

## *The Beginnings of Wessex*

IT has long been evident that we cannot accept without question the story of the conquest of Wessex told by the 'Old-English Chronicle.' It is enough to justify the doubts to reflect that the 'Chronicle' gives the dates of events that happened a century before the first conversion of an English king to Christianity, the earliest date at which it would have been possible to commit the annals to writing. Of the use of runes for keeping annals there can be no question.<sup>1</sup> It is therefore evident that these annals must rest upon a basis of song or tradition or be figments of later times. The latter is the view that Sir Henry Howorth maintains in the October number of this *Review*. According to him they are a concoction of the time of Edward the Elder, which he holds to be the date of the composition of the 'Chronicle.' The procedure of this concoctor, according to Sir Henry Howorth, was singular to a degree. Not being satisfied with taking a list of Welsh names, possibly 'some series of Welsh princely names,' and passing them off as the ancestors of his king, he pressed into his service the very latest novelty in the shape of a man's name—to wit, the Scandinavian *Stúfr*,<sup>2</sup> which he conferred upon an unnecessary nephew

<sup>1</sup> Palgrave, *English Commonwealth*, i. 391, suggested the use of runes for this purpose, and they are referred to by Freeman, *Norman Conquest*, i. 10. Scherer, *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur*, p. 23, has truly remarked that they were never used in this way.

<sup>2</sup> The name *Stuf*, upon which this assertion rests, has been claimed as Scandinavian by E. Jessen, *Undersøgelser til nordisk Historie*, p. 55, who endeavoured to prove from it that the English Jutes were Scandinavians. It is exceedingly doubtful whether the Norse *stúfr* was in use as a personal name early enough to support Sir Henry Howorth's assertion. It was really a nickname, meaning 'stump.' In the sagas I have been able to trace only two men bearing this name, both much later in date than the Chronicle. One is the Greenlander *Stuf*, a retainer of St. Olaf of Norway, and the other is the blind scald of Harald Hardrada, who accompanied him to Stamford Bridge. The excessive rarity of the name may be gauged by the tale told in the saga of this king. When *Stúfr* informed the king of his name, the latter remarked, 'You have an improbable' (*ónafnlígr*, literally 'un-name-like') 'name' (*Floatejar-bók*, iii. 880). Phonologically there is nothing to prove that *Stuf* is not a native English form, whether it corresponds to the Norse *Stúfr*, which is assumed to stand for *Stumf*, or whether it is the English cognate of the Greek *στύρος*, which is recorded in the derivatives *stybb*, *stofn*, and *styfic*. Nearly every Germanic language affords instances of personal names that occur only once or twice, and this is more especially true of hypocoristic forms, a category to which *Stuf*, being a single-stem name, seems to belong. I do not think that the name *Stuf* can be branded as bogus by reason of its rarity, and I can see no valid reason for holding that it is borrowed from the Norse.

of the bogus founder of Wessex. All this is so astonishing that it is worth while to examine Sir Henry Howorth's statements.

After setting forth several seeming inconsistencies in the narrative, upon which he lays great stress, but which are non-existent or unimportant,<sup>3</sup> he brings forward the familiar suggestion that some of the names of the actors are evolved from place names. It is easy to make these suggestions, especially when one is not fettered by considerations of the laws of Old-English philology, and we have had many such suggestions.<sup>4</sup> It is not explained why, given the fact that *Cerdices-leaf*, &c., is derived from a man's name *Cerdic*, this name should be selected out of the thousands of personal names embodied in local names with which the concoctor must have been familiar and converted into the founder of the kingdom. If it had been a name familiar in Germanic song, we might understand the choice, but it is a rare and difficult name. Some of the alleged inventions are quite unnecessary for the history. We hear nothing more of Port, Bieda, and Mægla, or of their descendants. The reference to the death of a very noble young Briton during the fight following their landing has the appearance of being derived from a lay or tradition.

Of the nine names cited by Sir Henry Howorth and denounced as being either Welsh or non-Teutonic, there are only two that have any claim to belong to these categories. One of these is *Cerdic*,

<sup>3</sup> I cannot see what is meant by saying that the description of Cerdic and Cynric as 'two ealdormen involves an anachronism.' *Ealdorman* is the natural Old-English word for chief, and it is applied to Romans, Britons, and men of other races. In the *Chronicle* we read of the slaying of 'twelve Welsh ealdormen' in 465, and of 'two ealdormen' in 568. There is no serious difficulty about the passage in 534, where Stuf and Wihthgar are called *nefan* of Cerdic and Cynric, who are stated to be father and son. The word *nefa* in Old English does not mean exclusively 'nephew,' but may mean 'grandson' or even 'stepson.' It is historically the same word as the Latin *nepos*, Greek ἀνεψίος, &c., an Indo-Germanic word that has no clearly defined meaning beyond that of 'kinman' or 'descendant.' Sir Henry Howorth objects that Port, Bieda, and Mægla are made to slay 'not the Walas, but a young British man.' This seems to have no point unless it is intended to convey that Briton is not synonymous with Welsh, or that one man only was slain on this occasion. The former can easily be disproved by the *Chronicle* itself or by Beda, while the latter is excluded by the fact that the *Chronicle* says 'a very noble young Briton,' not simply 'a young British man.'

<sup>4</sup> Thus Professor Earle (*Two of the Saxon Chronicles Parallel*, p. ix) suggested that Shoreham, Lancing, and Chichester (*Cissan-coaster*) were probably responsible for the names of Ælle's sons Cyman, Wlencing, and Cissa. The former town is held to stand for the impossible *Cymeneshoreham*, while there is nothing to connect the pre-English name of Chichester with any name like Cissa. The initial *w* in Old English names was still pronounced at the time of the Norman Conquest, and we may be sure, therefore, that the *Lancinges* of Domesday had no initial *w*. *Wlencingas* would have produced something like 'Lanching.' The name-stem from which *Wlencing* is derived appears in Domesday in the form *Walanc* (= O.E. *Wlanc*) in *Walanceslau* (l. 859). Similarly Domesday represents O. E. *Wr-* by *Wur-* or *Wer-*. The assertion that the *Hrof of Hrofes-coaster* is from *Durobrevis* is one of the curiosities of that strange book, the *Romans of Britain*, by H. C. Coote.

which he roundly states to be 'merely the Welsh Ceredig or Caradoc.' This was said by Sir Francis Palgrave,<sup>5</sup> but the Welsh names are distinct, and there can be no talk of the latter appearing as *Cerdic*. It is questionable whether *Cerdic* can represent *Ceredig*, for that name, originally *Coroticus*,<sup>6</sup> appears much later as *Ceretic*,<sup>7</sup> and there is no reason for the disappearance in early West-Saxon of the medial and accented vowel, or for the change of *t* to *d*. The reason for saying that *Cerdic* is Welsh is its occurrence in Beda as the name of a Welsh king.<sup>8</sup> Beda's form puzzles the Welsh

<sup>5</sup> *English Commonwealth*, i. 899, note.

<sup>6</sup> Rhys, *Celtic Britain*, p. 257, citing a letter of St. Patrick in Haddan and Stubbs, *Councils*, ii. pp. 314-319. So St. Brieu's Life calls the inhabitants or district of Cardigan (*Ceredigianum*) 'gens Corriticiana; ' *AA. SS.*, 1 Mali, i. 92.

<sup>7</sup> In the Book of St. Chad (Rhys and Evans, *Liber Landavensis*, pp. 199, 220, 247, 279) it is written *Ceretic* between 974 and 992.

<sup>8</sup> *Historia Ecclesiastica*, iv. 28; probably the *Certic*, king of Elmet, of the *Historia Brittonum*, ed. Mommsen, p. 206. The spelling here is probably based upon an English manuscript, for the Genealogies in which it occurs repeat English inflexional forms in the Latin, they copy the *D* as *D*, and show generally that they are derived from an English original. Zimmer, *Nennius Vindictus*, p. 78, holds that they were the work of a northern Briton. The alleged interpreter of Hengist and Vortigern is called *Ceretic* in the best MSS. of the *Historia*, though others exhibit the forms *Cerdic*, *Cedic* (ed. Mommsen, p. 177). The passage 'fecit Henegistus convivium Guorthigirno et militibus suis et interpreti suo, qui vocatur Ceretic,' has been read by Müllenhoff (*Beowulf*, Berlin, 1889, p. 62) to mean that *Cerdic* signifies 'interpreter,' and he refers to Irish *etarcert*, 'interpretatio; ' *elercerta*, 'interpretatur,' &c., in Zeus-Ebel, *Grammatica Celtica*, p. 874. But Prof. Rhys thinks it probable that this *cert* would appear in Welsh with a *p* instead of *c*. Moreover the omission of the *cl* = *inter* would seriously change the meaning. The form of *Cerdic* in English is irregular. If from *Cerdic*, it ought to appear as *Ceordic*. The form *Ceardic*, which occurs occasionally in the genealogy in the Parker MS., and in the somewhat earlier text in Sweet's *Oldest English Texts*, p. 179, would normally represent an older *Cardic*, but in Alfred's time there are instances of the confusion of *ear* and *eor* plus a consonant. Cf. Cosijn, *Altwestsächsische Grammatik*, i. § 13. An undoubted *Cerdic*, *Ceardic*, *Cardic* was a *praefectus* (misprinted *presbyter*) of king Cynewulf of Wessex, and attests between 759 and 774 (*Cart. Sax.* i. 266, 284, 314). The texts are derived from later chartularies, and they may all represent an original *Cerdic*, for thirteenth and fourteenth century scribes copy *æ* as *ea* or *e* simply. The *Ceardices-beorg* of the twelfth century Codex Wintoniensis (*Cart. Sax.* ii. 241) at Hurstbourne, Hants, may also represent a *Cerdic* in the same way. An unknown Bishop *Cerdic* subscribes a charter of 981 (*Cod. Diplom.* iii. 184). The stem of the name occurs also as a name in 949, *Cardan hleaw*, 'Carda's tumulus,' at Welford, Berks (*Cart. Sax.* iii. 29, an original charter), which is copied into the Abingdon Chartulary from a charter of 958 as *Cerdan* or *Cerdan hleaw*, for *hleaw* (*Cart. Sax.* iii. 147). There was also a *Cardan stigol* at Poitwick, co. Worcester (*ibid.* 588, from a pre-Norman text). Cf. also *Cardington*, co. Salop, *Cardintune*, in *Domesday*, i. 255. There are also *Cerd* forms in *Cerdentone*, *Domesday*, i. 180 b, co. Middlesex, for *Cerdan-tun* and *Cerdes-ling* (? Charlneh), co. Somerset (*ibid.* i. 93, col. 2), and *Cerdes-lai*, Chearsley, co. Bucks (*ibid.* i. 180), a form that cannot be reconciled with Dr. Guest's strange identification of this village with the *Cerdeses-leag* of the *Chronicle*. *Domesday* (i. 266 b) also records a Cheshire *Cerdingham*. The use of the English hypocoristic suffix *a* in these names clearly proves that the stem *Cerd* or *Card* had been adopted into English, whatever its ultimate origin may have been. It is possible that the stem *Card* is represented by *Cadd(a)* and *Cerd* by *Cedd(a)*, which would be regular hypocoristic formations. The possibility of borrowing from the Britons before the English conquest cannot be excluded from

philologist quite as much as it does the English, for it stands absolutely alone. A very great German scholar has suggested that Cerdic the West-Saxon may have derived his name from connexion with the Britons of *Aremorica*.<sup>9</sup> The next name is Port, which we are told was 'manufactured out of the Latin *Portus*.' This may be so. But there is evidence that Port did exist as an English personal name.<sup>10</sup> Müllenhoff held that Port's name was evidence of relations with the Romans, which he referred to Gaul, the coasts of which the Saxons had been harrying for more than a century before Port was born. We are next told that 'Cynric (or Kenrick) is also a Welsh name.' There is, it is true, a Welsh name *Cynuric*,<sup>11</sup> from which *Kenrick* may descend,<sup>12</sup> but Professor Rhys tells me that this seems to be an adaptation of an English name. It could not in any case appear as *Cynric* in the ninth or tenth century. The latter, so far from being a Welsh name, is an undoubted English one.<sup>13</sup> We then read that 'Elesa and Esla are apparently forms of one name,' and that neither of them is Teutonic. The only ground for the latter assertion is that there is a Welsh *Heli*. Now Elesa and Esla are distinct names and are

consideration. The Norsemen at a later time borrowed several Celtic names, such as *Kormakr*, *Nial*, and the *Nialsaga* shows us an Icelander bearing the Irish name of *Nial* as early as the tenth century. Yet his sons bear Norse names.

<sup>9</sup> Karl Müllenhoff, *Beowulf*, Berlin, 1889, p. 62. But, as will be seen below, the settlement in *Aremorica* does not seem to have taken place early enough for this.

<sup>10</sup> Thus there is a *Portes wedu* at Stoneham, Hants (*Codex Diplom.* iv. 95), and a *Portes-bricg* in the same place (*ibid.* iv. 96); *Portesham*, co. Dorset, *Portes-hamme* (*ibid.* iv. 80); *Portishcad*, co. Somerset; *Portes-ladc*, co. Sussex (*Portes-lage* (?)) (*Domesday Book*, i. 26 b, col. 2); *Portes-ig* (*Cod. Diplom.* iv. 191). There is a *Portington* in co. York, whose Domesday form (*Portiton*, i. 304 b) may represent *Portington* or *Portan-tun*. The *Portan-merc* in Worcestershire (*Cart. Sax.* iii. 533) contains the hypocoristic suffix *-a*, and the same name seems to occur in *Portan-beorg*, co. Wilts (*Cod. Diplom.* iv. 4, printed *Wortan* in *Cart. Sax.* iii. 240). It is not impossible that *Port* and *Porta* may be native English, for the Mercian royal family shows us several Germanic names beginning with *p*, which seem to have changed their initial by some unknown hypocoristic law. There are traces of the related personal names *Purta* and *Pyrtā*, and a Germanic *port* seems to be recorded in the O.-E. *verba portian*, *pyrtan*, 'to beat.' A continental *Porto*, a monk of the Poitevin Charroux (Vienne), occurs in the ninth century at Reichenau (*Lib. Confrat. Augiensis*, ed. Piper, col. 348, 32). But it is not clear whether this corresponds to O.-E. *Porta* or to *Borda* (by the High-German sound-change).

<sup>11</sup> *Kynuric*, Rhys and Evans, *Red Book of Hergest*, pp. 269, 311, 324, 368.

<sup>12</sup> The confusion with the English name may be seen in the *Calendar of Patent Rolls*, Edward I, where a *Cynuric*, son of Llywarch, appears in 1284 as *Kenswrek*, son of Louhargh (p. 121), and in 1293 as *Kenrick*, son of Thlewargus (*ibid.* p. 521). An instructive example of the adoption of Old-English names by the Welsh may be seen in the Griffin ap *Hereward* of this *Calendar*, p. 243. The *Liber Landavensis* reveals numerous instances of English personal names in Welsh districts in the eleventh and twelfth centuries.

<sup>13</sup> The more usual and later form is *Cyne-ric*, but *Cynric* is regular. Cf. Sievers, *Anglia*, xlii. 13, for the syncope. It seems to occur in the corresponding Old High German *Chun(i)rih* (Förstemann, *Alteutsches Namenbuch*, i. 315).

English and Germanic.<sup>14</sup> Sir Henry then states that 'Giwis or Gewissa again is no Teutonic name,' apparently because the Welsh called the West-Saxons by this name. But there is clear proof that it was the native denomination of the latter, and that it is not Welsh.<sup>15</sup> Next we are told that *Cerdices-ora* 'is compounded of the Latin *ora* and the name Cerdic,' and that 'it seems impossible as a Teutonic gloss.' The word *ora* is a genuine Old-English one, which shows by its gender, declension, and form that it is not the Latin *ora*, but is a cognate. It is then stated that 'Bieda and Mægla are very un-Teutonic in look, and Mægla seems to be certainly a Welsh gloss.' Both these names are English, the former being the spelling of the great Northumbrian historian's name in the Parker MS. of the 'Chronicle,'<sup>16</sup> while the latter is a regular hypocoristic form of a full-name in Mæg-, a well authen-

<sup>14</sup> The former occurs as *Elex* and *Eliso* in the ninth century in Germany (*Liber Confraternitatis Augiensis*, ed. Piper, 41, 18; 408, 12; 458, 28). See further Förstemann, i. 69. It is spelt *Elsa* in the Old-English *Widsith*, line 117. I have failed to find an English bearer of this name, but, as it is a genuine Germanic name, this is an argument that the West-Saxon pedigree is not a forgery of the tenth century. The name of the monk *Elsan* or *Ilsan* of the *Nibelungen Lied* is connected. While *Elesa* represents a Germanic *Aliso(n)*, *Ēsla* is descended from *Ansila(n)*. This, which is a hypocoristic form of a name in *Ans.* O.-E. *Ūs-*, was the name of an ancestor (*Ansila*) of the Gothic kings, according to Jordanes, and it is met with elsewhere on the continent (Förstemann, p. 108). Like *Elesa*, it is a proof of the antiquity of the West-Saxon genealogy, for in Old English this form of the name was superseded by the new formation *Ōsla*.

<sup>15</sup> That the *Giuuys* of the *Annales Cambriae* is an adaptation of the English *Gewis* is proved by the form *Iuuy*s of the 'Brut y Tywysogion' (*Red Book of Hergest*, ed. Rhys and Evans, p. 260), for O. E. *gi* or *ge* might be represented by *i*, but a Welsh *gi* could not possibly be. We have not only the express statements of Beda ('gens Occidentalium Saxonum, qui antiquitus Geuissae vocabantur,' iii. 7; 'episcopus Geuissorum, id est Occidentalium Saxonum' iv. 15. &c.), but the fact that the kings of Wessex described themselves as 'kings of the Gewisse,' a title that was revived by King Edgar in the tenth century. Smith suggested that the name might be connected with the *Visi*- of the Visigoths, a word that does not seem to mean 'west,' but to be the Germanic representative of Indo-Germanic *wesu-s*, 'good' (Skt. *visu-ṣ*, Gaulish *wesu-*). The Visigoths, it may be noted, are called simply *Wesi*, *Wisi* by Trebellius Pollio, Claudian, and Apollinaris Sidonius. See Professor Streitberg, *Indogermanische Forschungen*, iv. 302. They are, no doubt, the *Visi* of the *Notitia Dignitatum Or.* v. 61 (ed. Seeck), who are disguised as *Ursi* in Böcking's text. Cf. Seeck, *praef.* p. xxi, on their Gothic nationality. Müllenhoff (*Beowulf*, p. 68) has connected the West-Saxon name with the Gothic *ga-wiss*, 'junction,' and would thus explain it as 'confederates.' In this case *Gewis* must be regarded as an eponym. Instances are, however, not unknown among the Germanic peoples of the folk being known by a name derived from an ancestor, real or mythical, of their royal house. Thus the Danes were called *Skjöldungar*, from *Skjöld*, the *Scyld* of *Beowulf*, a name that is applied to them, in the form *Scaldingi*, in the *Historia de Sancto Cuthberto*, ed. Arnold (*Simson of Durham*, i. 200, 202). The Franks similarly are called *Merewioingas* (Merowings) in *Beowulf*. The stem *Wisi* occurs in the name of the Lombard *Wisigardis*, the wife of Theodebert I.

<sup>16</sup> Sub ann. 734. Similarly *Biedan-leafod* in 675. The same stem, with another hypocoristic suffix, occurs in *Biedcan-ford* in MS. B, C, and E in 571, where the Parker MS. has *Bedcan-ford*.

ticated English and Germanic name-stem.<sup>17</sup> We have then the familiar assertion that 'Wihtgar is assuredly merely condensed from the men of Wight'—that is, the *Wihtware*. The genitive plural of this form is *wara*, but the archetype of the 'Chronicle' used the older weak form *wara*,<sup>18</sup> the genitive plural of which is *warena*, so that we ought to have *Wihitwarena-burh*, not *Wihitgara-burh*. The change of *w* to *g* in such a position as is here assumed is unknown in Old English, and it never occurs in any of the numerous compounds of *ware* or *waru*.<sup>19</sup> On the other hand, *Wihtgār* is a well-established Old-English masculine name, the first stem of which has no connexion with the Isle of Wight, but is our *wight*,<sup>20</sup> which in personal names probably refers to the *δαίμων* or *genius* of Germanic paganism (cf. *Elf-gar*). It is on record that the second member *gār* was in Old English a *u*-stem,<sup>21</sup> and therefore originally formed its genitive singular in *-a* (*gāra*). Most of these stems in Old English went over to the *o*-declension, and therefore formed their genitive singular in *-es*. By the ninth century the number that retained their original declension could be counted on the fingers. It is therefore evident that this *Wihitgara-burh* of the 'Chronicle,' which is there said to be the burial-place of *Wihtgār*, can only be derived from some older written form or possibly tradition. We can see from the Parker MS. that the scribes were puzzled by this archaic genitive singular, for they convert the correct *Wihitgara-byrg* of 544 into *Wihitgaras-byrg* under 530, under the influence of the genitive *Wihitgares* with which alone they were acquainted.<sup>22</sup> This preservation of the old genitive was first recognised by Professor Cosijn of Leyden,<sup>23</sup> the distinguished author of a grammar of Old West-Saxon, and it has been accepted by the supreme authority on Old English, Professor Sievers of Leipzig.<sup>24</sup> It is not beyond the reach of the long arm of coincidence that a *Wihtgar* should have ruled in Wight.

<sup>17</sup> German forms are given in Förstemann, i. 885.

<sup>18</sup> Sub ann. 661.

<sup>19</sup> The *Wihitgara* of the tribal hidage (*Cart. Sax.* i. 414) may be thought to refer to Wight. But the hidage is only half that of Wight as given by Bede, and the list seems to relate to non-West-Saxon districts. Cf. Maitland, *Domesday and Beyond*, p. 507, note. It is possibly a mistake of the copyist for *Wihitgaga*, since it precedes *Now gaga* and *Oht gaga*. From its position in the list it should be somewhere near the Chilterns.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. Much, in Paul, Braune, and Sievers, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur*, xvii. 30. An early instance of the stem is the *Victi-marius* of a Rhenish inscription, which has been claimed erroneously as Celtic. Cf. W. Reeb, *Germanische Namen auf rheinischen Inschriften*, Mainz, 1895, p. 42. It has also been suggested that *Wight* in Germanic names may be the unrecorded cognate of the Welsh *gweith*, 'battle,' from an older *wect*.

<sup>21</sup> In the Epinal Glossary the compound *ast-garu* for the later *at-gār* occurs thrice (ed. Sweet, *Oldest English Texts*, 440, 839, 922). On this very archaic form see Sievers, *Beiträge*, ix. 273.

<sup>22</sup> This has been already remarked by Sievers, *l. c.*

<sup>23</sup> *Taalkundige Bijdrage*, ii. 272.

<sup>24</sup> *Angeldächsische Grammatik*, ed. 2, 1886, ed. 3, 1898, § 273, note 2.



If the *Winta* of the Lindsey pedigree had been connected with Hampshire, we should have been told that he had been manufactured out of *Wintan-ceaster*, the Latin *Venta*.

There are other philological proofs that the annals rest upon a written basis older than the time of Edward the Elder. The West-Saxon genealogies retain traces of eighth-century orthography, and Professor Napier has referred them to an original written before 750.<sup>25</sup> The genealogies are a separate work from the 'Chronicle,' and it may therefore be contended that the latter is really a forgery of the tenth century. But here, again, we have philological evidence that cannot be reconciled with Sir Henry Howorth's theory. The scribes of the 'Chronicle' fortunately copied carefully many of the old written forms. Hence we get, in addition to this old genitive *Wiltgara*, such forms as *Giwis*, the *gi* of which must go back to the early part of the eighth century at the latest,<sup>26</sup> since by that date it had assumed its later form of *ge*. Another proof of early origin is the use of *leag* in *Andredes-leag* and no doubt in *Cerdices-leag*, *Natan-leag*, and *Fethun-leag*, in the sense of 'wood,' for by the latter part of the eighth century this word had acquired the sense of 'field.'<sup>27</sup> We know from its continental Germanic cognates that it must once have meant 'wood,' a conclusion supported by its Latin cognate *lucos*, older *lonkos*. Unless the *leaga* of *Andredes-leaga* in 508 and *Cerdices-leaga* of 527 is latinised, which is unlikely,<sup>28</sup> they must represent the dative singular, used as a nominative, of a *u*-stem. By Alfred's time the dative singular was *leage*.

The theory that the early annals are partly founded upon songs is supported by the fact that there are distinct traces of a metrical origin.<sup>29</sup> It would indeed be strange if the English had no lays relating to the conquest when they had poems concerning the conquests of Goth and Lombard, their own fights with the Danes before the migration from Germany, and so much of the early history of Sweden as is preserved in *Browulf*. This work, which was committed to writing about the year 1000, preserves a wonderfully accurate account of a Scandinavian inroad into Holland that occurred, according to Gregory of Tours,<sup>30</sup> between the years 512 and 528. The interval between the event and the committing of the song to writing is greater than we should have to assume in the instance

<sup>25</sup> *Modern Language Notes*, xii. p. 110.

<sup>26</sup> In the Epinal Glossary, which represents a seventh-century work, the *gi* form is the most common, but the later *ge* occurs (Ferdinand Dieter, *Ueber Sprache und Mundart der ältesten englischen Denkmäler*, Göttingen, 1885, § 29).

<sup>27</sup> Thus, in a contemporary charter of 805, 'campus armentorum, id est hriðra leah' occurs (*Cart. Sax.* i. 450).

<sup>28</sup> In the O.-E. Latin charters and writings the names are very seldom latinised.

<sup>29</sup> Sweet, *Englische Studien*, ii. 310, has shown that the annal of 475 preserves fragments of an alliterative poem in 'unarimedico herereaf,' and in 'flugon þa Engle swa fyr,' and that the annals of 457, 491, and 501 also seem to have a metrical basis.

<sup>30</sup> *Historia Francorum*, iii. c. 3, where it is assigned to c. 515 by Arndt.

of the 'Chronicle.' The disappearance of the songs need create no difficulty, for few of the old lays were ever written down, and few of those that were thus favoured have come down to us. We should have had no trace of the fine lay of Maldon if it had not been for the energy of Thomas Hearne. As late as the fourteenth century, the English peasants were still acquainted with the story of a hero of North Germanic song of whom we would fain know more, the god or demi-god *Ing*,<sup>31</sup> the 'Stammvater' of the *Ingæ-vones*, the great confederacy to which the ancestors of Saxon and Angle belonged in the first century of our era.

Sir Henry Howorth bases an argument against the authenticity of the early West-Saxon annals upon the fact that Beda derived information relating to Wessex from Bishop Daniel of Winchester, and that he does not mention the battles of Cerdices-ford and Cerdices-leag and knows nothing of Cerdic and Cynric. This argument loses sight of the nature of Beda's work, which is almost exclusively ecclesiastical in its interests. It is no mere inference that the information supplied by Daniel was ecclesiastical only, but an express statement of Beda.<sup>32</sup> This writer had little concern with the details of the foundation of the English kingdoms. All that he tells us is that Hengist and Horsa were the leaders of the first band of invaders, *ut perhibentur*. As he says nothing of the conquest of his own land of Northumbria, it is unreasonable to expect him to record that of distant Wessex. His 'perhibentur' in reference to Hengist and Horsa and their pedigree given by him suggests that he had before him materials of a similar nature to those that seem to have formed the basis of the early West-Saxon annals.

The non-appearance of the West-Saxon genealogy in Nennius does not compel us to conclude that it is a forgery of the tenth century. The pedigrees copied into this work were derived from a compilation that was taken up to about 750,<sup>33</sup> and we have philological evidence that the West-Saxon pedigree must have been committed to writing at or before that time. We have an older copy of the Northumbrian collection of royal pedigrees that were copied into the 'Historia Brittonum.'<sup>34</sup> As some of the pedigrees end in

<sup>31</sup> Robert of Brunne, *Chronicle*, fo. 85:

Bot of Inge sauh I never nouht  
In boke writen ne wrouht,  
But lewed men thereof crië  
And maynten that ilke lie.

*Cf. Binz, Zeugnisse zur germanischen Sage in England*, in Paul, Braune, and Sievers, *Beiträge*, xx. 151.

<sup>32</sup> *Praefatio to Hist. Eocl.*: 'Sed et Danihel, reverentissimus Occidentalium Saxonum episcopus, qui nunc usque superest, nonnulla mihi de historia ecclesiastica provinciae ipsius . . . litteris mandata declaravit.'

<sup>33</sup> Zimmer, *Nennius Vindicatus*, 78 sqq.; Thurneysen, *Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie*, xxviii. 101.

<sup>34</sup> Printed in Sweet's *Oldest English Texts*, p. 169. This was written before 814.



about 680,<sup>35</sup> it is evident that the nucleus of the work goes back to that period. Beda mentions the keeping of lists of kings in Northumbria in the seventh century in words that may possibly refer to some date near 684.<sup>36</sup> The Northumbrian collection includes the Anglian and Jutish kings only. None of the Saxon kings are inserted. If it were not for the appearance of Mercia<sup>37</sup> in it, we might assume that the kings of Wessex, Essex, and Sussex were omitted because they were pagan when it was drawn up, and were therefore like the two kings mentioned by Beda, left out of 'the catalogue of Christian kings.' These three kingdoms were still pagan in 690.

Sir Henry Howorth repeats Kemble's objection to the 'Chronicle' account that Cerdic is made to die forty years after his arrival, and that Cynric, who is described as joint leader upon their arrival in Britain, reigned twenty-six years after Cerdic's death. This is branded by Sir Henry Howorth as 'outrageous,' but it cannot be said to be impossible. The 'Chronicle' speaks of King Alfred as joint leader with his brother at the age of nineteen, and the reader of sagas must recollect how frequently the hero acts as a leader at an earlier age than this. We may also think of the early age at which the sons of the duke of York are leaders in battles during the Wars of the Roses. Cynric might well have lived to eighty-six, and thus have been twenty at the time of his arrival in Britain. Æthelberht of Kent reigned fifty-six years, according to Beda, while Penda of Mercia succeeded to the throne at the age of fifty and reigned thirty years afterwards. Moreover, the genealogies say that Cerdic reigned sixteen years, and that his reign commenced six years after his arrival, which they place in 494. Thus his death would be in 516, or 517 if we adopt the date of the landing given by the 'Chronicle.' The latter work tells us that Cerdic and Cynric began to reign in 519, and that Cerdic died in 534. Several of the texts of the genealogies insert a Crioda between Cerdic and Cynric, and this would seem to have been the reading of the archetype.<sup>38</sup> It is evident that there has been some confusion of Cerdic and Crioda.<sup>39</sup> Possibly they have been wrongly identified through the similarity between the forms *Cerdic* (or *Ceordic*?) and *Creoda*, and the resemblance of the eighth century *u* to *ac*. It is therefore possible that the entry in the 'Chronicle' under 519 may mean that Crioda, not Cerdic, and Cynric began to reign, and that it was Crioda, not Cerdic, who died in 534. In that case the duration of Crioda's reign would afford another reason for confusing him with Cerdic.

<sup>35</sup> Zimmer fixes the date as 685-6 (p. 78).

<sup>36</sup> *H. E.* iii. cc. 1, 9.

<sup>37</sup> Zimmer and Thurneysen (p. 85, note 4) regard the Mercian pedigrees as interpolated.

<sup>38</sup> Napier, l. c.

<sup>39</sup> The names are distinct, even if *Cerdic* be regarded as a metathesis of *Credic*, for *Crioda* appears in the Mercian pedigree and in local names.

A further objection raised by Sir Henry Howorth is that he has always been puzzled to know where the Saxons can have come from at the end of the fifth century, since 'their raids were a thing of the past in the year 500,' and he is struck by the singularity of their landing so far west as Charmouth<sup>40</sup> in Dorset. The former is a difficulty that historians have not generally felt. We have the evidence of Apollinaris Sidonius that the Saxons were still active on the coasts of Aremorica at a time when Cerdic might have participated in their raids.<sup>41</sup> I am tempted to throw out the suggestion that the settlements on the south coast of Britain were a result of the power of Clovis reaching the east coast of Gaul, and thus diverting the attempts of the Saxons to settle in Gaul to Britain.<sup>42</sup> The attack upon Angers in 463 by the Saxons under Eadwæccer (*Adovacrius*)<sup>43</sup> seems to have been an attempt at settlement.<sup>44</sup> It is evident that the Saxons who did succeed in settling in Picardy and Flanders were own brothers of the Saxons who conquered Britain.<sup>45</sup> But there is surely no difficulty about

\* There is no ground for saying that the landing was at Charmouth, except the unsatisfactory suggestion that 'the mouth of the river Char,' formerly Chard, is identical with 'Cerdic's shore.'

<sup>40</sup> *Carmm.* vii. 369, ed. Krusch, *Auctt. Antiquissimi, VIII. (Mon. Hist. Germ.)*:

Quin et Aremoricus piratam Saxona [accus. sing.] tractus  
Sperabat, cui pelle salum sulcare Britannum  
Ludus et assuto glaucum mare findere lembo.

The 'Tractus Aremoricanus' of the *Notitia Dignitatum Occident.* 37 embraced more than the coast of Brittany, and included part of the Litus Saxonicum of Gaul. Sidonius also records an arrival of Saxon freebooters near Saintes (*Epist.* viii. 6, §18), and, in exile at Bordeaux after 475, he mentions the presence of Saxons and of Herule pirates (*Ep.* viii. 9). This attack on Saintes by Saxons, who landed at Marsas (Gironde), is mentioned in the Life of St. Bibianus or Vivianus, bishop of Saintes, in *Scriptt. Rerum Merovingicarum* (*M. H. G.*), iii. 98.

<sup>41</sup> Müllenhoff, *Beowulf*, p. 62, has suggested that the West-Saxons crossed the English Channel from Gaul, thus explaining Cerdic and Port bearing what are assumed to be British and Roman names.

<sup>42</sup> Gregory of Tours, ii. 18, 19.

<sup>43</sup> Felix Dahn, *Urgeschichte der germanischen und romanischen Völker*, iii. 48, thinks these Saxons were seeking a home, as others were doing in Britain. In 468 their islands at the mouth of the Loire were captured by the Franks, with whom their leader afterwards made peace. There were still Saxons on the Loire in the middle of the sixth century, for Venantius Fortunatus refers to their boats on the Loire about 579 (*Carm.* iii. 4, sec. 9: 'te mihi Canobo, Cherucis adcersientibus myoparonem prepetem . . . tutus . . . exiissem'). This reference to them as Cheru(s)ci is, no doubt, a learned affectation, like the application of Sigambri to the Franks, Getæ to the Goths, &c., and does not prove that they were Saxons from the south of the Elbe, still calling themselves Cherucis, as Dahn, iv. 176, holds. Zeuss, *Die Deutschen und die Nachbarstämme*, p. 384, believed 'Cherucis' to be miscopied for 'Chaucis.'

<sup>44</sup> They have left on record local names of a peculiarly English complexion, such as *Diorwaldingatun*. See upon these names Waitz, *Das alte Recht der salischen Franken*, Kiel, 1846, p. 53 sqq. It is noteworthy that there are traces of the settlement of Sweves in Picardy (*ibid.* p. 56), who are twice named as allied with the Angles of the continent in the lay of Widsith. Cf. also the *Χουῆβαι*: *Ἀγγεῖλοι* of Ptolemy, ii. 11. In the eighth century the 'Nordosquavi' (North Sveves) are called Saxons (*Annales Mettenss*, Pertz, *Scriptt.* i. 390; Zeuss, p. 364).

the Saxons coming all the way from the Elbe to Hampshire or Dorset. Such a voyage would be no more difficult than to the mouth of the Loire, where the Saxons had occupied the islands before the settlement of Wessex.<sup>46</sup>

There remains one more objection of Sir Henry Howorth's to deal with. This is that Hampshire cannot have been part of the original West-Saxon land, because it was settled by Jutes and not by Saxons. He even claims to have found the name of these Jutes in the Meon-ware, who were, however, merely the dwellers by the river Meon, and have no more connexion with the rest of Hampshire than they have with the surname *Mainwaring*. All that we know about the Jutes of Hampshire is that they occupied the parts facing the Isle of Wight, and that the river Hamble was in their district.<sup>47</sup> There is no evidence that they ever formed a separate state from Wessex, they left no trace of their language in the West-Saxon of Hampshire, and their name soon faded out of memory.<sup>48</sup> The 'Chronicle' treats the Isle of Wight as a conquest of the West-Saxons, which was handed over to Cerdic's 'nephews,' who are regarded as bringing reinforcements to him. It can hardly be maintained that this is improbable. Cerdic may have had grandsons or nephews who were Jutes by race, and who may have brought a detachment of their folk to his assistance. Similar instances of co-operation are not unknown in the history of the Germanic invasions of other portions of the empire. Moreover, the Jutes were most closely connected with the Saxons.<sup>49</sup>

<sup>46</sup> See above, note 44.

<sup>47</sup> Bede, *H. E.* i. 15; iv. 14.

<sup>48</sup> This is proved by the *Chronicle* not mentioning the Jutes, except in the later addition under 449 from Bede, and by its regarding the Jutes of Wight as West Saxons. The translation of Bede ascribed to King Alfred calls the Jutes 'Geatas' (i. 12 = 15), which is the English form of the *Gautar*, whose name is preserved in *Beowulf* and in the Swedish province of Götland; while Æthelweard confuses them with the Danish Jutes (Old Norse *Iotar*, O. E. (*geotas*)). If Bede's form *Iutae*, *Iuti*, means that their name began with a diphthong and not with a semi-vowel, the name must represent an older *Euti-*, since *iu* only occurs in West-Germanic when it preceded an *i* (Sievers, *Beiträge*, xviii. 411). The normal West-Saxon development of this would be *ÿete*, later *ÿte*, and this form seems to be recorded in the dat. pl. *ÿtum* of the Widsith lay, line 26. In Old English ethnic names were frequently declined as *i*-stems with a weak gen. pl.: e.g. *Seaxe*, gen. pl. *Searna*, so that we get a West-Saxon gen. pl. *ÿtenu*, which occurs in the eleventh century C.C.C. MS. of the translation of Bede, iv. 16. This may possibly be represented by *ÿtenu*, which Florence of Worcester records as the English name of the New Forest (sub an. 1100: 'in Nova Foresta, quae lingua Anglorum ÿtenu nuncupatur'). The form *Eota-land* of the other MSS. of the translation of Bede, iv. 16, is Anglian, and suggests a nom. pl. *Eotas*, corresponding to a West-Saxon *Ietas*, *ÿtas*, and to the Northumbrian *Iutas* that seems to be recorded in Bede's latinised *Iutae*, *Iuti*. As this translation calls them *Geatas* in book i., it is probable that the *Eota* of book iv. is merely a modernisation of Bede's form, and not a form with which the translator was familiar.

<sup>49</sup> They are joined with the Saxons in the letter of King Theodebert to Justinian, 584-547 (*Mon. Hist. Germ.*, *Epp.* iii. 183), in which he informs the emperor of the provinces in which he dwells and of the people who have submitted to him. After

Sir Henry Howorth, having thus eliminated Hampshire from the original Wessex, disposes of Dorset, Wilts, and Somerset on the ground that the word *sæte* in the Old English forms of their names means that their inhabitants were 'colonists and others planted on British ground.' It is true that the word is connected with the verb 'sit,' but in compounds it is the exact equivalent of *ware*, and means simply 'dwellers.' Thus the *Wihthware*, the folk of Wight, are called '*Wihthsætan*' in the translation of Beda's history ascribed to King Alfred.<sup>50</sup> It is a baseless guess of Green's that *sæte* meant 'settler' or 'colonist.'<sup>51</sup>

These three shires and Hampshire having been cut off from Wessex, there only remain Berkshire and the counties that are recorded as later conquests. Berkshire must therefore, according to Sir Henry Howorth, be the nucleus of Wessex. He then asserts that Dorchester in Oxfordshire was the original capital of Wessex, simply because it was the see of the first bishop of the West-Saxons.

mentioning the conquest of the Thuringians, the voluntary submission of the Norsevi, probably the Sweves who are connected with the Angles (see above, note 45), and the Thuringians, the Wisigoths of south Gaul, he proceeds: 'Pannoniam, cum Saxonibus Euciiis [for Eutiis?], qui se nobis voluntate propria tradiderunt; per Danubium et limitem Pannoniæ usque in oceani littoribus, custodiendo Deo, dominatio nostra porrigetur.' The mention of Pannonia presents a difficulty. Zeuss, *Die Deutschen*, p. 357, proposed to emend it to *Aquitanium*, but *Britanniam*, which is omitted, may be intended. These Eutian Saxons, or Saxons and Eutii, might in that case be the inhabitants of the Saxon settlements in Picardy, or the Saxons of Bayeux. If they could be connected with the district of the North Suevi, who Zeuss, p. 364, thought must be Frisians, we should have the curious result that, in a district where the Suevi are recorded, where there was a Frisonfeld, and in the vicinity of the Thuringians, amongst whom some Anglii are mentioned, there was a tribe of Eutii, whose name seems to be identical with that of the conquerors of Kent, whose language was nearer to Frisian than to any other continental Germanic. It would thus seem that the Eutii and Iutæ were Frisians, the latter being the *ϕισσορες* who are described by Procopius as settled in Britain with the *Ἀγγίλοι*. Nor must it be forgotten that at Merseburg, in the neighbourhood of Frisonfeld, traces of a language even nearer to English than Frisian have been found; so near, in fact, that it has been christened 'Continental English.' The Jutes (*Euthiones*) are again mentioned in connexion with the Saxons by Venantius Fortunatus (*Carm.* ix. 1, 78, ed. Leo, *Auct. Antiqq.* iv. 1, *M. H. G.*), writing about 580:

Quem [sc. Chilpericum] Geta, Vasco tremunt, Danus, Euthio, Saxo,  
Britannus,

Cum patre quos acie te domitasse patet.

Terror es extremis Fresonibus atque Suebis,

Qui neque bella parant, sed tua frena rogant.

Omnibus his datus est timor illo iudice campo,

Et terrore novo factus es altus amor.

Of the races named in the first line the Danes and the Euthiones are the only two who are not recorded as dwelling in Gaul at this time, and it is therefore possible that they and the Saxons were settlers within the Frankish empire. But in *Carm.* vii. 7, 50 Venantius refers to a defeat of the Saxons and Danes by Duke Lupus near the river Bordau in Friesland. Cf. Ten Brink, *Beowulf*, p. 207.

<sup>50</sup> Lib. i. c. 12 (= 15).

<sup>51</sup> A continental Saxon analogy may help to make this plain. The name of Holstein is a corruption of *Holt-sati*, and meant, as Adam of Bremen says, the 'dwellers in the wood,' in contrast to the inhabitants of the marsh recorded in Ditmarsh.

It preceded Winchester by less than a score of years. This is a somewhat slender basis for the conclusion that it was the capital. It might be the bishop's see without being the capital. The Mercian bishopric was at Lichfield, which has no claim to be regarded as the capital. That title belongs to Tamworth if to any place. But why should it be assumed that the early West-Saxon kings had a capital? Kings do not usually give away their capitals *en bloc*, yet we read in Beda that king Cynegils of Wessex and king Oswald of Northumbria gave to Birinus the city called 'Dorcic' in order that he might make therein a bishop's see.<sup>52</sup> Thus Dorchester was given jointly by the two kings, and was probably purchased jointly by them. In all probability it was then, like most of the Roman cities, a 'waste chester,' a memorial of the devastating march of the English conquerors. This is supported by the fact that the 'Chronicle' records under 571—Sir Henry Howorth's condemnation of this work does not extend beyond 560—that Cuthwulf of Wessex captured, after a fight with the Britons, Bensington, Eynsham, Aylesbury, and *Lygeanburh* (at or near Luton). There is no mention of Dorchester, but this must be the date when it was conquered by the West-Saxons. Bensington is four miles only from Dorchester.

This annal of 571 is fatal to Sir Henry Howorth's theory, unless he condemn it as another fabrication or unless he maintain that his imaginary landing of the West-Saxons at Dorchester took place in or immediately before that year. We have evidence that rules out of court the latter contention in the history of the settlement of Armerica by the Britons, evidence that supports in a very remarkable way the account of the foundation of Wessex contained in the 'Chronicle' and even justifies the dates. M. Loth<sup>53</sup> has recently examined the early history of this settlement, and he comes to the conclusion that the Breton and the Welsh traditions that the migration was caused by the attacks of the Saxons is correct, and that the West-Saxons had more to do with the migration than any of the other invaders of Britain. From the language of the Bretons it is plain that most of them came from the Dumnonii and Cornovii of Britain, and, indeed, the names of these tribes were applied to the kingdoms founded by them in Armerica. As late as the twelfth century their language was, according to the competent observer Giraldus Cambrensis, intelligible to men of Cornwall but not to Welshmen. As M. Loth says, there is no question of Bretons in Armerica in the fifth century; in the middle of the sixth they are masters of the greater part of

<sup>52</sup> *Hist. Eccl.* iii. 7.

<sup>53</sup> J. Loth, *L'Émigration bretonne en Armorique du V<sup>e</sup> au VII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, Paris, 1883. The results are confirmed by Arthur de la Borderie, *Histoire de Bretagne: I. Les trois vies anciennes de Saint Tudual*, Paris, 1887, p. 57 sqq. Reference may also be made to Mr. Egerton Phillimore's notes in *Y Cymmrodor*, xi. 61.

the peninsula.<sup>54</sup> The principal saints are said to arrive from Britain in the early part of the sixth century; <sup>55</sup> all the saints of that century with the exception of six are said to be immigrants from Britain or the sons of immigrants.<sup>56</sup> An ancient genealogy of the dukes or kings of Domnonée, which goes back at least as far as the ninth century, states that Riual, the first of them, came from Britain in the reign of Clothair, and the *Chronicum Britannicum* dates the first coming of the Britons into Aremorica in the same reign (511-560).<sup>57</sup> This migration attracted the notice of Procopius, who, however, makes the Angles and Frisians of Britain participate in it.<sup>58</sup> It is probable that this information reached him through the embassy of Theodebert, king of Austrasia, to Byzantium between 534 and 547,<sup>59</sup> to which the Frankish king had attached some Angles to make believe that he exercised supremacy over Britain.<sup>60</sup> Gildas, who, according to the Breton Life, was one of these immigrants, records the migration of the Britons in consequence of the Saxon invasion.<sup>61</sup>

We have thus evidence of independent origin that about the time when the West-Saxons were occupying, according to the 'Chronicle,' the south-west of England, the Dumnonii, the inhabitants of that district, were fleeing to Aremorica. Such a displacement of the population might be reconciled with Sir Henry Howorth's theory by the assumption that the hypothetical arrival of the founders of Wessex at Dorchester in Oxfordshire occurred some fifty years or so before the date assigned by the 'Chronicle' for the arrival of Cerdic. The date can hardly be projected further backwards than this, and the period seems too short for the conquest of the district between Dorchester and Dumnonia when we consider how slow the Saxon conquest was and that we have to allow for the rolling back of the advance by the great defeat of Mons Badonicus, which seems to have been in Dumnonia. If, as M. Loth suggests,<sup>62</sup> they had during their raids crossed Dumnonia, their defeat must have retarded their advance for a considerable period. It is also evident that the 'Chronicle' does not mention this great defeat, and it must also omit many other battles. The account is manifestly imperfect. That is a character it must necessarily bear if it is founded upon song or tradition. It is not

<sup>54</sup> P. 93.<sup>55</sup> P. 159.<sup>56</sup> P. 163.<sup>57</sup> De la Borderie, p. 58; Loth, p. 159.<sup>58</sup> *Bellum Gothicum*, iv. 20; Loth, p. 169. Zeuss, *Die Deutschen*, p. 492, note \*\*, had already referred this passage to the emigration of the Britons.<sup>59</sup> Loth dates it between 534 and 539, referring to Gregory of Tours, *Miracula*, i. 31 (read 30), which, however, gives only the king's reign.<sup>60</sup> Procopius, *l. c.*<sup>61</sup> *De Excidio*, c. 25.<sup>62</sup> P. 166. It is possible that Gildas, c. 24, refers to Dumnonia when he speaks of the Saxons reaching the Western ocean.



until 568 that the 'Chronicle' records any advance of the West-Saxons eastwards of their reputed landing-place. This is another feature in which it harmonises with the history recorded in the settlement of Brittany.

In place of the history told by the 'Chronicle,' and thus supported, Sir Henry Howorth asks us to accept a purely hypothetical scheme, whose only approach to anything like evidence is the bare fact that the first West-Saxon bishopric was at Dorchester in Oxfordshire; which makes the almost universally rejected assumption that the *Litus Saxonicum* of Britain was inhabited by Saxons, necessarily before the end of the fourth century;<sup>63</sup> which further assumes that the descendants of these Saxon settlers, who, we are told, had become good Roman citizens, suddenly drop their civilisation, revert to ships, sail up the Thames, and found Wessex, without receiving any addition to their numbers, since there were no Saxon rovers on the sea at the time; and finally supposes that these Roman citizens, who must have been Christians, revert to their pagan name of Saxon and found a pagan state, whose inhabitants showed great acquaintance with the gods and demons of Germanic religion.<sup>64</sup> The difficulties involved in the traditional account of the foundation of Wessex are small in comparison with those into which this imaginary history of Sir Henry Howorth would lead us.

In conclusion, I may state that I do not claim that the 'Chronicle' account is to be absolutely trusted, but that it is not so hopelessly absurd as Sir Henry Howorth would have us believe, and that, whatever its defects, it is not a figment of the early tenth century. Through the mists of song and tradition we may, I think, claim that we can discern the blurred outlines of real events. As the whole of the annals in question might be written on a single sheet of paper, any attempt to vindicate them must necessarily resemble Herder's scientific work as characterised by a brilliant countryman: *mehr Anregungen als Resultate, mehr Fragen als Antworten; kühne Hypothesen, wenig Beweis.*<sup>65</sup>

W. H. STEVENSON.

<sup>63</sup> If the two *Litora Saxonica* derived their names from a Saxon population, that population must have been settled thereon for some time before the composition of the *Notitia*, for a new settlement would not at once be recorded in the official denomination.

<sup>64</sup> No part of England has preserved so many traces of Germanic myth and sagas as Wessex, and Wilts would seem to have been a great centre of Germanic paganism.

<sup>65</sup> Scherer, *Geschichte der deutschen Literatur*, p. 478.