1 | execrabilis | et | flebilis | ipsa | nequiter | et |
|-----|-------------|----|----------|------|----------|----|

[15,18]

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------------------------|-----------|----------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|------------|--------------|----------------|
| St | <i>irrationabiliter</i> | <i>in</i> | <i>propria</i> | - | <i>vixisse</i> | - | <i>refertur,</i> | <i>ita</i> | <i>multo</i> | - |
| Co | ⁴⁷³ | | | - | | - | | | | - |
| B | | | | - | | - | | | | - |
| Ar | | | | - | <i>rexisse</i> | - | | | | - |
| W | | | | - | | - | | | | - |
| SD1 | | | | - | <i>vixit</i> | <i>regione</i> | - | | | <i>nequius</i> |
| ASN | | | | - | | - | | | | - |
| GC | | | <i>patrio</i> | <i>regno</i> | | - | | | | - |

[15,19]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----------------------|-----------|-----------------------|-----------|--------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|--------------------------------------|
| St | - | - | <i>irrationabilis</i> | <i>in</i> | - | <i>aliena</i> | <i>gente</i> | <i>vivere</i> | <i>deprehenditur.</i> ⁴⁷⁴ |
| Co | - | - | ⁴⁷⁵ | | - | | | | |
| B | - | - | | | - | | | | |
| Ar | - | - | | | - | | | | |
| W | - | - | | | - | | | | |
| SD1 | <i>miserabilibus</i> | <i>et</i> | | | <i>terra</i> | - | <i>vixisse</i> | | |
| ASN | - | - | <i>inrationabilis</i> | | - | | | | |
| GC | - | - | | | - | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------------|--------------------|----------------|------------|-------------|---------------|--------------|------------------|-----------|---------------|--------------------|
| SD1 | <i>namque</i> | <i>interstitio</i> | <i>peracto</i> | <i>dum</i> | <i>quae</i> | <i>sancta</i> | <i>erant</i> | <i>exerceret</i> | <i>ut</i> | <i>quidam</i> | <i>aestimabant</i> |
|-----|---------------|--------------------|----------------|------------|-------------|---------------|--------------|------------------|-----------|---------------|--------------------|

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------------------------|-----------|---------------|------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|
| SD1 | ⁴⁷⁶ <i>Æstas</i> | <i>ut</i> | <i>quidam</i> | <i>ait</i> | <i>cererem</i> | <i>fervida</i> | <i>siccat</i> |
|-----|-----------------------------|-----------|---------------|------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|

| | | | | |
|-----|---------------|--------------|---------------|-----------------|
| SD1 | <i>reheat</i> | <i>pomis</i> | <i>gravis</i> | <i>autumnus</i> |
|-----|---------------|--------------|---------------|-----------------|

| | | | | |
|-----|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| SD1 | <i>hiemem</i> | <i>defluus</i> | <i>irrigat</i> | <i>imber</i> |
|-----|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|

⁴⁷³ The Co transcript has an apparent correction to the script, implying that the Cotton manuscript may have had the reading *irrationabiliter*.

⁴⁷⁴ What follows in this year (802) in SD1 is an expansion of the *Vita* material.

⁴⁷⁵ Like *irrationabiliter* in line 15,18, There appears to be a pen correction in the text of Co to read *irrationabilis*, perhaps from *inrationabilis*, which is the ASN reading.

⁴⁷⁶ "Aestas... imber." Boethius *Consolation of Philosophy* (iv., 27-9).

[15,20]

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|-------|----------|---------|--------|-----|-------------|----------|-----|-------|
| SD1 | Sed | hujus | Pessimae | reginae | mentem | nec | pulchritudo | aestatis | nec | Algor |
|-----|-----|-------|----------|---------|--------|-----|-------------|----------|-----|-------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|--------|---|----------|----------|--------|-------------|---------|-----|------|
| SD1 | hiemis | valuit | a | libidine | cohibere | Namque | interstitio | peracto | dum | quae |
|-----|--------|--------|---|----------|----------|--------|-------------|---------|-----|------|

| | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|-------|-----------|----|--------|-------------|
| SD1 | sancta | erant | exerceret | ut | quidam | aestamabant |
|-----|--------|-------|-----------|----|--------|-------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|---|--------|------|----------|--------|----------|--------|--------------|-----|
| St | Nam | a | quodam | suae | propriae | gentis | - | homine | constuprata, | - |
| Co | | | | | | | - | | | - |
| B | | | | | | | - | | | - |
| Ar | | | | | | | - | | | - |
| W | | | | | | | - | | | - |
| SD1 | - | | | | | | ignobili | viro | | est |
| JoW | | | laico | - | - | - | - | - | | - |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | |
| GC | | | | | | | - | lenone | | et |

| | | | | |
|-----|----------------------|-----------|----------|-------|
| SD1 | ⁴⁷⁷ cedat | inscitiae | nubilius | error |
|-----|----------------------|-----------|----------|-------|

| | | | | |
|-----|---------|----------|------|--------|
| SD1 | cessent | profecto | mira | videri |
|-----|---------|----------|------|--------|

[15,21]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----------|--------|----|-----------|-------------|-------|--------|-----|
| SD1 | mulierem | inquit | in | adulterio | deprehensam | nihil | itaque | est |
|-----|----------|--------|----|-----------|-------------|-------|--------|-----|

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------|--------|-------|----------|------|-----|---------|------|------|
| SD1 | quod | admire | nihil | occultum | quod | non | sciatur | post | haec |
|-----|------|--------|-------|----------|------|-----|---------|------|------|

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------------|-------|-----------------------|------------|----------|-----|-----|-------|--------|
| SD1 | praecipiente | magno | Carolo ⁴⁷⁸ | imperatore | projecta | est | cum | magno | mentis |
|-----|--------------|-------|-----------------------|------------|----------|-----|-----|-------|--------|

| | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|----|------------------------|---|-----|--------|
| SD1 | taedio | et | anglore ⁴⁷⁹ | a | suo | sancto |
|-----|--------|----|------------------------|---|-----|--------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|--------------|--------------|--------------------|-----|---------|--------|----|-------------|---------|
| St | - | <i>demum</i> | <i>palam</i> | <i>deprehensa,</i> | - | - | - | de | monasterio, | imperio |
| Co | - | | | | - | - | - | | | |
| B | - | | | | - | - | - | | | |
| Ar | - | | | | - | - | - | | | |
| W | - | | | | - | - | - | | | |
| SD1 | - | - | - | (-)↑21 | - | - | - | - | | - |
| JoW | eiecta | - | - | - | que | - | - | | | (-)↓22 |
| ASN | - | | | | - | - | - | | | iussu |
| GC | - | | | | - | Imperio | Karoli | | | - |

⁴⁷⁷ "Cedat... videri." *Consolation of Philosophy* (iv., 11-12). Byrhtferth is evidently fond of this passage; he quotes it also under year 799, both times with slight variation.

⁴⁷⁸ SD1 uses a similar phrase elsewhere, "magno Carolo imperatore" (for "imperio Karoli regis").

⁴⁷⁹ *Et anglore* is interlined.

[15,22]

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|--------|---------|----------|-----|--------|----|------------|----|---------|
| St | Karoli | regis, | (-)↑21 | deiecta, | - | - | in | paupertate | et | miseria |
| Co | | | (-)↑21 | | - | - | | | | |
| B | | | (-)↑21 | | - | - | | | | |
| Ar | | | (-)↑21 | | - | - | | | | |
| W | | | (-)↑21 | | - | - | | | | |
| SD1 | - | - | - | quae | - | - | | | | |
| JoW | | | imperio | (-)↑21 | - | - | | | | |
| ASN | Karoli | | - | | - | - | | | | |
| GC | (-) | - | (-) | eiecta | que | postea | | - | - | |

| | | | |
|-----|-------|------|---------|
| SD1 | vitae | suae | tempora |
|-----|-------|------|---------|

[15,23]

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|----|------------|--------|------|-------|-------|---------------|--------|
| GC | et | paupertate | maxima | sese | quoad | uixit | miserabiliter | habuit |
|----|----|------------|--------|------|-------|-------|---------------|--------|

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------|--------|-----------------|----|-------|-------|----------|-----|----|----|------|------|
| St | leto | tenuis | vituperabiliter | - | - | vitam | duxit; | ita | ut | ad | - | (-)← |
| Co | | | | - | - | | | | | | - | (-)← |
| B | letho | | | - | - | | | | | | - | (-)← |
| Ar | letho | | | - | - | | | | | | - | (-)← |
| W | letho | | | - | - | | | | | | - | (-)← |
| SD1 | - | - | | ad | finem | - | perduxit | - | - | - | quae | ad |
| JoW | | | - | | | | | - | - | - | - | - |
| ASN | | | | - | - | | ducit | | | - | - | - |
| GC | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | | - | (-)← |

[15,24]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------------|------------|----------------|------------------|--------------|----------|---------------|-------------------|
| St | <i>ultimum,</i> | <i>uno</i> | <i>servulo</i> | <i>comitata,</i> | <i>sicut</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>multis</i> | <i>videntibus</i> |
| Co | | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | | |
| SD1 | | | | | - | - | - | - |
| ASN | | | | | | | | |
| GC | | | | | - | - | - | - |

| | | |
|-----|----|-----|
| SD1 | et | per |
|-----|----|-----|

[15,25]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------------|-------------------|----|----------------|----|-------|----------|-------------------|
| St | <i>eam</i> | <i>audivimus,</i> | - | <i>cotidie</i> | - | - | - | <i>mendicans,</i> |
| Co | | | - | | - | - | - | |
| B | | | - | quotidie | - | - | - | |
| Ar | | | - | quotidie | - | - | - | |
| W | | | - | quotidie | - | - | - | |
| SD1 | - | - | - | | - | - | - | |
| ASN | | | - | | - | - | - | |
| GC | - | - | et | | In | summa | egestate | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|-------|----|-----|-----------|-------|----------|
| SD1 | per | domos | et | per | civitates | Atque | castella |
|-----|-----|-------|----|-----|-----------|-------|----------|

| | | |
|-----|-----------|------------------------------|
| St | <i>in</i> | <i>Pavia</i> |
| Co | | |
| B | | |
| Ar | | |
| W | | |
| SD1 | | |
| ASN | | <i>Pavia</i> ⁴⁸⁰ |
| GC | | <i>Pappia</i> ⁴⁸¹ |

| | | | | | |
|----|----------|----------|-------|---------|--------|
| GC | civitate | indignam | vitam | indigna | quidem |
|----|----------|----------|-------|---------|--------|

[15,26]

| | | | |
|-----|----------------------|-------------------|----------|
| St | <i>miserabiliter</i> | <i>moreretur.</i> | - |
| Co | | | - |
| B | | | - |
| Ar | | moriretur | - |
| W | | | - |
| SD1 | | obiit | - |
| ASN | | moriretur | - |
| GC | - | morte | finierit |

[16,1]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------|------|-------------|----------------------|----------------|-------|--------|-------|----------|
| St | Vixit | ergo | Æthelwulfus | rex | - | (-)→ | duobus | annis | postquam |
| Co | | | | | - | (-)→ | | | |
| B | | | Ethelwolfus | | - | (-)→ | | | |
| Ar | | | | | - | (-)→ | | | |
| W | | | | [rex] ⁴⁸² | - | (-)→ | | | |
| SD1 | | | Ethelwlfus | | clementissimus | annis | | (-)← | |
| SD2 | | | Atheluulfus | | - | (-)→ | | | |
| JoW | | | Aðeluulfus | | - | (-)→ | | | |

⁴⁸⁰ "[S]ubsequently altered to *Papia* or *Papua!*" state Dumville and Lapidge, *The Annals of St Neots*, p.49.

⁴⁸¹ Cf. *Annales S. Neoti* in this chapter.

⁴⁸² W: "Sic MS Cott Deest Edd. P[arker]. & C[amden]."

[16,2]

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----|----------|-------|-------|--------|-----------|----|---------|-------|--------|-------|
| St | a | Roma | - | - | - | pervenit; | in | quibus, | inter | alia | multa |
| Co | | | - | - | - | | | | | | |
| B | | | - | - | - | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | - | - | - | | | | | | |
| W | | | - | - | - | | | | | | |
| SD1 | - | romuleas | adire | sedes | caepit | - | - | qui | | | - |
| SD2 | -† | | - | - | - | rediit | - | qui | | cetera | - |
| JoW | -† | | - | - | - | rediit | | | | | |

[16,3]

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------------|-------|------|-----|---------|---------|--------|----------|----|-----|----|
| St | praesentis | vitae | bona | - | studia, | - | - | cogitans | de | suo | ad |
| Co | | | | - | | - | - | | | | |
| B | presentis | | | - | | - | - | | | | |
| Ar | presentis | | | - | | - | - | | | | |
| W | | | | - | | - | - | | | | |
| SD1 | | | | et† | | regalis | operis | - | | | - |
| SD2 | - | - | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| JoW | | | | - | | - | - | | | | |

[16,4]

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------------|------|-----------|---------------|-----|------|-----|------|---|------|--------|
| St | universitatis | viam | transitu, | - | - | ne | sui | fili | - | post | patris |
| Co | | | | - | - | | | | - | | |
| B | | | | - | - | | | | - | | |
| Ar | | | | - | - | | | | - | | |
| W | | | | - | - | | | | - | | |
| SD1 | - | - | | praemeditatus | est | (-)→ | | Sui | | | - |
| JoW | | | | - | - | | | | - | | |

[16,5]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|-----------|-------|----|-------|------------------------------|---------------|
| St | obitum | indebite | inter | se | - | disceptarent, ⁴⁸³ | hereditariam, |
| Co | | | | | - | discerptarent | |
| B | | | | | - | | |
| Ar | | | | | - | discerptarent | |
| W | | | | | - | | |
| SD1 | | - | - | - | vitae | | - |
| JoW | | indebitae | | | - | | |

⁴⁸³ W: "Discerptarent Ed. P[arker]. & MS. Cott"

[16,6]

| | | | | | |
|-----|-------------|------------------------|----------|-----------|------------|
| St | <i>immo</i> | <i>commendatoriam,</i> | scribi | imperavit | epistolam: |
| Co | | | scribere | | |
| B | | | scribere | | |
| Ar | | | scribere | | |
| W | | | scribere | | |
| SD1 | - | - | -† | - | |
| JoW | - | - | scribere | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------|----------|--------------|-----------|------|-------|------|-----|
| SD1 | satis | eleganti | compositione | composuit | quae | omnia | quae | sui |
|-----|-------|----------|--------------|-----------|------|-------|------|-----|

| | | | |
|-----|-------|-------|-------------|
| SD1 | juris | erant | distribuit. |
|-----|-------|-------|-------------|

[16,7]

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----|-----|----|-------|-------|--------|--------------|-------------|-----------------|------------|----|--------------|
| St | in | qua | et | regni | inter | filios | <i>suos,</i> | <i>duos</i> | <i>scilicet</i> | - | - | - |
| Co | | | | | | | | | | - | - | - |
| B | | | | | | | | | | - | - | - |
| Ar | | | | | | | | | | - | - | - |
| W | | | | | | | | | | - | - | - |
| JoW | | | | | | | - | - | - | Aðelbaldum | et | Æthelberhtum |

[16,8]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------------------|----|----------|-------------|-------|--------|----|--------|
| St | <i>seniores,</i> | et | propriae | hereditatis | inter | filios | et | filiam |
| Co | | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | | |
| JoW | - | | | | | | | |

[16,9]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|----|-------|-------------|-------------|------|------|----|
| St | et | etiam | propinquos, | pecuniarum, | quae | post | se |
| Co | | | | | | | |
| B | | eciam | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | | |

[16,10]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------------|-------|--------|----|--------|----|-------|---------|
| St | superessent, | inter | animam | et | filios | et | etiam | nobiles |
| Co | | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | eciam | |
| Ar | | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | | | |

[16,11]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|-------|------------|---------------|---------|---------|-------------|
| St | suos, | divisionem | ordinabiliter | literis | mandari | procuravit. |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | mandare | |
| Ar | | | | | mandare | |
| W | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | mandare | |

[16,12]

| | | | | | | |
|----|-----------|------------|-----------------|-----------------------|--------------|-----------|
| St | <i>De</i> | <i>qua</i> | <i>prudenti</i> | <i>consideratione</i> | <i>pauca</i> | <i>de</i> |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | | consideracione | | |
| Ar | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | |

[16,13]

| | | | | | | |
|----|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------|------------------|
| St | <i>pluribus</i> | <i>posteris</i> | <i>imitanda</i> | <i>scribere</i> | <i>decrevimus,</i> | <i>scilicet,</i> |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | |

[16,14]

| | | | | | | |
|----|-------------|-----------|---------------------|---------------|---------------|------------------|
| St | <i>quae</i> | <i>ad</i> | <i>necessitatem</i> | <i>animae</i> | <i>maxime</i> | <i>pertinere</i> |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | necessitatem | | | |
| Ar | | | necessitatem | | | |
| W | | | | | | |

[16,15]

| | | | | | | | |
|----|-----------------------|------------|----------------|-------------|-----------|----------------|-----------------------|
| St | <i>intelliguntur.</i> | <i>Nam</i> | <i>cetera,</i> | <i>quae</i> | <i>ad</i> | <i>humanam</i> | <i>dispensationem</i> |
| Co | | | | | | | |
| B | | | caetera | | | | dispensacionem |
| Ar | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | |

[16,16]

| | | | | | | |
|----|-------------------|-----------|------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|
| St | <i>pertinent,</i> | <i>in</i> | <i>hoc</i> | <i>opusculo</i> | <i>inserere</i> | <i>necesse</i> |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | |

[16,17]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|----|------------|-------------|-----------|------------------|-----|--------------------|-------------------|------------|--------------|
| St | <i>non</i> | <i>est,</i> | <i>ne</i> | <i>fastidium</i> | - | <i>prolixitate</i> | <i>legentibus</i> | <i>vel</i> | <i>etiam</i> |
| Co | | | | | - | | | | |
| B | | | | | pro | | | | eciam |
| Ar | | | | | pro | | | | |
| W | | | | | - | | | | |

[16,18]

| | | | | | |
|-----|---------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----|-----------|
| St | <i>audire</i> | <i>desiderantibus</i> | <i>procreaverit.</i> | Pro | utilitate |
| Co | | | | | |
| B | | | | | |
| Ar | | | procreaverat† | | |
| W | | | | | |
| JoW | - | - | - | | |

[16,19]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|----------|-----------------|-------------------|
| St | <i>namque</i> | <i>animae</i> | <i>suae,</i> | <i>quam</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>primaevo</i> | <i>iuventutis</i> |
| Co | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | | |

[16,20]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------------|--------------|-----------|----------------|------------------|-----------------|------------|--------------|
| St | <i>suae</i> | <i>flore</i> | <i>in</i> | <i>omnibus</i> | <i>procurare</i> | <i>studuit,</i> | <i>per</i> | <i>omnem</i> |
| Co | | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | | |
| SD1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | | |
| JoW | | | | | | | | |

[16,21]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|-----------|--------------|-------------------|
| St | <i>hereditariam</i> | (-)→ | <i>terram</i> | <i>suam</i> | <i>semper</i> | <i>in</i> | <i>decem</i> | <i>manentibus</i> |
| Co | | (-)→ | | | | | | |
| B | | (-)→ | | | | | x | |
| Ar | | (-)→ | | | | | | |
| W | | (-)→ | | | | | | |
| SD1 | | <i>suae</i> | <i>terrae</i> | (-)← | | | | <i>mansis</i> |
| JoW | | (-)→ | | | | | x | |

[16,22]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|------|-----------|-----|-----------|-----|-------------|
| St | unum | pauperem, | aut | indigenam | aut | peregrinum, |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | |
| SD1 | | | | | vel | |
| JoW | | | | | | |

[16,23]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------|------|------|------|---|------------|---------------|-------|
| St | cibo, | potu | et | (-)← | - | vestimento | successoribus | suis, |
| Co | | | - | (-)← | - | | | |
| B | | | -† | (-)← | - | | | |
| Ar | | | | (-)← | - | | | |
| W | | | | (-)← | - | | | |
| SD1 | | (-)→ | potu | sive | | | | |
| JoW | | | -† | (-)← | - | | | |

[16,24]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------|----|----------|------|----------|------|----|---------|
| St | usque | ad | ultimam | diem | iudicii, | post | se | pascere |
| Co | | | ultimum | | | | | |
| B | | | ultimum | | | | | |
| Ar | | | ultimum | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | | |
| SD1 | | | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | ultimum† | | | | | |

[16,25]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------------|-----|--------|----|-------|------|-------|-----------|----|
| St | praecipit; | ita | tamen, | si | (-)→ | illa | terra | hominibus | et |
| Co | | | | | (-)→ | | | | |
| B | praecipit | | | | terra | | (-)← | | |
| Ar | praecipit | | | | (-)→ | | | | |
| W | | | | | (-)→ | | | | |
| SD1 | | | | | (-)→ | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | (-)→ | | | | |

[16,26]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|-------------|----|---------|-----|--------|-------|
| St | pecoribus | habitaretur | et | deserta | non | esset. | Romae |
| Co | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | |
| SD1 | | | | | | | Romam |
| JoW | | | | | | | Rome |

[16,27]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|------|------|---------------|------------|---|--------------|------------|------------------|
| St | quoque | omni | anno | <i>magnam</i> | <i>pro</i> | - | <i>anima</i> | <i>sua</i> | <i>pecuniam,</i> |
| Co | | | | | | - | | | |
| B | | | | | | - | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | - | | | |
| W | | | | | | - | | | |
| SD1 | | - | - | - | | | redemptione | | - |
| JoW | | | | - | - | - | - | - | - |

| | | | | | | | |
|------------------|---------|-----------|------|---------|-----|--------------|----------|
| B ⁴⁸⁴ | portare | praecepit | quae | taliter | ibi | dividerentur | scilicet |
|------------------|---------|-----------|------|---------|-----|--------------|----------|

[16,28]

| | | | | | |
|-----|-----|--------|-------|------|------|
| SD2 | que | gessit | opera | omni | anno |
|-----|-----|--------|-------|------|------|

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|------------|----------|------------|--------|
| St | <i>id</i> | <i>est</i> | trecentas | mancussas, | - | portari | praecepit, | quae |
| Co | | | | | - | | | |
| B | | | ccc | | - | (-)↑27 | (-)↑27 | (-)↑27 |
| Ar | | | 300 | | - | - | - | - |
| W | | | | | - | | | |
| SD1 | - | - | 485 | | - | | | - |
| SD2 | - | - | | | denariorum | portare | | - |
| JoW | - | - | ccc | | denariorum | portare† | | |

[16,29]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|---------|--------|---------------|----------|--------|-----------|
| St | taliter | ibi | dividerentur: | scilicet | centum | mancussas |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | (-)↑27 | (-)↑27 | (-)↑27 | (-)↑27 | c | 486 |
| W | | | | | | |
| SD1 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| SD2 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| JoW | | | | | | |

[16,30]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----|--------|--------|---------|--------|--------|-------------|----|---------|
| St | - | - | in | honorem | Sancti | Petri, | specialiter | ad | emendum |
| Co | - | - | | | | | | | |
| B | - | - | | honore | | | | | |
| Ar | - | - | | | | | | | |
| W | - | - | | | | | | | |
| SD1 | ad | limina | (-)↓31 | (-)↓31 | | | | | |
| SD2 | - | - | | | | | - | | |
| JoW | - | - | | honore | | | | | |

⁴⁸⁴ This is interlined with a caret after *mancussas* [16,28].

⁴⁸⁵ There is a correction of "tis" to "tas" in the MS.

⁴⁸⁶ Written in the margin.

[16,31]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|-----|-------------|-------|-----------|--------|-------------|
| St | oleum, | quo | impleantur | omnia | luminaria | illius | apostolicae |
| Co | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | |
| SD1 | | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| SD2 | | | implerentur | | | | - |
| JoW | | | | | | | |

[16,32]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|----------------------------|----|---------|----------|----|------------|
| St | ecclesiae | in | vespera | Paschae, | et | aequaliter |
| Co | aecclesiae | | | Pasce | | |
| B | | | | Pasche | | |
| Ar | | | | Pasche | | equaliter |
| W | | | | | | |
| SD1 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| SD2 | aecclesiae† ⁴⁸⁷ | | | Pasce† | | finiliter† |
| JoW | | | | | | |

[16,33]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----|-------|----------------|----|--------|----|-----------|----|---------|
| St | in | galli | cantu, | et | centum | - | mancussas | in | honorem |
| Co | | | | | | - | | | honore |
| B | | | | | c | - | | | honore |
| Ar | | | ⁴⁸⁸ | | | - | | | |
| W | | | | | | - | | | |
| SD1 | - | - | - | | | - | - | ad | |
| SD2 | | | | - | | Et | - | | honore† |
| JoW | | | | | c | - | | | honore |

[16,34]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|--------|-------------|-------|-------------|----|--------------------|
| St | Sancti | Pauli, | - | eadem | condicione, | ad | <i>comparandum</i> |
| Co | | | - | | | | |
| B | | | - | | | | |
| Ar | | | - | | | | |
| W | | | - | | | | |
| SD1 | | | - | - | - | - | - |
| SD2 | | | apostolici | | de causa | - | - |
| JoW | | | apostolici† | | de causa | - | - |

⁴⁸⁷ "aecclesiae...pasce." This may mean that SD2 had a copy of the Cotton Otho A.xii or that Parker corrected his transcript to match SD2. It may also be simply a regionalism.

⁴⁸⁸ *gallicantu*

[16,35]

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|--------------|-----------|-------------------|---------------|--------------|-----------------|-----------|-----------------|
| St | <i>oleum</i> | <i>in</i> | <i>ecclesia</i> | <i>Sancti</i> | <i>Pauli</i> | <i>Apostoli</i> | <i>ad</i> | <i>implenda</i> |
| Co | | | <i>aecclisiae</i> | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | | |

[16,36]

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|------------------|-----------|----------------|----------------|-----------|-----------|--------------|---------------|
| St | <i>luminaria</i> | <i>in</i> | <i>vespera</i> | <i>Paschae</i> | <i>et</i> | <i>in</i> | <i>galli</i> | <i>cantu,</i> |
| Co | | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | | |

[16,37-8⁴⁸⁹]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|---------------|---------------|------------------|-------------------|--------------|--------------------|
| St | <i>centum</i> | <i>quoque</i> | <i>mancussas</i> | <i>universali</i> | <i>papae</i> | <i>apostolico.</i> |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | <i>c</i> | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | |
| SD1 | | - | - | | | |
| SD2 | | | | | | |
| JoW | <i>c</i> | | | | | |

[17,1]

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------------|---------------|-------------|-----------|--------------------|----------------|-------------|------------------|------------|----------------------|----------------|
| St | <i>Defuncto</i> | <i>autem</i> | - | - | <i>Æthelwulfo</i> | <i>rege</i> | - | - | - | - | - |
| Co | | | - | - | | | - | - | - | - | - |
| B | | | - | - | <i>Æthelwolfo</i> | | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ar | | | - | - | | | - | - | - | - | - |
| W | | | - | - | | | - | - | - | - | - |
| SD1 | | <i>igitur</i> | - | - | <i>Ethelulfo</i> | | - | - | - | - | - |
| SD2 | | | <i>illo</i> | <i>et</i> | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| JoW | | | <i>illo</i> | <i>et</i> | - | ⁴⁹⁰ | - | - | - | - | - |
| ASN | - | - | - | - | <i>Adheluulfus</i> | - | <i>sepe</i> | <i>memoratus</i> | <i>rex</i> | <i>Occidentalium</i> | <i>Saxonum</i> |

| | | | | | | |
|-----|-------------|----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------|-------------|
| ASN | <i>viam</i> | <i>universitatis</i> | <i>adiit</i> | <i>quievit</i> | <i>in</i> | <i>pace</i> |
|-----|-------------|----------------------|--------------|----------------|-----------|-------------|

⁴⁸⁹ The last word of this chapter, *apostolico*, is broken to a new line in St.

⁴⁹⁰ Stevenson has in a footnote: "*post rege add. Illo idibus Ianuarii Flor,*" but this reading is not in MS Bodley 157.

| | | | |
|-----|-------------|-----|----------|
| St | <sepultoque | - | - |
| Co | sepultoque | - | - |
| B | sepultoque | - | - |
| Ar | sepultoque | - | - |
| W | sepultoque | - | - |
| SD1 | - | - | glorioso |
| SD2 | - | - | - |
| JoW | - | - | - |
| ASN | sepultusque | est | - |

[17,2]

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|------|----------------------------|---------|--------|------|----------|-------------|--------|-------|--------|
| St | apud | Wintoniam ⁴⁹¹ > | - | (-)→ | (-)→ | - | Æthelbald, | filius | eius, | contra |
| Co | | wintoniam | - | (-)→ | (-)→ | - | | | | |
| B | | Stemrugam | - | (-)→ | (-)→ | - | | | | |
| Ar | | Stemrugam | - | (-)→ | (-)→ | - | | | | |
| W | | Wintoniam | - | (-)→ | (-)→ | - | | | | |
| SD1 | - | - | - | filius | eius | - | Ethelbald | (-)← | (-)← | |
| SD2 ⁴⁹² | | Wintoniam | - | (-)→ | (-)→ | - | Ethelbaldus | | | - |
| JoW | | Uintoniam ⁴⁹³ | sepulto | (-)→ | (-)→ | - | | | | |
| ASN | | Steningam | - | (-)→ | (-)→ | regnauit | Adhelbaldus | | | - |

ASN⁴⁹⁴ post illum duos annos et dimidium qui et ipse antea cum patre

ASN regnauit annis duobus et dimidio sed post patrem contra

[17,3]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------------|-------------|----|---------------|-------------|--------|-------------|
| St | Dei | interdictum | et | Christianorum | dignitatem, | necnon | - |
| Co | | | | | | | - |
| B | | | | | | | - |
| Ar | | | | | | | - |
| W | | | | | | | - |
| SD1 | Jesu Christi | | | | | | traditionem |
| JoW | | | | | | | - |
| ASN | Deum | - | | | | | - |

[17,4]

| | | | | | |
|-----|----|--------|--------|-----------|----------------|
| St | et | contra | omnium | paganorum | consuetudinem, |
| Co | | | | | |
| B | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | |
| W | | | | | |
| SD1 | ac | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | |

⁴⁹¹ W: "Desunt MS. Cott."

⁴⁹² [17,2-7] "contra...duxit" in Co has been moved to after "rexit" in SD2, [17,9].

⁴⁹³ Wintoniam appears to have derived from JoW, copied by SD2.

⁴⁹⁴ Cf. [17,8].

[17,5]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|--------|-----|------------|------------|--------|
| St | thorum | patris | sui | ascendens, | Iuthittam, | Karoli |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | |
| SD1 | | | | | Iuditham | |
| JoW | | | | | Iuðittam | |
| ASN | | | | | Iudithtam | KAROLI |

[17,6]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|------------|--------|---------|------------|--------------|-----------|----------------|
| St | Francorum | regis, | filiam, | <i>cum</i> | <i>magna</i> | <i>ab</i> | <i>omnibus</i> |
| Co | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | |
| Ar | Ffrancorum | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | |
| SD1 | | | | | | - | - |
| JoW | | | | - | - | - | - |
| ASN | | | | | | | |

[17,7]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|--------------------|-----------------|----|-------------|--------|--------------|
| St | <i>audientibus</i> | <i>infamia,</i> | in | matrimonium | duxit, | effrenisque |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | aeffrenisque |
| Ar | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | |
| SD1 | - | | | | | |
| JoW | - | - | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | 495 | - |

[17,8]

| | | | | | |
|-----|--------|-------|---------|-------|---------------|
| St | duobus | et | dimidio | annis | Occidentalium |
| Co | | | | | |
| B | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | |
| W | | | | | |
| SD1 | | | | | |
| SD2 | | ac† | | | |
| JoW | | ac† | | | |
| ASN | (-)↑2 | (-)↑2 | (-)↑2 | (-)↑2 | |

⁴⁹⁵ ASN stops borrowing from ch. 17 of the *Vita* here.

[17,9]

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------|------|-------------|--------|-------|-----|-------|---------|-------------|--------|
| St | Saxonum | post | - | patrem | regni | - | - | - | gubernacula | rexit. |
| Co | | | - | | | - | - | - | | |
| B | | | - | | | - | - | - | | |
| Ar | | | - | | | - | - | - | | |
| W | | | - | | | - | - | - | | |
| SD1 | | | nobilissimi | patris | - | sui | obitu | imperii | | |
| SD2 | | | - | | | - | - | - | | |
| JoW | | | - | | | - | - | - | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|--------|------|---------|-------------|----|---------------|-------------|----|--------|
| SD2 | qui | contra | iesu | christi | interdictum | et | christianorum | traditionem | ac | contra |
|-----|-----|--------|------|---------|-------------|----|---------------|-------------|----|--------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|-----------|---------------|--------|--------|-----|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|
| SD2 | omnium | paganorum | consuetudinem | thorum | patris | sui | ascendens | Iuditham | Karoli | Francorum |
|-----|--------|-----------|---------------|--------|--------|-----|-----------|----------|--------|-----------|

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------|--------|-----|-------|---------|-------------|----------------------|
| SD2 | regis | filiam | cum | magna | infamia | matrimonium | duxit ⁴⁹⁶ |
|-----|-------|--------|-----|-------|---------|-------------|----------------------|

[17b,1⁴⁹⁷]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------------------|------------------|----------------------|------------|-----------|--------------------|-------|
| St | [⁴⁹⁸ Anno | <i>Dominicae</i> | <i>Incarnationis</i> | DCCCLVI | <i>et</i> | <i>nativitatis</i> | - |
| B | anno | | | 856 | - | | autem |
| JoW | anno | | - | 856 | et | | - |
| ASN | anno | - | - | .dcccclvi. | - | - | - |

[17b,2]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----------|-------|-----------------------|-----|-----|------|---------|--------|-------------|
| St | Aelfredi | - | Octavo, | hoc | est | anno | secundo | Karoli | imperatoris |
| B | | regis | decimo ⁴⁹⁹ | | | | | | |
| Ar | | - | decimo | | | | | | |
| ASN | - | - | - | | | | | Karoli | |

[17b,3]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------|------|------|-------|-------------|-------|---------------|
| St | tertii, | anno | vero | regni | Æthelwulfi, | (-)↓4 | Occidentalium |
| B | 3 | | | - | | regis | |
| Ar | 3 | | | | Athelwulfi | (-)↓4 | |
| ASN | tercii† | | | | Adheluulfi, | (-)↓4 | |

[17b,4]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|---------|--------|---------|---------|------------------------------|-------------|
| St | Saxonum | regis, | decimo | octavo, | Hunberchtus ⁵⁰⁰ , | Orientalium |
| B | | (-)↑3 | 18 | (-)← | Nunberchus ⁵⁰¹ | |
| Ar | | | 18 | (-)← | Nunberchus | |
| ASN | | | .xviii. | (-)← | | |

⁴⁹⁶ Cf. "qui...duxit" Co [17,2-7].

⁴⁹⁷ As Stevenson has noted, this chapter is derived from the *Annales S. Neoti* and appears in Parker's edition and Camden's edition in some form, as well as in transcripts B and Ar (16). It appears in the Cotton Manuscript, but was likely a later interpolation after the Co transcript was created. It is also noted by W to be an interpolation writing by a "manu recentiori."

⁴⁹⁸ W: "totam hanc clausulam deest MS. Cott."

⁴⁹⁹ W: "Decimo MS. Cott. Edd. P[arker]. & C[amden]."; also in Ar and B.

⁵⁰⁰ W: "Humbertus"; St follows ASN.

⁵⁰¹ W: "Nunberchus MS. Cott. Edd. P[arker] & C[amden]."

[17b,5]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----------|-----------|-------|------|----------------|----|-------|-----------|
| St | Anglorum | antistes, | unxit | oleo | consecravitque | in | regem | Eadmundum |
| B | | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | |

[17b,6]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------------|-----|--------|-------|----|--------|
| St | gloriosissimum, | cum | gaudio | magno | et | honore |
| B | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | |

[17b,7]

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------|----|-------|--------|------|---------|--------|----|------|------|
| St | maximo, | in | villa | regia, | quae | dicitur | Burua, | in | qua | tunc |
| B | | | | | | | Burya | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | Burna | - | quia | |

[17b,8]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----------|---------|-------|-------|------|---------|------|--------|---------|
| St | temporis | regalis | sedes | erat, | anno | aetatis | suae | decimo | quinto, |
| B | | | | | | | | 15 | (-)← |
| Ar | | | | | | | | 15 | (-)← |
| ASN | | | | | | | | .xv. | (-)← |

[17b,9]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------|--------|------|----------|---------|-----|---------|----------|
| St | sexta | feria, | luna | vecesima | quarta, | die | natalis | domini.] |
| B | | | | 24 | (-)← | | | domini |
| Ar | | | | 24 | (-)← | | | domini |
| ASN | sexta | feria, | luna | .xxiiii. | (-)← | | | domini. |

[18,1]

| | | | | | |
|-----|-------------|------------------|----------------------|---------|--------------------|
| St | <i>Anno</i> | <i>Dominicae</i> | <i>Incarnationis</i> | DCCCLX, | <i>nativitatis</i> |
| Co | | | | | |
| B | | | | 860 | |
| Ar | | | | 860 | |
| W | | | | | |
| SD1 | - | - | - | | |
| SD2 | | - | - | | - |
| JoW | - | - | - | 502 | - |
| ASN | | - | - | | - |

⁵⁰² Year placed outside the annal text.

[18,2]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------------|----------------|--------------|----------|-------------------|-------|--------------|
| St | <i>autem</i> | <i>Ælfredi</i> | <i>regis</i> | - | <i>duodecimo,</i> | (-)↓3 | Æthelbald, |
| Co | | | | - | | (-)↓3 | |
| B | | Ælfredi | | - | 12 | - | Æthelbald |
| Ar | | | | - | 12 | (-)↓3 | |
| W | | | | - | | (-)↓3 | |
| SD1 | - | Elfredi | clitonis | insignis | xii | - | Ethelbald |
| SD2 | - | - | - | - | - | Rex | ethelbaldus |
| JoW | - | - | - | - | - | Rex | Aethelbaldus |

[18,3]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|------------------------|------------------|-------|-----------|-------|----|-------|
| St | [<i>Occidentalium</i> | <i>Saxonum</i>] | <rex, | defunctus | est>, | et | - |
| Co | Occidentalium | Saxonum | rex | | est | | - |
| B | - | - | - | | est | | - |
| Ar | Occidentalium | Saxonum | rex | | est | | - |
| W | Occidentalium | Saxonum | rex | | est | | - |
| SD1 | - | - | - | | | - | atque |
| SD2 | - | - | (-)↑2 | | | | - |
| JoW | - | - | (-)↑2 | | | | - |
| ASN | Occidentalium | Saxonum | rex | | est | et | |

[18,4]

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----|---------------------------|-----------|--------|---|---------|---|----|--------------|--------|--------|-------|
| St | in | Scireburnan | sepultus, | - | - | - | - | et | Æthelberht, | - | frater | suus, |
| Co | | | | - | - | - | - | | | - | | |
| B | | | | - | - | - | - | | Ethelberht | - | | |
| Ar | | | | - | - | - | - | | | - | | |
| W | | | | - | - | - | - | | Æthelberht | - | | |
| SD1 | | Scireburna ⁵⁰³ | quo | ablato | e | saeculo | - | | Ethelbyrht | ipsius | | - |
| SD2 | | Scireburna | - | - | - | - | | | Ethelberht | - | | |
| JoW | | | - | - | - | - | | | | - | | |
| ASN | | Scireburna | - | - | - | - | | | Adhelbrictus | - | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|------------|-----|-------|----------|-----|-----|
| SD1 | has | Provincias | suo | regno | adjunxit | hoc | est |
|-----|-----|------------|-----|-------|----------|-----|-----|

[18,5]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------|----|---------------------------|-------------|--------|---------|-----|
| St | Cantiam | et | Suthrigam, | Suth-Seaxam | quoque | (-)↓6 | suo |
| Co | | | | | | (-)↓6 | |
| B | | | | Suthseaxum | | (-)↓6 | |
| Ar | | | | Suthseaxam | | (-)↓6 | |
| W | | | | Suthseaxam | | (-)↓6 | |
| SD1 | | | | Suthsexam | | - | - |
| SD2 | | | Suthregiam | Suthseaxan | quoque | Dominio | |
| JoW | | - | Suðregiam | Suðseaxam | | (-)↓6 | |
| ASN | | - | Suthrigiam ⁵⁰⁴ | Suthseaxam | | (-)↓6 | |

| | | | | |
|-----|---------|--------|----|-------------|
| SD1 | omnibus | villis | et | territoriis |
|-----|---------|--------|----|-------------|

⁵⁰³ There is erasure after the "a"; an "m" may have been removed.

⁵⁰⁴ The second "i" is interlined and appears in a later hand. See Dumville and Lapidge, *The Annals of St Neots*, p. 52.

[18,6]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|----------|----|--------|-------|-----|---------|------------|
| St | dominio, | ut | iustum | erat, | - | - | subiunxit. |
| Co | | | | | - | - | |
| B | | | | | suo | dominio | |
| Ar | | | | | - | - | |
| W | | | | | - | - | |
| SD1 | - | | | | - | - | - |
| SD2 | (-)↑5 | | | | - | - | |
| JoW | | | | | - | - | |
| ASN | | | | | - | - | |

| | | | | |
|-----|----------|-----|-------|--------------------|
| ASN | regnavit | que | annis | .v. ⁵⁰⁵ |
|-----|----------|-----|-------|--------------------|

| | | | | | | |
|-----|----|--------|--------|--------|-------|-------|
| St | In | cuius | diebus | - | - | - |
| Co | | | | - | - | - |
| B | | | | - | - | - |
| Ar | | | | - | - | - |
| W | | | | - | - | - |
| SD1 | | ipsius | | quoque | regni | statu |
| SD2 | | | | - | - | - |
| JoW | | | | - | - | - |
| ASN | | | | - | - | - |

[18,7]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|-----------|------------|----|------|------------|
| St | magnus | paganorum | exercitus, | de | mari | adveniens, |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | |
| SD1 | | | | | | |
| SD2 | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | |

[18,8]

| | | | | | |
|-----|------------|-----------|------------|----------|-------------|
| St | Wintoniam | civitatem | hostiliter | invadens | depopulatus |
| Co | | | | | |
| B | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | |
| W | | | | | |
| SD1 | | | | | |
| SD2 | | | | | |
| JoW | Uuintoniam | | | | |
| ASN | Uuintoniam | | | | |

⁵⁰⁵ For more on this sentence, see Dumville and Lapidge, *The Annals of St Neots*, p. 52.

[18,9]

| | | | |
|-----|------|------|-----|
| St | est. | Cui, | cum |
| Co | | | |
| B | | | |
| Ar | | | |
| W | | | |
| SD1 | | - | - |
| SD2 | | | |
| JoW | | | |
| ASN | | | |

| | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|------|------------|-----|--------------|
| SD1 | Exercitus | vero | praedictus | cum | reverteretur |
|-----|-----------|------|------------|-----|--------------|

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------|---------|------|-------|-----|---------|--------|------|-------|
| St | (-)→ | (-)→ | ad | naves | cum | ingenti | praeda | (-)← | (-)← |
| Co | (-)→ | (-)→ | | | | | | (-)← | (-)← |
| B | (-)→ | (-)→ | | | | | | (-)← | (-)← |
| Ar | (-)→ | (-)→ | | | | | preda | (-)← | (-)← |
| W | (-)→ | (-)→ | | | | | | (-)← | (-)← |
| SD1 | cum | ingenti | (-)→ | (-)→ | - | - | | ad | naves |
| SD2 | - | - | | | | | | (-)← | (-)← |
| JoW | - | - | | | | | | (-)← | (-)← |
| ASN | - | - | | | | | preda | (-)← | (-)← |

[18,10]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|----------------|---------|-------------|-----|--------------|--------|-----|
| St | reverterentur, | Osric, | - | - | Hamtunensium | comes, | cum |
| Co | | | - | - | | | |
| B | | | - | - | | | |
| Ar | | | - | - | | | |
| W | | | - | - | | | |
| SD1 | (-)↑9 | | dignissimus | dux | | - | |
| SD2 | | | - | - | | | |
| JoW | | | - | - | | | |
| ASN | | Osricus | - | - | | | |

[18,11]

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------|---------|---------|----|-------------|--------|----------|-----|--------------------------------|-----------|
| St | suis, | - | - | et | Æthelwulf | comes, | - | cum | Bearrocensibus, ⁵⁰⁶ | viriliter |
| Co | | - | - | | | | - | | | |
| B | | - | - | | Æthelwulfe | | - | | | |
| Ar | | - | - | | | | - | | | |
| W | | - | - | | | | - | | | |
| SD1 | | populis | advenit | | Ethelwlf | | insignis | | | |
| SD2 | | - | - | | Etheluulf | | - | | | |
| JoW | | - | - | | Aðeluulf | | - | | | |
| ASN | | - | - | | Adheluulfus | | - | | | |

⁵⁰⁶ Dumville and Lapidge state that "Bearrocensibus is the form reported in the tradition of Asser's text" (*The Annals of St Neots* 52), but no version that has come down to us reproduces the "cc" form. This may be a case of mistaking the short-hand mark in *Co* for representing a "c" instead of "n."

[18,12]

| | | | | | |
|-----|--------------|----------|-----|---------|----------|
| St | obviaverunt, | - | - | - | - |
| Co | | - | - | - | - |
| B | | - | - | - | - |
| Ar | | - | - | - | - |
| W | | - | - | - | - |
| SD1 | - | occurrit | cum | immenso | exercito |
| SD2 | | - | - | - | - |
| JoW | | - | - | - | - |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------------|---------|-------|----|------|---------------|--------|
| St | consertoque | proelio | - | - | - | <i>oppido</i> | pagani |
| Co | | | - | - | - | | |
| B | | praelio | - | - | - | | |
| Ar | | prelio | - | - | - | | |
| W | | | - | - | - | | |
| SD1 | | praelio | - | - | - | - | |
| SD2 | | | - | - | - | - | |
| JoW | | prelio | longe | ab | omni | | |

[18,13]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|--------------|-----|-----|---------|-----------|-----|
| St | passim | trucidantur, | et, | cum | diutius | resistere | non |
| Co | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | |
| SD1 | | | - | - | - | - | - |
| SD2 | | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | diu | | |

| | | | | | | |
|-----|----|--------|-----------|---|------------|-----------|
| SD1 | ab | anglis | suffultis | a | spiritibus | angelicis |
|-----|----|--------|-----------|---|------------|-----------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|---------|--------|-----------|-------|-----------|------|------------|---------|------------|
| SD1 | cumque | diutius | hostes | dirissimi | stare | nequirent | prae | vulneribus | cadebat | crudeliter |
|-----|--------|---------|--------|-----------|-------|-----------|------|------------|---------|------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------------|-----------|------|-----|----------|----------|---------|----|----------|----------|
| SD1 | perplurima | multitudo | alii | per | latibula | densarum | veprium | se | abdentes | nonnulli |
|-----|------------|-----------|------|-----|----------|----------|---------|----|----------|----------|

[18,14]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----------|--------------|-------|-------------|----|------------|-------|------|
| St | possent, | muliebriter | fugam | arripiunt, | et | Christiani | - | - |
| Co | | | | | | | - | - |
| B | | | | | | | - | - |
| Ar | | | | | | | - | - |
| W | | | | | | | - | - |
| SD1 | | | | arripientes | - | - | angli | vero |
| SD2 | | ‡muliebrem‡‡ | | | | | - | - |
| JoW | | | | | | | - | - |
| ASN | | | | | | | - | - |

[18,15]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|------|---------|---------|-----------|----------|-------|
| St | loco | funeris | - | - | dominati | sunt. |
| Co | | | - | - | | |
| B | | | - | - | | |
| Ar | | | - | - | | |
| W | | | - | - | | |
| SD1 | | | fortuna | arridente | | |
| SD2 | | | - | - | | |
| JoW | | | - | - | | |
| ASN | | | - | - | | |

[19,1]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------------------------------|---------|-------|-----------------|-----------|----------|--------------|
| St | Æthelberht | itaque, | - | - | - | - | - |
| Co | | | - | - | - | - | - |
| B | Æthelberht | | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ar | | | - | - | - | - | - |
| W | | | - | - | - | - | - |
| SD1 | Ethelbyrht | | Rex | - | - | - | - |
| SD2 | | | - | - | - | - | - |
| JoW | | | - | - | - | - | - |
| ASN | ‘Adhelberchtus’ ⁵⁰⁷ | - | ‘rex’ | ‘Occidentalium’ | ‘Saxonum’ | ‘frater’ | ‘Adhelbaldi’ |

| | | | | | | |
|-----|---------|-------|--------|------|-----------|----------|
| St | quinque | annis | regno | - | - | pacifice |
| Co | | | | - | - | |
| B | | | | - | - | |
| Ar | 5 | | | - | - | |
| W | | | | - | - | |
| SD1 | | | regnum | sibi | commissum | |
| SD2 | | | | - | - | |
| JoW | V | | | - | - | |
| ASN | “ | “ | “ | - | - | “ |

[19,2]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|----------------|------------|-------|---------------|------------|-----|
| St | et | amabiliter | atque | honorabiliter | gubernato, | - |
| Co | | | | | | - |
| B | | | | | | - |
| Ar | | | | | | - |
| W | | | | | | - |
| SD1 | | | | | gubernavit | qui |
| SD2 | ⁵⁰⁸ | | | | | - |
| JoW | | | | | | - |
| ASN | “ | “ | “ | “ | “ | - |

⁵⁰⁷ The section of the *Annales S. Neoti* here occupies the year 866 and has been moved here for comparative purposes.

⁵⁰⁸ *Et amabiliter atque honorabiliter gubernato* is written over erasure. Consult the manuscript: Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, MS 139, fol.78r.

[19,3]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|-------|--------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-----------|
| St | cum | magno | suorum | - | - | - | - |
| Co | | | | - | - | - | - |
| B | | | | - | - | - | - |
| Ar | | | | - | - | - | - |
| W | | | | - | - | - | - |
| SD1 | | | | principum | episcoporum | omniumque | populorum |
| SD2 | | | | - | - | - | - |
| JoW | | | | - | - | - | - |
| ASN | '' | '' | '' | - | - | - | - |

| | | | | | |
|-----|---------|--------|---------------|--------|--------|
| St | dolore, | (-)→ | universitatis | viam | adiit, |
| Co | | - | | - | |
| B | | (-)→ | | | |
| Ar | | (-)→ | | | |
| W | | (-)→ | | | |
| SD1 | | viam | | (-)← | |
| SD2 | | viam | | (-)← | |
| JoW | '' | 'viam' | '' | '(-)←' | '' |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------------|---------|-------|------------|----------|--------|------|-----------|
| SD1 | relinquens | terreni | regni | monarchiam | alterius | coepit | esse | particeps |
|-----|------------|---------|-------|------------|----------|--------|------|-----------|

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----------|-----|--------|-------|---------|------|----|-------------|
| SD1 | Sepultus | est | igitur | juxta | fratrem | suum | in | scireburnam |
|-----|----------|-----|--------|-------|---------|------|----|-------------|

[19,4]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|----|-------|---------------|-------|---------|-------|-----------------|
| St | et | in | Scireburnan | iuxta | fratrem | suum | honorabiliter |
| Co | | | | | | | |
| B | | | Scireburnam | | | | |
| Ar | | | Schireburnan† | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | |
| SD1 | - | (-)↑3 | (-)↑3 | (-)↑3 | (-)↑3 | (-)↑3 | - |
| SD2 | | | | | | | honorifice |
| JoW | | | | | | | honorifice |
| ASN | '' | '' | 'Scireburna' | '' | '' | '' | 'honorabiliter' |

[19,5]

| | | |
|-----|----------|-------------|
| St | sepultus | requiescit. |
| Co | | |
| B | | |
| Ar | | |
| W | | |
| SD1 | (-)↑ | - |
| SD2 | | |
| JoW | | |
| ASN | '' | '' |

| | | | | | |
|-----|-----|----------|---------------|---------|----------------|
| SD1 | quo | expectat | consolationem | futurae | resurrectionis |
|-----|-----|----------|---------------|---------|----------------|

[20,1]

| | | | | | |
|-----|-------------|------------------|----------------------|----------------|--------|
| St | <i>Anno</i> | <i>Dominicae</i> | <i>Incarnationis</i> | DCCCLXIV | pagani |
| Co | | | | dccclxiiii | |
| B | | | | 864 | |
| Ar | | | | 864 | |
| W | | | | | |
| SD1 | | - | - | dccclxiiii | |
| SD2 | | - | - | dccclxiiii | |
| JoW | - | - | - | ⁵⁰⁹ | |
| ASN | | - | - | .dccclxiiii. | |

[20,2]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------------|----|--------|------|------------|--------|----|-----------|---------|
| St | hiemaverunt | in | insula | - | - | Tanet, | et | firmum | foedus |
| Co | | | | - | - | | | | |
| B | hyemaverunt | | | - | - | Tenet | | | faedus† |
| Ar | | | | - | - | | | | fedus |
| W | hyemaverunt | | | - | - | | | | |
| SD1 | hyemaverunt | | | quae | appellatur | Tened | - | (-)→ | (-)↓3 |
| SD2 | hyemaverunt | | | - | - | Thenet | - | firmumque | fedus |
| JoW | | | | - | - | Tenet | - | firmumque | |
| ASN | | | | - | - | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|------|-------------|---------|-------|---------|-----|--------|
| SD1 | quae | circumdatur | undique | maris | Flumine | Qui | firmum |
|-----|------|-------------|---------|-------|---------|-----|--------|

[20,3]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|------------|-------------|-------|--------|-----------|
| St | cum | Cantuariis | pepigerunt. | (-)↑2 | Quibus | Cantuarii |
| Co | | | | (-)↑2 | | |
| B | | | | (-)↑2 | | |
| Ar | | | | (-)↑2 | | |
| W | | | | (-)↑2 | | |
| SD1 | | | | fedus | | |
| SD2 | | | | (-)↑2 | | |
| JoW | | | | (-)↑2 | | |
| ASN | | | | (-)↑2 | | |

[20,4]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|----------|-----|----------|----------|---------|--------------|
| St | pecuniam | pro | foedere | servato | reddere | promiserunt. |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | faedere† | | | |
| Ar | | | federe | | | |
| W | | | | | | |
| SD1 | | | federe | | | |
| SD2 | | | federe | servando | | |
| JoW | | | | Servando | | |
| ASN | | | | seruato | | |

⁵⁰⁹ Although the year dccclxiiii is indicated in MS Bodley 157, it is not in-line with the text, and is instead placed where the scribe often places it: outside the text block.

[20,5]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------|--------|---------------------|---------|------|---------|-------|
| St | Interea | tamen, | (-)→ | vulpino | more | pagani, | noctu |
| Co | | | (-)→ | | | | |
| B | | | (-)→ | | | | |
| Ar | | | (-)→ | | | | |
| W | | | (-)→ | | | | |
| SD1 | | | Dani ⁵¹⁰ | | | (-)← | |
| SD2 | | cum | (-)→ | | | | |
| JoW | | | (-)→ | | | | |
| ASN | | | (-)→ | uulpino | | | |

[20,6]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|------|---------|-------------|------------|---------|----|--------------|
| St | clam | castris | erumpentes, | foedere | dirupto | et | promissionem |
| Co | | | | | | | promissione |
| B | | | | faedere† | | | |
| Ar | | | | federe | | | |
| W | | | | | | | |
| SD1 | | | | federeque† | dirupto | | |
| SD2 | | | | federe | dirupto | | |
| JoW | | | | | dirupto | | |
| ASN | | | | federe | dirupto | | |

[20,7]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|----------|-------------|--------|--------|------------|--------|
| St | pecuniae | spernentes | - | - | - | - |
| Co | | | - | - | - | - |
| B | | | - | - | - | - |
| Ar | | spernentis† | - | - | - | - |
| W | | | - | - | - | - |
| SD1 | | | paucis | diebus | extiterunt | quieti |
| SD2 | | | - | - | - | - |
| JoW | | | - | - | - | - |
| ASN | | | - | - | - | - |

| | | | |
|-----|-----|---|--------|
| SD1 | Sed | O | Nefas! |
|-----|-----|---|--------|

| | | |
|-----|-----------|------|
| St | (sciebant | enim |
| Co | sciebant | |
| B | sciebant | |
| Ar | sciebant | |
| W | | |
| SD1 | (-)↓10 | - |
| SD2 | sciebant | |
| JoW | sciebant | |
| ASN | sciebant | |

⁵¹⁰ Cf. *pagani*.

[20,8]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------|----------|--------|---------|--------|--------|--------|
| St | maiorem | pecuniam | se | furtiva | praeda | quam | pace |
| Co | | | | | | | |
| B | - | - | - | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | praeda | | |
| W | | | | | | | |
| SD1 | (-)↓10 | (-)↓10 | (-)↓10 | (-)↓10 | (-)↓10 | (-)↓10 | (-)↓10 |
| SD2 | | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | praeda | | |
| ASN | | | | | praeda | | |

[20,9]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------------|-------|------------|------------------------|--------|--------|------------|
| St | adepturos), | totam | orientalem | Cantiae | - | plagam | depopulati |
| Co | adepturos | | | | - | | |
| B | adepturos | | | | - | | |
| Ar | | | | Cantii† | - | | |
| W | adepturos | | | Cantii† ⁵¹¹ | - | | |
| SD1 | (-)↓ | | | | gentis | | |
| SD2 | adepturos | | | | - | | |
| JoW | adepturos | | | | - | | |
| ASN | adepturos | | | Cantie | - | | |

[20,10]

| | |
|-----|-------|
| St | sunt. |
| Co | |
| B | |
| Ar | |
| W | |
| SD1 | |
| SD2 | |
| JoW | |
| ASN | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----------|---------|----------|----|---------|--------|------|------|-----------|
| SD1 | sciebant | maiorem | pecuniam | se | furtiva | praeda | quam | pace | adepturos |
|-----|----------|---------|----------|----|---------|--------|------|------|-----------|

| | | | | |
|-----|------|----|--------|-----|
| SD1 | quod | et | factum | est |
|-----|------|----|--------|-----|

⁵¹¹ The source for W is P, though St does not mention that W has this variant (nor that Ar has it) in his edition. W notes that *cantiae* was the reading in the Cotton manuscript.

[21,1]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----------|------|-------------|----|-----|------------------|----------------------|-----------|--------------------|
| St | - | - | <i>Anno</i> | - | - | <i>Dominicae</i> | <i>Incarnationis</i> | DCCCLXVI, | <i>nativitatis</i> |
| Co | - | - | | - | - | | | | |
| B | - | - | | - | - | | | 866 | |
| Ar | - | - | | - | - | | | 866 | |
| W | - | - | | - | - | | | | |
| SD1 | sequenti | vero | anno | li | est | - | - | | |
| SD2 | - | - | | - | - | - | - | | |
| JoW | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | _512 | - |
| ASN | eodem | vero | anno | - | - | - | - | - | - |

[21,2]

| | | | | | |
|-----|--------------|----------------|--------------|---------------|----------------|
| St | <i>autem</i> | <i>Ælfredi</i> | <i>regis</i> | <i>decimo</i> | <i>octavo,</i> |
| Co | | | | | |
| B | | | | xviii | (-)← |
| Ar | | Aelfredi | | 18 | (-)← |
| W | | | | | |
| SD1 | | Elfredi | - | - | xviii |
| SD2 | | | | | |
| JoW | - | - | - | - | - |

[21,3]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------------------------|-----------|--------|--------|-------|-------------|-------|---------|---------------|
| St | - | Æthelred, | (-)→ | | (-)→ | Æthelberhti | regis | frater, | Occidentalium |
| Co | - | | (-)→ | | (-)→ | | | | |
| B | - | Ælfred† | (-)→ | | (-)→ | Æthelberhti | | | |
| Ar | Æthelberhti | Æthelfred | (-)→ | | (-)→ | | | | |
| W | - | | (-)→ | | (-)→ | | | | |
| SD1 | - | Ethelred | frater | | (-)→ | Ethelbyrti | | (-)← | |
| SD2 | - | Ethered | (-)→ | | regis | Ethelberti | (-)← | | |
| JoW | - | Æthered | (-)→ | | regis | | (-)← | | |
| ASN | - | Adheredus | frater | ipsius | (-)→ | Adhelberhti | | (-)← | |

[21,4]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------|------------------------|-----------------------|-------|--------------|-----------|-----------|-------|
| St | Saxonum | - | - | regni | gubernacula | suscepit. | <i>Et</i> | eodem |
| Co | | - | - | | | | | |
| B | | - | - | | | | | |
| Ar | | ⁵¹³ quinque | annis† ⁵¹⁴ | | | | | |
| W | | - | - | | | | | |
| SD1 | | - | - | | | | - | |
| SD2 | | - | - | | | | - | |
| JoW | | - | - | | gubernacula† | | - | |
| ASN | | - | - | | | | | |

⁵¹² Year is indicated in margin.

⁵¹³ W: "Desunt Ms. Cott."

⁵¹⁴ Cf. [19,1]; also in P. and C.

[21,5]

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------|--------|-----------|---------|---------|------|---------|--------|----|-------|---|----|---------|
| St | anno | magna | paganorum | classis | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | de | Danubia |
| Co | | | | | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | |
| B | | magnus | | | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | |
| Ar | | | | | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | |
| W | | | | | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | |
| SD1 | | | | | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | |
| SD2 | | | | | ducibus | rege | haldano | Inguar | et | hubba | | | |
| JoW | | | | | - | - | - | - | - | - | | | |
| ASN | | | | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

[21,6]

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------------|-------|------------------------|----------|----------|------------------|-----|----|--------|-------------|
| St | Britanniam | - | - | - | advenit, | <i>et</i> | - | in | regno | Orientalium |
| Co | | - | - | - | | | - | | | |
| B | | - | - | - | | | - | | | |
| Ar | | - | - | - | | | - | | | |
| W | | - | - | - | | | - | | | |
| SD1 | Britanniae† | fines | duoibus ⁵¹⁵ | introiit | - | | sic | ad | regnum | |
| SD2 | Brittanium | - | - | - | | | - | | | |
| JoW | | - | - | - | | † ⁵¹⁶ | - | | | |
| ASN | Angliam | - | - | - | | | - | | | |

[21,7]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|----------|------|----------|---------|---------|--------------|----------|
| St | Saxonum, | quod | Saxonice | (-)→ | - | 'East-Engle' | dicitur, |
| Co | | | | (-)→ | - | | |
| B | | | | (-)→ | - | Eastengle | |
| Ar | | | | (-)→ | - | Eastengle | |
| W | | | | (-)→ | - | | |
| SD1 | Anglorum | | Saxonico | dicitur | eloquio | Eastengle | (-)← |
| SD2 | Anglorum | | | (-)→ | - | Eastangle | |
| JoW | Anglorum | | | (-)→ | - | East engle | |
| ASN | Anglorum | - | - | - | - | - | - |

[21,8]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|--------|------|----------|-----------|--------|----|-------|
| St | hiemavit, | ibique | ille | - | exercitus | maxima | ex | parte |
| Co | | | | - | | | | |
| B | hyemavit | | | - | | | | |
| Ar | | | | - | | | | |
| W | | | | - | | | | |
| SD1 | | | ipse | copiosus | | - | - | - |
| SD2 | hyemavit | | | - | | | | |
| JoW | | | | - | | | | |
| ASN | | | | - | | | | |

⁵¹⁵ In the right margin and partly damaged from erasure of surrounding leaf. This may be part of a marginal note that has become difficult to read.

⁵¹⁶ Stevenson offers that this is not in JoW, but it is, in fact, in MS Bodley 157.

[21,9]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|--------|------|-------------|-----------|-------------|--------------------|
| St | equester | factus | est. | <i>Sed,</i> | <i>ut</i> | <i>more</i> | <i>navigantium</i> |
| Co | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | |
| SD1 | equestris | | | - | - | - | - |
| SD2 | | | | - | - | - | - |
| JoW | | | | - | - | - | - |
| ASN | | | | - | - | - | - |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|------------|----|--------------|-----|-------|---------|-------------|
| SD1 | equitantes | et | discurrentes | hac | illac | praedam | diripientes |
| SD2 | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------|-----|-----------|-------|-----|---------|-----|--------|-----|------------|
| SD1 | enormem | non | parcentes | viris | vel | feminis | vel | viduis | nec | virginibus |
| SD2 | | | | | | | - | | | |

[21,10]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----------------|-----------|----------------|--------------|--------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------------|
| St | <i>loquar,</i> | <i>ne</i> | <i>diutius</i> | <i>navim</i> | <i>undis</i> | <i>et</i> | <i>valamentis</i> | <i>concedentes</i> |
| Co | | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | | |
| SD2 | | | | | | | | |

[21,11]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|----------|--------------|----------------|--------------------|---------------|----------------------|
| St | <i>et</i> | <i>a</i> | <i>terra</i> | <i>longius</i> | <i>enavigantes</i> | <i>longum</i> | <i>circumferamur</i> |
| Co | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | |
| SD2 | | | | | | | |

[21,12]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|--------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------|----------------|
| St | <i>inter</i> | <i>tantas</i> | <i>bellorum</i> | <i>clades</i> | <i>et</i> | <i>annorum</i> |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | |
| SD2 | | | | | | |

[21,13]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------------------|-----------|------------|-------------|------------|---------------|-----------|------------|-------------|
| St | <i>enumerationes,</i> | <i>ad</i> | <i>id,</i> | <i>quod</i> | <i>nos</i> | <i>maxime</i> | <i>ad</i> | <i>hoc</i> | <i>opus</i> |
| Co | | | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | | | |
| SD1 | | | | | | | | | |
| SD2 | | | | | | | | | |

[21,14]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------------------|--------------|------------------|-------------|----------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| St | <i>incitavit,</i> | <i>nobis</i> | <i>redeundum</i> | <i>esse</i> | <i>censeo,</i> | <i>scilicet</i> | <i>aliquantum,</i> |
| Co | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | |
| SD2 | | | | | | | |

[21,15]

| | | | | | |
|-----|----------------|--------------|-------------------|------------------|-----------|
| St | <i>quantum</i> | <i>meane</i> | <i>cognitioni</i> | <i>innotuit,</i> | <i>de</i> |
| Co | | | | | |
| B | | meae† | | | |
| Ar | | meae† | | | |
| W | | | | | |
| SD2 | | | | | |
| JoW | - | - | - | - | 517 |

[21,16]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|---------------------|-----------|-------------------|---------------|------------|--------------------|
| St | <i>infantilibus</i> | <i>et</i> | <i>puerilibus</i> | <i>domini</i> | <i>mei</i> | <i>venerabilis</i> |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | est† | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | |
| SD2 | | | | | | |
| JoW | 517 | 517 | 517 | - | - | - |

[21,17]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------------|---------------------|---------------|----------------|------------|-----------|-------------|
| St | <i>Ælfredi,</i> | <i>Angulsaxonum</i> | <i>regis,</i> | <i>moribus</i> | <i>hoc</i> | <i>in</i> | <i>loco</i> |
| Co | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | |
| SD2 | | | | | | | |
| JoW | - | - | - | 517 | 517 | 517 | 517 |

⁵¹⁷ These passages beginning here and marked with 517 occur under the year 871 in JoW (all manuscripts). These follow what corresponds to St, ch.42.

[21,18]

| | | | | |
|-----|----------|------------|------|---------------|
| St | breuiter | inserendum | esse | existimo. |
| Co | | | | |
| B | | | -† | |
| Ar | | | | |
| W | | | | |
| SD2 | | | | |
| JoW | '' | '' | '' | 'existimamus' |

[22,1]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|--------|----------|-------|------|-------------|--------|---------|
| SD1 | his | diebus | elfredus | clito | iugi | meditatione | coepit | divinis |
|-----|-----|--------|----------|-------|------|-------------|--------|---------|

| | | | | |
|-----|-------|-----------|-----|------|
| SD1 | imbui | doctrinis | qui | miro |
|-----|-------|-----------|-----|------|

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------------|------------|---------|----|---------|--------|-----|----|
| St | <i>Nam,</i> | <i>cum</i> | communi | et | Ingenti | Patris | Sui | et |
| Co | | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | | |
| SD1 | - | - | - | - | - | | - | - |
| SD2 | | | | | | | - | - |
| JoW | - | - | '' | '' | '' | '' | '' | '' |

[22,2]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|-------|-------|-------|---------|-------|------|----|
| St | matris | amore | supra | omnes | fratres | suos, | immo | ab |
| Co | | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | | |
| SD1 | matrisque | | | | | | - | |
| SD2 | matrisque | | | | | | | |
| JoW | '' | '' | '' | '' | '' | '' | '' | '' |

[22,3]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----------|-------|-------|---------------|----|----|-------|--------|
| St | omnibus, | nimum | - | diligeretur, | et | in | regio | semper |
| Co | | | - | | | | | |
| B | | | - | | | | | |
| Ar | | | - | | | | | |
| W | | | - | | | | | |
| SD1 | - | - | ipsis | diligebatur | - | - | - | - |
| SD2 | | | ipsis | | | | | |
| JoW | '' | '' | - | 'diligebatur' | '' | '' | '' | '' |

[22,4]

| | | | | | |
|-----|-------|-----------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|
| St | curto | inseparabiliter | nutriretur, | accrescente | infantili |
| Co | curro | | | | |
| B | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | |
| W | | | | | |
| SD2 | - | | | | |
| JoW | '' | '' | '' | '' | '' |

| | | | | | | |
|-----|------------|-----------|---------|------|---------|----|
| SD1 | cunabulis. | crescente | denique | illo | corpore | in |
|-----|------------|-----------|---------|------|---------|----|

[22,5]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----|---------|---------|--------|-----------|-------------|-----------|---------|-----------|
| St | et | puerili | aetate, | forma | ceteris | <i>suis</i> | fratribus | (-)← | decentior |
| Co | | | | | | | | (-)← | |
| B | | | | | caeteris | | | (-)← | |
| Ar | | | | | | | | (-)← | |
| W | | | | | | | | (-)← | |
| SD1 | - | | | | caeteris | | | (-)← | |
| SD2 | | | | | caeteris | | | (-)← | |
| JoW | '' | '' | '' | '(-)→' | 'cunctis' | - | '' | 'forma' | '' |

[22,6]

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------------|----------|----------|-----------|----|--------|-------|---------|----------|----------|
| St | videbatur, | vultuque | - | - | et | verbis | atque | moribus | - | - |
| Co | | | - | - | | | | | - | - |
| B | | | - | - | | | et | | - | - |
| Ar | | | - | - | | | ac | | - | - |
| W | | | - | - | | | | | - | - |
| SD1 | | | insignis | renitebat | | | - | - | refulsit | egregiis |
| SD2 | | | insignis | renitebat | | | - | - | refulsit | egregiis |
| JoW | '(-)↓7' | 'vultu' | - | - | - | '' | '' | '' | - | - |

[22,7]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------------|-------------|------------|-----------|--------------------|-------------|--------------|-----------|------------|
| St | gratiosior. | (-)↑6 | <i>Cui</i> | <i>ab</i> | <i>incunabulis</i> | <i>ante</i> | <i>omnia</i> | <i>et</i> | <i>cum</i> |
| Co | | (-)↑6 | | | | | | | |
| B | | (-)↑6 | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | (-)↑6 | | | | | | | |
| W | | (-)↑6 | | | | | | | |
| SD1 | - | (-)↑6 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| SD2 | - | (-)↑6 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| JoW | '' | 'videbatur' | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

[22,8]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----------------|-------------------|--------------|-----------------|-------------------|---------|--------|-------------------|
| St | <i>omnibus</i> | <i>praesentis</i> | <i>vitae</i> | <i>studiis,</i> | <i>sapientiae</i> | - | - | <i>desiderium</i> |
| Co | | | | | | - | - | |
| B | | presentis | | | sapiens | - | - | |
| Ar | | | vite | | sapientie | - | - | |
| W | | | | | | - | - | |
| SD1 | - | - | - | - | - | cervino | quoque | desiderio |
| SD2 | | | | | | cervino | quoque | desiderio |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|-----|--------|------------|----------|----|---------|----------|
| SD1 | aestuabat | Sui | Cordis | Penetralia | Suffundi | Et | Thalmum | pectoris |
| SD2 | estuabat | | | | | | | |

| | | | |
|-----|--------|---------|-------|
| SD1 | sacris | literis | imbui |
| SD2 | | | |

[22,9]

| | | | | | | |
|----|------------|-------------------|-----------------|----------------|---------------|-----------------|
| St | <i>cum</i> | <i>nobilitate</i> | <i>generis,</i> | <i>nobilis</i> | <i>mentis</i> | <i>ingenium</i> |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | |

[22,10]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------------------|------|------|--------|---------|--------|----------|--------|
| St | <i>supplevit;</i> | sed, | proh | dolor! | Indigna | suorum | parentum | (-)← |
| Co | | | | | | | | (-)← |
| B | | | | | | (-)→ | | suorum |
| Ar | | | | | | | | (-)← |
| W | | | | | | | | (-)← |
| SD1 | - | | | | - | - | | |
| SD2 | - | | | | - | - | | |
| JoW | - | '' | '' | '' | - | '' | '' | '(-)←' |

[22,11]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----|------------|---------|-------------|-----------|-------|----|------------|
| St | et | nutritorum | incuria | (-)↓12 | (-)↓12 | usque | ad | duodecimum |
| Co | | | | (-)↓12 | (-)↓12 | | | |
| B | | | | (-)↓12 | (-)↓12 | | | 12 |
| Ar | | | | (-)↓12 | (-)↓12 | | | 12 |
| W | | | | (-)↓12 | (-)↓12 | | | |
| SD1 | ac | | | illiteratus | permansit | | | |
| SD2 | ac | | | illiteratus | permansit | | | |
| JoW | '' | '' | '' | - | - | '' | '' | '' |

[22,12]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------|---------|--------|-----|----|----------|-------------|------------|
| St | - | aetatis | annum, | aut | eo | amplius, | illiteratus | permansit. |
| Co | - | | | | | | | |
| B | - | | | | | | | |
| Ar | - | etatis | | | | | | |
| W | - | | | | | | | |
| SD1 | Suae | | | - | - | - | (-)↑11 | (-)↑11 |
| SD2 | suae | etatis | | - | - | - | (-)↑11 | (-)↑11 |
| JoW | - | '' | '' | - | - | - | '' | '' |

[22,13]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------------|----------|---------|---------|-----|----------|----------|----------|
| St | <i>Sed</i> | Saxonica | - | poemata | die | noctuque | solers | auditor, |
| Co | | | - | | | | | |
| B | | | - | | | | | |
| Ar | | | - | | | | | |
| W | | | - | | | | | |
| SD1 | - | | quoque | | - | - | - | - |
| SD2 | - | | quoque | | - | - | - | - |
| JoW | | '' | 'tamen' | '' | '' | '' | 'solers' | '' |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|------------|----|---------|-----|-----|----------|---------|---------|
| SD1 | gloriosus | adolescens | et | futurus | rex | die | noctuque | discere | studuit |
| SD2 | | | | | | | | | |

| | | |
|-----|---------|---------|
| SD1 | eratque | docilis |
| SD2 | | |

[22,14]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|---------|------------|----------|-----------|-----------|
| St | realtu | aliorum | saepissime | audiens, | docibilis | memoriter |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | |
| JoW | '' | '' | '' | '' | '' | '' |

[22,15]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------------|----|------|------|-----------|------|-------------------|----|------|
| St | retinebat. | In | - | omni | venatoria | arte | <i>industrius</i> | - | - |
| Co | | | - | | | | | - | - |
| B | | | - | | | | | - | - |
| Ar | | | - | | | | | - | - |
| W | | | - | | | | | - | - |
| SD1 | - | | arte | (-)→ | | (-)← | | in | omni |
| SD2 | - | | arte | (-)→ | | (-)← | | in | omni |
| JoW | '' | '' | - | '' | '' | '' | - | - | - |

[22,16]

| | | | | | | | |
|----|----------------|-----------------------|----------------|------------|-----------|---------------|------------|
| St | <i>venator</i> | <i>incessabiliter</i> | <i>laborat</i> | <i>non</i> | <i>in</i> | <i>vanum;</i> | <i>nam</i> |
| Co | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | |

[22,17]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----------------|-----------------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------|-------------------|-----------|-------------|
| St | (-)→ | <i>incomparabilis</i> | <i>omnibus</i> | <i>peritia</i> | <i>et</i> | <i>felicitate</i> | <i>in</i> | <i>illa</i> |
| Co | (-)→ | | | | | | | |
| B | (-)→ | | | <i>pueritia</i> | | | | |
| Ar | (-)→ | | | | | | | |
| W | (-)→ | | | | | | | |
| SD1 | <i>peritia</i> | | - | (-)← | - | - | - | - |
| SD2 | <i>peritia</i> | | - | (-)← | - | - | - | - |
| JoW | - | ⁱ | ⁱ | ⁱ | ⁱ | ⁱ | - | - |

[22,18]

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------------|--------------|-----------|-----------|----------------|----------------|------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|
| St | <i>arte,</i> | <i>sicut</i> | <i>et</i> | <i>In</i> | <i>ceteris</i> | <i>omnibus</i> | <i>Dei</i> | <i>donis,</i> | <i>fuit,</i> | <i>sicut</i> |
| Co | | | | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | | | | (<i>sicut</i> |
| JoW | - | ⁱ | ⁱ | ⁱ | ⁱ | ⁱ | ⁱ | ⁱ | ⁱ | - |

[22,19]

| | | | | |
|----|-----------|------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| St | <i>et</i> | <i>nos</i> | <i>saepissime</i> | <i>vidimus.</i> |
| Co | | | | |
| B | | | | |
| Ar | | | | <i>vidimus)</i> |
| W | | | | |

[23,1]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|------------|-------------|----------------|------------|-------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| St | <i>Cum</i> | <i>ergo</i> | <i>quodam</i> | <i>die</i> | - | - | - |
| Co | | | | | - | - | - |
| B | | | | | - | - | - |
| Ar | | | | | - | - | - |
| W | | | | | - | - | - |
| SD1 | | | <i>quadam†</i> | | <i>eius</i> | <i>dignissima</i> | <i>genitrix</i> |
| SD2 | | | <i>quadam†</i> | | <i>eius</i> | <i>dignissima</i> | <i>genitrix</i> |
| JoW | ⁱⁱ⁵18 | ⁱ | ⁱ | ⁱ | - | - | - |

⁵¹⁸ All ⁱ in this chapter occur under the year 871 in JoW (all manuscripts).

| | | | | | |
|-----|-------|-----|------|----|-----------|
| St | mater | sua | sibi | et | fratribus |
| Co | | | | | |
| B | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | |
| W | | | | | |
| SD1 | - | - | | | |
| SD2 | - | - | | | |
| JoW | '' | '' | '' | '' | '' |

[23,2]

| | | | | | |
|-----|------|---------|-----------|------------|-------|
| St | suis | quendam | Saxonicum | poematicae | artis |
| Co | | | | | |
| B | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | |
| W | | | | | |
| SD1 | | | | | |
| SD2 | | | | poematice | |
| JoW | '' | '' | '' | '' | '' |

[23,3]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------|------|----|------|----------|-------------|------|-----|
| St | librum, | quem | in | manu | habebat, | ostenderet, | ait: | - |
| Co | | | | | | | | - |
| B | | | | | haberet | | | - |
| Ar | | | | | | | | - |
| W | | | | | | | | - |
| SD1 | | - | - | - | - | | | eis |
| SD2 | | - | - | - | - | | | eis |
| JoW | '' | '' | '' | '' | '' | '' | '' | - |

[23,4]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------------------|-----------|------|---------|---------|--------|-------|----------|---------|
| St | ' <i>Quisquis</i> | - | - | vestrum | discere | citius | istum | - | codicem |
| Co | | - | - | | | | | - | |
| B | | - | - | | | | | - | |
| Ar | | - | - | | | | | - | |
| W | | - | - | | | | | - | |
| SD1 | | karissimi | fili | | - | - | | potuerit | - |
| SD2 | | karissimi | fili | | - | - | | potuerit | - |
| JoW | '' | - | - | '' | '' | '' | '' | '(-)↓5' | '' |

[23,5]

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|--------|---------|------|------|---------|----|------|-----|-------|------|--------|
| St | possit, | - | - | dabo | illi | illum.' | - | - | Qua | voce, | immo | divina |
| Co | | - | - | | | | - | - | | | | |
| B | | - | - | | | | - | - | | | | |
| Ar | | - | - | | | | - | - | | | | |
| W | | - | - | | | | - | - | | | | |
| SD1 | (-)↑4 | citius | discere | | ei | ipsum | At | ille | - | - | - | |
| SD2 | (-)↑4 | citius | discere | | ei | ipsum | At | ille | - | - | - | |
| JoW | 'poterit' | - | - | '' | '' | '' | - | - | '' | '' | '' | '' |

[23,6]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|----------------------|------------|-------------|----|-------------|--------|---------------|
| St | <i>inspiratione,</i> | instinctus | <Ælfrēdus>, | et | (-)↓7 | (-)↓7 | pulchritudine |
| Co | | | | | (-)↓7 | (-)↓7 | |
| B | | instructus | - | | (-)↓7 | (-)↓7 | |
| Ar | | | - | | (-)↓7 | (-)↓7 | |
| W | | | | | (-)↓7 | (-)↓7 | |
| SD1 | | | - | | (-)↓7 | (-)↓7 | |
| SD2 | | | - | | principalis | litere | (-)↓7 |
| JoW | '' | '' | 'Alfredus' | '' | - | - | '' |

[23,7]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------------|----------|-------------|--------|-------|-----------|-----|-------|-------------|
| St | principalis | litterae | - | illius | libri | illectus, | ita | matri | respondens, |
| Co | | | - | | | | | | |
| B | | | - | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | - | | | | | | |
| W | | | - | | | | | | |
| SD1 | | litterae | exhilaratus | - | - | - | | | respondit† |
| SD2 | (-)↑6 | (-)↑6 | exhilaratus | - | - | - | | | respondit |
| JoW | '' | '' | - | '' | '' | '' | '' | '' | '' |

[23,8]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|----|---------|------|---------|---------|-----|---------|
| St | et | fratres | suos | aetate, | quamvis | non | gratia, |
| Co | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | |
| SD1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| SD2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| JoW | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

[23,9]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------------|-------------|---------|---------|-------|-------|
| St | <i>seniores</i> | anticipans, | inquit: | 'Verene | dabis | istum |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | |
| SD1 | - | - | - | | - | - |
| SD2 | - | - | - | | - | - |
| JoW | - | - | '' | '' | '' | '' |

| | | | | | |
|-----|-----|-----|-------|------|--------|
| SD1 | sic | ait | matri | suae | dabis? |
| SD2 | | | | | |

[23,10]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|-----|----|--------|----------|-------|-----|-----------|-------------|
| St | librum | uni | ex | nobis, | scilicet | illi, | qui | citissime | intelligere |
| Co | | | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | | | |
| SD1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| SD2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| JoW | '' | '' | '' | '' | '' | '' | '' | '' | '' |

[23,11]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----|----------|-----|------|----|----------|----|------|
| St | et | recitare | eum | ante | te | possit?' | Ad | haec |
| Co | | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | | hec |
| W | | | | | | | | |
| SD1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | | |
| SD2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | | |
| JoW | '' | '' | '' | '' | '' | '' | '' | '' |

[23,12]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------|----------|-----------|----------------|--------------|-------------------|---------|
| St | illa, | arridens | <i>et</i> | <i>gaudens</i> | <i>atque</i> | <i>affirmans:</i> | 'Dabo,' |
| Co | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | |
| SD1 | | | | | | | |
| SD2 | | | | | | | |
| JoW | '' | '' | - | - | - | - | '' |

[23,13]

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----------------|------|-----|-------|---------|------|------|--------|---------|--------|----|
| St | infit, | - | - | - | 'illi.' | Tunc | ille | statim | tollens | librum | de |
| Co | ⁵¹⁹ | - | - | - | | | | | | | |
| B | inquit | - | - | - | | | | | | | |
| Ar | inquit† | - | - | - | | | | | | | |
| W | | - | - | - | | | | | | | |
| SD1 | inquit | dabo | mox | autem | - | - | - | - | tulit | | |
| SD2 | inquit | dabo | mox | autem | - | - | - | - | tulit | | |
| JoW | '' | - | - | - | '' | '' | '' | '' | '' | '' | '' |

⁵¹⁹ This word is underlined. Interlined *inquit*.

[23,14]

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------|------|------------|-----------|--------|-------|----------|----------|----|--------|-----|--------|
| St | manu | sua, | - | magistrum | - | adiit | - | - | et | legit. | Quo | lecto, |
| Co | | | - | | - | | - | - | | | | |
| B | | | - | | statim | | - | - | | | | |
| Ar | | | - | | | | - | - | | | | |
| W | | | - | | | | - | - | | | | |
| SD1 | | | genitricis | | | | libellum | ostendit | | | - | - |
| SD2 | | | genitricis | | | | libellum | ostendit | | | - | - |
| JoW | ⁂ | ⁂ | - | ⁂ | | ⁂ | - | - | ⁂ | ⁂ | ⁂ | ⁂ |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------------|------------|------|---------|-----|-------|----------|-------|
| SD1 | praeceptore | ostendente | post | spatium | non | longi | temporis | uenit |
| SD2 | | | | | | | | |

| | | | |
|-----|------|-------------|----------|
| SD1 | ante | praesentiam | dilectae |
| SD2 | | | |

[23,15]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|---------|----|-----------|-----------|------------|
| St | matri | retulit | et | - | - | recitavit. |
| Co | | | | - | - | |
| B | | | | - | - | |
| Ar | | | | - | - | |
| W | | | | - | - | |
| SD1 | matris | - | - | librumque | memoriter | |
| SD2 | matris | - | - | librumque | memoriter | |
| JoW | ⁂ | ⁂ | ⁂ | - | - | ⁂ |

[24,1]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------|------|--------|----------|--------|------------|---------|------------|
| SD1 | Ipsa | uero | grates | immensas | reddit | saluatoris | gratiae | (-)← |
| SD2 | | | | | | (-)→ | | saluatoris |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|---------|-----|------|----|-------|---------|
| SD1 | agnoscens | gratiam | Dei | esse | in | mente | iuuenis |
| SD2 | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------------------|------------------|-------------|--------|--------|-----------|---------|-------------|
| St | Post | haec | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Co | | | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| B | | | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ar | | hec | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| W | | | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| SD1 | | | inflammatus | divini | amoris | desiderio | psalmos | perplurimos |
| SD2 | | hec | inflammatus | divini | amoris | desiderio | psalmos | perplurimos |
| JoW | ⁂ ⁵²⁰ | ⁂ ^{hec} | - | - | - | - | - | - |

⁵²⁰ All ⁂ in this chapter occur under the year 871 in JoW (all manuscripts).

| | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|----------|----|-----|---------------|
| St | cursum | diurnum, | id | est | celebrationes |
| Co | | | | | |
| B | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | |
| W | | | | | |
| SD1 | cursumque | | | | |
| SD2 | cursumque | | | | |
| JoW | " | " | - | - | - |

[24,2]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|----------|----|--------|---------|---------|----|-----------|
| St | horarum, | ac | deinde | psalmos | quosdam | et | orationes |
| Co | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | |
| SD1 | | - | - | (-)↑1 | - | - | - |
| SD2 | | - | - | (-)↑1 | - | - | - |
| JoW | - | - | - | " | " | " | " |

[24,3]

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|------------|------|---------|-------|---------|----|-----|----------|--------------|-------|
| St | multas | <didicit>; | - | - | quos | - | in | uno | libro | congregatos | in |
| Co | | | - | - | | - | | | | | |
| B | | - | - | - | | - | | | | | |
| Ar | | - | - | - | | - | | | | | |
| W | | - | - | - | | - | | | | | |
| SD1 | - | didicit | ipse | devotus | | - | | | volumine | | (-)↓4 |
| SD2 | - | didicit | ipse | devotus | | - | | | volumine | | (-)↓4 |
| JoW | " | "didicit" | - | - | "que" | "Omnia" | " | " | " | "congragata" | " |

[24,4]

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------|------|-----|------------|-------|------|------|--------|------|----------|-------|
| St | sinu | suo | die | noctunque, | (-)↑3 | (-)← | (-)← | sicut | ipsi | vidimus, | secum |
| Co | | | | | (-)↑3 | (-)← | (-)← | | | | |
| B | | | | | (-)↑3 | (-)← | (-)← | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | (-)↑3 | (-)← | (-)← | | | | |
| W | | | | | (-)↑3 | (-)← | (-)← | (sicut | | vidimus) | |
| SD1 | (-)→ | (-)→ | | | In | sinu | suo | - | - | - | - |
| SD2 | (-)→ | (-)→ | | | In | sinu | suo | - | - | - | - |
| JoW | " | " | " | " | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

[24,5]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|------------------|----------|-----------|---------|-------|-------|------------|
| St | inseparabiliter, | - | orationis | gratia, | inter | omnia | praesentis |
| Co | | - | | | | | |
| B | inseparabiliter | - | | | | | |
| Ar | inseparabiliter† | - | | | | | |
| W | | - | | | | | |
| SD1 | | portabat | - | - | - | - | - |
| SD2 | | portabat | | | | | |
| JoW | - | - | " | " | " | " | " |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|-------|---------|-------|---|-----|---------|--------|
| SD1 | O | felix | hominum | genus | O | rex | prudens | gestas |
| SD2 | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|------------|-------|-------|------------|---------|---------|------|
| SD1 | gestantem | sapientiae | claus | uehis | sapientiam | diligis | sapiens | eris |
| SD2 | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|-----|---------|----------|----|-----------|----|-----------------------|
| SD1 | faciens | iudicium | et | iustitiam | in | terris ⁵²¹ |
| SD2 | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---|---------|-----------|----|--------|-------|----|------|
| SD1 | O | clerici | attendite | et | uidete | regem | in | sinu |
| SD2 | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|---------|-----|-------------------------|-----|------|-----|-------|
| SD1 | librum | deferre | die | noctuque ⁵²² | uos | uero | nec | legem |
| SD2 | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|--------|-----|-------|--------|-----------|------|-----|
| SD1 | dei | scitis | nec | scire | uultis | Praecipue | idem | rex |
| SD2 | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|---------|--------|------|----|-----|--------|------|
| SD1 | factus | lugebat | filium | suum | id | est | animum | quod |
| SD2 | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|-----|-------------|-----|--------|---------|-------------|
| SD1 | liberalibus | non | fuerat | artibus | instructus. |
| SD2 | | | | | |

[24,6]

| | | | | | |
|-----|-------|-----------|--------|----------------|------|
| St | vitae | curricula | ubique | circumducebat. | Sed, |
| Co | | | | | |
| B | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | |
| W | | | | | |
| SD1 | - | - | - | - | |
| SD2 | - | - | - | - | - |
| JoW | '' | '' | '' | '' | '' |

[24,7]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|------|--------|------|--------|--------------|-----------|
| St | proh | dolor! | quod | maxime | desiderabat, | liberalem |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | literalem |
| Ar | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | |
| SD1 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| SD2 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| JoW | '' | '' | '' | '' | '' | '' |

⁵²¹ *Faciens...terris* from Jerome.

⁵²² Cf. [25,7].

[24,8]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|----------|--------|-----------|-----|-----|-------------|----|
| St | scilicet | artem, | desiderio | suo | non | suppetebat, | eo |
| Co | | | | | | | |
| B | - | | | - | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | |
| SD1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| SD2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| JoW | '' | '' | '' | '' | '' | '' | '' |

[24,9]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------|----|-------------|------|---------|--------------|------|----|
| St | quod, | ut | loquebatur, | illo | tempore | lectores | boni | in |
| Co | | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | | |
| SD1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| SD2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| JoW | '' | - | - | '' | '' | 'grammatici' | - | '' |

[24,10]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|------|-------|---------------|---------|-----|--------|
| St | toto | regno | Occidentalium | Saxonum | non | erant. |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | |
| SD1 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| SD2 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| JoW | '' | '' | '' | '' | '' | '' |

[25,1]

| | | | | | | |
|----|-------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------|--------------|
| St | <i>Quod</i> | <i>maximum</i> | <i>inter</i> | <i>omnia</i> | <i>praesentis</i> | <i>vitae</i> |
| Co | | | | | presentis | |
| B | | | | | presentis | |
| Ar | | | | | presentis | vite |
| W | | | | | | |

[25,2]

| | | | | | | | |
|----|-------------|--------------------|-----------|------------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------|
| St | <i>suae</i> | <i>impedimenta</i> | <i>et</i> | <i>dispendia</i> | <i>crebris</i> | <i>querelis</i> | <i>et</i> |
| Co | | | - | | | | |
| B | - | | - | | | | |
| Ar | <i>sue</i> | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | |

[25,3]

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|----------------|---------------|------------|------------------|---------------|-------------------|-----------|------------|
| St | <i>intimis</i> | <i>cordis</i> | <i>sui</i> | <i>suspiriis</i> | <i>fieri</i> | <i>affirmabat</i> | <i>Id</i> | <i>est</i> |
| Co | | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | <i>fiere†</i> | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | | |

[25,4]

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|-----------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|---------------|----------------|-----------|------------------|
| St | <i>eo</i> | <i>quod</i> | <i>illo</i> | <i>tempore,</i> | <i>quando</i> | <i>aetatem</i> | <i>et</i> | <i>licentiam</i> |
| Co | | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | <i>etatem</i> | | |
| W | | | | | | | | |

[25,5]

| | | | | | | |
|----|--------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|------------|
| St | <i>atque</i> | <i>suppntiam</i> | <i>discendi</i> | <i>habebat,</i> | <i>magistros</i> | <i>non</i> |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | |

[25,6]

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|------------------|---------------|-------------|-----------|---------------|-------------|------------------|-----------|
| St | <i>habuerat;</i> | <i>quando</i> | <i>vero</i> | <i>et</i> | <i>aetate</i> | <i>erat</i> | <i>provecior</i> | <i>et</i> |
| Co | | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | -† | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | <i>etate</i> | | | |
| W | | | | | | | | |

[25,7]

| | | | | | | | |
|----|------------------------|------------|------------------|-------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|
| St | <i>inecessabilis</i> | <i>die</i> | <i>noctuque,</i> | <i>immo</i> | <i>omnibus</i> | <i>istius</i> | <i>insulae</i> |
| Co | | | | | | | |
| B | <i>inecessabilibus</i> | | | | | | |
| Ar | <i>inecessabilibus</i> | | | | | | <i>insule</i> |
| W | | | | | | | |

[25,8]

| | | | | | |
|----|----------------|-------------------|---------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| St | <i>medicis</i> | <i>incognitis</i> | - | <i>infirmatibus,</i> | <i>internisque</i> |
| Co | | | - | <i>infirmantibus</i> | |
| B | | | <i>credo†</i> | | <i>interumque</i> |
| Ar | | | - | <i>infirmantibus</i> | |
| W | | | - | | |

[25,9]

| | | | | | | |
|----|--------------|-----------------|---------------|-------------------|--------------------------|---------------|
| St | <i>atque</i> | <i>externis</i> | <i>regiae</i> | <i>potestatis</i> | <i>sollicitudinibus,</i> | <i>necnon</i> |
| Co | at | | | | | |
| B | ac | | | | sollicitudinibus | |
| Ar | | | regie | | | |
| W | | | | | | |

[25,10]

| | | | | | |
|----|-----------|------------------|--------------|----------------|------------------------|
| St | <i>et</i> | <i>paganorum</i> | <i>terra</i> | <i>marique</i> | <i>infestationibus</i> |
| Co | | | | | |
| B | | | | | infestacionibus† |
| Ar | | | | | |
| W | | | | | |

[25,11]

| | | | | | | |
|----|-------------------|-------------|--------------|---------------------|------------------|-----------|
| St | <i>occupatus,</i> | <i>immo</i> | <i>etiam</i> | <i>perturbatus,</i> | <i>magistros</i> | <i>et</i> |
| Co | occupatus | | | | | |
| B | | | eciam† | | | |
| Ar | | | | perturbatos | | |
| W | | | | perturbatos | | |

[25,12]

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|-------------------|--------------------|-----------|--------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------|------------|
| St | <i>scriptores</i> | <i>aliquantula</i> | <i>ex</i> | <i>parte</i> | <i>habebat,</i> | <i>legere</i> | <i>ut</i> | <i>non</i> |
| Co | | | | | | | et | |
| B | | | | | | | et | |
| Ar | | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | | |

[25,13]

| | | | | | | | |
|----|-----------------|------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------|--------------|--------------------|
| St | <i>poterat.</i> | <i>Sed</i> | <i>tamen</i> | <i>inter</i> | <i>praesentis</i> | <i>vitae</i> | <i>impedimenta</i> |
| Co | | | | | presentis | | |
| B | | | | | presentis | | |
| Ar | | | | | presentis | vite | |
| W | | | | | | | |

[25,14]

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|-----------|-----------------|--------------|-----------|-------------------|-------------|--------------|-----------|
| St | <i>ab</i> | <i>infantia</i> | <i>usque</i> | <i>ad</i> | <i>praesentem</i> | <i>diem</i> | [<i>et,</i> | <i>ut</i> |
| Co | | | | | presentem | | et | |
| B | | | | | presentem | | et | |
| Ar | | | | | | | et | |
| W | | | | | | | et | |

[25,15]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|----|---------------|--------------|-----------|---------------|--------------|--------------|-----------|--------------|---------------------|
| St | <i>credo,</i> | <i>usque</i> | <i>ad</i> | <i>obitum</i> | <i>vitae</i> | <i>suae]</i> | <i>in</i> | <i>eodem</i> | <i>insaturabili</i> |
| Co | | | | | | sue | | | |
| B | | | | | | suae | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | sue | | | |
| W | | | | | | suae | | | |

[25,16]

| | | | | | | | | |
|----|-------------------|--------------|------------|-------------|-------------------|------------|------------|--------------|
| St | <i>desiderio,</i> | <i>sicut</i> | <i>nec</i> | <i>ante</i> | <i>destituit,</i> | <i>ita</i> | <i>nec</i> | <i>etiam</i> |
| Co | | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | destitit | | | eciam† |
| Ar | | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | | |

[25,17]

| | | | |
|----|--------------|----------------|-----------------|
| St | <i>adhuc</i> | <i>inhiare</i> | <i>desinit.</i> |
| Co | nec | | |
| B | | | |
| Ar | | | |
| W | | | |

[26,1]

| | | | | | |
|-----|-------------|------------------|----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| St | <i>Anno</i> | <i>Dominicae</i> | <i>Incarnationis</i> | <i>DCCCLXVII,</i> | <i>nativitatis</i> |
| Co | | | | | |
| B | | | incarnacionis | 867 | |
| Ar | | | | 867 | |
| W | | | | | |
| SD1 | | - | - | | |
| SD2 | | - | - | | - |
| JoW | - | - | - | 889 | - |
| ASN | Anno | - | - | .dcccclxvii. | - |

[26,2]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|----------------|------------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|--------------------------|
| St | <i>Ælfredi</i> | <i>prae</i> fati | <i>regis</i> | <i>decimo</i> | <i>nono,</i> | praedictus |
| Co | | | | xix | (-)← | predictus |
| B | | prae | fati | 19 | (-)← | predictus |
| Ar | | | | 19 | (-)← | predictus |
| W | ⁵²³ | | | | | |
| SD1 | elfredi | - | | xix | - | |
| SD2 | - | - | - | - | - | predictus |
| JoW | - | - | - | - | - | predictus ⁵²⁴ |
| ASN | - | - | - | - | - | predictus |

[26,3]

| | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|-----------|----|--------------|--------|
| St | paganorum | exercitus | de | Orientalibus | Anglis |
| Co | | | | | |
| B | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | |
| W | | | | | |
| SD1 | | | | | |
| SD2 | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | |

[26,4]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|----|----------|-----------|-----------|------|----|------------|
| St | ad | Eboracum | civitatem | migravit, | quae | in | aquilonali |
| Co | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | aquilonari |
| Ar | | | | | | | aquilonari |
| W | | | | | | | aquilonari |
| SD1 | | Eboracam | | | | | |
| SD2 | | Eboracam | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | Eboracam | | | | | |

⁵²³ W: "Ms. Cott habuit Karol, sed deletur."

⁵²⁴ In MS Bodley 157, the *r* is written over the rubricated *P*.

[26,5]

| | | | | | |
|-----|------|---------------------------|----------|------|------|
| St | ripa | Humbrensis | fluminis | sita | est. |
| Co | | | | | |
| B | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | |
| W | | | | | |
| SD1 | | Humbrensis ⁵²⁵ | | | |
| SD2 | | Humbre | | | |
| JoW | | Humbrae | | | |
| ASN | | | | | |

[27,1]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------|---------|--------|-------|-----------------|---------|-----------|
| St | Eo | tempore | maxima | inter | Northanhymbros | (-)↓3 | discordia |
| Co | | | | | | (-)↓3 | |
| B | | | | | | (-)↓3 | |
| Ar | | | | | | (-)↓3 | |
| W | | | | | | (-)↓3 | |
| SD1 | eodem | | | | Nortanhymbrorum | populos | |
| SD2 | | | | | Norhumbros | (-)↓3 | |
| JoW | | | | | Norðanhymbros | (-)↓3 | |
| ASN | | | | | Nordanhymbros | (-)↓3 | |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------|----------|----|------|------|-----|-------|---------|-------|----------|
| SD1 | erat | succensa | et | apte | quia | qui | odium | diligit | odium | inveniet |
|-----|------|----------|----|------|------|-----|-------|---------|-------|----------|

[27,2]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|-----------|------|---------|-------|--------|
| St | diabolico | instinctu | orta | fuerat, | sicut | semper |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | - | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | |
| SD2 | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | |

[27,3]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------|-----|-------|------------|------|---------|--------|
| St | populo, | qui | odium | incurrerit | Dei, | evenire | solet. |
| Co | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | |
| SD1 | (-)↑1 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| SD2 | | | | | - | | |
| JoW | | | | | - | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | |

⁵²⁵ The *r* is interlined above.

[27,4]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|-----|--------|-----------------|----|----------|-----|----------|------|
| St | Nam | - | - | Northanhymbri | eo | tempore, | ut | diximus, | - |
| Co | | - | - | | | | | | - |
| B | | - | - | | - | | | | - |
| Ar | | - | - | | | | | | - |
| W | | - | - | | - | | (ut | diximus) | - |
| SD1 | - | his | diebus | Nortanhimbrorum | - | - | - | - | gens |
| SD2 | | - | - | Northumbri | | | - | - | - |
| JoW | | - | - | Norðanhymbri | | | | | - |
| ASN | | - | - | Nordanhymbri | | | | | - |

[27,5]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|-----|--------|-------|-------|---------------------------|
| St | legitimum | - | - | regem | suum, | Osbyrht |
| Co | ligitimum | - | - | | | Osbyrth |
| B | | - | - | | | Osbirht |
| Ar | | - | - | | | |
| W | | - | - | | | |
| SD1 | | fue | gentis | | - | Osbyrth |
| SD2 | | - | - | | | Osbyrth |
| JoW | | - | - | | | Osbriht |
| ASN | | - | - | | | Osbrichtum ⁵²⁶ |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|---------|----|---------|-------|------------|-------------|
| St | - | - | - | nomine, | regno | - | expulerant, |
| Co | - | - | - | | | - | |
| B | - | - | - | | | - | |
| Ar | - | - | - | | | - | |
| W | - | - | - | | | - | |
| SD1 | vocitatum | onomate | de | - | | hostiliter | expulerunt |
| JoW | - | - | - | | | - | |
| ASN | - | - | - | | | - | |

[27,6]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|----|-----------|----------|---------|------|---------|-----|
| St | et | tyrannum | quendam, | (-)→ | Ælla | nomine, | non |
| Co | | | | (-)→ | | | |
| B | | | | (-)→ | Ella | | |
| Ar | | | | (-)→ | | | |
| W | | | | (-)→ | | | |
| SD1 | | | | nominee | Alla | (-)← | - |
| JoW | | tirannum† | | (-)→ | | | |
| ASN | | | | (-)→ | | | |

⁵²⁶ Dumville notes that "the -I- has been crudely altered to -E-, and the last three letters are written over an erasure" (*The Annals of St Neots* 54, fn.5 [867]).

[27,7]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----|--------|----------|-------------|-------|--------|-------|--------|
| St | de | regali | prosapia | progenitum, | super | (-)→ | regni | apicem |
| Co | | | prosapie | | | (-)→ | | |
| B | | | | | | (-)→ | | |
| Ar | | | | | | (-)→ | | |
| W | | | | | | (-)→ | | |
| SD1 | - | - | - | - | | apicem | | (-)← |
| JoW | | | | | | (-)→ | | |
| ASN | | | | | | (-)→ | | |

[27,8]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----------------|-------------|-------|--------|------|---------------|----------|----------|
| St | constituerant. | - | - | - | Sed, | advenientibus | paganis, | consilio |
| Co | | - | - | - | | | | |
| B | | - | - | - | | | | |
| Ar | | - | - | - | | | | |
| W | | - | - | - | | | | |
| SD1 | constituerunt | venientibus | super | regnum | - | - | | |
| JoW | | - | - | - | | | | |
| ASN | | - | - | - | | | | |

[27,9]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|----|-----------|-------------|-----|---------|
| St | divino | et | optimatum | adminiculo, | pro | communi |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | |
| SD1 | | | | | - | - |
| JoW | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | amminiculo | | |

[27,10]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------------|-----------|------|--------------|---------|-----|-----|------|------------|
| St | utilitate, | discordia | illa | aliquantulum | sedata, | - | - | - | Osbyrht |
| Co | | | | | | - | - | - | |
| B | | | | | | - | - | - | |
| Ar | | | | | | - | - | - | |
| W | | | | | | - | - | - | |
| SD1 | - | | | - | | est | rex | vero | Osbyrht |
| JoW | | | | | | - | - | - | |
| ASN | | | | | | - | - | - | Osbrichtus |

[27,11]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|----|-------|----------|---------|---------------|-----------|
| St | et | Ælla, | adunatis | viribus | congregatoque | exercitu, |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | Ella | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | |
| SD1 | | Alla | | | | |
| SD2 | | Ella | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | congregato | |

[27,12]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|----------|---------|---------|---------|--------|----------------|
| St | Eboracum | oppidum | adeunt. | (-)← | Quibus | advenientibus, |
| Co | | | | (-)← | | |
| B | | | | (-)← | | |
| Ar | | | | (-)← | | |
| W | | | | (-)← | | |
| SD1 | | (-)→ | | oppidum | | |
| SD2 | | | | (-)← | | |
| JoW | | | | (-)← | | |
| ASN | | | | (-)← | | |

[27,13]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----------|-----------|--------|-----------|-------|------------|----|-------|-------|
| St | - | - | pagani | confestim | fugam | arripiunt, | et | intra | urbis |
| Co | - | - | | | | | | | |
| B | - | - | | | | | | | |
| Ar | - | - | | | | | | | |
| W | - | - | | | | | | | |
| SD1 | classica | multitudo | - | | | | - | - | - |
| SD2 | - | - | | | | | | | |
| JoW | - | - | | | | | | | |
| ASN | - | - | | | | | | | |

[27,14]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|----|-----------|------------|--------|-------|----|
| St | moenia | se | defendere | procurant. | Quorum | fugam | et |
| Co | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | |
| SD1 | - | - | - | - | | | |
| SD2 | menia | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | |

[27,15]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|---------|------------|------------|-------|-------|-------|
| St | pavorem | Christiani | cernentes, | etiam | intra | urbis |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | |
| SD1 | | | | - | - | - |
| SD2 | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|-------|---------|------|----------|-----|
| SD1 | fortiores | ipsis | inventi | sunt | pugnatum | est |
|-----|-----------|-------|---------|------|----------|-----|

| | | | | | |
|-----|-------|------------|----|---------|-------|
| SD1 | satis | crudeliter | ex | utraque | parte |
|-----|-------|------------|----|---------|-------|

[27,16]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|-----|----------|----|-------|----------|-------------|
| St | moenia | eos | persequi | et | murum | frangere | instituunt; |
| Co | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | |
| SD2 | menia | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | |

[27,17]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------|----|-----------|------|------|------|-------|------|---------|
| St | quod | et | fecerunt. | Non | enim | tunc | adhuc | illa | civitas |
| Co | | | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | (non | | | | | |
| SD2 | | | | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | |

[27,18]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|----|------------|-------|-------|------------|----------|
| St | firmos | et | stabilitos | muros | illis | temporibus | habebat. |
| Co | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | habebat) |
| SD2 | | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | |

[27,19]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|------------|--------|----|---------------|-------------|
| St | Cumque | Christiani | murum, | ut | proposuerant, | fregissent, |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | |
| SD2 | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | |
| ASN | cunque | | | | | |

[27,20]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----|----------|-------|------|----|-----------|-------|-----|
| St | et | eorum | magna | pars | in | civitatem | simul | cum |
| Co | | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | | |
| SD2 | - | eorumque | | | | | | |
| JoW | - | eorumque | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | |

[27,21]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|---------|---------------------------|---------|--------|----|-------------|
| St | paganis | intrasset, | pagani, | dolore | et | necessitate |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | |
| SD2 | | intrassent | | | | |
| JoW | | intrassent ⁵²⁷ | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | |

[27,22]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|-------|-----|-----------|-----------|----------|
| St | compulsi, | super | eos | atrociter | irrupunt, | caedunt, |
| Co | | | | | | cedunt |
| B | | | | | erumpunt | cedunt |
| Ar | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | |
| SD2 | | | | | | cedunt |
| JoW | | | | | | cedunt |
| ASN | | | | | | cedunt |

⁵²⁷ The *n* is interlined above *intrasset* in MS Bodley 157.

[27,23]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------|-------------|-------|----|--------|-------|--------|----|
| St | fugant, | prosternunt | intus | et | extra. | Illic | maxima | ex |
| Co | | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | | |
| SD2 | | | | | 528 | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | |

[27,24]

| | | | | | |
|-----|-------|-------|---------------------|---------|---------|
| St | parte | omnes | Northanhymbrensi-um | coetus, | Occisis |
| Co | | | | coeti | |
| B | | | Northanhymbrenses | - | - |
| Ar | | | Northanhimbrensi-um | | |
| W | | | | 529 | |
| SD2 | | | Northumbrensi-um | coeti | |
| JoW | | | | coeti | |
| ASN | | | Nordanhymbrensi-um | capti | |

[27,25]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|----------|--------|-----|--------|-----------|-----|
| St | duobus | regibus, | deleti | - | - | - | - |
| Co | | | delete | - | - | - | - |
| B | - | - | | - | - | - | - |
| Ar | | | | - | - | - | - |
| W | | 530 | | - | - | - | - |
| SD2 | | | | - | - | - | - |
| JoW | | | | - | - | - | - |
| ASN | | | - | cum | multis | nobilibus | ibi |

| | | | | | |
|-----|-----|------|-------|--------------|---------|
| St | - | - | - | occubuerunt. | Reliqui |
| Co | - | - | - | | |
| B | - | - | - | | |
| Ar | - | - | - | | |
| W | - | - | - | | |
| SD1 | quo | ambo | reges | | |
| SD2 | - | - | - | | |
| JoW | - | - | - | | |
| ASN | - | - | - | | |

⁵²⁸ This sentence occurs after this word: *hoc factum est .xii. k[alends]. April feria .vi. ante dominicam palmarum.*

⁵²⁹ W: "Capti MS. Cott. Edd. P[arker]. & C[amden]."

⁵³⁰ W: "Desunt MS. Cott."

[27,26]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------|-----|------------|-------|-----|----------------|----------------|
| St | vero, | qui | evaserunt, | pacem | cum | paganis | pepigerunt. |
| Co | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | |
| SD1 | | | | | | Danis | |
| SD2 | | | | | | ⁵³¹ | ⁵³² |
| JoW | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------------|-------|-----------------|-----------|----------------|-----------|-----|-----|-------------|
| JoW | defecerunt | reges | Norðanhymbrorum | Alhstanus | Scireburnensis | episcopus | .l. | sui | episcopatus |
|-----|------------|-------|-----------------|-----------|----------------|-----------|-----|-----|-------------|

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------|-------|----|------------|-----------|------|------------|------|------------|
| JoW | anno | obiit | et | scireburne | sepelitur | Illi | substituit | sunt | Heahmundus |
|-----|------|-------|----|------------|-----------|------|------------|------|------------|

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------------|--------|---------|-----|--------|--------|----|--------------|-------------|
| JoW | Æthelhegus | Alsius | Asserus | qui | librum | Boetii | De | consolatione | Phylosophie |
|-----|------------|--------|---------|-----|--------|--------|----|--------------|-------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------------|--------|------------|----|-------|-------|---------|----|----------|----------|------------|
| JoW | planioribus | verbis | elucidavit | et | iussu | regis | Ælfredi | in | Anglicum | sermonem | transtulit |
|-----|-------------|--------|------------|----|-------|-------|---------|----|----------|----------|------------|

[28,1]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|----------------|-------|------|-------------|-----------|----------------|
| St | Eodem | - | anno | Ealhstan, | episcopus | Scireburnensis |
| Co | | - | | | | |
| B | | - | | | | |
| Ar | | - | | | | |
| W | | - | | | | |
| SD1 | ipso | autem | | | (-)↓2 | |
| SD2 | | | | | | |
| JoW | ⁵³³ | - | | | | |
| ASN | | - | | Ealchstanus | | Scyreburnensis |

⁵³¹ Interlined above: *id est Danis*.

⁵³² This sentence is inserted after: "Egbertus non regnavit per hec super northumbros ultra Tine .vi. annis." There is also a note at the bottom of the page "Quibus predicti pagani sub suo dominio regem egbertus praefecerunt"

⁵³³ "Eodem...est" this occurs only in the HL manuscripts, and not in the principal JoW manuscript, MS Bodley 157. See Darlington and McGurk, *The Chronicle of John*, p. 282. It is worth mentioning that in MS Bodley 157, there appears to have been space left, which has then been filled in with a passage (and on into the margin, the tail-end of [27,26]) derived from the *Gesta Pontificum*. See Darlington and McGurk, *The Chronicle of John*, p. 283.

[28,2]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------------------|-----------|-------------|----|------|----------------------|----------------|
| St | <i>ecclesiae,</i> | (-)↑1 | <i>viam</i> | - | - | <i>universitatis</i> | <i>adiens,</i> |
| Co | | (-)↑1 | | - | - | | |
| B | | (-)↑1 | | - | - | | |
| Ar | | (-)↑1 | | - | - | | |
| W | | (-)↑1 | | - | - | | |
| SD1 | | episcopus | | et | viam | | |
| SD2 | | (-)↑1 | - | - | - | - | - |
| JoW | | (-)↑1 | | - | - | | |
| ASN | | (-)↑1 | | - | - | | |

| | | | | | |
|-----|----------|------------|---------|-----------------|--------------------|
| St | - | - | - | <i>postquam</i> | <i>episcopatum</i> |
| Co | - | - | - | | |
| B | - | - | - | | |
| Ar | - | - | - | | |
| W | deseruit | temporalis | saeculi | | |
| SD1 | - | - | - | | |
| SD2 | - | - | - | - | - |
| JoW | - | - | - | | |
| ASN | - | - | - | | |

[28,3]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|------------|-------|------------------|--------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| St | <i>per</i> | (-)→ | <i>quingenta</i> | <i>annos</i> | <i>honorabiliter</i> | <i>rexerat,</i> |
| Co | | (-)→ | .l. | | | |
| B | | (-)→ | 50 | | | |
| Ar | | (-)→ | | | | |
| W | | (-)→ | | | | |
| SD1 | | annos | | (-)← | | |
| SD2 | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| JoW | | (-)→ | .l. | | | |
| ASN | | (-)→ | .l. | | | |

[28,4]

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-----------|------------|-------------|----------|------|
| St | (-)→ | - | <i>in</i> | <i>pace</i> | <i>in</i> | - | - | Scireburnan | sepultus | est. |
| Co | (-)→ | - | | | | - | - | | | |
| B | (-)→ | - | | | | - | - | | | |
| Ar | (-)→ | - | | | | - | - | | | |
| W | (-)→ | - | | | | - | - | | | |
| SD1 | - | - | qui | | - | ecclesiae | requiescit | - | | - |
| SD2 | est | defunctus | - | - | | - | - | | | (-)← |
| JoW | (-)→ | - | | | | - | - | | | |
| ASN | (-)→ | - | | | | - | - | Scyreburnan | | |

| | | | | | |
|-----|----------|----|------|-----|--------------|
| SD1 | decenter | in | sede | sui | episcopatus. |
|-----|----------|----|------|-----|--------------|

[29,1]

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------------|------------------|----------------------|--------------|--------------------|-------|-------|--------|------|-------|
| St | <i>Anno</i> | <i>Dominicae</i> | <i>Incarnationis</i> | DCCCLXVIII | <i>nativitatis</i> | - | - | - | - | - |
| Co | | | | | | - | - | - | - | - |
| B | | | | 868 | | autem | (-)↓2 | (-)↓2 | - | - |
| Ar | | | | | | - | (-)↓2 | (-)↓2 | - | - |
| W | | | | | | - | - | - | - | - |
| SD1 | | - | - | | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| SD2 | | - | - | | cometis | - | - | - | - | - |
| JoW | - | - | - | | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| ASN | | - | - | .dvvvlxviii. | - | - | fames | valida | anno | eodem |

| | | | | | |
|-----|------|-----|----------------|-----|------|
| SD2 | visa | est | manifestissime | hoc | anno |
|-----|------|-----|----------------|-----|------|

[29,2]

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----------------|--------------|-------------------|-------|-----------------------|-------------|----------------------------|------|---------------------|------------------|
| St | <i>Ælfredi</i> | <i>regis</i> | <i>vigesimo,</i> | - | - | <i>idem</i> | <i>ipse</i> ⁵³⁴ | - | - | <i>praefatus</i> |
| Co | | | .xx. | - | - | | | - | - | prefatus |
| B | | | 20 | fames | valida | - | - | erat | tunc ⁵³⁵ | prefatus |
| Ar | | | | fames | valida | - | - | erat | tunc | prefatus |
| W | | | | fames | valida ⁵³⁶ | - | - | erat | tunc ⁵³⁷ | |
| SD1 | Elfredi | | xx ⁵³⁸ | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| JoW | - | - | - | (-)↑1 | (-)↑1 | - | - | - | - | - |

[29,3]

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|--------------------|------|----------|-------------|------|--------|-------------------|--------------|-------------|
| St | <i>ac</i> | <i>venerabilis</i> | (-)→ | Ælfred | (-)← | rex, | (-)← | <i>secundarii</i> | <i>tamen</i> | <i>tunc</i> |
| Co | | | (-)→ | | (-)← | | (-)← | | | |
| B | | | (-)→ | | (-)← | | (-)← | | | |
| Ar | | | (-)→ | | (-)← | | (-)← | | | |
| W | | | (-)→ | | (-)← | | (-)← | | | |
| SD2 | - | | rex | Ælfredus | (-)← | (-)← | (-)← | | | |
| JoW | - | | (-)→ | (-)→ | (-)← | | Ælfred | | | |
| ASN | | (-)→ | (-)→ | | venerabilis | | (-)← | | | |

⁵³⁴ W testifies to this reading in the Cotton Manuscript and Co, but omits it from his edition.

⁵³⁵ It is false that the reading *erat tunc* in B and Ar derives from ASN, as Stevenson claims (p.24), as the phrase "rex secundarii tamen tunc ordine fretus"—the relevant passage from ASN—appears to be in the tradition of the *Vita* [29,3-4].

⁵³⁶ W: "Desunt MS. Cott."

⁵³⁷ W: "Idem pse praefatus MS. Cott."

⁵³⁸ Interlined above *mo* for *vigesimo*.

[29,4]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|---------|--------|---------|----|---------|---------|----------|
| St | ordine | fretus, | uxorem | - | de | Mercia, | nobilem | scilicet |
| Co | | | | - | | | | |
| B | | | | - | | | | |
| Ar | | | | - | | | | |
| W | | | | - | | | | |
| SD1 | - | - | | accepit | | | | |
| SD2 | | | | - | | | | |
| JoW | | | | - | | | | |
| ASN | | | | - | | | | |

[29,5]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------|--------|------------|-------------------------|--------|-----------|----------|-----|
| St | genere, | filiam | Æthelredi, | Gainorum | (-)← | (-)← | comitis, | qui |
| Co | | | | | (-)← | (-)← | | |
| B | | | | | (-)← | (-)← | | |
| Ar | | | | | (-)← | (-)← | | |
| W | | | | | (-)← | (-)← | | |
| SD1 | | | Ethelredi | | (-)← | (-)← | | |
| SD2 | | | Athelredi | | (-)← | (-)← | | |
| JoW | | | | | (-)← | (-)← | | |
| ASN | | (-)→ | (-)→ | Gainorem ⁵³⁹ | filiam | Adhelredi | | |

[29,6]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----------------|----|--------|----------------------|--------------------------|----|--------|-------|
| St | cognominabatur | - | - | Mucill, | subarravit | et | duxit. | Cuius |
| Co | | - | - | | | | | |
| B | | - | - | | expetivit | | | |
| Ar | | - | - | ⁵⁴⁰ | expetivit | | | |
| W | | - | - | ⁵⁴¹ | expetivit ⁵⁴² | | | |
| SD1 | | ab | anglis | Mucel | - | - | - | - |
| SD2 | | - | - | Mucil ⁵⁴³ | | | | |
| JoW | | - | - | | | | | |
| ASN | | - | - | | | | | - |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----|------|------|---------|--------|----|-----------|------------|
| SD1 | eo | quod | erat | corpore | magnus | et | prudentia | grandaevus |
|-----|----|------|------|---------|--------|----|-----------|------------|

⁵³⁹ The scribe here has revised the ordering of the words. See Dumville and Lapidge, *The Annals of St Neots*, p. 55.

⁵⁴⁰ Marginalia: *mucil, eo quod erat corpore magnus*.

⁵⁴¹ W: "Mucil eo quod erat corpore magnus." It may be likely that Wise was utilizing the Ar transcript at this point and was merely repeating one of P's notes. Evidence in [29,2] suggests that he was either using this transcript for a good portion of the edition.

⁵⁴² W: "Subarravit [JoW]. & MS. Cott."

⁵⁴³ Interlined above: *id est magnus*.

[29,7]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|---------|-------|----------|--------------|----|--------|
| St | feminae | mater | Eadburh | nominabatur, | de | regali |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | Eadburgh | | | |
| Ar | | | Eadburgh | | | |
| W | | | | | | |
| SD2 | | | Eadburg | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | |

[29,8]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|-----------|--------|-------------|------------|-------------|-----------------|
| St | genere | Merciorum | regis; | <i>quam</i> | <i>nos</i> | <i>ipsi</i> | <i>propriis</i> |
| Co | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | (quam | | | |
| SD2 | | | regnum | - | - | - | - |
| JoW | | | | - | - | - | - |

[29,9]

| | | | | | | | |
|----|-----------------|------------------|------------------|------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|
| St | <i>oculorum</i> | <i>nostrorum</i> | <i>obtutibus</i> | <i>non</i> | <i>paucis</i> | <i>ante</i> | <i>obitum</i> |
| Co | | | optutibus | | | | |
| B | | | intutibus | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | |

[29,10]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|-------------|--------------|-------------------|-----------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| St | <i>suum</i> | <i>annis</i> | <i>frequenter</i> | <i>vidimus,</i> | <i>venerabilis</i> | <i>scilicet</i> |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | |
| W | | | | vidimus) | | |
| SD2 | - | - | - | - | | |
| JoW | - | - | - | - | | |

[29,11]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------|--------|-----|--------|-------|------|--------|--------|
| St | femina, | <quae> | per | multos | annos | post | obitum | viri |
| Co | | - | | | | | | |
| B | | et | | | | | | |
| Ar | | et | | | | | | |
| W | foemina | et | | | | | | |
| SD2 | | et | | | | | | |
| JoW | | et | | | | | | patris |

[29,12]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|------------|-------|-------|-------|------------|
| St | sui | castissima | vidua | leto | tenus | permansit. |
| Co | | | | loeto | | |
| B | | | | letho | | |
| Ar | | | | letho | | |
| W | | castissima | | letho | | |
| SD2 | | castissima | | | | |
| JoW | | castissima | | loeto | | |

[30,1]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|-------|------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|
| St | Eodem | - | anno | praedictus | paganorum | exercitus |
| Co | | - | | predictus | | |
| B | | - | | predictus | | |
| Ar | | - | | predictus | | |
| W | | - | | | | |
| SD1 | Ea | - | tempestate | | | |
| SD2 | | - | | | | |
| JoW | | - | | | | |
| ASN | | vero | | predictus | | |

[30,2]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|----------------|-------------|----|---------|--------|----|
| St | Northanhymbros | relinquens, | in | Merciam | venit, | et |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | - | - | (-)↓3 | - |
| Ar | Northanhimbros | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | |
| SD1 | | reliquit | - | - | - | - |
| SD2 | Northanhimbros | | | | | |
| JoW | Norðanhymbros | | | | | |
| ASN | Nordanhymbros | | | | | |

[30,3]

| | | | | | |
|-----|----------------|---------|---------|----------|----|
| St | Snotengaham | - | - | - | - |
| Co | | - | - | - | - |
| B | | - | - | - | - |
| Ar | | - | - | - | - |
| W | Scnotengaham | - | - | - | - |
| SD1 | Snotingaham | pessimo | adventu | vistavit | et |
| SD2 | ⁵⁴⁴ | - | - | - | - |
| JoW | Snotingaham | - | - | - | - |
| ASN | | - | - | - | - |

⁵⁴⁴ The *o* is interlined above.

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------|-----|---------|-------|-------|------------|---------|---------------|
| St | adiit | - | - | (-)↑2 | (quod | Britannice | - | "Tiguocobauc' |
| Co | | - | - | (-)↑2 | quod | | - | |
| B | - | - | - | venit | quod | | - | |
| Ar | | - | - | (-)↑2 | quod | | - | |
| W | | - | - | (-)↑2 | | | - | |
| SD1 | | que | civitas | - | - | Britannico | sermone | Tiguocebauc |
| SD2 | | - | - | (-)↑2 | quod | | - | Tigguocabauc |
| JoW | | - | - | (-)↑2 | quod | Brytannice | - | |
| ASN | | - | - | (-)↑2 | - | - | - | - |

[30,4]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|----------------|--------|-----------------|---|-------|--------------|
| St | interpretatur, | Latine | - | | autem | 'speluncarum |
| Co | | | - | | | |
| B | | | - | | | |
| Ar | | | - | | | |
| W | | | - | | | |
| SD1 | | | interpretatione | - | | |
| SD2 | | | - | | | |
| JoW | | | - | | | |

[30,5]

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----------|---------|-----|----|-------|------|----------|------------|-----------|------|--------------|
| St | domus'), | - | et | - | eodem | loco | - | - | eodem | anno | hiemaverunt. |
| Co | domus | - | | - | | | - | - | | | |
| B | domus | - | | in | | | - | - | | | hyemaverunt |
| Ar | domus | - | | in | | | - | - | | | |
| W | | - | | in | | | - | - | | | hyemaverunt |
| SD1 | domus | dicitur | quo | in | - | | hospites | insidiosos | | | hiemavere |
| SD2 | domus | - | | in | illo | | - | - | | | hyemaverunt |
| JoW | domus | - | | - | illa | | - | - | | | |
| ASN | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | ibidemque | - | hiemavit |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|----------|---------|---------|-------|------|----------|---------|-------|-------|----------|
| SD1 | quorum | adventus | omnibus | populis | satis | erat | ingratus | audiens | autem | eorum | adventum |
|-----|--------|----------|---------|---------|-------|------|----------|---------|-------|-------|----------|

[30,6]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|-------|----------------|-----------|-------|-----------|------------|
| St | Quibus | illic | advenientibus, | confestim | (-)↓7 | (-)↓7 | Burhred, |
| Co | | | | | (-)↓7 | (-)↓7 | |
| B | | | | | (-)↓7 | (-)↓7 | Burrhed† |
| Ar | | | | | (-)↓7 | (-)↓7 | |
| W | | | | | (-)↓7 | (-)↓7 | |
| SD1 | - | - | - | - | rex | Merciorum | |
| SD2 | | | | | - | - | Buthred |
| JoW | | | | | (-)↓7 | (-)↓7 | |
| ASN | - | - | - | - | (-)↓7 | (-)↓7 | Burchredus |

[30,7]

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------|-----------|-------|------------|----|----------|--------|---------|--------|-----------|
| St | (-)→ | Merciorum | rex, | - | et | omnes | (-)→ | eiusdem | gentis | optimates |
| Co | (-)→ | | | - | | | (-)→ | | | |
| B | (-)→ | | | - | | | (-)→ | | | |
| Ar | (-)→ | | | - | | | (-)→ | | | |
| W | (-)→ | | | - | | | (-)→ | | | |
| SD1 | (-)→ | (-)↑6 | (-)↑6 | appellatus | | | - | - | - | |
| SD2 | (-)→ | | | - | - | omnesque | (-)→ | | | |
| JoW | (-)→ | | | - | - | omnisque | gentis | | (-)← | |
| ASN | Rex | | (-)← | - | | | (-)→ | | | |

SD1 consilium habuit cum suis comitibus et commilitonibus et omni populo sibi subjecto

SD1 qualiter inimicos bellica virtute exuperaret sive de regno expelleret

SD1 direxit et nuncios veloci cursu

[30,8]

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------|----|----------|-----------|------|---------------|---------|---------------|----------|-------|
| St | nuncios | ad | (-)↓7 | Æthered, | - | Occidentalium | Saxonum | - | - | - |
| Co | | | (-)↓7 | | - | | | - | - | - |
| B | | | (-)↓7 | | - | | | - | - | - |
| Ar | | | (-)↓7 | | - | | | - | - | - |
| W | | | (-)↓7 | | - | | | - | - | - |
| SD1 | - | | Elfredum | (-)↓7 | - | - | - | insignissimae | virtutis | virum |
| SD2 | | | (-)↓7 | Ætheredum | - | | | - | - | - |
| JoW | nuntios | | (-)↓7 | Ætheredum | - | | | - | - | - |
| ASN | nuntios | | (-)↓7 | Ætheredum | rege | | | - | - | - |

[30,9]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|----|----|------------|----------|----------|-----------|-------------------------|------|
| St | regem, | et | - | (-)↑6 | Ælfred, | fratrem, | - | - | (-)← |
| Co | | | - | (-)↑6 | | | - | - | (-)← |
| B | | | - | (-)↑6 | | | - | - | (-)← |
| Ar | | | - | (-)↑6 | | | - | - | (-)← |
| W | | | - | (-)↑6 | | | - | - | (-)← |
| SD1 | - | | ad | Ethelredum | (-)↑6 | eius | - | (-)← | |
| SD2 | | | ad | (-)↑6 | (-)→ | eius | - | Ælfredum | |
| JoW | | | ad | (-)↑6 | (-)→ | eius | - | Ælfredum ⁵⁴⁵ | |
| ASN | | | ad | (-)↑6 | Ælfredum | eius | confestim | (-)← | |

SD1 ut ei fratrum ostenderent adminiculum

⁵⁴⁵ These changes may suggest a close connection between ASN and JoW.

| | | | |
|-----|-----------|-------------|--------------|
| St | dirigunt, | suppliciter | obsecrantes, |
| Co | | | |
| B | | | |
| Ar | | | |
| W | | | |
| SD2 | | | |
| JoW | | | |
| ASN | | | |

[30,10]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|----|------|-------|----------------|-----|---------|
| St | ut | illi | illis | auxiliarentur, | quo | possent |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | |
| SD1 | - | - | - | - | | |
| SD2 | | sibi | - | | | |
| JoW | | sibi | - | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | |

SD1 vicrici fortitudine eos debellare

SD1 quod ipsi quasi intrepidi leones agere non distulerunt tunc incitus Elfredus rapidis

SD1 coepit praeceptis exercitum congregare illud corde tenus recordans nunquam dives agit

SD1 quod desiderat qui trepidus gemens sese credit egentem nequaquam potens vir agit

SD1 quod desiderat qui trepidus constat et qui se putat egentem id est

SD1 miserum si agat quod optat viriliter decertando

[30,11]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|-----------|---------|------------|------|----|
| St | contra | praefatum | pugnare | exercitum. | Quod | et |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | |
| SD2 | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | |

[30,12]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|----------------|-----|------|----------|-----|---------|
| St | facile | impetraverunt. | Nam | illi | fratres, | non | segnius |
| Co | | perpetraverunt | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | |
| SD2 | | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | perpetraverunt | - | - | - | - | - |

[30,13]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|--------------|------------|----|------|-------|---------|
| St | promissione, | congregato | ex | omni | parte | <regni> |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | - |
| Ar | | | | | | - |
| W | | | | | | [regni] |
| SD2 | | | | | | - |
| JoW | | | | | | - |

| | | | | | |
|-----|--------|------|-------|-----------|--------|
| SD1 | frater | eius | simil | succensus | furore |
|-----|--------|------|-------|-----------|--------|

[30,14]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|---------|-----------|---------|---------|----|-------|
| St | sui | immenso | exercitu, | Merciam | adeunt, | et | usque |
| Co | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | |
| SD1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| SD2 | | | | | | | |
| Jo | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | |

[30,15]

| | | | | | |
|-----|----|--------------|--------|------------|-------------|
| St | ad | Snotengaham, | bellum | unanimiter | quaerentes, |
| Co | | | | | |
| B | | | | | querentes |
| Ar | | | | | querentes |
| W | | Snotengaham | | | |
| SD1 | | Snotingaham | - | - | - |
| SD2 | | Snotingaham | | | |
| JoW | | Snotingaham | | | querentes |

[30,16]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|-------------|--------|---------|----------|-------|---------|
| St | perveniant. | Cumque | pagani, | tuitione | arcis | muniti, |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | |
| SD1 | | - | - | - | - | - |
| SD2 | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | |
| ASN | - | cunque | | | | |

| | | | | |
|-----|--------|----------|------------|-------|
| SD1 | parati | adversus | temptamina | stare |
|-----|--------|----------|------------|-------|

[30,17]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|------|----------|----|-------------|----------|-------|
| St | bellum | dare | negarent | et | Christianis | frangere | murum |
| Co | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | |
| SD2 | | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | |

[30,18]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|-------------|--------------------|-------|---------|----|---------|
| St | non | suppeteret, | pace | inter | Mercios | et | paganos |
| Co | | suppetebat | | | | | |
| B | | suppetebat | | | | | |
| Ar | | suppetebat | | | | | |
| W | | suppetebat | | | | | |
| SD2 | | suppetebat | | | | | |
| JoW | | suppetebat | | | | | |
| ASN | | suppetebat | pax ⁵⁴⁶ | | | | |

[30,19]

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|-----|------|---------|-----------|-----|-----|----------------|-----|------|
| St | facta, | duo | illi | fratres | Æthered | - | et | Ælfred | cum | suis |
| Co | | | | | | - | - | ₅₄₇ | | |
| B | | | | | | - | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | - | - | - | | |
| W | | | | | | - | [et | Ælfred] | | |
| SD2 | | | | | Ætheredus | Rex | | Elfredus | | |
| JoW | | | | | Ætheredus | Rex | | Ælfredus | | |
| ASN | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

⁵⁴⁶ Dumville and Lapidge: "In the manuscript *pax* is followed by a small erasure, perhaps suggesting that the *pace* of the transmitted text was originally written here" (*The Annals of St Neots* 55).

⁵⁴⁷ Stevenson notes that "et Ælfred" was supplied by W through JoW.

[30,20]

| | | | | |
|-----|------------|-------|---------|-------|
| St | cohortibus | domum | reversi | sunt. |
| Co | | | | |
| B | | | | |
| Ar | | | | |
| W | | | | |
| SD2 | | | | 548 |
| JoW | | | | |
| ASN | - | - | - | est |

SD1 pagani vero munitione arcis muniti bellum promittunt acies struunt numerosum

SD1 exercitum ostendunt sed tremebundi claris cernentes visibus Christianum populum

SD1 In centenis et millenis millibus adversariis resistere sacris ducibus exhortantibus

SD1 Tandem per gratiam Omnipotentis Domini cessavit ventus turbinis sedata sunt

SD1 corda iniquorum pacem rogantes et foedus a Christianis ac si ipsi tali

SD1 propitio Christo mente exorarent Rapidos Rector comprime fluctus Et quo caelum

SD1 regis immensum Firma stabiles foedere terras Facta est inter reges et

SD1 Paganos pax et segregati ab invicem sicut oves ab haedis sequestrantur

[31,1]

| | | | | | |
|-----|------|------------------|----------------------|------------|--------------------|
| St | Anno | <i>Dominicae</i> | <i>Incarnationis</i> | DCCCLXIX, | <i>nativitatis</i> |
| Co | | | | | |
| B | | | | 869 | |
| Ar | | | | 869 | |
| W | | | | | |
| SD1 | - | - | | | - |
| SD2 | - | - | | | - |
| JoW | - | - | - | dccclxviii | - |
| ASN | | - | - | .dccclxix. | - |

⁵⁴⁸ *Inguar et hubba* follows.

[31,2]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------|------|--------------|----------------|--------------|-----------------|---------------|
| St | - | - | <i>autem</i> | <i>Ælfredi</i> | <i>regis</i> | <i>vigesimo</i> | <i>primo,</i> |
| Co | - | - | | | | .xxi. | (-)← |
| B | - | - | | | | 21 | (-)← |
| Ar | - | - | | | | 21 | (-)← |
| W | - | - | | | | | |
| SD1 | aetatis | vero | - | | - | xxi | (-)← |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------|----------------|----------------|----|------------|---------|----|--------|-----------|----|
| B | - | fames | magna | et | mortalitas | homnium | et | pestis | animalium | Et |
| Ar | - | | ⁵⁴⁹ | | | | | | | |
| W | - | ⁵⁵⁰ | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | item | | | | | | | | | - |

| | | | |
|-----|-------|------|-----------|
| St | - | - | praefatus |
| Co | - | - | prefatus |
| B | - | - | |
| Ar | - | - | |
| W | - | - | |
| SD1 | - | - | |
| SD2 | - | - | |
| JoW | - | - | |
| ASN | eodem | anno | |

[31,3]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|-----------|------|--------|------|-----------------|
| St | paganorum | exercitus | (-)→ | iterum | ad | Northanhymbros |
| Co | | | (-)→ | | | |
| B | | | (-)→ | | | |
| Ar | | | (-)→ | | | Northanhimbros |
| W | | | (-)→ | | | |
| SD1 | - | | ad | gentem | (-)← | Nortanhymbrorum |
| SD2 | | | (-)→ | | | |
| JoW | | | (-)→ | | | Norðanhymbros |
| ASN | | | (-)→ | | | Nordanhimbros |

| | | | |
|-----|-----------|-----|--------|
| SD1 | profectus | est | ibique |
|-----|-----------|-----|--------|

⁵⁴⁹ Marginalia: "Fames cum peste"

⁵⁵⁰ W states here "Desunt MS. Cott.," but nonetheless supplies this passage. This evidently derives from *Annales S. Neoti*.

[31,4]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----------|-------|----------|-----------|--------|----|--------|------|
| St | equitans | (-)→ | Eboracum | civitatem | adiit, | et | ibi | anno |
| Co | | (-)→ | Eboracam | | | | | |
| B | | (-)→ | | | | | | |
| Ar | | (-)→ | | | | | | |
| W | | (-)→ | | | | | | |
| SD1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| SD2 | | adiit | Eboracam | | (-)← | - | ibique | |
| JoW | | (-)→ | Eboracam | | | - | ibique | |
| ASN | | | Eboracam | | | | | |

[31,5]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------|-----------|------------|----|-----------|----------|----|
| St | integro | mansit. | - | - | - | - | - |
| Co | | | - | - | - | - | - |
| B | | | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ar | | | - | - | - | - | - |
| W | | | - | - | - | - | - |
| SD1 | | permansit | debacchans | et | insaniens | occidens | et |
| SD2 | | | - | - | - | - | - |
| JoW | | | - | - | - | - | - |
| ASN | | | - | - | - | - | - |

SD1 perdens perplurimos viros ac mulieres

[32,1]

SD1 sequenti vero anno dum solis jubar mundi perlustraret orbes

SD1 et annus advenisset

| | | | | | |
|-----|------|------------------|----------------------|------------|--------------|
| St | Anno | <i>Dominicae</i> | <i>Incarnationis</i> | DCCCLXX, | (-)← |
| Co | | | | | (-)← |
| B | | | | | (-)← |
| Ar | | | | | (-)← |
| W | | | | | (-)← |
| SD1 | (-)← | - | (-)→ | | incarnatione |
| SD2 | | - | - | | - |
| JoW | - | - | - | | - |
| ASN | | | | .dcccclxx. | (-)← |

| | | | | | |
|-----|--------------------|--------------|--------|-------------------------|--------|
| St | <i>nativitatis</i> | - | - | - | - |
| Co | | - | - | - | - |
| B | | - | - | - | - |
| Ar | | - | - | - | - |
| W | | - | - | - | - |
| SD1 | | - | (-)→ | - | Domini |
| ASN | - | Sanctissimus | Deoque | acceptus ⁵⁵¹ | (-)← |

| | | |
|-----|------|----------|
| SD1 | tunc | refulsit |
|-----|------|----------|

[32,2]

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|-----|--------------|----------------|--------------|-------------------|-----------------|--------------|--------|-------|
| St | - | - | <i>autem</i> | <i>Ælfredi</i> | <i>regis</i> | <i>vigesimo</i> | <i>secundo,</i> | <i>supra</i> | - | - |
| Co | - | - | | | | 21 ⁵⁵² | (-)← | | - | - |
| B | - | - | | | | 21 | (-)← | | - | - |
| Ar | - | - | | | | 21 | (-)← | | - | - |
| W | - | - | | | | ⁵⁵³ | | | - | - |
| SD1 | tempus | quo | - | Elfred | rex | vicesimum | primum | - | habuit | annum |
| SD2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | - | - |
| JoW | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | - | - |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------------------------|------|---------|-----------|----|----|-----|-------|--|--|
| SD1 | Danorum ⁵⁵⁴ | vero | enormis | multitudo | et | ut | ita | dicam | | |
|-----|------------------------|------|---------|-----------|----|----|-----|-------|--|--|

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----------|----------|-------------|------|-----|----|-------|------------|--------|--------|
| SD1 | legionum | catervae | congregatae | sunt | ita | ut | multa | viderentur | millia | affore |
|-----|----------|----------|-------------|------|-----|----|-------|------------|--------|--------|

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----|-------|----|-------|----|---------|----------|--------------|
| SD1 | et | sicut | de | mille | in | viginti | myriades | excrevissent |
|-----|----|-------|----|-------|----|---------|----------|--------------|

[32,3]

| | | |
|-----|----------|--------|
| SD1 | pervenit | dehinc |
|-----|----------|--------|

| | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------|---------|-------|
| St | memoratus | paganorum | exercitus | per | Merciam | in |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | Mercios | |
| Ar | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | |
| SD1 | - | (-)↑2 | - | | | |
| SD2 | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | ↓33,3 | ↓33,3 | ↓33,3 |

⁵⁵¹ At this point in *Annales S. Neoti*, the compiler begins to utilize Abbo's *Passio S. Eadmundi* and the *Vita* material breaks off.

⁵⁵² Added in margin.

⁵⁵³ W: "*vigesimo primo*" was the reading in the Cotton Manuscript.

⁵⁵⁴ Cf. [32,3].

[32,4]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------------|---------|------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|------|----------|
| St | Orientales | Anglos | transivit, | et | ibi | in | loco, | (-)← | qui |
| Co | | | | | | | | (-)← | |
| B | Orientelem | Angliam | | | | | | (-)← | |
| Ar | | | | | | | | (-)← | |
| W | | | | | | | | (-)← | |
| SD1 | | | (-)↑3 | | - | | civitate | - | quae |
| SD2 | | | | | (-)→ | | | ibi | |
| JoW | | | | | | | | (-)← | |
| ASN | ↓33,3 | ↓33,3 | (-)↓33,3 | (-)↓33,3 | (-)↓33,3 | (-)↓33,3 | (-)↓33,3 | (-)← | (-)↓33,3 |

[32,5]

| | | | |
|-----|----------|------------|-----------|
| St | dicitur | Theodford, | hiemavit. |
| Co | | | |
| B | | | hyemavit |
| Ar | | | |
| W | | | hyemavit |
| SD1 | | Theoford | hyemavit |
| SD2 | | | hyemavit |
| JoW | | | |
| ASN | (-)↓33,3 | (-)↓33,3 | (-)↓33,3 |

[33,1]

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|-------|--------------|-------------|--------------|-----------------|-------|------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|
| St | - | - | <i>Eodem</i> | <i>anno</i> | - | <i>Eadmund,</i> | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Co | - | - | | | - | | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| B | - | - | | | - | | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ar | - | - | | | - | | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| W | - | - | | | - | | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| SD1 | rex | autem | - | - | - | Eadmundus | ipsis | temporibus | regnavit | super | omnia | regna |
| SD2 | - | - | | | sanctissimus | (-)→ | - | - | - | - | - | - |

| | | | | |
|-----|--------------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------|
| St | <i>Orientalium</i> | <i>Anglorum</i> | (-)↓2 | (-)← |
| Co | | | (-)↓2 | (-)← |
| B | | | (-)↓2 | (-)← |
| Ar | | | (-)↓2 | (-)← |
| W | | | (-)↓2 | (-)← |
| SD1 | | | (-)←, (-)↓2 | (-)← |
| SD2 | | | rex | Eadmundus |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|---------|----|--------|-------|-------|------|-----------------------------|-------|----------|---------|
| SD1 | vir | sanctus | et | justus | sicut | finis | eius | sanctissimae ⁵⁵⁵ | vitae | probavit | eventus |
|-----|-----|---------|----|--------|-------|-------|------|-----------------------------|-------|----------|---------|

| | | | |
|-----|-------|------|------|
| SD1 | eodem | vero | anno |
|-----|-------|------|------|

⁵⁵⁵ Cf. SD2 [33,1].

[33,2]

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------------|------------|---------------|--------------|------------------|------------------|----|-----------|-----|------|
| St | <i>rex,</i> | - | <i>contra</i> | <i>ipsum</i> | <i>exercitum</i> | <i>atrociter</i> | - | - | - | - |
| Co | | - | | | | | - | - | - | - |
| B | | - | | | | (-)→ | - | - | - | - |
| Ar | | - | | | | | - | - | - | - |
| W | | - | | | | | - | - | - | - |
| SD1 | | praedictus | | | | | et | viriliter | cum | suis |

| | | | |
|-----|------------------|-----------|-------------|
| St | <i>pugnavit.</i> | (-)← | <i>Sed,</i> |
| Co | | (-)← | |
| B | | atrociter | |
| Ar | | (-)← | |
| W | | (-)← | |
| SD1 | | (-)← | |

SD1 quia misericors Deus eum praescivit per martyrii coronam ad caelestis

[33,3]

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------------|---------------|----------------|--------------|----------------------|----------------------|------------|-----|---------|------|
| St | <i>proh</i> | <i>dolor!</i> | <i>paganis</i> | <i>nimum</i> | <i>gloriantibus,</i> | <i>ipso</i> | <i>cum</i> | - | - | - |
| Co | | | | | | ipse ^{556†} | | - | - | - |
| B | | | | | | ipse | | - | - | - |
| Ar | | | | | | ipse | | - | - | - |
| W | | | | | | ⁵⁵⁷ | | - | - | - |
| SD1 | - | - | - | - | gloriose | - | - | - | - | - |
| ASN | | | pagani | | gloriantes | - | - | per | Merciam | item |

ASN In Orientales Anglos transierunt⁵⁵⁸ Et ibi in loco qui dicitur

ASN Theodforda hiemaverunt.

SD1 occubuit de cuius passionis honore libet aliqua historiae nostrae inserere

SD1 ut sciant et agnoscant filii hominum quam terribilis est Christus

SD1 filius Dei in consiliis hominum et quam glorioso triumpho exornat

SD1 quos hic passionis titulo excruciat ut illud impleatur Non coronatur

SD1 quis nisi legitime certaverit Rex autem Eadmundus imperium Orientalium Anglorum

SD1 suscepit devotus quod et tenuit dextra forti potentiae Deum Omnipotentem

SD1 semper adorans ac glorificans pro omnibus bonis suis quibus usus fuerat

SD2 ut in sita legitur passione ab inguaro rege paganissimo indictione ii xii

⁵⁵⁶ St has "ipso Co rell." but Co has *ipse*.

⁵⁵⁷ W: "Ipse & mox occisa MS. Cott. Edd. P[arker]. & C[amden]."

⁵⁵⁸ Cf. [32,4].

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------|-----------|-----|----------|--------------|-----|-----|-----|----|-----------|----------|-----------|
| SD2 | kalends | Decembris | die | dominico | martyrizatus | est | cum | quo | et | humbertus | episcopo | occiditur |
|-----|---------|-----------|-----|----------|--------------|-----|-----|-----|----|-----------|----------|-----------|

[33,4]

| | | | | | | | |
|----|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|-----------------------|----------------|-------------|
| St | <i>magna</i> | <i>suorum</i> | <i>parte</i> | <i>ibidem</i> | <i>occiso,</i> | <i>inimici</i> | <i>loco</i> |
| Co | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | - | | | |
| Ar | | | | | occisa ⁵⁵⁹ | | |
| W | | | | | | | |

[33,5]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----------------|-----------------|--------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|-----------------|------------|
| St | <i>funeris</i> | <i>dominati</i> | <i>sunt,</i> | <i>et</i> | <i>totam</i> | <i>illam</i> | <i>regionem</i> | <i>suo</i> |
| Co | | | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | - | - | - | | | | | |

[33,6]

| | | |
|-----|----------------|---------------------|
| St | <i>dominio</i> | <i>subdiderunt.</i> |
| Co | | |
| B | | |
| Ar | | |
| W | | |
| ASN | | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----|------|-------|-----------|----|------------|---------|--------|-----|-----|--------|------|
| ASN | eo | quod | omnes | fortiores | et | nobiliores | eiusdem | gentis | una | cum | sancto | rege |
|-----|----|------|-------|-----------|----|------------|---------|--------|-----|-----|--------|------|

| | | | | | | |
|-----|------|------|--------|--------|------------|--------------|
| ASN | sive | ante | beatum | regem, | crudeliter | occubuerunt. |
|-----|------|------|--------|--------|------------|--------------|

[34,1]

| | | | | |
|-----|-------|--------|----------------------|------|
| St | Eodem | - | (-)← | anno |
| Co | | - | (-)← | |
| B | | - | (-)← | |
| Ar | | - | (-)← | |
| W | | - | (-)← | |
| SD1 | | - | (-)← | |
| SD2 | (-)→ | quo | etiam | |
| JoW | (-)→ | quo | etiam ⁵⁶⁰ | |
| ASN | | quoque | (-)← | |

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|----|--------|----------|-----|---------|----------|----------|-------------|--------|--------|
| SD1 | rex | et | martyr | insignis | per | coronam | martyrii | supernae | felicитatis | gaudia | subiit |
|-----|-----|----|--------|----------|-----|---------|----------|----------|-------------|--------|--------|

⁵⁵⁹ W states this was the reading in the Cotton Manuscript.

⁵⁶⁰ Cf. *eodem*.

| | | | | |
|-----|--------|------------|----------------|----------------|
| St | - | Ceolnoth, | archiepiscopus | Doroborniae, |
| Co | - | | | |
| B | - | | | |
| Ar | - | | | |
| W | - | | | |
| SD1 | - | | | doroborniae |
| SD2 | - | Ceolnothus | (-)→ | dorubernensis† |
| JoW | - | Ceolnothus | (-)→ | dorubernensis† |
| ASN | domnus | Ceolnothus | | |

| | | | |
|-----|----------------|-------------------|-----------|
| St | (-)← | - | - |
| Co | (-)← | antistes | - |
| B | (-)← | antistes | - |
| Ar | (-)← | antistes | - |
| W | (-)← | antistes | - |
| SD1 | (-)← | -† ⁵⁶¹ | civitates |
| SD2 | archiepiscopus | - | - |
| JoW | archiepiscopus | - | - |
| ASN | (-)← | - | - |

[34,2]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------------------|-------------|------------------|----------------------|----------------|------------|-----------|--------------|-----------------|
| St | - | <i>viam</i> | - | <i>universitatis</i> | <i>adiens,</i> | - | <i>in</i> | <i>eadem</i> | <i>civitate</i> |
| Co | - | | - | | | - | | | |
| B | - | | - | | <i>adeuns</i> | - | | | |
| Ar | - | | - | | | - | | | |
| W | - | | - | | | - | | | |
| SD1 | - | | <i>veritatis</i> | - | <i>adiit</i> | <i>qui</i> | | | |
| SD2 | <i>defunctus</i> | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| JoW | <i>defunctus</i> | - | - | - | - | - | | | |
| ASN | - | | - | | | - | | | |

[34,3]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------|-------------|------------|-----------------|-------------|----------|-----------------|
| St | <i>in</i> | <i>pace</i> | (-)→ | <i>sepultus</i> | <i>est.</i> | - | - |
| Co | | | (-)→ | | | - | - |
| B | | | (-)→ | | | - | - |
| Ar | | | (-)→ | | | - | - |
| W | | | (-)→ | | | - | - |
| SD1 | | | <i>est</i> | | (-)← | <i>a</i> | <i>clericis</i> |
| SD2 | - | - | - | - | <i>est</i> | - | - |
| JoW | | | (-)→ | | | - | - |
| ASN | | | (-)→ | | | - | - |

| | | | | | |
|-----|------------|------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|
| SD2 | <i>cui</i> | - | - | <i>successit</i> | <i>Ætheredus</i> |
| JoW | <i>cui</i> | <i>vir</i> | <i>reverendus</i> | <i>successit</i> | <i>Ætheredus</i> |

⁵⁶¹ St incorrectly gives this reading as occurring in SD1.

[35,1]

| | | | | | |
|-----|------|------------------|----------------------|-------------|--------------------|
| St | Anno | <i>Dominicae</i> | <i>Incarnationis</i> | DCCCLXXI, | <i>nativitatis</i> |
| Co | | | | | |
| B | | | | 871 | |
| Ar | | | | 871 | |
| W | | | | | |
| SD1 | | | | | |
| SD2 | | - | - | | - |
| JoW | | - | | | |
| ASN | | - | - | .dcccclxxi. | - |

[35,2]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------------|----------------|----------|--------------|-----------------|----------------|---------------|
| St | <i>autem</i> | <i>Ælfredi</i> | - | <i>regis</i> | <i>vigesimo</i> | <i>tertio,</i> | <i>exosae</i> |
| Co | | | - | | .xxii. | (-)← | |
| B | | | - | | 22 | (-)← | |
| Ar | | | - | | 22 | (-)← | |
| W | | | - | | ⁵⁶² | (-)← | |
| SD1 | - | elfredi | gloriosi | | xxii | (-)← | |
| SD2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| JoW | - | - | - | - | - | - | |
| ASN | - | - | - | - | - | - | |

[35,3]

| | | | | | |
|-----|-----------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|---------------|
| St | <i>memoriae</i> | <i>paganorum</i> | <i>exercitus</i> | <i>Orientales</i> | <i>Anglos</i> |
| Co | | | | | |
| B | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | |
| W | | | | | |
| SD1 | | | | | |
| SD2 | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | |

[35,4]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------------|-----------|---------------|----------------------|----------------|----------------|
| St | <i>deserens</i> | <i>et</i> | <i>regnum</i> | <i>Occidentalium</i> | <i>Saxonum</i> | <i>adiens,</i> |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | |
| SD1 | deseruit | qui | | | | adiit |
| SD2 | | - | regnumque | | | |
| JoW | | - | regnumque | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | |

⁵⁶² W: "Secundo MS. Cott. Edd. P[arker]. & C[amden]."

[35,5]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------|----|--------|---------|------|---------|----|------------------------|----|
| St | venit | ad | villam | regiam, | quae | dicitur | - | Rædigam, | in |
| Co | | | | | que | | - | | |
| B | | | | | | | - | Redigan | |
| Ar | | | | | | | - | | |
| W | | | | | | | - | | |
| SD1 | veniens | | | | | | et | Redingum | |
| SD2 | | | | | | | - | Readingum | |
| JoW | | | | | | | - | Readingum | |
| ASN | | | | | | | - | Redinga ⁵⁶³ | |

[35,6]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------------|----------------|-----------|----------|------|--------|----|------|-------|
| St | meridiana | Tamesis | - | fluminis | ripa | sitam, | in | illa | paga, |
| Co | | | flumensis | | | | | | |
| B | | Thamesis | flumensis | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | flumensis | | | | | | |
| W | | ⁵⁶⁴ | - | | | | | | |
| SD1 | meridianam | | - | | | - | | | plaga |
| SD2 | | Tamensis | - | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | - | | | | | | |
| ASN | | Tamensis | | | | | | | |

[35,7]

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|------|------------|----|---------|--------|---------|---------|---------------|-----------|----------|-----|
| St | quae | - | - | - | - | - | dicitur | Bearroscire; | tertioque | adventus | sui |
| Co | que | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | |
| B | | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | |
| Ar | que | - | - | - | - | - | | Bearroschire | | | |
| W | | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | |
| SD1 | que | nuncupatur | ab | incolis | ipsius | patriae | - | | tertio | (-)→ | - |
| SD2 | | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | |
| JoW | | - | - | - | - | - | | | | | |
| ASN | | - | - | - | - | - | | Bearroscopyre | | | |

SD1 vero die quo ibi advenerunt inimici Anglorum

[35,8]

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------------|-----|-------|---------|-------|-----|-------|-------------|----|-------|--------|
| St | <i>ibidem</i> | die | <duo> | comites | eorum | cum | magna | - | - | (-)↓9 | illius |
| Co | | | - | | | | | - | - | (-)↓9 | |
| B | | | - | | | | | - | - | (-)↓9 | |
| Ar | | | - | | | | | - | - | (-)↓9 | |
| W | | | - | | | | | - | - | (-)↓9 | |
| SD1 | - | - | - | | | | | multitudine | In | parte | |
| SD2 | - | | duo | | | | | - | - | (-)↓9 | |
| JoW | - | | duo | | | | | - | - | (-)↓9 | |
| ASN | | | - | | | | | - | - | (-)↓9 | |

⁵⁶³ The shorthand mark over the *a* has been removed by erasure in the Trinity manuscript.

⁵⁶⁴ W: "Tamesis Flumensis fluminis MS. Cott. Edd. P[arker]. & C[amden]."

[35,9]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------|------|----------|---|---------------|------|-------|--------|-------|
| St | parte | in | praedam | | equitaverunt, | (-)← | aliis | vallum | inter |
| Co | | | predam | | æquitaverunt | (-)← | | | |
| B | | | | | | (-)← | | | |
| Ar | | | predam | | | (-)← | | | |
| W | | | | | | (-)← | | | |
| SD1 | (-)↑8 | (-)→ | fluminis | | praedamque | - | - | - | |
| SD2 | | | predam | - | | (-)← | | | |
| JoW | | | predam | | | (-)← | | | |
| ASN | | | predam | | | (-)← | | | |

SD1 immensae multitudinis acceperunt

[35,10]

SD1 Quidam autem ex ipsis vallum inter

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----------------|---------|-----------|----|---------|---------|---|----------|-------|
| St | duo | flumina | Tamesen | et | Cynetan | (-)← | a | dextrali | parte |
| Co | | | | | | (-)← | | dextrali | |
| B | | | Thamesin | | | (-)← | | dextrali | |
| Ar | | | | | | (-)← | | | |
| W | | | Tamesin | | Cynetam | (-)← | | | |
| SD1 | ⁵⁶⁵ | (-)→ | Tamense | | Kenetan | flumina | - | - | - |
| SD2 | | | Tamensen† | | | (-)← | | dextra | |
| JoW | | | | | | (-)← | | | |
| ASN | | | Tamensem | | Kynetan | (-)← | | | |

[35,11]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------|--------|--------|--------|--------------|--------|-------------|------------|
| St | eiusdem | regiae | villae | (-)← | facientibus. | Quibus | Æthelwulf, | - |
| Co | | regie | ville | (-)← | | | | - |
| B | | (-)→ | | regiae | | | Æthelwolfe | - |
| Ar | | regie | ville | (-)← | | | | - |
| W | | | | (-)← | | | | - |
| SD1 | - | - | - | - | facere | - | (-)↓12 | studuerunt |
| SD2 | | (-)→ | | | | | Atheluulf | - |
| JoW | | (-)→ | | regie | | | Atheluulf | - |
| ASN | | | | | | | Adheluulfus | - |

SD1 sed consilium eorum et opus Danorum dissipatum est

SD1 per auxilium angelorum ut impleretur in eis illud scolastici

SD1 quamvis se tyrio superbit ostro comet et niveis lapillis

SD1 invisus tamen omnibus pollet

⁵⁶⁵ Cf. "ex ipsius vallum inter Tamense et Kenetan."

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----|-------|------|-------|--------|-------|--------|------|--------|----------|---------|--|
| SD1 | et | aliud | quis | Illos | igitur | putet | beatos | quos | miseri | tribuunt | Honores | |
|-----|----|-------|------|-------|--------|-------|--------|------|--------|----------|---------|--|

[35,12]

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|----------|----------|-----------|----------|------------|---------|----------|----------|
| SD1 | cumque | perversi | raptores | viriliter | operibus | desudarent | advenit | protinus | Ethelwlf |
|-----|--------|----------|----------|-----------|----------|------------|---------|----------|----------|

| | | | |
|-----|--------------|-------|--------|
| St | Bearrocensis | pagae | comes, |
| Co | Berrocensis | page | |
| B | Bearrocensis | | |
| Ar | | page | |
| W | | | |
| SD1 | Bearrocensis | - | - |
| SD2 | Bearrocensis | | |
| JoW | Bearrocensis | page | |
| ASN | Beorrocensis | page | |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----------|---------|---------|-----|-----|------|-----------|-------------|----|----------|
| SD1 | regionis | incliti | vigoris | dux | cum | suis | agminibus | centuriatus | et | trilicis |
|-----|----------|---------|---------|-----|-----|------|-----------|-------------|----|----------|

| | | |
|-----|---------|------------|
| SD1 | toracis | circumdatu |
|-----|---------|------------|

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------|-------|--------------|------------|----------|---------------|-----------|-------|------|
| SD1 | cernens | autem | multitudinem | barbarorum | princeps | Christianorum | populorum | dixit | suis |
|-----|---------|-------|--------------|------------|----------|---------------|-----------|-------|------|

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-------|-----------|-----|-----------|-----|-------|-----|------------|
| SD1 | horum | numerosus | est | exercitus | sed | tamen | est | spernendus |
|-----|-------|-----------|-----|-----------|-----|-------|-----|------------|

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|----|-----------|--------|-----|-------|---------|-----------|------------|--------|--------|
| SD1 | qui | si | aliquando | contra | nos | aciem | struens | valentior | incubuerit | noster | quidam |
|-----|-----|----|-----------|--------|-----|-------|---------|-----------|------------|--------|--------|

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|-----|----------|-----|---------|-------|-----|
| SD1 | dux | qui | Christus | est | fortior | illis | est |
|-----|-----|-----|----------|-----|---------|-------|-----|

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|---------|---------|------------|-------|-------------|----|----------|---------|---------|
| SD1 | obviant | denique | Christiani | Danis | confidentes | in | tuitione | Christi | nominis |
|-----|---------|---------|------------|-------|-------------|----|----------|---------|---------|

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|-----------|------|----------|-----------|----|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| SD1 | dux | praefatus | suos | hortatur | praecipue | ut | resisterent | adversariis | constitutus |
|-----|-----|-----------|------|----------|-----------|----|-------------|-------------|-------------|

| | | | | |
|-----|-----|------|----------|------------------|
| St | cum | suis | - | <i>sodalibus</i> |
| Co | | | - | |
| B | | | - | |
| Ar | | | - | |
| W | | | - | |
| SD1 | | | inclitis | legionibus |
| SD2 | | | - | - |
| JoW | | | - | - |
| ASN | | | - | |

[35,13]

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----|-------|-----|---------|-----------|--------|----------|--------|
| St | in | loco, | qui | (-)→ | (-)→ | (-)→ | (-)↓14 | (-)↓14 |
| Co | | | | - | (-)→ | - | - | - |
| B | | | | - | (-)→ | - | - | - |
| Ar | | | | - | (-)→ | - | - | - |
| W | | | | - | (-)→ | - | - | - |
| SD1 | | | | - | (-)→ | - | - | - |
| SD2 | | | | Anglice | Englafeld | Latine | Anglorum | campus |
| JoW | | | | Anglice | Englafeld | Latine | Anglorum | campus |
| ASN | | | | - | (-)→ | - | - | - |

| | | | | |
|-----|------------|------------|-----------|--------|
| St | dicitur | Englafeld | <Anglice, | Latine |
| Co | | | - | - |
| B | | | - | - |
| Ar | | Englafelde | - | - |
| W | | | - | - |
| SD1 | appellatur | | - | - |
| SD2 | | (-)← | (-)← | (-)← |
| JoW | | (-)← | (-)← | (-)← |
| ASN | | | - | - |

[35,14]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|-----|-----------|-----|-------|--------|-------|-----|
| SD1 | Ubi | dimicatum | est | satis | atroci | bello | quo |
|-----|-----|-----------|-----|-------|--------|-------|-----|

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----------|---------|-----------|-----|---------|-----|------|--------------------------|----------|----|---------|
| St | Anglorum | Campus> | obviavit, | et | animose | - | - | - | (-)↓15 | ex | utraque |
| Co | - | - | | | | - | - | - | (-)↓15 | | |
| B | - | - | | | | - | - | - | (-)↓15 | | |
| Ar | - | - | | | | eum | suis | sodalibus ⁵⁶⁶ | (-)↓15 | | |
| W | - | - | | | | - | - | - | (-)↓15 | | |
| SD1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | (-)↓15 | | |
| SD2 | (-)↑13 | (-)↑13 | | ubi | | - | - | - | pugnatum | | |
| JoW | (-)↑13 | (-)↑13 | | ubi | | - | - | - | pugnatum | | |
| ASN | - | - | | | | - | - | - | (-)↓15 | | |

⁵⁶⁶ Eyeskip from [35,12].

[35,15]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|-------|------------|-----------|-------|----|-------------|
| St | parte | - | - | - | - | - |
| Co | | - | - | - | - | - |
| B | | - | - | - | - | - |
| Ar | | - | - | - | - | - |
| W | | - | - | - | - | - |
| SD1 | | ceciderunt | vulnerati | multi | et | occubuerunt |
| SD2 | | - | - | - | - | - |
| JoW | | - | - | - | - | - |
| ASN | | - | - | - | - | - |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----------|---------------|-------------------|------|--------|------|-----|------|---------|
| St | - | <i>ibidem</i> | pugnatum | est. | Cumque | (-)→ | ibi | diu | utrique |
| Co | - | | | | | (-)→ | | | |
| B | - | | | | | (-)→ | | | |
| Ar | - | | | | | Diu | | (-)← | |
| W | - | | | | | (-)→ | | | |
| SD1 | occubuit | | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| SD2 | - | - | (-)↑14 | - | | (-)→ | | | |
| JoW | - | - | -† ⁵⁶⁷ | -† | cunque | (-)→ | | | |
| ASN | - | | | | | (-)→ | | | |

[35,16]

| | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|----------|---------|-----|-------|-------------|
| SD1 | quidam | princeps | Danorum | cum | magna | multitudine |
|-----|--------|----------|---------|-----|-------|-------------|

| | | | | | | |
|-----|--------------|--------|-----------|--------|---------|----|
| St | resisterent, | altero | paganorum | comite | occiso, | et |
| Co | | | | | | |
| B | | | | | | |
| Ar | | | | | | |
| W | | | | | | |
| SD2 | | | | | | |
| JoW | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | |

[35,17]

| | | | | | | | |
|-----|--------|-----|-----------|-------|---------|-------------|------|
| St | maxima | - | exercitus | parte | deleta, | ceterisque | fuga |
| Co | | - | | | | | |
| B | | - | | | | caeterisque | |
| Ar | | - | | | | | |
| W | | - | | | | caeterisque | |
| SD1 | | sui | | - | - | caeteris | |
| SD2 | | - | | | | | |
| JoW | | - | | | | | |
| ASN | | - | | | | | |

⁵⁶⁷ "pugnatum est" not present in MS Bodley 157.

[35,18]

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----------|------------|-----------|--------------|--------|--------|------|----|------|---------|
| St | elapsis, | Christiani | victoriam | accipientes, | - | - | - | - | loco | funeris |
| Co | | | | | - | - | - | - | | |
| B | | | | | - | - | - | - | | |
| Ar | | | | | - | - | - | - | | |
| W | | | | | - | - | - | - | | |
| SD1 | | | victoriae | - | palmas | adepti | sunt | et | | |
| SD2 | | | | | - | - | - | - | | |
| JoW | | | | | - | - | - | - | | |
| ASN | | | | | - | - | - | - | | |

[35,19]

| | | |
|-----|----------|-------|
| St | dominati | sunt. |
| Co | | |
| B | | |
| Ar | | |
| W | | |
| SD1 | | |
| SD2 | | |
| JoW | | |
| ASN | | |

Bibliography

- Adamson, John W. "*The Illiterate Anglo-Saxon,*" and *Other Essays on Education, Medieval and Modern.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1946.
- Allington, Daniel. "How to Do Things with Literature: Blasphemous Speech Acts, Satanic Intentions, and the Uncommunicativeness of Verses." *Poetics Today* 29 (2008): 473-523
- Austin, John L. *How to Do Things with Words.* 2nd ed. Marina Sbisa ed. Boston: Harvard UP, 1975.
- Bale, John. *Illustrium Maioris Britanniae Scriptorum Summarium.* [Wesel]: [van der Straeten] 1548.
- Bale, John *Index Britanniae Scriptorum.* Reginald Lane Poole and Mary Bateson eds. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1902.
- Bale, John. *Index Britanniae Scriptorum: John Bale's Index of British and Other Writers.* Reginald Lane Pool and Mary Bateson eds. Rev. James P. Carley. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer, 1990.
- Bale, John. *Scriptorum Illustrium Maioris Britanniae Catalogus.* 2 vols. Basel: Oporinus 1557-9.
- Barker, Nicholas. "Editing the Past: Classical and Historical Scholarship." *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, IV: 1557-1695.* John Barnard and D. F. McKenzie eds. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002. Pp. 206-27.
- Barthes, Roland. "From Work to Text." *Image. Music. Text.* Trans. Stephen Heath. New York: Hill, 1977. 155-64.
- Barthes, Roland. *Image-Music-Text.* London: Fontana Press, 1977.
- Biggs, Frederick M. "A Picture of Paul in a Parker Manuscript." *Intertexts: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Culture presented to Paul E. Szarmach.* ed. Virginia Blanton and Helene Scheck,

- Arizona Stud. in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance 334 [= Med. and Renaissance Texts and Stud. 24] (Tempe, AZ, 2008), pp. 169–89.
- Bjorklund, Nancy Basler. "Parker's Purposes behind the Manuscripts: Matthew Parker in the Context of His Early Career and Sixteenth-Century Church Reform." in *Old English Literature in its Manuscript Context*, ed. Joyce Tally Lionarons, ed., Med. European Stud. 5 (Morgantown, WV: WV UP, 2004), pp. 217–41.
- Bollandists. *Acta Sanctorum, Antwerp et alibi: Socii Bollandiani 1643-1925*.
- Bollandists. *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina Antiquae et Mediae Aetatis*. 1 vol in 2. Brussels: Socii Bollandiani, 1898. [cited with suppl. in Fros, *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina Antiquae Et Mediae Aetatis. Novum Supplementum*.]
- Bowers, Fredson. "Presidential Address, the Society of Textual Scholarship, April 26, 1985, Unfinished Business." *Text* 4 (1988): 1-11
- Bozovic, Marijeta. "Love, Death, Nabokov: Looking for the Original of Laura." *Nabokov Online Journal* 5 (2011): 1-19
- Bradshaw, Henry. *Collected Papers of Henry Bradshaw*. Ed. Francis Jenkinson. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1889.
- Brett, M. "John of Worcester and his Contemporaries," *The Writing of History in the Middle Ages. Essays presented to Richard William Southern*, edd. R. H. C. Davis et al. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1981. Pp.101-26.
- Brewer, J. S. ed. *Giraldi Cambrensis Opera*, Vol III. *Rerum Britannicarum Medii Aevi Scriptores* 21 [=Rolls Series]. London: Longman, 1863.
- Bruce, J. and T. T. Perowne. eds. *Correspondence of Matthew Parker, D. D. S. Archbishop of Canterbury, Comprising Letters Written by and to Him, from A.D. 1535, to His Death, A.D.*

1575. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1853.
- Butler, Emily Elisabeth. *Textual Community and Linguistic Distance in Early England*.
(Unpublished Thesis) University of Toronto. 2010.
- Caius, John. *De Antiquitate Cantabrigiensis Academiae*. London: Bynneman, 1568.
- Camden, William. *Anglica, Normannica, Hibernica, Cambrica, a veteribus scripta, Ex quibus Asser Meneuensis, Anonymus de vita Guilielmi Conquestoris, Thomas Walsingham, Thomas de la More, Guilelmus Gemiticensis, Giraldus Cambrensis, plerique, nunc primum in lucem editi, ex bibliotheca Guilielmi Camdeni*. Frankfurt: Claudus Marnus, 1603.
- Campbell, A. *Encomium Emmae Reginae*. Rev. Simon Keynes. Camden Classic Reprints 4.
Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998.
- Campbell, A. "Asser's Life of Alfred." *The Inheritance of Historiography, 350-900*. Christopher Holdsworth and T. P. Wiseman eds. Liverpool: Liverpool UP, 1986. Pp. 115-35.
- Collinson, Patrick, Arnold Hunt, and Alexandra Walsham. "Religious Publishing in England 1557-1640." *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain, IV: 1557-1695*. John Barnard and D. F. McKenzie eds. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002. Pp. 29-96.
- Cook, Albert S. trans. *Asser's Life of King Alfred*. Boston and New York: Ginn & Co., 1906.
- Darlington, R. R., and P. McGurk, eds. *The Chronicle of John of Worcester*. II. Oxford Medieval Texts. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.
- de Hamel, Christopher. "Collectors and Collecting in Cambridge." *The Cambridge Illuminations: Ten Centuries of Book Production in the Medieval West*, ed. Paul Binski and Stella Panayotova (London: Harvey Miller, 2005), pp. 17-21 [M. Parker *et al.*]
- Derrida, Jacques. "Signature Event Context." *Glyph 1* (1977): 172-97

- Dumville, David, and M. Lapidge, eds. *The Annals of St Neots with Vita Prima Sancti Neoti*. The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A Collaborative Edition 17. Cambridge, 1984.
- Eggert, Paul. "Document and Text: The 'Life' of the Literary Work and the Capacities of Editing." *Text* 7 (1994): 1-24
- Fish, Stanley. *Is There a Text In This Class?* Cambridge, MA; Harvard UP, 1980.
- Foucault, Michel. *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice*. Donald F. Bouchard. Ed. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1977.
- Foucault, Michel. "What Is an Author?" *The Foucault Reader*. Ed. Paul Rabinow. New York: Pantheon 1984. Pp. 101-20.
- Fros, Henryk, and Bollandists. *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina Antiquae et Mediae Aetatis. Novum Supplementum*. Subsidia Hagiographica 70. Brussels: Socii Bollandisti, 1986. [suppl. to Bollandists. *Bibliotheca Hagiographica Latina*]
- Fulk, Robert D., and Christopher M. Cain. *A History of Old English literature*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2005.
- Galbraith, V. H. *An Introduction to the Study of History*. London: C.A. Watts, 1964.
- Gameson, Richard, and Fiona Gameson, 'From Augustine to Parker: the Changing Face of the First Archbishop of Canterbury.' *Anglo-Saxons: Studies presented to Cyril Roy Hart*, ed. Simon Keynes and Alfred P. Smyth (Dublin, 2006), pp. 13–38.
- Giles, J. A. "Harmony of the Chroniclers During the Life of King Alfred: A.D. 849-901." *Memorials of King Alfred, Essays on the History and Antiquities of England During the Ninth Century, the Age of King Alfred*. Burt Franklin, New York, 1969. Pp. 1-128.
- Gneuss, H. "Die Handschrift Cotton Otho A. xii" *Anglia* 94. (1976): 289-318
- Gordon, E.V. ed. *The Battle of Maldon*. 1973. Rpt. London: Methuen, 1968.

- Graham, Timothy, "Matthew Parker's Manuscripts: an Elizabethan Library and its Use." *The Cambridge History of Libraries in Britain and Ireland*, ed. Elisabeth Leedham-Green *et al.*, 3 vols. (Cambridge, 2006), I, 322–41.
- Gransden, Antonia. *Historical Writing in England: c.500 to c. 1307*. 1974. Rpt. London: Routledge; Kegan Paul, 2005.
- Greetham, David. *The Pleasures of Contamination*. Textual Cultures: Theory and Practice. Indiana: Indiana UP, 2010.
- Greetham, David. "Editorial and Critical Theory: From Modernism to Postmodernism." *Palimpsest: Editorial Theory in the Humanities*. George Bornstein and Ralph C. Williams eds. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1993. Pp. 9-28.
- Greg, W. W. "The Rationale of Copy-Text." *Studies in Bibliography* 3 (1950-51): 19-36
- Grigely, Joseph. "The Textual Event." *Textuality: Art, Theory and Textual Criticism*. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1995. Pp. 89-119.
- Gibson, Strickland. "Francis Wise, B.D.: Oxford Antiquary, Librarian, and Archivist." *Oxoniensia* 1 (1936): 173-95
- Goodman, Nelson. *Languages of Art: an Approach to a Theory of Symbols*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Co., 1968.
- Hagedorn, "Received Wisdom: The Reception History of Alfred's Preface to the *Pastoral Care*." Reissue in. *Anglo-Saxonism and the Construction of Social Identity*. Ed. Allen J. Frantzen and John D. Niles, Gainesville, FL: U of Florida, 1997. pp. 88-90.
- Hancher, Michael. "Three Kinds of Intention." *MLN* 87 (1972): 827-851
- Hardy, Thomas D. *Willelmi Malmesbiriensis Monachi Gesta Regum Anglorum atque historia novella*. 3 vols. English Historical Society. London: Sumptibus Societatis, 1840.

- Heidegger, Martin. "The Origin of the Work of Art." *Basic Writings*. New York: HarperCollins, 1977.
- Heidegger, Martin. "The Thing." *Poetry, Language, Thought*. New York: Harper & Row, 1971.
- Hemon, Aleksandar. *The Question of Bruno*. New York: Knopf, 2000.
- Hewitt, R. "Vita Ælfredi regis" 2003. *Fontes Anglo-Saxonici: World Wide Web Register*, <http://fontes.english.ox.ac.uk/>, accessed July 2014
- Hirsch Jr., E. D. *Validity in Interpretation*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1967.
- Hunter Blair, Peter. *Anglo-Saxon Northumbria*. Ed. Lapidge. Collected Studies 192. London: Variorum Reprints, 1984.
- Hunter Blair, Peter. "Some Observations on the *Historia Regum* Attributed to Symeon of Durham." Hunter Blair, *Celt and Saxon*. N. K. Chadwick ed. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1963. Pp. 63-118. Rpt in Hunter Blair, *Anglo-Saxon Northumbria*. Ed. Lapidge.
- Hunter Blair, Peter. "Symeon's History of the Kings." Hunter Blair, *Archaeologia Aeliana*, 16 (1939): Pp.87-100. Rpt in Hunter Blair, *Anglo-Saxon Northumbria*. Ed. Lapidge.
- Irvine, Susan. "The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and the Idea of Rome in Alfredian Literature." in Reuter, ed. *Alfred the Great*. Aldershot-Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2003. Pp. 63-77.
- James, M. R. "Two Lives of St Ethelbert, King and Martyr" *English Historical Review*, 32 (1917): 214-44
- Ker, N. R. *A Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1957.
- Ker, N. R. *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain, a List of Surviving books*. 2nd ed. Royal Historical Society Guides and Handbooks 3. London: Royal Historical Society, 1964.
- Keynes, Simon, and Michael Lapidge. *Alfred the Great: Asser's "Life of King Alfred" and Other Contemporary Sources*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England; New York, N.Y., U.S.A.:

- Penguin, 1983.
- Kirby, D. P. "Asser and His Life of King Alfred" *Studia Celtica* 6 (1971): 13-25
- Kleist, Aaron J. "Monks, Marriage and Manuscripts: Matthew Parker's Manipulation (?) of Ælfric of Eynsham." *JEGP* 105 (2006): 312–27
- Lapidge, Michael. "Asser's Reading." *Alfred the Great. Papers from the Eleventh-Century Conferences*. Ed. Reuter. 27-47.
- Lapidge, Michael. "Asser." *The Wiley Blackwell Encyclopedia of Anglo-Saxon England*. 2nd ed. Oxford and Hoboken, NJ: Wiley, 2013. P. 52.
- Lapidge, Michael. "Byrhtferth of Ramsey and the Early Sections of the *Historia Regum* attributed to Symeon of Durham." *Anglo-Saxon England* 10 (1981): 97-122
- Lapidge, Michael, ed. *Byrhtferth: The Lives of St Oswald and St Ecgbwine*. Oxford Medieval Texts. Oxford and New York: Oxford UP, 2009.
- Lapidge, Michael, and Richard Sharpe. *A Bibliography of Celtic-Latin Literature, 400-1200*. Dublin: Royal Irish Academy, 1985.
- Latham, R. A. ed. *Revised Medieval Latin Word-List from British Sources and Irish Sources*. Oxford UP, 1965. [Rpt with suppl. 2012]
- Lees, Beatrice A. *Alfred the Great, the Truth Teller, Maker of England, 848-899*. 1902. New York and London: Knickerbocker Press, 1915.
- Leland, John, and Thomas Hearne, ed. *Antiquarii De rebus britannicis collectanea* 3. London: Impensis Gul. & Jo Richardson, 1770.
- Leland, John. *Commentarii de Scriptoribus Britannicis*. Ed. Anthony Hall. Oxford: Theatrum Sheldonianum, 1709.
- Leland, John. *De viris illustribus*. Carley, James P. ed., with Caroline Brett. Studies and Texts

- 172 [=British Writers of the Middle Ages and the Early Modern Period 1]. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2010.
- Leland, John. *The Laboryouse Journey & Serche of John Leylande: For Englandes Antiquitees Geuen of Hym as a Newe Years Gyfte to Kynge Henry the VIII. in the XXXVII. Yeare of His Reygne*. Ed. W. A. Copinger. Manchester: Priory Press, 1895.
- Levison, Wilhelm. "Dicta Ælfredi." Appendix to "Aus englischen Bibliotheken, II." *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für altere deutsche Geschichtskunde* 35 (1910): 331-431, at 424-7
- Macray, William Dunn. *A Manual of British Historians to A.D. 1600*. London: William Pickering, 1845.
- Mailloux, Stephen. *Interpretive Conventions: the Reader in the Study of American Fiction*. Ithaca and London: Cornell UP, 1982.
- Martens, Gunter. "What is a Text? Attempts at Defining a Central Concept in Editorial Theory." *Contemporary German Editorial Theory*. Hans Walter Gabler, George Bornstein, and Gillian Borland Pierce eds. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1995. Pp. 209-31.
- McCormick, Kathleen. "Swimming Upstream with Fish." *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*. 44 (1985): 67-76
- McGann, Jerome. *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1983.
- McGann, Jerome. *The Textual Condition*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1991.
- McGann, Jerome. "What is Critical Editing?" *Text* 5 (1991): 15-29
- McKisack, May. *Medieval History in the Tudor Age*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.
- McLaverty, James. "Issues of Identity and Utterance: an Intentionalist Response to 'Textual Instability.'" *Devils and Angels: Textual Editing and Literary Theory*. Ed. Philip G. Cohen. Charlottesville, VA: U of Virginia P, 1991. Pp. 134-51

- McLaverly, James. "The Mode of Existence of Literary Works of Art: The Case of the 'Dunciad Variorum.'" *Studies in Bibliography* 37 (1984): 82-105
- McLeod, Randall. "From 'Tranceformations in the Text of *Orlando Furioso*.'" *New Directions in Textual Studies*. Ed. Dave Oliphant and Robin Bradford. Austin: U of Texas P, 1990. Pp. 61-90.
- McLeod, Randall. "Un 'Editing' Shak-speare." *SubStance* 11 (1982): 26-55
- Nabokov, Vladimir. *The Original of Laura*. Dmitri Nabokov, ed. New York: Knopf, 2009.
- Page, R. I. *Matthew Parker and His Books: Sandars Lectures in Bibliography Delivered on 14, 16, and 18 May 1990 at the University of Cambridge*. Kalamazoo, MI: Medieval Institute Publications, Western Michigan University, 1993.
- Page, R. I. "Sixteenth Century Reception of Alfred the Great's Letters to his Bishops," *Anglia* 110 (1992): 26-64
- Parker, Hershel. "'The Text Itself'—Whatever That Is." *Text* 3 (1987): 47-54
- Parker, Matthew. *De Antiquitate Britannicae Ecclesiae*. London: John Day, 1572.
- Parker, Matthew, ed. *De rebus gestis Ælfredi*. London: John Day, 1574.
- Parker, Matthew, ed. *Chronica Maiora*. [=Matthaei Paris, monachi Albanensis, Angli, historia maior]. London: Reginaldus Vuolfius, 1571.
- Peckham, Morse. "Reflections on the Foundations of Modern Textual Editing." *Proof* 1 (1971): 122-155
- Plummer, Charles. *Life and Times of Alfred the Great, Being the Ford Lectures of 1901*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1902.
- Preston, Todd. *King Alfred's Book of Laws: A Study of the "Domboc" and Its Influence on English Identity, with a Complete Translation*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland and Co., 2012.

- Preest, David, and James G. Clark. *The Chronica Maiora of Thomas Walsingham (1376-1422)*. Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2005.
- Reuter, Timothy, ed. *Alfred the Great: Papers from the Eleventh-Centenary Conferences*. Aldershot-Burlington, VT: Ashgate. 2003.
- Rouse, Richard H., and Mary A. Rouse, eds. *Henry of Kirkstede: Catalogus de libris authenticis et apocrifis*. Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues 11. London: British Library, 2004.
- Rouse, Richard H., Mary A. Rouse, and R.A.B. Mynors, eds. *Registrum Anglie de libris doctorum et auctorum veterum*. Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues 2. London: British Library, 1991.
- Scharer, Anton. "Alfred the Great and Arnulf of Carinthia: A Comparison." *Alfred the Great*. Ed. Reuter. Pp. 311-21.
- Scholes, Robert. "Who Cares About the Text?" Review of Fish, *Is There a Text in This Class?* *NOVEL: A Forum on Fiction* 17 (1984): 171-80
- Schutt, Marie. "The Literary Form of the Vita Alfredi." *English Historical Review*, 72 (1957): 209-220.
- Scragg, Donald, ed. *Battle of Maldon*. Old and Middle English Texts. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1981.
- Searle, John R. "Reiterating the Differences: A Reply to Derrida." *Glyph* 1 (1977): 198-208
- Searle, W. G. *Onomasticon Anglo-Saxonicum*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1897.
- Sharpe, Richard. *A Handlist of the Latin Writers of Great Britain and Ireland Before 1540*. *Journal of Medieval Latin*, Publications 1. Turnhout: Brepols, 1997.
- Sheppard, Alice. *Families of the King: Writing Identity in the "Anglo-Saxon Chronicle"* Toronto and Buffalo: U of Toronto Press, 2004.

- Shillingsburg, *From Gutenberg to Google*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2006.
- Shillingsburg, Peter. *Resisting Texts*. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1997.
- Shillingsburg, Peter. *Scholarly Editing in the Computer Age: Theory and Practice*. 3rd ed. Ann Arbor, MI: U of Michigan P, 2004.
- Shillingsburg, Peter. "Text as Matter, Concept, and Action." in Shillingsburg, *Resisting Texts*.
- Skinner, Quentin. "Motives, Intentions, and the Interpretation of Texts," *New Literary History* 3 (1972): 393–408.
- Smyth, Alfred P. *King Alfred the Great*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Smyth, Alfred P. *The Medieval Life of King Alfred the Great: A Translation and Commentary on the Text Attributed to Asser*. New York: Palgrave, Ltd., 2002.
- Spelman, John. *The Life of Ælfred the Great* Ed. Thomas Hearne. Oxford: Maurice Atkins, 1709.
- Stenton, F. M. *Anglo-Saxon England*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1947.
- Stevenson, William Henry, ed. *Asser's Life of King Alfred, together with the Annals of Saint Neots Erroneously Ascribed to Asser*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1904.
- Strype, John. *The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker*. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1821.
- Swanton, M. J. trans. *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. London: Orion House, 1996.
- Simeon, of Durham. Symeonis Dunelmensis, *Opera et Collectanea*. Durham: Society by Andrews and Co., 1868.
- Tait, James. Review of Stevenson, ed. *Asser's Life*. *English Historical Review* 20 (1905): 137-40
- Tanner, Thomas. *Bibliotheca Britannico-Hibernica, sive, De scriptoribus, qui in Anglia, Scotia, et Hibernia ad saeculi XVII initium floruerunt*. David Wilkins, ed. London: Societas ad literas promovendas, 1748.
- Tanselle, G. Thomas. *A Rationale of Textual Criticism*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1989.

Tanselle, G. Thomas. "Greg's Theory of Copy-Text and the Editing of American Literature."

Studies in Bibliography 28 (1975): 167-229

Tanselle, G. Thomas. "The Editorial Problem of Final Authorial Intention." *Studies in*

Bibliography 29 (1976): 167-211

"The Center for Scholarly Editions: An Introductory Statement." *PMLA*, 92 (1977): 583-97

Thomson, Rodney. *William of Malmesbury*. Rev. ed. Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2003

Thomson, Rodney, and Michael Winterbottom, eds. *William of Malmesbury: Gesta regum Anglorum*. 2 vols. Oxford Medieval Texts. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2002.

Thornton, David E. *Kings, Chronologies, and Genealogies: Studies in the Political History of Early Medieval Ireland and Wales. Prosopographica et Genealogica. Vol. 10*. Keats-Rohan and Settapani, eds. OUPPR: Linacre College, Oxford, 2003.

Thorpe, James. "The Ideal of Textual Criticism." *Principles of Textual Criticism*. San Marino, CA: Huntington Library, 1972. Pp. 50-79.

Thorpe, James. "The Aesthetics of textual Criticism." *PMLA*, 80 (1965): 465-82

Townsend, Matthew. "Assandun and Assatun: the Value of Skaldic Evidence for English place-name studies." *Journal of the English Place-Name Society*. 27 (1994): 21-29

Twyne, Brian. *Antiquitatis Academiae Oxoniensis Apologia*. 3 vols. Oxford: Joseph Barnes, 1608.

Ussher, James. *Britannicarum ecclesiarum antiquitates, quibus inserta est pestiferae adversùs Dei gratiam à Pelagio britanno in ecclesiam inductae haereseos historia*. 2nd ed. London: Benjamin Tooke, 1687.

Watson, Andrew G. ed. *Medieval Libraries of Great Britain, a List of Surviving Books*.

Supplement to the Second Edition. Royal Historical Society Guides and Handbooks 15.

- London: Royal Historical Society, 1987. [Suppl. to Ker, *Medieval Libraries*]
- Wellek, Rene, and Austin Warren. "The Mode of Existence of a Literary Work of Art." *Theory of Literature*. New York: Harcourt and Brace, 1949. Pp.142-57.
- Wheeler, G. H. "Textual Emendations to Asser's Life of Alfred." *English Historical Review* 47 (1932): 86-8
- White, Hayden V., *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins UP, 1973.
- Whitelock, Dorothy. *The Genuine Asser: The Stenton Lecture*, 1967. Reading: U of Reading, 1968.
- Whitelock, Dorothy. "William of Malmesbury on the Works of King Alfred." *Medieval Literature and Civilization*. D. A. Pearsall and R. A. Waldron eds. London: Athlone, 1969. Pp. 78-93.
- Whitelock, Dorothy, et al., trans. *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1962.
- Wimsatt, W. K., and Monroe C. Beardsley. "The Intentional Fallacy." *Critical Theory Since Plato* Hazard Adams, ed. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1971. Pp. 944-951.
- Wise, Francis, ed. *Annales rerum gestarum Ælfredi magni auctore asserio menevensi, recensuit franciscus wise*. Oxford: Oxford Press, 1722.
- Wright, Thomas. "Some Historical Doubts Relating to the Biographer Asser in a Letter to Sir Henry Ellis, K.H., F.R.S., Secretary." *Archaeologia* 29 (1842): 192-201

Appendix A: Notes to the Alfred Dossier with Corrections to Stevenson's Apparatus

Chapter 0 (Epistolary "Dedication")

For a discussion, see pp. 28-29.

Chapter 1

[1,5] *habuntantissime*, Ar, is misreported by Stevenson.

[1,6] *Elfredus*, SD2, is not reported by Stevenson.

[1,14] the orthography *Ceolhuald*, JoW, is misreported by Stevenson.

[1,16] *qui fuit esla*, W, St, derives from JoW and is not reported in the *Vita* tradition.

[1,18] *qui...Freothe gar*, W, St, derives from JoW and is not reported in the *Vita* tradition.

[1,18] St does not report the name *Brand*, SD1, SD2, JoW.

[1,20] St gives a stylized form of *Woden*.

[1,20] *Ffrihowalde*, Ar, and [1,21] *Ffrealaf*, Co, Ar, appear to be a stylization characteristic to the Ar transcriber, as the double-f form is repeated in this same line (*Ffingodwulfe*, and also [14,1], [15,4], and [17,6]). The stylization is not always produced by Co (see, [1,21]).

[1,23] *iamiudum*, Ar, is not reported by Stevenson.

[1,24] *insignis*, SD1, SD2, and *faciens*, SD1, SD2, are unreported by Stevenson.

[1,25] *exorsus*, SD1, SD2, is unreported by Stevenson.

[1,27] *sonis*, B, is unreported by Stevenson.

[1,28] the gloss of Geta derives from Caelius Sedulius's *Paschale Carmen* in Parker's transcript (a misidentification of Geta the slave with the god Geat⁵⁶⁸) and is given a brief treatment by Stevenson in his Notes. Stevenson considers the use of Sedulius in the *Historia regum* a redaction to the original that also appears in the transmitted text of the Cotton Otho A.xii. He writes:

That the ensuing quotation was present in the original work is proved by the presence of the first three lines, followed by *et cetera*, in the northern compilation handed down to us by Symeon of Durham. From Symeon these three lines were taken by the twelfth-century author of the St. Albans compilation that forms the nucleus of the chronicles of Roger of Wendover and Matthew of Paris. But in these works they are transferred to Offa under 758, whose pedigree from Woden to Adam agreed with the one here given.⁵⁶⁹ Sedulius was, from his religious subjects, a very favourite poet in Western Europe. Bede and Aldhelm make frequent references to him in their grammatical works, and he was well known to Alcuin and to the Carolingian poets. See the index of writers who quote or imitate him given at the end of Huemer's edition, to which the present work should be added. The passage here quoted appears, rearranged so as to suit the requirements of metrical prose, in the prologue of the Life of St. Eloy. The commencement of the first hymn of Sedulius is quoted in the late tenth-century Life of St. Oswald. Sedulius is mentioned amongst the authors in the library at York by Alcuin. Leland met with a copy of the *Carmen Paschale* at Sherborne. Sedulius is referred to in a poem wrongly attributed to Alcuin, but which seems to be by Aethilwald, a contemporary Northumbrian (?) writer. (162-3)

⁵⁶⁸ Stevenson, *Asser's Life*, p. 163.

⁵⁶⁹ Indeed, these chronicles match the Sedulius quote from SD1, with the "et cetera" included.

Stevenson's makes three assumptions. The first is that Sedulius's *Paschale Carmen* was popular in the middle ages, and Asser had likely known it. This may have been the case, as the popularity of the *Paschale Carmen* is widely known. The qualification that the *Paschale Carmen* was well known does necessarily equate the quote as originating from a pre-Cottonian exemplar. Co, W, and SD1 are all witness to the Sedulius in the *Vita* tradition; Co and W are witnesses to the passage specifically in Cotton Otho A.xii. The second observation is that, excluding Audoin of Rouen's rearrangement of the Sedulius in the prologue to his *Vita Sti. Eligius*, every classical and medieval witness to the Sedulius quote reproduces the protracted version from the *Historia regum* and not the expanded one found in the *Vita Ælfredi*. Besides their protracted form in the *Historia regum*, the ten lines of Sedulius do not appear to be reproduced in the tradition of the *Vita* until the sixteenth century. Furthermore, neither extant witness to the *Vita Ælfredi* nor twelfth-century chronicle that treats the *Vita Ælfredi* material gives the reading of Sedulius found in the Co transcript in this context; this includes the *Chronica chronicarum* which excludes the gloss entirely.

The *Historia regum* does give a partial gloss. Wise testifies that the Cotton Otho A.xii agreed with the Co transcript reading [1,26-35]; however, the authority of Wise's edition is suspect. His collator, James Hill, utilized Camden's edition for his collation, and at times appears to have been copying from one of the chronicle sources. Stevenson asserts that Wise, in several cases, mistakenly gives readings he states are not in the manuscript. In Stevenson's opinion, "[t]his confusion renders it probable that in other cases the readings given by Wise as those of the MS. were really alterations by Parker" (xxix). It is undeniable that Wise's intentions with his edition superseded the reality of his scholarly efforts, and so his witness to the Sedulius may rest solely on Hill's authority. Furthermore, evidence that Hill was basing his collation on readings

given in the *Historia regum* or the Corpus Christi Oxford manuscript of the *Chronica chronicarum* is evidenced by his supplying of "Sem" in Alfred's genealogy (see above, Chapter 5) instead of "Seth."

The third observation by Stevenson is that the phrase "et cetera" in Byrhtferth's chronicle implies a shortening of available evidence extant in the Cotton Otho A.xii. This might be true, but characteristics of Byrhtferth's writing do not immediately corroborate this claim. We find a similarity use of partial quotes with "et cetera" in Byrhtferth's *Vita St. Oswaldi*, where he quotes Psalm 67(68): 1. He writes:

Ille uero, uidens eum sua uirtute non posse uincere, inuocauit Domini auxilium, dicendo:

'Exsurge Deus, et dissipentur inimici eius', et cetera.⁵⁷⁰ (Lapidge, *Byrhtferth* 160)

"et cetera," in this context, is supplied in lieu of the source material, which was readily available to Byrhtferth's readers, as was the *Paschale Carmen*; in other words, Byrhtferth tends to add glosses in the form of verse in their partial form. This does not prove, as Stevenson claims, that the source was present in the source material, nor does it affirm the opposite. Furthermore, Byrhtferth was exceptionally familiar with Sedulius's work, specifically the passage in question. Lapidge has pointed out that the structure of the same portion from the first book of the *Paschale Carmen* used in the *Historia regum* and in the Co transcript is recast by Byrhtferth for use in the opening lines of his *Vita S. Oswaldi*.⁵⁷¹ Further, evidence for Byrhtferth's characteristic supplying of quotes at the beginning of his treatments reveal that they are often supplemental to the narrative. This example found in Byrhtferth's *Vita St. Oswaldi* comes from Sedulius' *Hymni*, i 1-4 and 109-10:

⁵⁷⁰ Lapidge, Michael. *Byrhtferth of Ramsey*, p. 160

⁵⁷¹ Lapidge, *Byrhtferth of Ramsey*, p. 2, fn. 2

Finito carmine, adiunxerunt laudes laudibus atque concinere ceperunt uersus Sedulii de laude Christi, consona uoce modulantes:

Cantemus, socii, Domino cantemus honorem:

Dulcis amor Christi personet ore pio.

Primus ad ima ruit magna de luce superbus;

Sic homo cum tumuit primus ad ima ruit.

...

Gloria magna patri, semper tibi gloria nate,

Cum spiritu sancto: gloria magna patri! —⁵⁷²

In this scene, Byrhtferth gives Sedulius' *Hymni*, several lines of which here are not present in his source material (the *Vita St. Dunstani*), to a chorus of heavenly souls in St. Augustine's monastery. The effect is to augment with partial semi-related materials for the purposes of exhortation.

The Co transcript gives only one reading from Sedulius, and there are no more glosses of its kind in any of the witnesses, or elsewhere in Co. The *Historia regum*, on the other hand, supplies several interjections into the chronicle material (in addition to the Sedulius) in passages related to the *Vita* material:

- *HR* heavily emends 866 and adds a passage taken from Jerome.
- *HR* adds a quote from Boethius and Matthew under the year 868
- *HR* adds Boethius de Consul. Iii.1-3, 7-8 & variations to 871 (ch 35)
- *HR* quotes Baruch, iii. 20, 21: anno 871

⁵⁷² Lapidge, *Byrhtferth of Ramsey*, pp. 162-4.

- *HR* adds "Inveterate dierum malorum" from Daniel xiii 52, in the year 871
- *HR* quotes Boethius, ii, 1-4; 17-21, under the year 877.
- Other quotes appear under the year 887 that are not in Asser.

Nevertheless, at present, as it was during Stevenson's day, it is as difficult to evaluate the originality of this gloss based on the silence of the available witnesses. The claim that the gloss is strictly original to the Cotton Otho A.xii MS is based on Co's and Wise's authorities, though it is possibly corroborated by B's witness to it. Stevenson claims that B was made from the MS and Parker's edition, given the mistakes Eowwa for Eoppa in ch. 1, and Faroli for Karoli in ch.8; however, it is also a reasonable prospect to suggest these mistakes were due to its being copied from the Co transcript, due to an incautious scribe, and that they were not present in BL Cotton Otho A.xii. B's derivation must be evaluated in light of these observations.

While there is no strict certainty, due to the contemporaneity of the Cottonian manuscript and the treatments of the *Vita* material by Byrhtferth in his chronicle—not to say that the Cottonian manuscript was of Byrhtferthian origin (which is impossible to prove)—that the Sedulius was known in a version of the *Vita Ælfredi* that pre-dated the creation of the Cottonian manuscript, we might offer a few potential cases that might prompt future research. One possible explanation is that the Sedulius gloss was transmitted to the Cotton Otho A.xii in the early-eleventh century in Northumbria. Byrhtferth, whose other works includes the *Vita St. Oswaldi*, the *Vita St. Ecgwini*, a book of computus called his *Enchiridion*, and possibly *Vita St. Dunstani*, which is signed "B," is known to have added to, removed, and transposed whole sections of his source material as gloss or elaboration. While the Sedulius poem does appear to have derived from the *Vita* tradition, given Byrhtferth's preeminent familiarity with and use of this passage, there are additional potentialities for the origin of the ten lines of Sedulius, with some

reservation, that might be corroborated with future research. The Sedulius has the potentiality to have been 1) transmitted by Parker through Byrhtferth and expanded to ten-line form in Cotton Otho A.xii, due to the passage's ubiquity and Parker's familiarity with Matthew of Paris, or 2) transmitted in redacted form through a Northumbrian, possibly by Byrhtferth. Unfortunately, because we cannot corroborate, with absolute accuracy, the copy of the *Vita* that Byrhtferth had access to was the Cotton Otho A.xii, this must remain only a guess.

[1,30] *cadunt*, Ar, is unreported by Stevenson.

[1,31] *tradunt*, Ar, is not reported by Stevenson.

[1,33] many of the forms of *chordarum* across all sources are misreported by Stevenson.

[1,36] *Beaw* is stylized by Stevenson; the name appears to be corrupted in SD2.

[1,37] *Seldwa*, SD1, *Scelduua*, SD2, *Scelduuea*, Jow, are misreported by Stevenson.

[1,38] *Hatra*, SD1, SD2, is misreported by Stevenson; forms of *Beduwig* across several sources are misreported by Stevenson.

[1,39] MS Bodley 157 has *Sem*. This is evidence that Stevenson was utilizing a derivative copy of the *Chronica*, possibly MS Bodley 297, which has *Seth*. See above, pp. 205-206, 371.

[1,40] The passage "qui fuit Iared" appears to have derived from MS Bodley 297, as it is not present in MS Bodley 157. Stevenson reproduces Wise.

[1,41] *Caynan*, B, not given by Stevenson.

[1,42] *primi hominis*, SD1, not given, though it is original to SD1.

Chapter 2

[2,5] *Indis* was the reading in the Cotton manuscript according to Wise.

[2,6] *Stuph*, SD1, SD2, JoW, is misreported by Stevenson; *Wightgur*, B, is misreported; *eciam*, is not reported. Stuf and Wihtgar are mentioned under years 530 and 534 in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, and Stevenson comments that the *Chronicle* perhaps derived its reference from Asser (163). The strange variation of Wihtzur for Wihtgar by Wise, was likely due to a transcription error by Hill.

[2,7] *Vectae*, SD2, and *Uectae*, JoW are not given by Stevenson.

[2,8] *Cinric*, SD2, is not reported by Stevenson.

[2,11] across most sources, forms of *Guuihtgaraburhg* are misreported by Stevenson.

Chapter 3

[3,6] *hyemaverunt*, W, SD1, are misreported by Stevenson.

[3,6-7] each of the main copyists follows the *Vita* in retaining the gloss of Sheppey (Sceapieg) as *insula ovium*. This gloss is omitted by ASNs.

[3,8] *proprior*, B, Ar, is not reported by Stevenson.

[3,10] forms of *East-Seaxum* are misreported by Stvenson.

Chapter 4

[4,1] *quoque*, SD1, is not mentioned by Stevenson.

Corrections to Stevenson's Apparatus:

[4,3] Stevenson misses that the SD1, SD2 and Co all have the reading *hostium* while *ostium* is otherwise in JoW; SD1 gives *Doroberniam*, which is misreported by Stevenson.

[4,4] The second *civitatem* in this line (*id est Cantwariorum civitatem et Londoniam civitatem*) Stevenson correctly states is the reading in Parker's edition and Ar: it is also present in

Wise's edition. This reading appears to derive from the ASN, and was derived by Wise through Parker.

[4,5] *aquilonali*, Co, is reported *aquilonari* by Stevenson; "Tāmsis" is the reading in both SD1 and ASN: for *Tamensis*. Stevenson gives the long version for the SD1 and the shortened version for ASN.

[4,9] *omnium* is the reading in SD2.

Chapter 5

[5,2] *Suhtrige*, SD1, is misreported in Stevenson. JoW—MS Bodley 157—supplies *suthregiam* instead of Stevenson's *suthregia* (there is a suspension mark over the *a*). Possibly a misprint in the edition.

[5,4] *Occidentalium*, B, Ar, W, ASN, derives, as Stevenson states, from ASN.

[5,5] *Eius*, is the reading in SD2, unreported in Stevenson.

Chapter 6

[6,1] *secondo*, SD1, is written above erasure to correct the date.

[6,1-2] Wise states that the Cotton manuscript was "desunt." *Filius Æthelwulfi regis*, W, ASN, St, appears, as Stevenson states, to be a Parkerian emendation from ASN.

[6,2] *rex* is the reading in all sources but St and JoW, but is not mentioned by Stevenson. Given the proximity to *filius Æthelwulfi*, it is likely this reading derived from the ASN.

[6,4] *rapuerunt*, SD1, SD2, is not given by Stevenson.

[6,5] *nativitatis Elfredi* is unique to SD2 and may be a corruption.

Chapter 7

[7,2] *undecimo*, Wise states, was the reading in the Cottonian manuscript, and *quinto* is his correction, likely from SD1 (and SD2) which also has the reading.

[7,6] *occidentaleum habitabant*, SD1, is not given by Stevenson.

[7,7] *subdere posset*, SD1, part of a phrase (to *reluctabantur*) inscribed over erasure. *Posset* is not recorded by Stevenson.

[7,8] *rex* is omitted by SD1, and not mentioned by Stevenson.

Chapter 8

[8,4] *quartus*, B, Ar, derives from ASN. Wise claims that this was present in the Cottonian manuscript, but it is not a reading given by Co, which supposedly would have it. We are in agreement with Stevenson that this reading was a modification to the Cotton manuscript done after the creation of Co (but before B and Ar) that derived from ASN.

Chapter 9

[9,7] In the phrase *ex utraque parte plurimi ceciderunt*, the verb "to die" given by Stevenson, has two variations across all witnesses (setting aside *corruerunt* in SD). Stevenson's apparatus tells us that the Co transcript has *occiderunt*, which it certainly does. The more common word, *ceciderunt*, *cado* for *occido*, is used by Parker in his edition and by Wise in his. Likewise, some of the derivative transcripts of Co (Roger Gales' transcription [Cambridge, Trinity 0.7.25], B and Ar) are with Parker in representing *cado*.

Stevenson's edition, however, does not attest to the reading in the principal John of Worcester manuscript (MS Bodley 157) nor in any copy of the John of Worcester chronicle, all of which agree with Co, keeping the form, *occiderunt*. On the contrary, Stevenson implies through his use of typeface that John agrees with Parker for the fact that that *ceciderunt* is represented in Roman type.

Given the agreement of Co and John, the form of *cado* given by sixteenth-century editions and transcriptions (and retained up to Stevenson) must be viewed as a modernization by editors in response to the lesser attested *occidio*. It is significant that SD1 revises the section but still retains *occidere*: SD1 reads, *corruerunt multique in flumine suffocati sunt et occisi inedicibilis multitudo duces uero predicti ambo ibidem*. Stevenson's retention of Parker's emendation, therefore, cannot stand firmly on available manuscript evidence and should be rejected, as it is not part of the *Vita* tradition.

[9,7] *aquam*, JoW (MS Bodley 157), is not given by Stevenson.

[9,10] *post*, SD1, is misreported by Stevenson.

Chapter 10

[10,2] *Ælfredi*, B, is not given by Stevenson.

[10,3-8] EAdmundus...secondi, derives from ASN.

[10,8] SD1 omits *magnus*, which is not reported in Stevenson.

Chapter 11

[11,2] *totium regni*, SD1, not reported by Stevenson; *ab omnius regali*, JoW (MS Bodley 157), is the reading instead of *ab omni regali*, found in Stevenson and other witnesses.

[11,3] *sempiterno*, SD2, JoW, ASN, not given by Stevenson (*et in sempiterno*, SD2).

[11,4] Co and Ar have the form *graphio*, not *grafio*, reported by Stevenson.

[11,6] *eodemque*, ASN, is reported as *eodem quoque* in Stevenson (which is the reading of B).

[11,9] *suis*, B, AR, ASN, is unreported in Stevenson's apparatus, and this reading in B and Ar derives from ASN.

Chapter 12

[12,5] *Æthelwulfi regis filius*, B, Ar, ASN, derives from ASN; SD1 has the form *Ealhastano*, not *Ealhastanus* as reported by Stevenson.

[12,13] *Æthelbald*, Co, and B, are additions, very likely originating with Parker.

[12,19] Stevenson suggests through the use of Roman type that JoW has the reading *tantum facinus perpetrare tentati sunt* when the *Chronica* has *temptati sunt* with Co, B, Ar, W, and ASN. Stevenson gives *tentati sunt* as a critical emendation, following Wise.

[12,24] *rebellante*, JoW (MS Bodley 157), given as *rebellantibus* in Stevenson.

Chapter 13

[13,8] *Iuthittam*, Ar, is reported as *Iuthitham* in Stevenson.

[13,9] there appear to have been corruptions to the Cotton manuscript here, says Wise; *suo* is a reading supplied by Wise.

[13,14] *eciam*, B, is not reported by Stevenson.

[13,20] *regali*, B, is not reported by Stevenson.

[13,21] *proiiceretur*, B, and *proiiceretur*, Ar, are not given by Stevenson.

[13,26] *reginali*, AR, is not given by Stevenson.

[13,29] *Tcheothiscirum*, Ar, is not the form given by Stevenson; *id est gentium*, W, derives from ASN through B.

[13,33] *eciam*, B, is not reported by Stevenson; *veridicis*, B, Ar, is not reported by Stevenson.

Chapter 14

[14,5] *fieri*, the only other source that produces this reading exactly is Cambridge, Trinity B.11.16.

[14,10] *Beorthric*, B, is not reported with this spelling in Stevenson.

[14,15] *rege*, Ar, is not reported by Stevenson.

Chapter 15

[15,2] *Occidentales* appears to derive from ASN.

[15,4] *magnum et*, Ar, W, derives from ASN.

The *Chronica chronicarum* has the odd variation *et sanctimonialium sumpto indumento* for *et sanctimoninalium indumento assumpto* (Co).

[15,18; 15,19] *irrationabiliter* and *irrationabilius* seem to have been corrected (possibly from *inrationa...*) against the text of ASN.

[15,25] the relationship of ASN and GC might be clarified through a study of the the apparent alteration of Pavia to Papia (or Papua) the ASN manuscript, Trinity R.7.25.

Chapter 16

[16,2] omission of *a*, SD2, JoW, not reported in Stevenson.

[16,3] *et*, SD1, not reported in Stevenson.

[16,6] SD1's omission of *scribe* or *scriber* not reported by Stevenson.

[16, 18] *procreaverat*, Ar, not reported by Stevenson.

[16,23] *et* is omitted from B and JoW, both omissions not given by Stevenson.

[16,24] *ultimum*, JoW, incorrectly reported by Stevenson.

[16,28] *portare*, JoW, incorrectly reported by Stevenson.

[16,32] the variations in SD2 are not given by Stevenson.

[16,34] *apostolici*, JoW (MS Bodley 157), not given by Stevenson (SD2 not reported).

Chapter 17

[17,1] Stevenson's footnote, giving the reading "Illo idibus Ianuarii" is not present in MS Bodley 157. This is further demonstrable proof that Stevenson was using a derivative manuscript.

[17,1-2] *sepultoque... Wintoniam*, this reading appears to derive from ASN.

[17,8] *ac*, SD2, JoW, not given by Stevenson.

Chapter 17b (interpolation from ASN)

[17b,1] this chapter was added to the Cottonian manuscript.

[17b,3] the variant, *tercii*, in ASN, is not given by Stevenson.

Chapter 18

[18,3] *Occidentalium Saxonum*, Co, Ar, W, ASN, is derived from ASN. This reading had not been added to B, suggesting that at some point the B transcript was independent from the Ar and Co transcripts, or that the B transcript was never returned to in order to add it.

[18,14] *muliebrem*, SD2, is corrupt.

Chapter 19

[19,4] *Schireburnan*, Ar, is incorrectly given by Stevenson.

Chapter 20

[20,2] *faedus*, B, is not the form given by Stevenson.

[20,4] *faedere*, B, is not the form given by Stevenson.

[20,6] *faedere*, B, and *federeque*, SD1, are not the forms given by Stevenson; the variant *britanniae fines duoibus introiit et sic ad regnum* appears SD1. *Duoibus* is damaged near the right margin of the MS due to erasure.

[20,7] *spernentis*, Ar, is not given by Stevenson.

[20,9] Wise's edition derives the reading *Cantii plagam depopulati sunt* from Parker's edition or Ar. Ar has the earliest form of this variation. Other sources have *Cantiae plagam depopulati sunt*. Wise also states that this variant was present in the Cotton Otho A.xii MS.

Chapter 21

[21,4] *quinque annis*, Ar, is marked as "desunt" by Wise and *annis* is not given by Stevenson. This appears to be a Parkerian reading. The reading *gubernanacula*, JoW (MS Bodley 157), is likewise not given by Stevenson.

[21,6] *Brittanniae*, SD1, is not given by Stevenson; *et*, JoW, is present in MS Bodley 157, but it is stated as omitted by Stevenson.

[21,15] *meae*, B, Are, this form is not given by Stevenson.

[21,16] *est*, B, is not given by Stevenson.

[21,18] *esse*, which Stevenson gives, is omitted from B.

Chapter 22

[22,18-19] *sicut...vidimus* derives from no source manuscript and is likely original to the Cotton manuscript.

Chapter 23

[23,1] *quadam*, SD1, SD2, is not given by Stevenson.

[23,7] *respondit*, SD1, SD2, is not given by Stevenson.

[23,13] *inquit*, Ar, is given incorrectly by Stevenson.

Chapter 24

[24,5] *inseperabiliter*, Ar, is not given by Stevenson.

Chapter 25

[25,3] *fiere*, B, is given incorrectly by Stevenson.

[25,6] *et* is omitted by B, given incorrectly by Stevenson.

[25,8] *credo*, B, is a reading not given by Stevenson.

[25,10] *infestacionibus*, B, is a form not given by Stevenson.

[25,11; 25,16] *eciam*, B, is incorrectly given by Stevenson.

Chapter 26

[26,2] JoW, MS Bodley 157, the *r* in *predictus* is written over a rubricated *p*.

Chapter 27

[27,26] JoW remarks on Asser's instruction of Alfred.

Chapter 29

[29,2] *erat tunc* derives from the *Vita* tradition. There is no evidence to suggest that this phrase derives from ASN, as Stevenson has suggested. See above, p. 331, fn. 534.

[29,6] Wise derives his gloss "Mucil eo quod erat corpore magnus" from marginalia in Ar, indicative that he had been using Ar for collation purposes for his edition.

Chapter 30

[30,6] *Burrhed*, B, is not a form of the name given by Stevenson.

John of Worcester MS 157 has *in illo loco eodem anno* instead of *in eodem loco eodem anno* found in Co. *illo*, a later scribal alteration, is found in the margin of MS Bodley 157.

Chapter 32

[32,2] Wise states that *vigesimo primo* was the reading in the Cotton manuscript.

Chapter 33

[33,3] *ipse*, Co, is incorrectly given by Stevenson.

[33,4] *occisa*, Ar: Wise states that this is the reading in the Cotton manuscript, but as this reading is only witnessed by Ar, we have reasons to doubt this claim, as Wise frequently borrowed from Ar as though from Cotton.

Chapter 34

[34,1] there are slight variations to the way Ceolnoth of Canterbury is named. JoW and SD2 read: *quo etiam anno Ceolnothus dorubernensis archiepiscopus defunctus*—the variant *dorubernensis* is minor but is not given in Stevenson. Stevenson also lists *antistes* for SD1, where it is omitted.

Chapter 35

[35,2] Wise states that *vigesimo secundo*, was the reading in the Cotton manuscript.

[25,5] the alternate reading from *ASN*, (ms *rędinga*), has erasure over the *a* which could have once been a suspension mark (and, therefore, this reading might not be a variant), as the passage is otherwise very close to *Co*. The passage beginning *Exosę memorię to rędinga in* is underlined in ochre pencil, likely from Parker or one of his secretaries. Much of this leaf shows sign of Parker's hand, and the damage may be due to his publication program.

[35,13-14] *Anglice Latine Anglorum Campus*, *St*, is a candidate for Parkerian emendation.

[35,15] *pugnatum*, *St*, *Co*, *B*, *Ar*, *W*, *ASN*, is absent from *JoW*, (*MS Bodley 157*), but *Stevenson* gives this reading. *Est* is likewise omitted from *Bodley 157*, though *Stevenson* gives this reading.